



---

**GANDHI AND AMBEDDAR: SOCIAL JUSTICE'S RELIGIOUS NATURE**

---

**PRAGYA**

Research Scholar

**DR T N SINGH & DR UMESH CHANRDA SHARMA**

Associate Professor

Deptt of Philosophy

JS University Shikohabad Firozabad (U.P.)

**DR A K SINGH**

Head, Deptt of Applied Philosophy

M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly(U.P.)

**ABSTRACT**

*The social intellectuals Gandhi and Ambedkar had a religious outlook, and both of them were social intellectuals. Their religion was defined by compassion, love, kindness, and good conduct, and it rejected all sorts of exploitation, oppression, and awful crimes that were predicated on incest. They did not think that religion was opium; rather, their religion focused on compassion, love, kindness, and good behavior. Both of these social philosophers argue for the construction of a civilized society in which it is possible to achieve the eradication of social differences on every level. This would make it possible to give service to all persons.*

**Keywords:** Social , Justice's , Religious , Nature

**INTRODUCTION**

Gandhi and Ambedkar are two examples of such geniuses from the 20th century. They are respected as everlasting sources of advice and inspiration that are relevant in some form or another in every country and historical period. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar's public careers started under the mental pressure of diverse experiences and backgrounds, despite the fact that they took different views in the study, analysis, and interpretation of social and political concepts. Despite this, it was clear that they had a common concern for those who were living on the outskirts of society and that they were committed to finding ways to improve their situation.

It follows that expressing differences in opinion is a pretty common procedure, and that acceptance by everyone is vital for living. This is because society is comprised of a wide variety of people, each of whom has their own unique characteristics. To put it another way, the only way to rescue creation and civilization is to refrain from extremism on a constant basis. It is impossible for social change to be completely novel since it can only originate from inside the framework of the present system. It receives support from both materialistic and non-materialistic points of view, and its basic tenet, which is the nonviolent principle of Mahatma Gandhi, clearly aligns with

Gautam Buddha's middle path. When seen by society, Ambedkar is portrayed as a passionate supporter of social transformation. It is only possible for any change to be beneficial to the population if it is accepted by society in some fashion and if it stops the pillars of the social system from competing with one another.

When we attempt to evaluate the principles and concepts of both of the pioneers of the twentieth century, Gandhi and Ambedkar, from the relativity perspective in light of the principles that were mentioned earlier, it appears that two of the pioneers formulate their thoughts and concepts with Mahatma Gautam Buddha as their target.

On the other hand, it seems that in this process, whereas Mahatma Gandhi maintains the practical aspect at the center, Ambedkar seems to be resolute on the theoretical side, which may result in a great deal of difficulty in putting it into practice. When this occurs, however, it is essential to adopt the realistic attitude that Mahatma Gandhi advocated. For the purpose of making it easier to study, it has been arranged according to the following headings: The socio-economic form of social justice, the political form of social justice, and the religious form of social justice are all examples of the work that Gandhi and Ambedkar have done. All of the aforementioned information will be taken into consideration as we make an effort to provide a comparative analysis of each of these remarkable individuals.

### **Gandhi and Ambedkar's Socio-Economic Form of Social Justice**

Gandhi and Ambedkar are in accord with the fact that the job of social upliftment should begin at the lowest level. This is something that both of them believe in. It is Gandhiji who is responsible for preparing the blueprint for such an all-encompassing growth. Because of this advancement, it is now feasible to raise all those individuals who are disadvantaged, oppressed, orphaned, defenseless, and victims of social distortions in order to increase their chances of being elevated. While Gandhi is referring to the concept of upliftment, he is not only referring to the elevation of material things; rather, in his view, the ultimate goal of a person is the elevation of their own moral and spiritual self. However, he is a strong advocate for material advancement to the extent that it satisfies the individual's most fundamental requirements. The ultimate goal, on the other hand, is "spirituality," which is designed to assist in the achievement of the highest goal. To put it another way, it is possible to argue that material possessions ought to be utilized for the purpose of life, rather than for the purpose of pleasure. Gandhi's perception of India is that it is largely a nation of work and not a place of pleasure. This is the rationale for this viewpoint.

On a socioeconomic, religious, and political level, Gandhi was very troubled by the disparities and unjust actions that were deeply rooted in the Indian culture. He was also deeply offended by the fact that these things were happening. Gandhi has been quoted as saying, "I will try to get such a constitution framed which will free India from all kinds of slavery and dependency and will, if necessary, give it the right to commit sins." This comment was made by Gandhi himself when he was in India. The construction of an India in which there is no discrimination between the upper and lower classes and in which there is harmony among the many different communities is something that I would want to strive toward.

