



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

A Tale Of Two Systems: Why Indias Approach To Social Justice Excels

NAME: MELANIE VEERA SALDANHA

COURSE: B.B.A L.L. B (Hons)

COURSE CODE: TLAW207L

COURSE INSTRUCTOR: Mr. Arun D Raj, Assistant Professor

Abstract

Around the world, differences in race have severe implications for socioeconomic status and politics. This essay analyses the case of racial inequalities in India and the US and argues that India's reservation policy is more effective in mitigating social injustice. Discrimination based on caste is an age-old issue in India. The government has instituted a legally mandated quota system for the Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs) and Other Backward Classes (OBCs). Unlike American policy, India's system provides guaranteed quotas in politics, employment, and education which enhances representation and helps marginalized sections to move up the social ladder. A comparison analysis reveals that while India has a legally guaranteed proactive reservation policy, the United States has a passive strategy that is open to judicial review and capricious enforcement. Both systems have their flaws, yet India's has been more effective in narrowing the socio-economic gaps. The analysis shows that India's reservation system fills the gaps of social mobility and historical injustices more efficiently than other systems. While other countries including the US have some issues, they could learn a great deal from India regarding socially just legislation. It can gain insights from India's unique way of formulating socially equitable legislation. The United States might incorporate certain features of India's approach to implement more definitive changes in providing greater equity to racial minorities. This research contributes toward social justice issues by evaluating different mechanisms and their effectiveness in reducing systematic discrimination.

Introduction

2.1 Background

In contemporary societies, issues of inequality are so deeply embedded in politics, economics, and society. These imbalances are not coincidental; they are the product of centuries of hierarchies that have long privileged some groups over others on the basis of inherent traits such as race, caste, ethnicity, or birth. The issue of how to minimize these disparities—through policy, law, or social movements—has been of concern to governments, scholars, and activists for decades.

The most visible and most persistent Indian social order is the caste system, an ancient system of social stratification which divided society into rigid hereditary castes. While the "untouchability" and discrimination based on caste were constitutionally abolished by Article 17 of the Indian Constitution, the

caste remains a pervasive influence in social, economic, and political life. The lower castes—primarily the Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), and Other Backward Classes (OBCs)—were denied education, property rights, temple entry, and equal employment for centuries. This centuries-old exploitation gave a very unequal basis in the socio-economic race.

To rectify these systemic distortions, India had one of the world's most sophisticated affirmative action programs in the guise of its reservation policy. The policy gives a proportionate number of seats to SCs, STs, and OBCs in government service, schools, and legislatures. The Indian Constitution and judicial rulings make the system of reservation constitutionally entrenched and politically established, and thus it has been a pillar of India's social justice policy.

In the meanwhile, the United States is already facing another such difficult problem of racial injustice. The history of African American slavery, segregation, and institutionalized racism has put an indelible stamp on the country's society. Despite the civil rights movement of the 1960s, when it yielded dramatic legislation like the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, ongoing disparities persist. African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans are still subject to disparity in wages, education, housing, and the criminal justice system.

Affirmative action in the US grew as a policy reaction to those earlier inequities. Initiated in the first place through executive orders issued by the administrations of the Kennedys and Johnson, affirmative action aimed at granting equal opportunity to education and employment for the minority populations. Though other than India's legally mandated quotas, however, US affirmative action has relied to this point in the main upon judicial rulings and voluntary initiative. Affirmative action has been the cause of inflammatory political and legal debate across the decades with courts regularly placing a brake upon its implementation in the name of defending "meritocracy" or to preclude "reverse discrimination."

The contrast between America and India tests the value of various models of social justice. Both nations desire an equal society, yet they possess dissimilar histories, political ideologies, and legal frameworks. India's reservation system is functioning, constitutionally approved, and politically endorsed, whereas the American model responds to circumstances, is less centred, and is subject to modification by court rulings. A comparison of the two systems side by side is a rare opportunity to contrast how various democracies deal with the problem of historical injustice. It provides researchers and policymakers an opportunity not only to contrast the technical design of social justice institutions, but to analyse their long-term impact on society. It also poses a more general question about the state: Is the state to provide only equal opportunity, or is it to intervene actively to redistribute power and resources to correct embedded imbalances? In an era in which the world is becoming increasingly preoccupied with equity and inclusion, India and the United States offer lessons that can be applied everywhere. As countries grapple with managing increasing diversity and embedded inequities, lessons from the two systems teach us what works, what does not, and why.

2.2 Objective

This research attempts to compare and contrast two primary mechanisms of fighting social injustice: India's system of reservation and the United States' affirmative action programs. These mechanisms were instituted to reverse centuries of imbalances—caste in India, race in the U.S.—which continue to influence access to power, education, and economic opportunities. While both mechanisms are designed to assist disadvantaged groups, they are quite distinct in conception, legal foundation, political application, and public perception. To ascertain how effective they are and how they might be enhanced, particularly as demands for social justice escalate globally, these distinctions need to be appreciated.

The central objective of this research is to demonstrate that India's reservation policy is a superior, safer, and more beneficial method to correct historical injustices compared to the American model of affirmative action. It posits that India's quota system ensures access and representation for the disadvantaged in

significant spheres such as education, employment, and politics. The U.S. model, on the other hand, is frequently stunted by court challenges, popular resistance, and ambiguous assurances by institutions.

