

Assessment of Dr. B R Ambedkar's views on Indian Left and its relevance to the present times

Dr. Dilip Kataria

Assistant Professor

Department of History

The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda

Two of the most important events that have occurred in past few years especially the JNU episode and Rohith Vemula's suicide case have driven the nation towards a new ideological conflict. After Rohith Vemula's suicide incident the Communist party's ideologue has been trying to establish communism as the guardian of the Dalits as well as the other oppressed classes. They are under the notion that, in the name of Hinduism, the ruling party i.e. the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) has been trying to re-establish the Brahminical Supremacy, which is certainly not in the interest of the Dalit as well as the other oppressed classes. For instance, Brinda Karat member of women leader of Communist Party of India said that under the BJP rule "*the self-contradictory Hindutva agenda vis-à-vis Dalits is being pursued at all levels and with State patronage. It is, therefore, clear that the Dalit resistance movements necessarily come into confrontation with the RSS-BJP political combine*¹." But when one tries to study the historical background of the Dalit movements along with that of the other classes, it can be inferred that its pioneers and the direction towards which they headed the protests had remained aloof from Communism and held anti-communist emotions as well. The strategic policy of Communist refusal to address non-economic forms of oppression directly, led to an inability to connect broadly with low caste groups that could have alienated the lower caste movements from the communist movement. Most of the protests that were held by the Dalits were non-violent and were demonstrated via democratic means. Dr. B R Ambedkar was an influential personality amongst the oppressed classes. He was one of the first political thinkers of the country who had scientifically rejected the idea of Communism. He had declared the Communist thoughts as violent, anarchical and anti-national. Ambedkar had defined the freedom of Communist struggle as the freedom that

¹ Karat Brinda article - <https://blog.leftword.com/dalit-resistance-and-the-role-of-the-left>.

culminated into unity, but did not guarantee the independence of an individual.² The Dalit protest that took place under his mentorship was non-violent, as well as such, that promoted democratic values. Instead of favoring bloody revolution, he emphasized on the education of Dalits and the upliftment of their organization. Along with the Dalit protests he also tried to keep workers protests away from the Communist ideology. The formation of ' *The Independent Labour Party*' in 1936 had been done considering similar motives. He had started feeling that the well-being of the workers was not in the safe hands. He believed that communists often leaned towards political opportunism over the welfare of their working class.³ On the other hand, Dr. Ambedkar was being severely criticized by the communists - he was referred to as the deterrent of the Communist Revolution. After the Poona Pact was signed, the attacks that were carried out upon him got even more intensified. He was charged with irrational allegations of being a '*British Agent*' the betrayer of dalit rights as well as being associated with imperialism. The communists did not even spare the constitution that was created by him, and thoroughly condemned it. His movement was seen as dividing their proletariat. This is the attitude that precipitated in Dange's call to the voters to waste their votes but not to cast it in favor of Ambedkar in the 1952 elections. As a result, he was defeated. Many scholarly works has been carried out by the scholars across the India and world, but due to Marxist domination on academic world, since independence, these views were lost in the myriad politics. Leading Ambedkarite Dr. Anand Teltumbde, for instance, it in his article titled "Ambedkar And Communists" accepted that Dr. Ambedkar was not a Marxist and his intellectual upbringing has been under Fabian influence in Columbia University and London School of Economics, but at the same time he proposed that Dr. Ambedkar without agreeing with Marx, took Marxism not only seriously but also used it as the benchmark to assess his decisions throughout his life.⁴ The work of Gail Omvedt on the Ambedkar: also lack clear picture on his relationship with Marxism. In her work "*Ambedkar: towards an Enlightened India*", she briefly examines Ambedkar's as antithesis to Marxism. However, the antagonized relationship between Ambedkar and the Communists is again only briefly mentioned. Her analysis remains focused on the problems of the Communist party without critiquing Ambedkar's response to the Communists.⁵ Another scholar who works on the similar lines is Julian Kirby. She has worked on the issue of relationship between Indian left and Dr. Ambedkar. In her work "*Ambedkar*

²Naimishraya Mohandas, *History of the Indian Dalit Movement*, Part-4, Radhakrishna Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2013, page no p-. 229.