The practice of untouchability, as well as the deleterious consequences of alcohol and other drugs that produce drunkenness, have no place in a nation such as India. When it comes to this matter, women will be accorded the same rights as men. Due to the fact that our relationship with the rest of the world will be peaceful, which means that we will not exploit anyone and we will not allow ourselves to be exploited by anybody, our army will be as tiny as it can possibly be. Each and every one of these interests will be respected in their totality, provided that they do not come into conflict with the interests of the millions of individuals who choose to remain quiet. When it comes to this subject, the problem that is exceedingly essential is, "What kind of organized society will it be in which the person standing in the triangle of the material world will make these social goals attainable by maintaining harmony with society and nature?"

The qualities of such a well-organized society were further commented upon by Gandhi, who said that The economics of India, as well as the economy of the whole world, should be constructed in such a manner that no one should be compelled to go through the difficulty of not having enough food and clothing to eat, according to his point of view. When the means of production of essential requirements of living continue to be under the control of the people, then and only then will this objective be attainable. To put it another way, enough work opportunities should be available to all individuals so that they may fulfill their need for food and clothing. In the same way that the air and water that God has bestowed upon us are available to us, they should be accessible to all persons without experiencing any kind of restriction. Under no circumstances are they permitted to be used as a means of transportation for a commercial activity that is carried out with the intention of exploiting other individuals of any kind.

Gandhi, the only society that is capable of supporting such an economy is one that does not participate in behaviour that is considered to be violent. In what specific ways would the non-violent method contribute to the realization of economic equality via its implementation? During the time when Gandhi was contemplating this matter, he made the following statement: "People should limit their needs." You need to exert control over their power in order to generate money. Make every effort to avoid going without any cash on you. You should stop the habit of speculating if you have a propensity to find yourself doing so. Every aspect of your life is entirely within your control.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To study on Gandhi and Ambedkar's Socio-Economic Form of Social Justice
2. To study on non-violent method contribute to the realization of economic equality

## **Political Social Justice Formation: Gandhi and Ambedkar**

When it comes to the political side of social justice, it would seem that both Gandhi and Ambedkar are in accord about the enhancement of political empowerment for those who are living on the periphery of society. After reviewing a number of papers, it has become clear that neither of the social philosophers had any political interest in the future in mind. This was discovered via the investigation of such materials. Civil and political rights are needed for the constructive growth of persons who are denied the right to justice, denied the right to political rights, and who are socially loathed. As a result, Gandhi and Ambedkar are of the opinion that these rights are vital. It is

important to note, however, that the methods that they have used in order to achieve this purpose are rather different from one another.

For the purpose of achieving this aim, Gandhi puts a significant amount of importance on the establishment of a "stateless democracy" that is based on the idea of village self-rule. Ambedkar, on the other hand, is a supporter of the concept of "representative democracy." A "condition-less democracy" is a situation of enlightened and awakened anarchy, in which social life achieves that perfection where it becomes self-governed and self-controlled. This condition is characterized by the absence of terms and conditions. Gandhi referred to this condition as an anarchic state in his definition. "In the ideal state, there is no political power, because no state exists." In his perspective, it would be challenging to achieve this ideal situation. Gandhi was of this opinion. This "ideal" is akin to that line of reasoning that is without width, which no one has been able to draw up to this point, and which no one will be able to draw in the years to come. This is the primary reason why this would be the case. In spite of this, we have made a significant amount of progress in geometry by making certain that we always have that beautiful line in front of us.

From a political standpoint, "Gandhiji's Gram Swarajya" is extremely comparable to the idea of a democracy that does not include the presence of a governmental component. He is of the belief that the state in question is the best one since it has the least amount of power. There is a "decentralization of the state" in Gandhi's Gram Swarajya, which signifies that the state does not come to an end. Gandhi is a strong supporter of sustainable democracy, which implies that power would be held by the very last person in the community. This is the most accurate interpretation of the phrase. Self-discipline and respect for others will be ingrained in each and every individual. Nevertheless, love and self-control will serve as the cornerstone of such a democracy, rather than force and willpower are going to be the foundation. The reason why Gandhi expresses his dissatisfaction with the western democracy that is prevalent all over the world is because of this in particular. Gandhi was cited as stating, "The democracy that exists in the West today is a slightly lighter shade of Nazi and Fascist democracy." This statement was made in reference to West European democracy. The vast majority of the time, democracy is nothing more than a facade that is employed to disguise the imperialist methods of Nazism and fascism. India is actively striving toward the construction of a democracy that is true to its word. To put it another way, a democracy in which there is no place for violence to exist. In addition, Gandhi believes that "true public power or people's self-rule can never be achieved through the use of fear, violence, or the fabrication of false information." This is a statement that Gandhi makes at the beginning of his work. In a straightforward manner, the reasoning is clear. When one utilizes techniques that are both dishonest and violent, the inevitable conclusion will be that all opposition will be destroyed, either via the repression of the opponents or by the annihilation of them. This will be the case regardless of which approach is used. 3) As a result of this, Gandhi puts a significant amount of importance on the integrity of both the ultimate aim and the means by which it might be accomplished.