In order to accomplish this, the study enumerates some corresponding objectives:

Historical and Legal Contextualization

Think about where caste discrimination in India and race discrimination in the U.S. come from historically, and think about the laws each country has put in place to correct these injustices.

Structural Comparison

Look at how both reservation and affirmative action mechanisms are created. This includes how they are applied, how they are implemented, and the legal support from the constitutions and court decisions.

Effectiveness in Practice

Evaluate the actual impact of these policies on historically marginalized groups, particularly in the areas of socio-economic mobility, access to quality education, and representation in government and public services.

Public and Political Discourse

Notice how people view these policies, for instance, complaints of reverse discrimination, political disagreements, and the fairness and merit narratives.

Policy Transferability and International Implications

Explain how lessons from India's vibrant reservation system could shape affirmative action and other fairness policies in other democracies, especially those with very acute social cleavages.

Scope of the Study

The study is primarily qualitative and comparative in scope. It is interested in the public education, work, and political representation policies—domains where institutional intervention has hitherto been most pronounced. Private sector inclusion policies, although important, fall outside the immediate remit of this study. The study is of India and America, and this helps to closely analyse two competing but important models. It doesn't try to universalize its observations to all affirmative action or social justice measures in the entire world, but it uses international ideas to illustrate useful lessons. The research covers events from the middle of the 20th century, when both countries started formal actions, to now. It includes important legal decisions, changes in policies, and social movements. This study is heavily oriented towards structure, impact, and flexibility. It aims to provide an academic critique and help with policies in ongoing debates about equity, justice, and institutional change.

Historical Context of Discrimination

Understanding the roots of systemic discrimination in India and America is central to comprehending the reasons why positive measures like reservation policies and affirmative action were embraced. These were not isolated actions—these took place as responses to centuries-long entrenched social hierarchies which excluded specific groups from full participation in society. This chapter explores the historical evolution of caste in India and race in America and how these legacies of domination define present realities.

3.1 Hierarchies of Caste in India

India's social life has always been dominated by the caste system—a rigid hereditary system which ruled over the life of the people for centuries. The system is intellectually derived from the Varna model explained in the ancient Hindu literature, in which society is divided into four broad rungs:

Brahmins (priests and scholars),

Kshatriyas (warriors and administrators),

Vaishyas (traders and merchants), and

Shudras (labourers and deliverers of service).

Outside of the system were the Avranas, or the "untouchables," who were later categorized as Scheduled Castes (SCs). These communities were compelled to engage in "impure" work, for example, manual scavenging, leather tanning, or handling the dead. These communities were increasingly subjected to untouchability, a severe social boycott whereby even physical contact or proximity was considered contaminating by the upper castes.

This stratification was not only social but was also institutionalized and spiritualized, effectively closing out large sections of the population from education, temples, land, and dignified professions.

Although the Varna system may have been an early abstract blueprint, it matured into the Jati system—a complex, localized system including thousands of caste-communities with their defined functions and restrictions. These groupings were often applied by way of religious dictums, traditional law, and subsequently colonial administrative orders, particularly by way of British colonialism that formalized casteness in census listings and work categorizations. Even following the legal abolition of untouchability by Article 17 of the Constitution, and the promise of equality by Article 15 and 16, caste still controls social interaction, access to goods and services, political representation, and even individual relationships such as marriage. The need to overturn these deep-rooted inequalities created the development of reservation policies for SCs, STs (Scheduled Tribes), and later OBCs (Other Backward Classes).

3.2 United States Racial Discrimination

The United States, although founded on liberty and equality values, has a bloody and extensive history of racial domination, particularly aimed at African Americans and Native people.

Its roots are found in chattel slavery, where millions of Africans were forcibly transported to the Americas and treated as property. Throughout the 17th century through the Civil War period, slavery was more than an economic system but a legal and social institution that delineated racial hierarchies in blunt terms. Even with official emancipation through the 1865 abolition of slavery by the 13th Amendment, African Americans were not granted genuine liberty. A brief Reconstruction (1865–1877) gave way to concerted resistance in the form of Jim Crow legislation that legally supported segregation on racial lines in public places, schools, transportation, and housing. Jim Crow was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in its 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson decision validating the ideology of "separate but equal."

In reality, segregation produced highly unequal access to quality healthcare, education, and employment. African Americans were disenfranchised on a regular basis through poll taxes, literacy tests, and violent intimidation. Lynchings, police violence, and economic marginalization became part of daily existence for Black communities, especially in the South. The civil rights movement of the 1950s and 60s, spearheaded by activists such as Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks, and Malcolm X, contested this regime. Landmark legislation like the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 worked to undermine legal segregation. The conclusion of de jure segregation did not result in de facto equality. Systemic racism still exists as mass incarceration, racial profiling, educational disparities, wealth disparities, and discrimination

in housing. Other groups of colour, Native Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans, as well, have faced discrimination, dispossession, and marginalization, but African Americans' long history of enslavement and officially sanctioned segregation imposes a peculiar centrality upon their case in American discussions of race and justice. Affirmative action programs were instituted to address this deep history, particularly in college and job access, but have met persistent political and judicial resistance.

3.3 Legacy of Marginalization and Social Hierarchies

The ancient Indian caste systems and the United States' race systems left indelible marks on the socio-economic lives of both nations. In both cases, oppression was not just the outcome of prejudice at a personal level but structural exclusion—codified into law, legitimized by religion or tradition, and passed down through generations.