³ Mittal Satish Chand, *Samayvad ka Sach*, Pratibha Pratisthan, New Delhi, 2007, p. 195

⁴ Teltumbde Anand, *Ambedkar and Communists*, Article, Countercurrents.org 16 August, 2012.

⁵ Gail Omvedt , *Ambedkar, Towards an Enlightened India*, Penguin, New Delhi, 2004 , p. 89-91

and the Indian Communists: The Absence of Conciliation” made in-depth comparative analysis of work done by the Gail Omvelt, Eleanor Zelliot, Christopher Jaffrelot, Debjani Ganguly, Anand Teltumbde and other scholars on historical relationship between the Indian left and Dr. Ambedkar, but still it lacked the core idea of Dr. Ambedkar on Marxism. The basic ideology of Dr Ambedkar stemmed from an in-depth study of Marxism that he carried out during the course of his life. He had also studied the theorizations of Indian and Western socialists.⁶ During Ambedkar’s stay in Europe, he had seen capitalism and its oppressive machinery from close quarters. Born a Dalit, he had firsthand experience of the cruelties of the caste system. He saw every theory, philosophy or norm from the perspective of the millions who were untouchables, exploited and poor. This led to a development of an idea of a different socialism that what Karl Marx proposed. He once said, “*Had Karl Marx been born in India and had written his famous treatise Das Capital sitting in India, he would have had to write it in an entirely different fashion.*”⁷

Dr. Ambedkar had deeply thought upon the problems that were faced by the Dalit community and in an attempt to resolve them he had come up with various means like, the acculturation of Dalits, demand for a different state, revolution through communism or establishment of a new religion. Finally he chose to employ the principles of Buddhism to liberate them as well as the other oppressed classes of India. On 14th October 1956, Dr. Ambedkar adopted the religion of Buddhism in Nagpur. At that that time he had said that, “*The motive of Buddhism is to uplift those were being exploited. A question that can be posed is, what purpose does the Das Capital serve? I believe that Buddha was born 2400 years before Karl Marx and he had already brought forth all those issues to light which were later discovered to be simply repeated by Karl Marx.*”⁸ Later in 1956, at the the Fourth World Buddhist Conference which was held at Kathmandu, Nepal under the chairmanship of Raja Mahendra, Dr. Ambedkar had said that, “*Buddhism can only be kept alive as an alternative of Communism.*”⁹ He believed that while Communism was based on strength on the other hand Buddhism was the promoter of the democratic system. He had accepted the teachings of Buddhism in the form of social principles rather than religious sermons and had eventually managed to influence the Dalit community to protest by abiding those principles. He firmly believed that for the betterment

⁶ Mittal Satish Chand, *Samayvad ka Sach*, Pratibha Pratisthan, New Delhi, 2007, p. 198

⁷ Ibid, p.189

⁸ Naimishraya Mohandas, *History of the Indian Dalit Movement Part-4*, Radhakrishna Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2013, p. 227

⁹ Ibid, p.227

of the present as well as the future generations, it would be necessary to adopt Buddhism. If the Asians deny the acceptance of the Buddhist principles, then Asia too shall soon be a victim of the Blood Revolution like Europe. One of the well known thinkers of the India, Shri Dattopant Thengdi had written in the context of Dr. Ambedkar's narrative that, "*While Dr. Ambedkar stood as an impediment between Dalits and Communism, on the other hand Dr. Golavalkar stood as an obstructionist between the upper class and Communism respectively.*"¹⁰ In a meeting with Shri Dattopant Thengdi, Dr. Ambedkar had told him that, "*He has an important issue to address before his death; of directing to his community towards the correct path. The people are referred to as Dalits, they are being exploited and have been suffering for a while now. But now they seem to have become aware, as a result of which they have become outrageous. This could victimize them against Communism, and I don't want that to happen to them. I would have to direct them towards the direction in which our country is currently progressing. Since you have been striving towards the well-being of the nation in collaboration with the organization, I believe that if I fail to guide the people towards the correct path, and they turn towards Communism, it would be impossible to bring them back on the track of Nationalism.*"¹¹

While addressing the laborers at a meeting in Mumbai, Dr. Ambedkar had said that, "*The number of texts that he had read based on Communism exceeded the total number of ordinary texts read by the Communist politicians.*"¹² This shows that he had deeply thought of and critically analyzed the issue. Shortly before his death, he had decided to prepare a volume of texts that would refute the principles of communism¹³. Due to his sudden death the text had remained unfinished. Yet he had managed to prepare the two chapters of section 2 i.e. 'The Hindu social order' and 'The basis of Hindu social order' which were later published. Four days before his death he had finished writing the book, "*Buddha and Karl Marx*" which was later published by Vijaya publishing house, Colombo.¹⁴ Although this text contains only 34 pages, it holds great significance and importance. The text consists of the rational arguments that are based on the principles of Communism like; scientific socialism, class struggle, the stagnancy and downfall of the country, the idea of history as well as the

¹⁰ Thengdi Dattopant, *Sanket Rekha*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi, 1998, p.287.

