

**Cite This Article:** Dr. Vinod Kumar Cherukuri, "Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Views on Socialism", Indo American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Review, Volume 6, Issue 1, Page Number 19-22, 2022.

**Copy Right:** © IAJMRR Publication, 2022 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Abstract:**

Throughout his life, Ambedkar worked tirelessly to find methods and means to construct an egalitarian society based on liberty, equality, fraternity, and social justice in India. State socialism was a term used by Ambedkar; however, it would be more accurate to refer to it as democratic socialism, given its other attributes. To better understand Ambedkar's battle for socialism in India, this study employs Marxism and Buddhism.

**Key Words:** Ambedkar, Marxism, Buddhism, Socialism

**Introduction:**

When Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar was a student in London, he came across Karl Marx's works. As far back as 1938, he boasted that he had studied more books on communism than all of India's communist leaders combined. Despite his prodigious output as a writer, Ambedkar never took the time to expound on Marx or Marxism throughout his academic career. While Marxism strongly influenced him, his extensive publications demonstrate that the Fabianism ideology greatly influenced him. And he honed his style of socialism over time.

For Ambedkar, it was not comfortable to support socialist ideas because of his preoccupation with Hinduism. For Hinduism, the Chaturvarna system, as opposed to socialism, advocated dividing the Hindu society into four distinct classes: Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaisya, Shudra. The Chaturvarna arrangement in a Hindu-dominated society is where the caste system began. Caste system was not only another name for labour division; it also divided workers, Ambedkar said at that time.

It's enlightening and beneficial to reflect on and analyses Ambedkar's social and political beliefs. To this day, no one can match Ambedkar's ability to underline the crucial need of constructing democratic socialism and to give an accurate picture of India's difficulties Ambedkar. The politics were the most effective means of attaining equality and freedom for all Indians occupied Ambedkar's thoughts for more than three decades. In this context, he fought tirelessly to establish democratic socialism in India's oppressive society, as well as the objective of justice for the untouchables, using political methods primarily. Ambedkar formed his views on modern Indian culture and politics via these efforts.

On the issue of socialism and the structure and political system, Ambedkar's self-created concept and Ambedkar's viewpoint remain significant. Socialism's economic and political theory is based on public or joint ownership and cooperative control of production and distribution of resources. Technocracy and industrial planning were promoted by Henri de saint (1760–1825), who invented socialism. Capitalist anarchy should be abolished so that contemporary technology might be widely used to systematize economic activity, as urged by Saint-Simon, Friedrich Engel and Karl Marx. It was said that the amount of work put into the manufacturing process would determine the quantity of economic output (or surplus value). Socialist ideology is divided into two camps: those who want absolute nationalization of the production, distribution, and exchange infrastructure and those who prefer the state's capital management in a free-market economy. Soviet economic development models lead socialists to pursue the establishment of a state-owned economy that is centrally planned and under the authority of a central government.

It took Ambedkar his whole life to develop the intellectual, organizational, and programmatic methods to build an equalitarian society in India founded on liberty, equality, and fraternity, as well as social justice. As part of contemporary India's socio-political history, his fight against caste and untouchability is extensively documented. Because of this, the caste system, which was ingrained in Hindu culture and civilization, was at the basis of social injustice and socio-economic exploitation of all kinds. While socialism strove for a classless society, Hinduism did not believe in one and did not strive for one. In addition, Ambedkar emphasized philosophically that the bedrock of Hinduism's socio-economic division was scorn. And socialism could not function appropriately in an environment of contempt.

Ambedkar saw social changes as necessary before economic reforms because of the inequitable structure of Hindu society, which was marked by socioeconomic and political exploitation. "The designers of political constructs must take into consideration social dynamics," he said. Ambedkar backed up his claims with quotes from Ferdinand Lasalle (1825-1864). Ambedkar concluded that socialism could not be realized without a revolution that resulted in seizing power. For the proletariat to take control, it must be done by them. On the other hand, men will not participate in a property equalization process unless they are confident that they will be treated equally and have no caste or creed prejudice. For socialists to be

satisfied, they would have to accept that the issue of social change was 'basic' and that there was no way out of it for them if they were to win the battle for socialism.