In India, the imprint of caste discrimination is seen on many levels:

Education gap: SC and ST communities have historically experienced poorer literacy rates and limited access to elite educational institutions.

Economic inequality: Large amounts of unskilled and manual labor remain performed by SC and ST groups.

Social exclusion: Practices such as caste discriminations in housing, limited inter-caste marriages, and Dalit violence are still common.

Political underrepresentation: Despite reservation, the top castes remain overrepresented within bureaucracy and the judiciary.

In the United States as well, the history of slavery and segregation is well known:

Wealth disparities: The average white household possesses far more wealth than the average Black household, largely due to intergenerational privilege and discriminatory housing practices.

Access to education: While legal segregation is a thing of the past, school funding remains unequal due to property tax-based funding systems.

Incarceration: African Americans are imprisoned at significantly higher rates, for the same or similar offenses as white Americans.

Employment discrimination: Resume tests and field studies show that job applicants with "Black-sounding" names are less likely to be called for an interview.

What unites the two systems is the intergenerational nature of exclusion. Past injustices, which withheld capital—economic, educational, and social—entire communities were left generations behind. Social mobility in such a situation is not merely a question of individual effort; it requires structural correction. Hence, reservation and affirmative action policies are not just tools of compensation; they are instruments of democratic inclusion. They attempt to end the cycles of exclusion by offering a legal and institutional pathway towards equality. Even as the contexts are dissimilar, the moral duty remains the same: to create a society where one's birth does not determine one's fate.

The Reservation System in India

India's affirmative action system, better known as the reservation system, is likely the most inclusive and constitutionally rooted such worldwide mechanism to correct structural social inequality. It is grounded on a special historic, legal, and political situation conditioned by the nation's persistent caste culture. This chapter discusses the constitutional and legal basis of the policy of reservation, its practice in education,

employment, and politics, and its effect on traditionally disadvantaged groups like the Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), and Other Backward Classes (OBCs). It also discusses the consequences and limitations of the system.

4.1 Constitutional and Legal Foundations

The Indian reservation system is justified by the Constitution that was adopted in 1950 after India had gained independence from British rule. The country's founders, led by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, who was a Dalit and chief Constitution architect, wanted to have a legal system that would eradicate centuries of oppression based on caste.

A number of important articles form the foundation of the policy of reservation:

Article 15(4) and 15(5) empower the state to provide special treatment for the advancement of socially and educationally backward classes, such as SCs and STs, especially in educational institutions.

Article 16(4) permits the state to reserve appointment or posts in government service for backward classes that are not suitably represented in government employment.

Article 46 encourages the state to advance the educational and economic interests of SCs, STs, and other weaker sections of society.

Article 330 and 332 make provisions for reservation of seats in Lok Sabha (Lower House of Parliament) and State Legislative Assemblies for SCs and STs.

The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, and post-constitutional amendments strengthened still further the legal mandate of affirmative action. In *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India* in 1992, the Supreme Court revived the 27% reservation of OBCs but implemented a 50% ceiling as an overall requirement of reservations across the board, which is yet another landmark milestone in the judiciary of reservation.

4.2 Education Quotas, Employment, and Politics

Reservation policy is distributed over three broad categories:

Education

At the government schools, a fraction of seats are reserved for SCs (15%), STs (7.5%), and OBCs (27%). These are provided to admissions in central universities, IITs, IIMs, and state colleges. New enactments, such as the Right to Education Act, have included this provision for economically weaker section children in private schools as well. Employment

Reservations are followed in public sector jobs, such as central and state government, public sector enterprises, and educational institutions. SCs and STs were already enjoying reservations in jobs for many years, but OBCs were included in their ranks with the Mandal Commission's proposals in the 1990s. Policy of promotion for SCs and STs is followed in some services, although it is a controversial subject of law and policy.

Politics

Political representation is assured via reserved seats in State Assemblies and Lok Sabha. SCs and STs possess special constituencies where only election candidates belonging to such groups are entitled to contest polls. It ensured that oppressed people have a representation in law-making.

4.3 Impact on SCs, STs, and OBCs

Reservation policy has contributed immensely towards social mobility and inclusion of oppressed classes. For SCs, STs, and OBCs, reservations have provided them with improved education, job security, and political representation—chances denied by history.

Educational Mobility

Reservation in education at the higher level has resulted in a significant rise in the representation of SCs, STs, and OBCs within professional institutions and universities. This has given rise to a new generation of entrepreneurs, scholars, bureaucrats, and professionals belonging to historically disadvantaged communities.

Employment Opportunities

In the public sector, reservations have facilitated entry to secure and high-status employment. The presence of SC/ST/OBC officers in administrative services and public sector undertakings has produced symbolic as well as substantive outcomes, increasingly transforming institutional cultures and decision-making.

Political Empowerment

Reserved constituencies have made sure that the problems of SCs and STs come before legislative houses. This has created increased exposure and accountability and made way for focussed development policies and welfare schemes in backward pockets.

4.4 Outcomes and Challenges

India's system of reservations, despite its success, has several challenges and criticisms:

Creamy Layer Debate

Within the OBC category, the idea of the "creamy layer"—the economically more prosperous and no longer in need of affirmative action—has been controversial. Critics say that the advantages accrue to the already mobile, to the detriment of the genuinely disadvantaged.

Stigma and Discrimination

Admitted students and reserved-category employees are susceptible to stigma, inferiority perceptions, and relegation from peer groups. This psychological load prevents the complete actualization of their capacities and perpetuates social hierarchy.