Dr. Ambedkar, on the other hand, has a vision of a Swarajya that would not be an authoritarian or people-ruled state, but rather a state that would be representational of the people. From the point of view of social justice, this is the Swarajya that Dr. Ambedkar sees for the future. The underprivileged segments of society, in particular the Dalit and untouchable castes, have the

potential to triumph over the centuries-old social inequity by seizing power on the basis of their numerical strength and enacting laws that are in accordance with their own values, according to Dr. Ambedkar, who is certain in his belief that this is the case. Ambedkar has endeavoured to make Swarajya a good state by putting a focus on caste-based representation while simultaneously expanding the right to vote. This is part of his attempts to construct Swarajya. It was in the course of Ambedkar's contemplation of the system of representation that would be used in the future Swarajya that he made it abundantly plain in his diary titled "Mook Nayak" that the marginalized parts of society need to be divided into groups. It is necessary to ensure that the representation of socioeconomically disadvantaged groups is in accordance with their needs. This should not be done on the basis of quantitative and logical thinking, but rather with an open mind and a viewpoint that is open to the future. Even if a caste has a relatively small number of members, if the majority of its criteria are higher than those of the majority, then the caste in question deserves to be awarded a larger level of representation than the number of members it has. This is because the majority of the requirements that the caste has are higher than those of the majority.

When compared to Gandhi, who strives to find answers to the problems that these castes experience on a social, economic, and religious level, Ambedkar puts a larger focus on political means for the aim of upliftment. Gandhi, on the other hand, seeks to find solutions to these problems. It was Gandhi's position that representation should not be founded on the basis of communality. Gandhi was resolute in his conviction that just granting representation on a communal basis would be equivalent to issuing an open invitation to bloodshed among groups. He believed this to be the case.

On the contrary, according to Ambedkar, "Communal representation is not a bad thing; rather, it is the best arrangement for the safety and security of different sections of the country because it is the best arrangement." It is hard for me to forget that the people of India are people who have a strong feeling of community, Ambedkar had declared during the Round Table Conference. He said this because it is impossible for me to forget. In spite of the fact that it is realistic to anticipate that there will come a day when the people of India will no longer approach the settlement of their administrative concerns from a communal viewpoint, it is essential to keep in mind that this will just be a hope and not a reality. On the other hand, the reality of the matter is that if the Indian people were given the chance to use discretion in the administration of law, then it is without a doubt that they would differentiate between the various socioeconomic groups as well as the various communities.

This is what Ambedkar had to say about his philosophy: "I am completely convinced that communalism ought to be my ideology." Regarding this matter, I do not feel any remorse whatsoever. Ambedkar made the following statement in order to emphasize the need of communal representation: "I would like to say that in my opinion, India will not be able to make political development without communalism." It is not conceivable for India to gain self-rule if communalism is not prevalent in the country. In Ambedkar's view, democracy in its most basic form is a government that is governed by the majority of the population. There is a great possibility that a specific class of society will always stay in power, while another particular class will always be bereft of power if the concept of community representation is neglected. This is because there is a positive correlation between the two extremes. Specifically, this is due to the

fact that the majority of the people in the society are anticipated to cast their votes for officials. The political dynamism and transformability that are characteristic of these sorts of regimes are non-existent. As a consequence of the minority population being exposed to social distortion, the members of the ruling class in the society are able to take pleasure in powerful positions. The only way, according to Ambedkar, that it would be possible to accomplish social justice in the most literal sense of the word would be if minority communities were to be given with appropriate political protection that was suited to their specific needs. The minority community should be provided a larger degree of political protection in proportion to the lower levels of education and economic position that it has, according to Ambedkar. This is because the minority population has a lower economic standing.

### **Gandhi and Ambedkar: Social Justice's Religious Nature**

In the context of social justice, religion is an important agent that plays a part in the control of the internal interactions that exist within a community. This is the case when the viewpoint of social justice is taken into consideration. It is responsible for regulating and controlling a person's conduct, beliefs, lifestyle, work style, and good conscience, among other things like these. In order to guarantee that a person does not participate in any kind of wrongdoing, oppression, or injustice, and that they are orientated toward the welfare of others and the profit of all, this is done. Meanwhile, Maharishi Kanad was of the idea that religion is the means by which one might accomplish both worldly growth and spiritual development. He believed that this was the case. According to the Mahabharata, anytime you engage with other people, you should never conduct in a way that you would not want anybody else to behave with you. This is a principle that is emphasized throughout the Mahabharata. Indeed, this is the core of religious belief.