¹¹ Ibid p.288

¹² Mittal Satish Chand, *Samayvad ka Sach*, Pratibha Pratisthan, New Delhi, 2007, p. 198

¹³ Moon Vasant, editor-*Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar's writing and speech part-3*, Education Department, Maharashtra Government, Mumbai, 2014, p.25.

¹⁴ Ibid p.15

opposition faced by the religion that are thoroughly refuted by Dr. Ambedkar. The text categorically gives rational arguments given by Dr. Ambedkar against the very principles of Communism. This critical commentary made on Communism eighty years ago is still found relevant in the present times. Along with this text, he had criticized Communism in his last few speeches that he had delivered before his death. He had also warned the government against the increasing influence of Russia and Communism. Dr. Ambedkar had also criticized the then Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy due to his inclination towards communism.. He advised Nehru to take effective steps on the issue of China's encroachment over Tibet. In short the books "*India and Communism*" and "*Buddha and Karl Marx*" that were written by him in his last phase of life were meant to serve the purpose of giving a new direction to the Dalit protests. Apart from the aforementioned texts, Dr. Ambedkar's other writings strongly oppose the idea of Communism as well. Due to the influence of Communism in the present day higher education system, there hasn't been enough thinking and analysis that ought to be in this context.

In his text "*Buddha and Karl Marx*" Dr. Ambedkar has described Communism as non-theoretical, unnatural and impractical. He had challenged Karl Marx's theory of "Scientific Socialism". Karl Marx firmly believed that the framework of socialism given by him was equivalent to that of scientific socialism; meaning, post industrial revolution, either Europe shall face class struggle, or the oppressed classes shall gain control over the nation's capital goods through proletariat dictatorship, or a society based on equality shall be established by nationalizing those goods, as a result of which Karl Marx had delineated these principles in the form of scientific socialism. Dr. Ambedkar believed that Marx was deeply interested in proving his ideology of socialism in the form of scientific socialism¹⁵. As much as he was against the capitalists, so was he against the socialist thinkers who had fetched him the label of an impractical socialist. He had claimed that the society shall gradually progress towards revolution or scientific socialism and no one would be able to stop it. This theory was soon ruled out when it was declared by Dr. Ambedkar that even after eighty years of the formation of this theory there were no signs of it anywhere in the world. It was only after sixty years of its evolution i.e. in 1917 that Russia had experienced the dictatorship of the proletariat class which had been deliberately established through a massive blood revolution. The dictatorial and violent nature of such a change resulted in fear of communism in many countries. In anticipating that the world was yet to

¹⁵ Buddha Or Karl Marx , Dr. Babasabeb Ambedkar International Association for Education, Japan, Digital Publication, p.8

face such dictatorships in the near future, its charm had eventually faded.¹⁶ This is how Dr. Ambedkar had questioned the theory of scientific socialism and its evaluation is still found relevant today. Upon close observation of the history of 20th century, it can be discerned that apart from Russia, China and a few other European countries, this revolution had remained unaffected in all other parts of the world. This could be due to the fact that the communist movement was not self serving but was rather triggered and pushed by communist lobbies of the world, lead by USSR, which often led to bloody civil wars. It was only in 1984, that the end of Communism began in Russia which led to dilution of communist ideology in most of the countries.