Political Exploitation

Reservations have been politicized at times by political parties making political promises of reservation of quotas to other groups in order to gain votes. It has created social tensions and agitations like those of the Jats, Patels, and Marathas for being provided with OBC status.

Merit vs. Social Justice Debate

Its critics counter that it is anti-meritocracy. Others retort that real merit can never be ascertained if one overlooks the unequal basis of disparate groups. Social justice, they say, must precede formal equality.

Implementation Gaps

Under-implementation also exists. The reserved jobs in education and work usually remain vacant because there is no enabling infrastructure, there is no contact, or owing to resistance in institutions.

Affirmative Action in the United States

The United States, similar to India, has struggled with centuries-old institutions of social inequity, the most prominent being racial. Following two centuries of racial discrimination, more visibly against African Americans, the nation implemented affirmative action policies—a series of initiatives intended to expand access to education, jobs, and public resources for historically disadvantaged groups. But, unlike India's constitution-protected reservation system, affirmative action in the United States is executive driven, legally debated, and politically contentious. The chapter describes how the United States's affirmative action came into being, its legal and policy basis, the judiciary and civil rights movements' role, challenges to its implementation, and effect on socioeconomic mobility.

5.1 Legal and Policy Framework

Affirmative action in the United States was born after the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s. The federal government created affirmative action during President Kennedy's time. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy signed Executive Order 10925, which mandated federal contractors to take "affirmative action" to treat employees equally without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin.

This momentum was also gaining momentum under President Lyndon B. Johnson, when in 1965 he signed Executive Order 11246. The executive order not only told government contractors not to discriminate in hiring, but to promote diversity in hiring practices. This was complemented by such landmark acts as:

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, which made it illegal to discriminate in employment.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 that shielded minorities from disenfranchisement.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, which gave teeth to the enforcement provisions.

In the academic sphere, affirmative action gained prominence following the Bakke case (1978), the beginning of passionate judicial review of race-conscious policies.

5.2 Judiciary and Civil Rights Movements Role

The Judiciary has had a determinative and occasionally contradictory role in shaping affirmative action in the U.S. It has determined what is constitutionally acceptable, especially under the Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause.

Principal Cases:

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978): The Supreme Court found racial quotas on admission to higher education unconstitutional but permitted race to be used as one of several factors.

Gratz v. Bollinger (2003) and *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003): The cases reaffirmed the affirmative action principle but invalidated point systems that provided automatic preference for minorities.

Fisher v. University of Texas (2013, 2016): The Court held that race-conscious admissions policies are under strict scrutiny and must prove that no means other than those based on race would be effective in producing the same diversity.

Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard (2023): The Supreme Court invalidated racial consideration in university admissions, effectively eliminating race-conscious affirmative action at the college level.

Although legal rulings have limited the scope of affirmative action, civil rights activism continues to battle racial inequality in schools, workplaces, and law enforcement. Groups such as the NAACP, Urban League, and student and union groups on campus have battled for broader legislation. Affirmative action has continued to be the focal point of struggle for racial justice in U.S. public life.

5.3 Implementation and Limitations

In practice, affirmative action in the U.S. has taken varied forms across sectors:

Education:

Affirmative action was most notably practiced in college admissions, especially among top colleges. It was used to enhance campus diversity and make up for historical exclusion. Its usage, however, was uneven and mostly confined to top colleges and only benefited a minuscule minority of minority students.

Employment:

Federal and state governments created affirmative action employment programs, specifically for government workers and government contractors. The private sector was not regulated across the board, however, and compliance was extremely varied. Enforcement was given to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), but it had no jurisdiction.

Limitations:

Legal Susceptibility: Affirmative action has never been in court, threatened with overturn or limitation. The Supreme Court ruling of 2023 extensively deconstructed its presence on campuses.

Public Rejection: One part of the American public sees affirmative action as reverse discrimination against white and Asian American applicants. Some states—California, Michigan, Washington—are among a small number that passed ballot initiatives banning affirmative action.

Inconsistent Outcomes: Implementation was not consistent across institutions, and the policies sometimes lacked strong support measures such as mentoring or assistance, which guarantee long-term success.

5.4 Trends in Socioeconomic Mobility

Despite the shortcomings, affirmative action has brought modest but significant progress toward enhancing the life chances of excluded racial minorities, particularly African Americans, Native Americans, and Latinos.

Improvement in Education:

Increased access to higher education for minority populations in the 1970s and 80s was observed. African American college attendance doubled from 1970 to 1990. Elite universities, under affirmative action, admitted more heterogeneous classes of students, creating a Black middle class.

Employment Mobility

Affirmative action opened doors in government service, education, and corporate America. Minority representation in government, police forces, schools, and hospitals was substantially increased. Federal civil service was more racially integrated than much of the private sector.

Persistent Gaps:

Although all this has been accomplished, structural disparities remain:

Wealth Gap: The racial wealth gap remains extreme—Black families on average hold approximately one-tenth of the wealth of white families.

Residential Segregation: Access to good schools continues to be zip code based, entrenching racial and economic segregation.

Mass Incarceration: African Americans continue to be disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system, constricting socioeconomic mobility.

Educational Inequality: Abandonment of race-conscious admissions threatens to undo recent gains, particularly in wealthy higher education.