To eradicate an oppressive Hindu society, Ambedkar eschewed Marx's tactics. On the other hand, the Fabians were more concerned with a long-term strategy that was both practical and constitutional. On March 15, 1947, a Memorandum to the Constituent Assembly from the All India Scheduled Castes Federation stated that if a Parliamentary majority could not suspend, amend, or repeal State Socialism, then Parliamentary Democracy should be retained and State Socialism should be enshrined in the Constitution." This is the only way to achieve socialism, democracy, and freedom from tyranny. In his Memorandum to the Constituent Assembly and debates in the Constituent Assembly Debates (CAD) on the Directive Principles of State Policy, Ambedkar laid out his vision of Constitutional State Socialism with Parliamentary Democracy "Aims for the Indian Constitution were to eliminate social, political, and economic disparities by providing greater opportunities for the underprivileged and allowing everyone to experience 'freedom from hunger, freedom from fear,' Ambedkar wrote. In addition, he requested that the Constitution make it clear that "forced labour or involuntary slavery shall constitute a criminal," as well.

The State should proclaim as 'part of the legislation of its constitution,' Ambedkar said, concerning the protection against economic exploitation. The state should control all essential industries; all primary industries should be taken over and operated by the state; and every adult citizen should be required to purchase life insurance policies corresponding with their salary, as determined by the government. Ambedkar favoured a collectivized agricultural system in agriculture and a truncated form of socialism in an industry owned by the state. In his view, neither agriculture nor industry could provide excellent results without the State's provision of Capital. The growing industrialization of India necessitates the adoption of State Socialism. Even if a private company could do it, this would lead to the same inequities in wealth distribution seen in Europe's private capitalism that should serve as a caution to Indians. Ambedkar was wary about delegating the construction of State Socialism to the legislative branch of government. 'Unalterable by any act,' he said, should be the unambiguous goal of government's legislative and executive departments while establishing State Socialism.

According to Ambedkar, the growth of a planned economy must meet the "fundamental criteria" of being "permanent," rather than "prone to suspension or abandonment.". This permanency was unlikely to be achieved under the parliamentary rule since the policies of the legislature and administration were dictated by the majority at any given moment under a parliamentary democracy. If any government wins a majority in an election, industry and agriculture might move toward state socialism. Voters in the next election may decide to reject it with a majority vote. Both parties would utilize their lawmaking authority to reverse the progress made by the pro-prostate socialism majority and vice versa.

An individual's right to freedom and democracy was denied by dictatorship; hence Ambedkar rejected the concept of dictatorship as an alternative to the long-term sustainability of State Socialism. He said that the goal was to achieve "State Socialism with Parliamentary Democracy, without Dictatorship." He came up with a solution he called "Constitutional State Socialism with Parliamentary Democracy."

Dispelling the "antiquated paradigm," Ambedkar argued that a Constitutional Law was not enough to ensure the people's participation in the democratic process. According to him, adult suffrage and basic human rights should be the sole items in the Constitution of Democracy. For him, constitutional law should be more than merely the definition of how society's political institutions should be organized. "Defining the condition and state of society's economic system is equally vital to describe the condition and state of democracy," he said.

Aiming for economic democracy, Ambedkar said, was not only a matter of saying, "Our aim is a political democracy," but also that "any Government whoever it is in power, must endeavour to introduce economic democracy." In his remarks on Jawaharlal Nehru's 13 November 1946 'Objectives Resolution,'<sup>25</sup> Ambedkar said the resolution should have contained a provision "whereby the State may make economic, social, and political justice a reality." As a matter of social and economic fairness, 'industry and land should be nationalized' should have been declared "in the clearest words." I don't see how any future government that believes in social, economic, and political fairness can exist without a socialist economy."

Ambedkar was also a staunch supporter of organized labour. Brahminism and capitalism, he said, were the two prominent foes of the Indian working class. He used the term "Brahminism" to denote the rejection of the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity. He thought Brahminism had a broader impact than only social privileges like inter-and-marriage. Civic freedoms were likewise restricted under this regime. When it comes to economic possibilities, Brahminism has an effect since it is "so omniscient."