Dr. Ambedkar was reluctant to accept Karl Marx's definition of history as well as the importance that he had given to the economic elements in it. Karl Marx believed that history was a result of the struggle that took place due to the conflict between any two classes to support their self-interests. History is largely shaped by the power of economy. He was of the opinion that political as well as social reforms were huge myths and that equality of wealth should be given the utmost priority in the economic reforms at any cost. Dr. Ambedkar did not agree with the idea of history given by Karl Marx. According to him, the history is not dependent on economic dialecticism but was much more and beyond that economic realm. In the Indian context of history Ambedkar says, "*Power has always been an ode to religion. In India the affluent take advices from the impoverished monks. In India the destitute sell away their jewelry in order to get on a pilgrimage to Banaras and Mecca.*"¹⁷ By giving the example of the Romans he tells us that, it was an accomplished belief amongst the Romans that until and unless Goddess Delphi does not declare that the officer is acceptable to her, no official can take up the charge of an officer. Hence Ambedkar implied that the caste issues were more than economic issues. Even if the Dalit obtained economic empowerment, yet, their problems will not resolved as caste conflict in India was more complex than the economic narratives given out by Marxist. In 1930 he had written an article for the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal, Lahore, in which, he stated that, "*Economic strength was not the only factor that motivated the formation of history – Religion, Social status also held equal importance*"¹⁸

¹⁶ Ibid p.9

¹⁷ Mittal Satish Chand, "*Samayvad ka sach*", Pratibha Pratishthan, New Delhi, 2007, p. 90

¹⁸ Ibid p.91

While comparing the ideologies of Communism and the principles of Buddhism, Dr. Ambedkar tells us that they bore quite a few resemblances with each other. Both stated the prevalence of class struggle and exploitation of the oppressed classes. Lord Buddha had said that the world is filled with sorrows. Although he did not mention the term 'exploitation', his religious preaching was certainly based on misery. By quoting the discussion that he had with Kaushal Naresh as an example, he used to tell that, "No matter what, struggle always prevails amongst the kings, nobles, brahmins, in the households, between a mother and her child, between a father and his child as well as amongst siblings."¹⁹ The 'Ashtangik' path as preached by Lord Buddha also suggests the existence of class struggle, the consequences of which are misery and sorrow. In this way both, Karl Marx and Lord Buddha have accepted the reality of philosophical exploitation and class struggle, yet offer distinct means of remedy. While Karl Marx believes in economic equality, on the other hand Lord Buddha preaches the path of righteousness to attain liberation from this exploitation.²⁰

Dr. Ambedkar disapproved the resistance towards religion that was propagated through the path of Communism. Defining communism he used to say that Communism treats religion as its opium – for them religion is a kind of a drug. Their happiness lies in eradicating religion and appreciating a person's deceptiveness. Dr. Ambedkar believed that religion played an important role in the social as well as overall development of the human beings. Man is a social animal and religion is an important part of his existence. He interprets the importance of religion by stating that its foundation is necessary for the development of human beings.²¹ Dr. Ambedkar said that "*My father was an extremely poor man which is why obtaining the items of luxury wasn't easy and that was totally acceptable to me.*" He further writes that man and power are quite distinct from each other. Man is blessed to have a body as well as a brain. The brain is ought to be socially developed. He terms religion in a slightly different manner. According to him religion is in no way related to divinity, heaven or hell, the theories and surmises related to earth. It is inappropriate to reckon religion as the warehouse of god or the emancipation of soul or salvation; it should rather be associated with the principles and reality of life. Religion should reside in a person's heart, instead of scriptures, human

¹⁹ Buddha Or Karl Marx , Dr. Babasabeb Ambedkar International Association for Education, Japan, Digital Publication, p. 09

²⁰ Ibid p. 09

²¹ Naimishraya Mohandas, "*History of the Indian Dalit Movement*", Part-4, Radhakrishna . Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2013, p. 230

morality should be at the center of it and its main aim should be to recreate the world and look after its happiness.²²