Comparative Analysis of the Two Systems

Affirmative action in the United States and India's reservation system both seek to reverse deeply ingrained social discrimination based on race and caste, respectively. Although both systems attempt to benefit historically disadvantaged groups through preferential access to education, jobs, and political opportunities, the system, enforceability, impact, and social perception of both systems are quite different. This chapter offers comparative analysis, based on their legal framework, implementation strategy, real impact, and public debate.

6.1 Structural and Strategic Differences

India's reservation system is structurally constitutionally sanctioned, whereas the U.S. affirmative action is policy-driven and evolved primarily from executive orders, judicial decisions, and institutional discretion.

India

India uses fixed quotas (15% for SCs, 7.5% for STs, and 27% for OBCs) in education, government employment, and politics. These quotas are applied across the board at the central and state levels, and there are institutional checks for monitoring and enforcement. The reservations are based on a group framework, with attention to community identity rather than individual disadvantage.

United States

Affirmative action in the United States is not numerically quota-based but race-conscious policy within a general diversity agenda. The policies are unevenly applied across institutions and states without a central mandate. The majority of affirmative action programs target individual merit plus race or background as among multiple factors.

Therefore, while India's model is proactive and prescriptive, that of the U.S. is reactive and interpretive, litigant and politically driven.

6.2 Political Will and Legal Enforceability

The political will and legal enforceability underpinning the two systems differ quite considerably, impacting policy effects' consistency and duration.

India

India's reservation policy is safeguarded by the Indian Constitution, specifically Articles 15, 16, 330, and 332. The safeguards have been extended through amendments and legislation over time—e.g., the 93rd Amendment permitted reservations in private schools. The judiciary has generally increased the legitimacy of reservations, though it added such checks as the 50% limit in the *Indra Sawhney* (1992) judgment.

Political will in India has largely favored expanding reservations because of vote bank politics. Reservations are used as a political tool by caste-based parties and regional coalitions, which, despite controversy, ensures that they continue.

United States

Conversely, affirmative action in America is not constitutionally enshrined. It remains subject to periodic judicial review, and courts have consistently held to limit or invalidate programs that seek to consider race. The *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard* (2023) case demonstrates the precarious legal footing on which affirmative action rests.

In addition, polarized public and political backing exist. Affirmative action has been prohibited by several U.S. states by referendum, and popularity at the national level declined. In general, legal susceptibility and polarized politics have compromised the effectiveness and scope of U.S. affirmative action.

6.3 Impacts on Representation, Education, and Employment

Though both models have tried to reverse historic disadvantages, their impacts differ in magnitude and effect.

Representation

India has achieved phenomenal progress in political representation of marginalized groups. SCs and STs have been given reserved seats in the Parliament and state legislatures to ensure their presence in law-making efforts. Although political representation does not constitute empowerment, it has enabled the groups to influence policy agendas.

In America, African Americans and other minorities have been represented by civil rights movements and voting rights acts but not reserved seats. Although there are influential leaders who have achieved the pinnacle, e.g., Barack Obama and Kamala Harris, disproportionate representation still exists—especially at the local and state levels.

Education

Reservations have greatly enhanced education access for SCs, STs, and OBCs in India. Public university student enrolment rates have risen, and elite institutions such as IITs and IIMs now have students of diverse backgrounds. Yet, gaps exist in outputs such as graduation rates and performance, partly owing to the absence of support mechanisms.

In the United States, affirmative action has helped put more minorities on the campuses of the country's most competitive colleges. Access still is restricted to a very limited number of students, particularly in the aftermath of the reversal of race-conscious programs. Community and less affluent state colleges educate a vast percentage of minority students, an indication of structural inequalities of the educational system.

Employment

Reservations have increased the inclusiveness of India's public sector. Marginalized groups entered the civil services and public enterprises. The private sector is exempted, however, although there are plans to have reservations applied there as well.

In the United States, affirmative action in employment—particularly in federal offices and government-contracting firms—has enhanced diversity. Minority representation is again largely limited to lower to middle ranks, institutional discrimination continuing through pay gaps, recruitment prejudices, and withholding promotion opportunities.

6.4 Public Perception and Resistance

Public debate on reservation and affirmative action policies also varies significantly on the basis of cultural, political, and historical realities.

India

Reservations in India provokes polarized views. Their defenders see them as necessary to social justice and equality after centuries of oppression on the basis of caste. Their opponents claim they lead to reverse discrimination, inefficiencies, and identity politics. Indignant at being left out, upper-caste groups demanding entry into reserved groups, like the Patidar and Maratha agitations, prove the strength and passion of the problem.

Despite the criticism, there is general political opinion to retain or expand reservations because to make them stricter would amount to seeking mass agitations and electioneering reactions.

United States

Meritocracy-vs-equity is how affirmative action in America is usually set out. It's usually thought to be demolishing individual merit, especially in admission to universities. Public sentiment has become aggressive, especially among whites and Asians who feel themselves underprivileged.

The failure of a solid political consensus, as well as judicial intervention, has been responsible for incremental weakening of race-based affirmative action, particularly in education. There is no mass movement of oppressed classes towards its extension or reform on such a scale unlike India.

Why Indias Model Excels

India's reservation policy is a singular policy worldwide as one of the most inclusive and institutionalized systems of social justice. Encouraged by constitutional ideals and motivated by political desire, the policy has never been meant to eliminate structural barriers for those historically disadvantaged groups. Unlike the loose and often fragile framework of affirmative action in countries like the United States, India's is robust, institutionalized, and rooted in law. The following chapter discusses the reasons for India's model being better, how it tackles representation in a systematic way, the benefits of mandatory quotas, what other countries can learn from it, and how it tackles issues of entrenched social mobility.