It was Ambedkar who countered Roy's claim that the primary goal of Indian politics was the destruction of imperialism, noting how workers would need their organization to fight against landlords, mill owners and money lenders who would remain in India to drain the people dry once imperialism was gone. Ambedkar anticipated that the freedom of workers to strike would be used infrequently. He saw a strike as nothing more than a violation of the employment contract. In his mind, this was just another term for the 'right to freedom,' and not a crime." Ambedkar was thinking about industrial and agricultural labour when he discussed labour issues. He argued that all workers should have access to the same benefits, regardless of whether they worked in the industrial or agricultural sectors; he also argued that

workers should have access to the same benefits, regardless of whether they worked in the industrial or agricultural sectors "As a matter of fact.

Ambedkar's views on socialism can be summarized as follows: (1) the existing social, political, and economic order is condemned as unjust; (2) the established order's immorality is ascribed to Hindu attitudes and corrupt social institutions; (3) the idea of a new order based on one man, one vote, and one value is realizable in State Socialism and parliamentary democracy; and (4) the idea is to be realized through a programme.

Ambedkar's opinions on socialism above demonstrate that he was not a Marxist socialist. True, he believed Marx's philosophy satisfied the 'lowest order,' but he saw it as a road, not a dogma. On the other hand, he refused to embrace Marx's idea of class struggle and proletarian rule. His disinterest in communism, which he never sought to hide throughout his more than forty-year political career, demonstrated that it could not have been otherwise. Ambedkar was concerned that the old system would collapse unless changes were made to India's social structure. If democracy fails in India, something akin to communism would be the alternative. Simultaneously, he condemned the notion of democracy and communism coexisting as "utterly absurd." 'Communism is similar to a forest fire in that it continues to burn and destroy everything and everyone in its path,' Ambedkar observed. He previously described communism in Russia as a "fraud."

In practice, Ambedkar never agreed with the communist claim that "industrial expansion and class warfare will sweep away caste differences by themselves" and that "no particular campaigns or fights were required for the purpose." The communists' goal was to unite working people, regardless of caste or community, against oppression and exploitation and encourage and assist this unification via "shared struggles." Ambedkar did not make this objective evaluation or the following action plan. Furthermore, it has been stated that during the Bombay strikes and the nationwide strike wave led by communists in the early 1930s, Ambedkar was deeply upset by the unity of textile workers. He warned his followers to be careful of communists, comparing them to "ants biting a slice of jaggery." Untouchable employees were forbidden from working in the weaving division of textile mills owing to caste prejudices, which the communists were unable to eradicate despite their rhetoric of class solidarity, he said.

'Despite all rhetoric of class solidarity, the communists could not prevail.' Three elements may be recognized as having influenced Ambedkar's anti-communist stance. First, in contrast to revolutionary communist techniques, he believed in constitutional measures and reforms to attain his goals. Second, he was hesitant to recognize the Indian working class as a "homogeneous" group capable of "driving a fundamental rebuilding of society as it was split along caste lines and discriminated against caste." Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Ambedkar had a natural aversion to most early Marathi communist leaders from the educated upper castes young.

Ambedkar's opposition to Communism is reflected in his support for and conversion to Buddhism. It should be remembered that he converted to Buddhism near the conclusion of his public life. Before his conversion in May 1956, he delivered a discussion at the BBC in London titled "Why I like Buddhism and How It Is Useful to the World in Its Present Circumstances." Ambedkar justified his admiration for Buddhism in the speech, accusing Marxism/Communism of shaking all the nations. 'Buddhism was a comprehensive solution to Marx and his Communism,' he believed. Because 'Russian Communism' sought a 'bloody revolution,' while Buddhist Communism advocated for a 'bloodless revolution.'

Ambedkar later attempted to seek common ground between Buddhism and Marxism/Communism in an article titled "Buddha or Karl Marx" (probably written a few months before his death) to defend his preference for the former. To begin with, Ambedkar claimed that the Marxian idea of poor exploitation could be found in the Buddhist concept of dukkha (sorrow). Second, he believes that both the Buddha and Marx believed that private property ownership gave "power to one class and Solow to another via exploitation." Third, in his perspective, both of them thought that removing sadness via the eradication of private property was necessary for the welfare of society. Ambedkar was suspicious of Marxism/Communism despite these parallels for two reasons. To begin with, Marxism was an unfamiliar concept. Second, it was founded on ideals of force, brutality, and tyranny, while Buddhism was founded on peace and democracy.