Dr. Ambedkar believed that Communism placed great emphasis on violence or physical force to establish equality all over the world. They (communists) intended to dissolve the current system as well as control the state through the dictatorship of the proletariat class. Dr. Ambedkar had downrightly opposed the violent practices that were induced by communism. On 25th November 1949, during the Constitutional assembly he had said that, *“As per my judgment it must be made sure that, the political as well as social goals should be achieved only through proper constitutional methods, which means that violence induced revolution should be completely annihilated.”*²³ He was of the opinion that the means of achieving social equality must be democratically obtained and perpetually lasting. Although Dr. Ambedkar was a staunch opponent of the violence that had occurred during the Communist Revolution, he was in the favor of the cause. He believed that violence should be replaced by non-violent means to achieve the goals. He had proposed three arguments against the use of violence. First argument being that the use of physical strength causes instability. While it can be temporarily used to exercise power over someone, it ceases the possibility of doing the same in the long run. One can never rule over any such country that needs to be attacked repeatedly to mark its victory. His second argument was that it is not necessary that the outcome of violence would be terrorism or victory that has been achieved through war; it should only be resorted to, only if all the other means remain unsuccessful. Power and position can be obtained through clemency but definitely not through defeat and violence. In the context of violence he further argues that it is capable of ruining the goal that one aims to achieve since the path that is chosen often contradicts it. Although one might attain success through the path of violence but it shall always remain insignificant and unsteady because war deteriorates everything and ultimately results in forfeit.²⁴

Dr. Ambedkar clearly opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat class. He believed that the communists themselves opposed any form of dictatorship, since it would be a misfortune on the part of their principles. Based on this scenario Karl Marx had given us the idea of the stagnancy and

²² Ibid p. 230

²³ Mittal Satish Chand, *"Samayvad ka sach"*, Pratibha Pratishthan, New Delhi, 2007, p. 93

²⁴ Ibid p.93

downfall of a state. Marx believed that shortly after the prevalence of the proletariat dictatorship, a society based on unity would be formed and soon the state shall mark its end and the supporters of Communism won't be able to answer any of those questions that would underlie the happenings. Dr. Ambedkar believed that safeguarding democracy as well as establishing a society based on equality through least dictatorship? Along with the eradication of democratic problems and obstacles would not abolish autocracy completely. This principle is completely wrong. However the communists were unable to answer that, what would be the consequences if the state ceases to exist?²⁵ In that case the establishment of a communist state would be meaningless. If a state cannot be preserved unless physical strength is employed its outcome shall also be anarchical. Dr. Ambedkar had briefly explained the French Revolution in three words, Brotherhood, Independence and Unity – these slogans had marked the welcome of the French revolution. This revolution had failed in establishing equality. We have welcomed the Russian Revolution because its aim was to spread equality but to achieve the same, one has to sacrifice brotherhood. However it should be noted that, a society that lacks brotherhood and equality holds no true value. He said that the aforementioned values can prevail only if the path of Buddhism is pursued. Communism can give us limited outcomes. Dr. Ambedkar favors democracy over class struggle, violence and the dictatorship of the proletariat class. According to him democracy can unite people and can help them gain mutual experience. The nation can act as an organization of the public welfare. Justifying democracy he has said that a government that can revolutionize the social and economic lives without bloodshed and violence is an example of a true democracy.

Dr. Ambedkar had perceived the Buddhist religion as an alternative of the Marxist view, he believed that both the ideologies aimed at eradicating social exploitation as well as the class struggle but had chosen two distinct paths to do so. While Karl Marx put emphasis on violence and economic equality Lord Buddha insisted upon religion and morality. As against Marx who opted for revolutionary means, Buddha chose those means that altered ones attitude as well as abided to the principles of democracy. Buddha had refused to preserve the personal wealth of the monks and had emphasized upon prevalence of the democratic system in the organization. He had even refused to announce his heir; he believed that since he himself was not a dictator therefore he shall not appoint one. He regarded Buddhism as a social theory rather than a system that could be worshipped or religiously

²⁵ Buddha Or Karl Marx , Dr. Babasabeb Ambedkar International Association for Education, Japan, Digital Publication, p. 21

argued upon. Lord Buddha greatly emphasized upon social unity as well as morality rather than contemplating life after death. He wished to end the exploitation and class struggle by altering the internal attitudes of the people for which he had created the 'Panchsheel' as well as the 'Ashtaang' path. These principles kept a person away from vices and instead focused upon morality. Along with these he had also propounded the 'Parmita' principle – meaning inducing ten values in a person's life namely: intelligence;modesty; dedication; donate; bravery; peace; truth; domicile; friendship; negligence. Lord Buddha believed that a society based on equality can be formed by accepting these values thoroughly.²⁶ He placed greater emphasis on morality, he believed that communist nations were based on two principles: Change of perception through ethics and second today's ethics won't shape tomorrow's morality. Marx was of the opinion that true morality lies in destroying the corrupt society through whichever means possible. Further discussing about Lord Buddha and his religion Dr.Ambedkar writes that class ethics often result into social uprising. Ethics of general ideals have made possible the development of people towards social cooperation and coordination. Humanity rests on the hope of restoring brotherhood which is only possible through the morality of human beings. He had said that the problems that were prevailing in India as well in the other parts of the world could be combated with the help of Lord Buddha's social principles. Social equality can't be established through communism or by protesting against the religion. The principles of Buddhism and the values of democracy are the only means of restoring the religion.