7.1 Systematic Approach to Representation

The second uniquely identifying feature of the Indian model is its intentional, multilevel approach to ensuring representation. The reservation system is not a ceremonial one but an intricately knit system that seeks to give proportional representation to disadvantage groups in key areas: education, employment, and politics.

Under politics, Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) reserved Parliament and State legislature constituencies provide voice to these individuals in the political process. Compulsory rotation of the reserved constituencies provides equal empowerment politically. In contrast to where marginalized classes have to rely on electoral goodwill or party patronage, India provides direct legislation representation through constitutionally assured power.

There are reserved seats in the educational system for SCs, STs, and Other Backward Classes (OBCs) in central universities, Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), and other government institutions. These

qualifications open the gates of opportunities for students from the backward sections to the institutions of excellence, leading to long-term upward mobility.

Similarly, in the government, India's policy of reservation ensures a predetermined percentage of employment for SCs, STs, and OBCs in civil services, government establishments, and public sector undertakings. This planned inclusion has come a long way in pluralizing previously closed institutional and bureaucratic spaces.

Such multi-level and concurrent intervention across sectors ensures an interface of support—education to employment and on to politics—providing maximum room for long-term empowerment.

7.2 Mandatory Quotas and Voluntary Affirmative Action

It is one of the primary reasons why India's system performs better to handle the gap between mandatory quotas and voluntary affirmative action. While affirmative action is so often a guideline susceptible to being overruled by judges, quotas are legally enforceable obligations that are supported by institutional accountability.

Legal Enforceability

In India, reservation policies are constitutionally integrated and supported by laws. Non-compliance risks judicial action as well as popular condemnation. Ministries and departments must report compliance annually, and some government agencies track implementation.

Conversely, the United States possesses a centrality of judiciary-based model and institutional discretion model. Affirmative action programs have been continually attacked, diluted, and overturned by courts, as brought to the surface in recent Supreme Court rulings. The U.S. lacks the constitutional mandate, so in its place, there isn't a strong enough structural solidity to protect these efforts from ideologically driven change.

Targeted Inclusivity

Forced quotas have concrete goals of inclusion, and quantifiable progress is easier. Institutions can design outreach, help, and mentorship strategies with measurable quotas. Voluntary programs are likely to be muddled, seldom invoked, and not utilized.

Long-lasting Consequences

India's model ensures that improvement is not left to the whim of public opinion or the volubility of successive governments. Quotas ensure a stable and certain system of social inclusion and motivate generations of individuals in vulnerable groups to compete for competitive work and leadership positions.

7.3 Lessons Learned and Best Practices

India's experience in creating a long-term, stable, and successful social justice system can potentially offer best practice lessons to other countries who want to deal with racial or ethnic inequality.

1. Constitutional Support Provides Permanence

By leaving reservation policy to the Constitution, India protected its plan from immediate ruination. America and other countries can do themselves a favor by following a policy of longer legislative or constitutional assurance on equity plans.

2. Collective Targeting Is Better Than Single Measures

India's model acknowledges the group nature of marginalization—caste, tribe, or community. This allows for improvement at the group level, rather than through individualized indicators like socioeconomic status or geographic zip code. It has a closer fit with the structural nature of exclusion.

3. Several Coverage Areas Have Greater Impact

Social justice cannot be delivered through standalone interventions. India's policy to integrate education, employment, and political participation establishes an overall supporting ecosystem. Countries interested in embracing India's policy have to carry out their policies on a across-the-board scale so that maximum effectiveness is created.

4. Monitoring and Accountability

India has a system in place, which includes data collection, assessment machinery, and enforcement machinery, introducing more transparency and accountability. India has a learning experience with the use of censuses on the basis of caste as well as monitoring agencies like the National Commission for Scheduled Castes (NCSC).

7.4 Closing Social Mobility Gaps

In spite of much that has been done, India's reservation system has come a long way in an attempt to promote social mobility, especially among communities that had fallen so far behind because of discrimination on the grounds of caste.

1. Education as a Ladder

Accessibility of higher education has transformed the life opportunity of millions of OBC, ST, and SC students. Thousands have become civil servants, professors, engineers, and leaders, ending the cycle of poverty and marginalization.

2. Economic Empowerment

Government jobs have created a new middle class among the SCs and STs, which has brought increased economic security, ownership of assets, and improved standards of living. This contrasts with voluntary diversity employment in most Western economies, where the impact is at a nascent stage.

3. Political Capital

Political reservation has provided marginalized groups with bargaining power to shape laws and public policy, mobilizing historically silenced communities as active participants in governance. This has produced spillover effects in the areas of identity assertion, social confidence, and group bargaining.

4. Cultural Recognition

India's model has facilitated a broad cultural acceptability of caste injustices, provoking controversy in the media, literature, academia, and civil society. Although discrimination continues, public debate today is more informed and accountable.

Policy Implications for the United States and Beyond

Since persistent systemic disparity continues to exist between societies on the basis of race, caste, ethnicity, and class, the efficacy of current policies on equity continues to be a subject of scathing international criticism. Comparative examination throughout the previous chapters has been able to discern the distinctive strengths of India's reservation system over the weaker, atomistic strategy of affirmative action in the United States. This final chapter summarizes U.S. policymaker lessons, reflects on possible reform of legal systems to allow for improved outcomes, and reflects on the wider relevance to other multiracial democracies facing similar issues.