While differentiating it from Buddhism, Ambedkar's understanding of Marxism/Communism may be scrutinized from a Marxist perspective. To begin with, the Buddhist notion of dukkha and the Marxist concept of exploitation have more superficial than actual analogies. Because, according to the Buddha, the world was complete with grief, and everyone, both exploiter and victim, shared that anguish. According to a Buddhist commentator, rather than focusing on 'class greed,' the Buddha spoke of greed in general, suffering and misery in general. Thus, the path of human salvation pointed out by him was also 'general' and was incapable of alleviating, much less removing entirely, the specific human suffering of a given social epoch. Furthermore, the Buddha counselled the afflicted to 'eradicate defilement from within, rather than battling the oppressor.' Because of the sentiments expressed, it's possible that the Buddha did not address the fundamental issues of feudal society, the contradiction between the little producer and the exploiter of his labour, the ruler and the merchants.

In the Marxian understanding, however, exploitation is defined as "the creation and distribution of things in societies where the production method creates a surplus beyond subsistence necessities." To put it another way, exploiters are those who "acquire the advantages of production, in cash or in-kind, by their control over tools, machinery, land, or raw materials required for production." Furthermore, Marxism considers it necessary to overturn the system that causes such exploitation by revolutionary methods, rather than relying on the exploiter's moral insight to eradicate 'impurity from inside himself.' Second, the Buddha's attempts to abolish private property were limited to Buddhist Bhikshus, who was prohibited from possessing personal property, except the eight things stipulated by the BhikshuSangh's laws. Three robes or pieces of cloth for daily usage, a loin girdle, an alms bowl, a razor, a needle, and a water filter are included. Additionally, a Bhikshu was not permitted to get money or silver for fear of utilizing them to acquire anything other than the eight articles he was allowed to possess. In Marxist ideas, private property does not only relate to personal possessions; it also refers to private ownership and control of production, resulting in exploitation. Consequently, one should not overstate the Buddha's contempt for private property, as Ambedkar said.

In response to Ambedkar's allegation that Marxism favoured dictatorships, it may be argued that Marx never maintained that a proletariat dictatorship meant a dictatorship over the proletariat without any democratic aspects. The Buddha's teachings may have informed Ambedkar's belief in the concept of absolute nonviolence as an end goal and relative violence as a means.

Finally, Ambedkar's whole endeavour to establish Buddhism as a better ideal to Marxism seems to be fascinating. The sociopolitical environments in which these two global ideologies arose were diametrically opposed. Marxism began as a response to capitalism's heyday's socio-economic demands even if it is assumed that Buddhist communism and Marxism have certain similarities for argument.

#### **Conclusion:**

Ambedkar had connected himself with the poorest and most oppressed sections of Indian society in reality. As a result, he chastised anything that glorified poverty. He was unable to embrace the established standards of bourgeois democracy and market economics as a result of this. This prompted him to advocate for State Socialism as a means of eradicating poverty. The fact remains that although acknowledging class exploitation's actuality, he did not recognize its "political revolutionary ramifications" since his programme did not consider the class's needs. To defend the right to private property, he was reluctant to usurp the affluent. It's difficult to see how he could accomplish socialism by removing socioeconomic disparity without jeopardizing society's main economic base, which the system of inequality was built on. His preference for state socialism within the liberal-democratic political framework and his aversion to Marxian socialism were expressed in the most acceptable form of Fabianism, which he embraced.

#### **References:**

1. Dhananjay Keer, Dr. Ambedkar" Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Bombay 1971.
2. B.R. Ambedkar, Annihilation of Caste (1936), (ed. with an intra. by Mulk Raj Anand), Arnold Publishers, New Delhi 1990.
3. M.K. Dongre, Economic Thoughts of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Ambedkar Samaj Publications, Nagpur 1974.
4. B.R. Ambedkar, States and Minorities,' What are Their Rights and How to Secure Them in the Constitution of Free India, Thacker and Co. Ltd., Bombay 1947.
5. Constituent Assembly Debates, (hereafter CAD), Manager of Government Press, Delhi, vol. 7(9), 1949.
6. W.N. Kuber, Dr. Ambedkar: a Critical Study, People's Publishing House, New Delhi 1973.
7. [https://www.india-seminar.com/2018/701/701\\_anand\\_teltumbde.htm](https://www.india-seminar.com/2018/701/701_anand_teltumbde.htm)