Post independence, Dr. Ambedkar had criticized Prime Minister Nehru's foreign policy that inclined towards communism and made a prediction that this policy shall remain harmful to nation's security and integrity. One of the important reasons of resigning from Nehru's government was that of the foreign policy that he had proposed. The reason being in spite of being a member of his government he had publicly criticized Nehru's foreign policy quite a number of times. On 22nd October 1952 it had been published in the Times, "*Dr. Ambedkar is one of the first Indian ministers who has criticized Nehru's foreign policy. He believed that Nehru's inclination towards China might prove fateful for the future of India.*"²⁷On 8th November, 1952 while addressing the students of Lucknow University he had said that, "*Nehru's foreign policy has remained unsuccessful in strengthening India. Under Nehru, India has never been a permanent member of the United Nation Organization.*

²⁶ Buddha Or Karl Marx , Dr. Babasabeb Ambedkar International Association for Education, Japan, Digital Publication, p. 19

²⁷ Chandra Bharil, *Social and political ideas of B R Ambedkar*, Alekh publication, Jaipur, 2011 p.111.

India would now have to make a choice between Pro-Democratic America and Western countries or countries like China or Russia where the system of dictatorship is prevailing.”²⁸ Dr. Ambedkar did not believe that war and violence were always wrong. He wanted to defend the country and make her war ready in case of an attack. He believed that submission to wrong and surrender to evil was cowardice. It was against self respect and dignity. He said “*war cannot be abolished by merely refusing to fight when attacked, to abolish war you must win war and establish a just peace*”²⁹. The coexistence between parliamentary democracy and communism was a myth to him. He believed that Nehru’s policy of absolutism was weakening the nation. Being a democratic country, India should have established friendly relations with America and Western Countries rather than favoring Mao and Stalin who promoted dictatorship. He believed that problems like poverty and unemployment could be solved by getting assistance from America. Dr Ambedkar had raised some searching questions concerning the Soviet Revolution. Sohanlal Shastri in his book “Babasaheb Ke Sampark Mein Mere Pacchis Varsh” quotes Ambedkar as saying that if Communists succeeded in establishing their rule in India, they would need civil servants for operating the administrative machinery, military and workers to run the nation.³⁰ They would have to make do with the civil servants, military and workers in employment at the time, when *savarna* Hindus dominated the administration and the military. These *savarna* Hindus wielded power during the British Raj. They were wielding power during the Congress Raj. They would wield power in the Communist Raj. The Untouchables, Tribals and *Shudras* were deprived of power previously and they would continue that way in the communist rule. Dr Ambedkar said that the third class, i.e. the workers, included the untouchables who were then sweeping roads, lifting garbage, toiling in the fields and factories and working as small-time artisans will continue to live in drudgery in the communist regime. They might get better wages and better housing but they would have no say in the administrative and military set up. They would continue to do what they were doing then, though their economic status may improve. When any member of this class would demand that their children be given a share in power, the communist government would reply that in its eyes, the administrative officer and the person sweeping the streets were equals; those who had the experience of sweeping the roads would be better off doing just that. The ultimate fallout would be that the Untouchables and other backward classes would continue to languish in third place

²⁸ Gaikwad, Vijay B., *Dr. Ambedkar's foreign policy and its relevance*, Vaibhav Prakashan, Raipur, 1999, p.188.

²⁹ Kuber, W. N., *Builders of Modern India: Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Publications Division, Information & Broadcasting Ministry, Govt. of India, New Delhi, 2017, p. 236.