8.1 What the United States Can Learn from India

India's reservation policy, as flawed as it is, provides pragmatic and tested solutions for the empowerment of historically disadvantaged groups. For the United States, with its growing opposition to race-based schemes, India presents an interesting example of how constitutionally rooted, group-based, and multi-dimensional solutions can yield more in the long term.

1. Institutional Commitment Rather Than Discretionary Action

India's model illustrates the necessity of infusing social justice, not into fleeting political or judicial caprices, but into institutional structure. The U.S. model, on the other hand, depends on executive orders, voluntary institutional practices, and judicial precedents—subjecting affirmative action to judicial reversals and disparate application.

The U.S. can also investigate the long-term legislative or constitutional provisions which enshrine and make mandatory inclusive policy in education, the workplace, and politics. These provisions would provide long-term continuity so that equity initiatives are not repealed with every new change of government or court decision.

2. Prioritize Group-Based Historical Disadvantage

India's strategy aims at whole communities that have been systemically excluded, rather than individual economic disadvantage. The U.S. would benefit from understanding that race and historical marginalization are group phenomena, not individual statuses. Equity policies that aim at community development—through strategic investment, reserved access, and outreach—can be more effective than existing paradigms based on individual merit or diversity targets.

3. Multi-Domain Coverage

The Indian model targets education, labor, and politics simultaneously. America compartmentalizes sector-by-sector policies, affirmative action largely contained in college admissions and a component of federal hiring. Expanding equity obligations to public contracting, political representation, and housing—like India—potentially is more revolutionary and just in reach.

4. Data-Driven Implementation and Monitoring

India's reservation system is backed by population data, triennial reviews, and institutional follow-up. It is possible to achieve in the U.S. by requiring improved reporting on race and outcomes in the public sector and creating independent commissions to oversee monitoring and enforcing goal achievement for equity.

8.2 Shaping Legal Structures Towards More Equity

For the U.S. to embrace a more activist and enforceable social equity policy, basic legal reform would perhaps be required. India's model is constitutionally based and therefore long-lasting and direction-setting. Although the U.S. legal and political environment is different, there are some possible directions:

1. Constitutional and Legislative Reform

The U.S. Constitution might be amended or interpreted to officially acknowledge systemic disadvantage and mandate corrective action. Politically difficult to pass, this measure would give affirmative action the legal certainty it now lacks. Alternatively, federal civil rights law might be broadened to incorporate equity obligations for both public and private institutions, as India's constitutional provisions and legislative mandates do.

2. Clarifying the Law on Affirmative Action

American courts have tended to impose strict scrutiny on any policy based on race, resulting in conflicting rulings and unpredictability. Well-defined federal regulations based on civil rights and equal protection norms can prevent judicial excess and rationalize how affirmative action is interpreted and implemented.

3. Targeting at the Local Level

Redesigning American equity programs in terms of community disadvantage categories—e.g., by ZIP codes, high-poverty school attendance areas, or sites of previous segregation—could provide an alternative that is more legally defensible and morally compelling than race-based categorizations. Short of outright copying India's caste system, even these methods could refine its emphasis on social mobility from ostracism.

4. Enhancing Enforcement Mechanisms

Similar to India's special SCs, STs, and OBC commissions, the U.S. too can gain from specialized equity agencies that are statutorily required to monitor compliance, investigate discrimination, and enforce corrective action across sectors.

8.3 Applications to Other Multiracial Democracies

Elsewhere in the world, India's experience is a lesson to any country that wants to overturn deeply established social hierarchies—colonial, racial apartheid, ethnic repression, or indigenous dislocation. The African, Latin American, and Southeast Asian countries are most likely to learn from India's experience.

1. South Africa and Brazil

Brazil and South Africa, as with the U.S., have used affirmative action with uneven political determination and legal sophistication. South Africa's Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policy and Brazil's racial quotas in universities demonstrate some copying of India's approach. However, the Indian experience teaches the lesson of constitutional anchorage and staying power in implementation. Institutionalization of quotas in these nations beyond education and employment may have longer-term effects.

2. Native Representation in Australia and Canada

Indigenous communities in Canada and Australia continue to be left behind. India leads by example when it comes to political empowerment of the indigenous in reserving legislator and local government council seats for Scheduled Tribes. More systematic representation on all tiers of government—not superficial tokenism—is likely to overhaul policymaking as well as disbursement of funds.

3. Religious and Ethnic Minorities of Europe

While Europe struggles with immigration, Islamophobia, and ethnic exclusion, India's system presents a model of diversity management that is inclusive but not at the expense of group identity. While Europe's universalist model resists group-based policies, India's experience indicates that acknowledging community-specific disadvantage is not antithetical to democratic values.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of India's reservation system and the United States' affirmative action program offers a rich comparison of two different approaches to combating entrenched social inequalities. The current study has determined that while both countries have shifted to address historical discrimination—caste-based in India and race-based in the United States—the structure, enforceability, and effectiveness of each of their systems differ significantly. India's quota system, established by law, is a more integrated, stable, and powerful model of institutional reform.

9.1 Summary of Key Findings

1. Historical Discrimination Has Lasting Impacts

Both the United States and India have long-standing stratification systems—race in the United States and caste in India—historically exclusionary of enormous portions of the population from education, employment, and leadership. These sources of injustice did not simply generate historical experience but continue to propel current socioeconomic patterns. This analysis points out that alleviating such disparities goes beyond symbolic rituals or short-term policy interventions; instead, it requires structural change.