During the time when Maharishi Vyas was working to promote the secularization of religion, he said that the objective of religion is to adopt, and that it embraces not just the individual but also the whole. In order to draw a relationship between religion and human society, Maharishi Vyas takes into consideration the expansive meaning of religion. In addition to this, he infuses human values into it, which ultimately leads to the establishment of a just system that enables the coordinated progress of society in accordance with social justice. Additionally, it is mentioned in Islamic sacred writings, such as the Quran and Hadith, that "Power and positions of profit in society are not reserved for any particular class, caste, family, or clan." This is a statement that pertains to the Islamic religion. Through the use of this remark, the significance of human equality is brought into focus. Clay is the material that Adam was created of, and all individuals are descendants of Adam. A human being's first ancestor was named Adam. There is no preference for an Arab over a non-Arab, a non-Arab over an Arab, a white over a black, or a black over a white, with the exception of Taqwa, which means "living one's life in accordance with the divine orders." Taqwa is the only exception to this rule.

As a consequence of this, we come to the realization that the word "dharma" has been used in each and every religious text to refer to the responsibilities, deeds, good conduct, and perfection, among other things, that are to be accepted in human society. In the course of the history of every religion, the idea of human well-being has been put up on several occasions. In point of fact, truth has the capacity to be acknowledged as the preeminent religion. There is a possibility that the foundation of the Sarva Dharma Sambhav might be based on the feeling and motivation of human

---

happiness that is inherent in truth. As a result of this fact, the development of the human soul is made possible, and the human society is driven by the spirit of social welfare, which ultimately results in the progression toward a system that is equitable.

The social intellectuals Gandhi and Ambedkar had a religious outlook, and both of them were social intellectuals. Their religion was defined by compassion, love, kindness, and good conduct, and it rejected all sorts of exploitation, oppression, and awful crimes that were predicated on incest. They did not think that religion was opium; rather, their religion focused on compassion, love, kindness, and good behavior. Both of these social philosophers argue for the construction of a civilized society in which it is possible to achieve the eradication of social differences on every level. This would make it possible to give service to all persons.

## **CONCLUSION**

Gandhi and Ambedkar are in accord about the enhancement of political empowerment for those who are living on the periphery of society. After reviewing a number of papers, it has become clear that neither of the social philosophers had any political interest in the future in mind. This was discovered via the investigation of such materials. Civil and political rights are needed for the constructive growth of persons who are denied the right to justice, denied the right to political rights, and who are socially loathed. As a result, Gandhi and Ambedkar are of the opinion that these rights are vital. It is important to note, however, that the methods that they have used in order to achieve this purpose are rather different from one another.

## **REFERENCES**

---

- [1.] Guru, G. (2017) Morality in Gandhi's Critique of Ambedkar Economic and Political Weekly, 95-100
- [2.] Puri, B. (2022) Ambedkar and Gandhi: Self, Community and God in The Ambedkar-Gandhi Debate: On Identity, Community and Justice (pp. 55-130) Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore
- [3.] Rodrigues, V. (2020) Gandhi and Ambedkar on Caste. Classical Buddhism, Neo-Buddhism and the Question of Caste (pp. 178-207) in Routledge India.
- [4.] Nadkarni, M.V. (2003) Relevance of Ethics and Conversion: A Critical Appraisal of Religious and Social Dimensions in Gandhian Perspective Economic and Political Weekly, 227-235
- [5.] Rajashekaraiyah, A.M., and Jayaraj, H. (1991) Political Philosophy of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar The Indian Journal of Political Science, 52(3), 357-375

- [6.] Zenn, C. (2013) Antonio Gramsci and the Political Philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar London: Routledge, 10, 9780203762035
- [7.] Mandal, I. (2003) Socio-religious Philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar and the Origins of the Neo-Buddhist Movement in India (Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Bengal)
- [8.] Puri, B. The Ambedkar-Gandhi Debate
- [9.] Ranjan, R. (2015) Gandhi and Ambedkar on Human Dignity. Adapted from Bombay Sarvodaya Mandal and Gandhi Research Foundation, 'Gandhi Marg, 37(2)
- [10.] Gehlot, N.S. (1993) Dr. Ambedkar, Mahatma Gandhi and the Dalit Movement. The Indian Journal of Political Science, 54(3/4), 382-387