³⁰ Shashtri Sohanlal, *25 years with Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, Samyak Prakashan, New Delhi, 2002, p.131.

in society, and *savarna* adherents of the Varna system would continue to wield the power. Untouchability would wither away in the communist rule but the Untouchables would continue to wield the broom. He strongly opposed Nehru's inclination towards the policy of China. The then India's Prime Minister, Nehru favored the policy of communism as well as tried to establish friendly ties with China, which Dr. Ambedkar was totally against it. He believed that if Mao had observed the 'Panchsheel' principle he would've stayed away from Tibet.³¹ Dr. Ambedkar's prediction had come true and within a short span of time China had encroached Tibet and had waged a war against India and had grabbed huge acres of land in Kashmir. He had advised Nehru to look after the internal security of India rather than taking unnecessary interest in the foreign countries as well as to resolve the issue of separatism; liberate Goa from Portuguese, focus upon military training and had even appealed to increase India's security budget. He supported compulsory military training for all persons within certain age group. Recruitment of the standing army must be open to all communities. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar advocated compulsory military education for Indian youth for awareness of defense and security matter to younger generation and create administrative and discipline for development and protection of country.

The demand of the autonomy for each state of India at Jawaharlal Nehru University of Delhi certainly raises pertinent questions. The answers can be searched through Ambedkar's idea on state autonomy. Dr. Ambedkar's was against the policy of state autonomy; he had opposed the idea of linguistic division of states and had put forward an initiative to divide the country into much smaller states. He firmly believed that, "*Those people who come together to preserve the prestige of their language, literature and community would form a group which shall automatically result into the formation of different states.*" Instead of the linguistic division of states he had suggested their creation should be based administrative conveniences. He was of the opinion that territorialism might hamper the integrity of the nation. He had opposed the big formation of states like Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh, and had recommended their division into much smaller parts. He believed that the large stature of the Hindi speaking states shall strengthen the Separatist Protests in the South. Along with Delhi he had insisted upon Hyderabad to be named as the capital of India.³² He had supported for the autonomy and powers that should be vested in a state. He was an aide of the

³¹ Gaikwad, Vijay B., *Dr. Ambedkar's foreign policy and its relevance*, Vaibhav Prakashan, Raipur, 1999, p. 231

central government; he had also proposed the division of Kashmir state. He had even recommended the separation of Ladakh and Jammu; give the status of a separate state to Jammu and make it a part of Indian Union as well as hold a referendum in Kashmir and make it an integral part of our nation; and at that time the public opinion of Kashmir was also in India's favor. Ambedkar gave thought on Kashmir issue, he said, "*give the Hindu and Buddhist part to India. We are really not concerned with the Muslim part of Kashmir. It is a matter between Muslims of Kashmir and Pakistan. They may decide the issue, as they like. Or if you like, divide it into three parts. The ceasefire zones the valley and Jammu-Ladakh region and has a plebiscite only in the valley. What I am afraid is that in the proposed plebiscite which is to be an overall plebiscite the Hindus and Buddhist of Kashmir are likely to be dragged into Pakistan against their wishes and we may have to face the same problems as we are facing today in East Bengal.*"³³ Dr. B.R Ambedkar, who was the First law minister of India and was the chairman of Constitution drafting committee but he refused to draft Article 370 because he was strictly opposed to it. Ambedkar thought that by inserting the Article and making limited application of laws made by Parliament for the state of Jammu and Kashmir, it would create lots of problem rather than solving.

Dr. B.R Ambedkar had refused to draft Article 370 of Indian Constitution by saying: "*You wish India should protect your border, she should built roads in your areas, she should supply you food, grains and Kashmir should get equal status as India. But government of India should have only limited powers and Indian people should have no right in Kashmir. To give consent in your proposal, would be treacherous thing against the interest of India and I, as a Law Minister of India, will never do.*"³⁴ In this way, through his theoretical vision Dr. Ambedkar had opposed the hypothesis of communism like the provincial autonomy.

Conclusion

While performing a composite analysis of Dr. Ambedkar's thoughts, it can be observed that he had deeply thought about the problems faced by the people of India. In spite of being trained to think on western lines due to the education he received, he was deeply attached to the roots of his country. While on one hand he criticized the Brahminical structure that prevailed all over Hindusim, on the other hand he substituted the theories of Buddhism that arose out of Indian ideology. He disdained the

³³

³⁴ Moon Vasant, editor-*Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar's writing and speech part-10*, Education Department, Maharashtra Government, Mumbai, 2014, p. 215

western thought which regarded human being as a capitalist being and that which paved way for Capitalism and Communism. He strongly believed that economic equality and liberation could hardly account for human being's Development. Along with that it would be necessary to inculcate virtues as well as cultural values to lead the human civilization towards the direction of overall development. He had repeatedly opposed communism, dictatorship and violence as well as rejected the fundamental principles of communism. His ideas are still found relevant in the case of rising influence of capitalism over the world; the freedom of the oppressed lies at the core of the Indian values and not in the western thoughts and ideologies. The violent revolution influenced by communism shall challenge the unity and integrity of the country, and yet again India shall suffer from enslavement. It is therefore a crucial need of the hour to deeply contemplate so as to make India one, by creating such a society that is free of corruption and exploitation.