2. India's Reservation Policy Is Comprehensive and Constitutional

India's system is unique for its breadth and constitutional foundation. It places quotas on three crucial pillars of society: education, public service, and politics. Constitutional backing ensures continuity and resilience against political or judicial reversals. Years ago, the system has enabled the emergence of a rising middle class among Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), and Other Backward Classes (OBCs), and solidified their presence in institutions from Parliament to civil services.

3. The US Affirmative Action Model Is Weak and Legally Contested

In contrast, the American system of affirmative action operates primarily through executive orders, institutional discretion, and judicial precedent. Without constitutional or statutory entrenchment, affirmative action stands to be vulnerable to politically changing ideologies and court judgments. The latest Supreme Court decisions curtailing race-conscious higher education admissions illustrate the weakness. Additionally, American affirmative action is disproportionately skewed towards university education and has lacked systemic application in areas like employment and politics.

4. Targeted Group-Based Strategies Have More Powerful Outcomes

India's focus on historically excluded groups as particular social groups allows for proportionate and targeted inclusion. The group-based approach recognizes structural discrimination rather than assumptions of a level playing field for all at the outset. This was more powerful than the generally colorblind or individualized frameworks advocated in the U.S., which cannot perceive exclusion as a collective reality.

5. Public Opinion and Political Will Matter

The study also confirmed that public perception of equity policies influences their implementation and longevity. In India, reservations have been resisted, but political parties across the board have largely continued them due to widespread acknowledgment of their necessity. In the U.S., affirmative action has been framed as preferential treatment, which erodes its legitimacy and makes it easier to legally dismantle it. India's success is a testament to the necessity of framing equity policies as restorative justice and not reverse discrimination.

9.2 Social Justice Literature Contributions

This research contributes to comparative social justice literature in several ways:

1. A Uncommon Caste-Race Comparative Framework

Few studies talk about caste-based and race-based inequalities at the same time. In comparing India and the United States in conversation, this book brings in a more sophisticated analysis of how societies institutionalize equality according to their own history and culture. It breaks the theory that all democracies do things the same way with the issue of equity, showing that structural injustice requires context-specific but deeply intentional solutions.

2. Crossing Legal, Political, and Social Dimensions

In contrast to most scholarship that focuses exclusively on the law of affirmative action or the sociology of discrimination, this work synthesizes constitutional designs, policy implementation, and real-world impact. It shows how legal design and political will come together to make social justice programs effective and offers a multi-dimensional analysis that can inform scholarship and practice.

3. Policy-Focused Comparative Frameworks

The article provides a framework for comparing two systems on dimensions such as legal enforceability, scope, consequences, and opinion. It may serve as a diagnostic tool for policymakers, activists, and scholars who wish to design or analyze equity systems in their context of interest. It adds to the literature by offering a structured method of international policy learning.

4. Recasting Affirmative Action Rhetoric

This research is one step towards turning affirmative action into a non-contentious and normative policy aimed at ushering in genuine equality, and not a controversial or aberrant one. It is a rebuke to the mainstream rhetoric in Western societies and seeks a shift of heart towards enacting long-term, system-based solutions modelled on India's adherence to social justice.

9.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, the following are some practical recommendations to the United States and also any other country looking at how to institutionalize their equity structures:

To the United States:

Develop Constitutional or Statutory Safeguards: Affirmative action policies should be safeguarded through constitution or statute revision in order to ensure enduring longevity and legally valid status.

Instruct Multi-Domain Policies: Deploy equity measures in education to the other domains of life like jobs, housing, healthcare, and politics, just like India implemented in its multi-domain strategy.

Highlight Group-Based Historical Injustice: Progress from merely working with individual-based variables (such as income or marks in the exams) towards group-focussed policies correcting and addressing group-based discrimination condoned by the state.

Enhance Public Education: Redefine affirmative action as a process of restorative justice and national healing, not a zero-sum game. An educated public can help generate broader support and reduce backlash.

Create Independent Oversight Agencies: Establish agencies dedicated to monitoring, enforcing, and auditing affirmative action across all sectors to ensure accountability and evidence-based policy-making.

Localize India's Model: Tailor India's model to the local history—racial apartheid, colonization, or indigenous dispossession—and design quotas or affirmative approaches accordingly.

Embed Inclusion in Legal Frameworks: Constitutional changes or national legislation provide legal support necessary to sustain the long-term viability of social justice policies.

Encourage Political Representation for Excluded Groups: Reserved seats or other arrangements can ensure that excluded groups have effective influence in government and policymaking.

Use Data to Drive Policy: Conduct comprehensive demographic and socioeconomic polls to establish discrepancies and monitor the impact of equity interventions over a period of time.

Final Thoughts

Social justice will not be reached through rhetorical allegiance or piecemeal attempts, however—it has to be done by means of disciplined, institutional action. India's record, flawed as it is, is a galvanizing demonstration of constitutional democracy in action enabling equity. The United States and other multiracial societies stand at a fork in the road. They can back away from race-conscious policy amidst controversy or take bold steps toward more profound, more enduring justice.

This research suggests the latter. By learning from India's reservation system, adapting its lessons to different legal and cultural contexts, and remaining committed to systemic change, nations everywhere can make equity not just an ideal—but a reality.