Bibliography

1. Ahir, D. C., *Dr. Ambedkar's Vision of Dhamma: An Assessment*, B.R.Publishing, New Delhi, 1998.
2. Ahir, D.C, *Buddhism and Ambedkar*, B.R. Publishing, New Delhi 2004.
3. Ahir, D.C., *Selected Speeches of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar (1927-1956)*, Blumoon Books, New Delhi,1997.
4. Jaffrelot, Christophe, *Dr. Ambedkar and Untouchability: Analyzing and fighting Caste*, Permanent Black, New Delhi, 2005.
5. Jatava, D. R., *The Critics of Dr. Ambedkar*. Surabhi Publications, Jaipur, 1997.
6. Kadam, K. N., *Dr. Babasahed Ambedkar and the Significance of his Movement*. Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1991.
7. Keer, Dhananjay, *Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1954.
8. Moon, Vasant, ed., *Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches Vol. 1-16.*, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 1979
9. Omvedt, Gail, *Ambedkar: Towards an Enlightened India*, Penguin, New Delhi, 2004.
10. Omvedt, Gail, *Dalit Visions: The Anti-Caste Movement and the Construction of an Indian Identity*, Orient Longman Private Limited, New Delhi, 2006
11. Omvedt, Gail, *Dalits and the Democratic Revolution*, Sage Publications, London 1994.
12. S. G. Sardesai, "*Gautam Buddha, Karl Marx and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar (1981)*" People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1998.

13. Shourie, Arun, *Worshipping False Gods*. Harper Collins, New Delhi, 2000.
14. Gore, M.S., *The Social Context of an Ideology: Ambedkar's Political and Social Thought*, Sage New Delhi, 1993.
15. Jatava, D.R., *Dr. Ambedkar: Social Philosophy*, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 1997.
16. Zelliott, E, *From Untouchable to Dalit: Essays on the Ambedkar Movement*, Manohar, New Delhi, 1992.
17. Zelliott, E, *From Untouchables to Dalit*, Manohar, New Delhi, 2001
18. Buddha Or Karl Marx , Dr. Babasabeb Ambedkar International Association for Education, Japan, Digital Publication
19. B.R. Ambedkar, '*Buddha and the Future of His Religion*', in *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Vol. 17, Part 2*, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 2003.
- 20 B.R. Ambedkar, '*Philosophy of Hinduism*', in *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Vol. 3 Part 2*, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 2003.
- 21 Chandra Bharil, *Social and political ideas of B R Ambedkar*, Alekh publication, Jaipur, 2011.
22. Mittal Satish Chand, "*Samayvad ka sach* , Pratibha Pratisthan, New Delhi, 2007
23. Naimishraya Mohandas, "History of the Indian Dalit Movement", Part-4, Radhakrishna . Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2013.
24. Shashtri Sohanlal, *25 years with Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar*, Samyak Prakashan, New Delhi, 2002.
25. Kshirsagar R. K, *Karl Marks and Babasaheb Ambedkar : A Comparative Study*, Kalpaz Publications, New Delhi, 2015.
26. Mishra S. N., *Socio-economic and Political Vision of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2010.
27. Sangharakshita, *Dr Ambedkar and the Revival of Buddhism*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Bangalore, 2017.
28. Jadhav. Praveen K., *Ambedkarism: Essays on Select Economic & Cultural Issues*, Rawat Publication, Jaipur, 2013.
29. Kuber, W. N., *Builders of Modern India: Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Publications Division, M/O Information & Broadcasting, Govt. of India, New Delhi, 2017.
30. Gaikwad, Vijay B., *Dr. Ambedkar's foreign policy and its relevance*, Vaibhav Prakashan, Raipur, 1999.