

## **Ambedkar on Poverty and Inequality: Policy Directions for the 21st Century**

**BibiSaleema Badgi<sup>1</sup>, H.H. Bharadi<sup>2</sup> & Sachin Kurade<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Studies in Economics, Karnatak University, Dharwad.

<sup>2</sup>Senior Professor, Department of Studies in Economics, Karnatak University, Dharwad.

<sup>3</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Studies in Economics, Karnatak University, Dharwad.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17805330>

### **ABSTRACT:**

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar remains one of the most influential thinkers on social justice, economic inequality, and structural poverty in India. While his writings are often discussed within political or social contexts, his economic insights particularly his analysis of caste-based exploitation, labour markets, and institutional exclusion offer timeless frameworks for contemporary policy discourse. This paper revisits Ambedkar's contributions to the debate on poverty and inequality and situates them within 21st-century developmental challenges. Using secondary literature, historical economic reasoning, and a qualitative analytical method, the paper evaluates Ambedkar's perspectives on structural deprivation and proposes policy directions aligned with the modern socio-economic landscape. The analysis highlights that Ambedkar's approach was essentially institutional, rights-based, and redistributive, advocating for state intervention, affirmative action, educational expansion, labour protections, and social democracy. The paper concludes by presenting actionable policy directions rooted in Ambedkarite principles for addressing contemporary poverty and inequality.

### **KEYWORDS:**

Ambedkar, Poverty, Inequality, Caste and Economy, Social Justice, Public Policy, Social Democracy.

.....

### **Introduction:**

Poverty and inequality in India continue to reflect deep structural roots rather than mere economic shortages. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar recognised early that social hierarchy, caste oppression, lack of economic opportunity, and institutional exclusion are fundamental causes of poverty among marginalised communities. His economic writings—spanning from The

Problem of the Rupee (1923) to speeches in the Constituent Assembly—present a consistently argued case for state-led economic transformation, labour protection, redistribution, and structural reforms. In the 21st century, India's developmental landscape has changed dramatically, yet challenges like jobless growth, agrarian distress, rural-urban disparities, caste-based discrimination, and unequal access to education and assets persist. As policymakers rethink frameworks for inclusive development, Ambedkar's intellectual legacy offers a robust analytical foundation. This paper systematically examines Ambedkar's ideas on poverty and inequality and develops policy directions suitable for contemporary India. The goal is not only historical interpretation but also applied policy relevance.

### **Literature Review**

Scholars have examined Ambedkar's economic thought from diverse lenses. Zelliot (1992) emphasises Ambedkar's role in conceptualising caste as an economic system tied to labour segmentation and exclusion. Ilaiah (1996) argues that Ambedkar's critique of Brahminical social order presents an alternative political economy rooted in dignity and rights. Jodhka (2010) analyses caste-based inequalities in modern markets, aligning with Ambedkar's view that caste persists within capitalism. Thorat and Newman (2012) empirically demonstrate discrimination in labour, housing, and credit markets, validating Ambedkar's structural analysis. Omvedt (2004) highlights Ambedkar's revolutionary vision linking democracy with socio-economic transformation, showing how his ideas predate modern social justice frameworks. Rodrigues (2002) compiles Ambedkar's writings to show his consistent advocacy for redistribution through state intervention. Kumar (2018) examines contemporary poverty debates and argues that Ambedkar's understanding of institutional exclusion remains essential for policy design. Galanter (1984) provides a legal perspective on affirmative action, emphasising Ambedkar's role in crafting safeguards for marginalised groups. Beteille (2007) explores the persistence of social inequality, often reaffirming Ambedkar's belief that caste is incompatible with economic mobility. Nagaraj (2020) analyses Dalit economic conditions in neoliberal India, arguing that despite growth, asset poverty and labour exclusions continue to reflect what Ambedkar described a century ago. Together, these works establish Ambedkar as a central figure in the economic analysis of inequality and social justice.

### **Objectives of the Study**

1. To examine Ambedkar's conceptualisation of poverty and inequality within the framework of caste and structural discrimination.
2. To analyse Ambedkar's economic and social philosophy relevant to contemporary challenges in India.
3. To evaluate the persistence of socio-economic inequalities through an Ambedkarite lens.
4. To propose policy directions for the 21st century that are grounded in Ambedkar's principles of social democracy, state intervention, and institutional reform.

### **Methodology**

This research is qualitative, interpretative, and analytical. It relies primarily on secondary data, including Ambedkar's original writings, government reports, scholarly books, peer-reviewed articles, and empirical studies on poverty and caste. The methodology involves (a) textual analysis of Ambedkar's speeches and works, (b) thematic categorisation of his economic and social principles, and (c) comparative analysis linking Ambedkar's ideas with contemporary socio-economic trends. No primary survey was conducted, but existing statistical literature is interpreted to understand modern inequality patterns in relation to Ambedkar's framework. This method is particularly suitable because Ambedkar's economic philosophy is largely accessible through textual and historical analysis.

### **Ambedkar on Poverty and Inequality: Analytical Discussion**

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's economic thought is fundamentally centred around the belief that poverty is not merely an outcome of low income or scarcity of resources, but the direct result of entrenched social hierarchies and institutional structures that regulate who controls property, labour, capital, and political agency. His analysis diverges from conventional classical and neoclassical interpretations, which treat poverty as an economic imbalance, by arguing that poverty in India is inseparable from the caste system and the rigid social order that legitimised exploitation. For Ambedkar, economic inequality was a consequence of social inequality, and therefore any attempt to eradicate poverty without transforming social relations would remain incomplete.

## **1. Poverty as a Structural and Institutional Problem**

Ambedkar rejected the notion that poverty could be solved through welfare or charity alone. He emphasised that poverty in India persisted because of structural restrictions on resource access, land ownership, education, and labour mobility. In his writings, he repeatedly highlighted that the majority of the oppressed classes remained landless and assetless not because of lack of skill or diligence but due to deliberate exclusion shaped by caste. Land ownership—an essential determinant of rural livelihood—was historically monopolised by upper castes, leaving Scheduled Castes and Tribes dependent on agrarian labour under exploitative terms.

Therefore, according to Ambedkar, poverty was institutionalised, imposed systematically through laws, customs, cultural norms, and social power. Even where economic resources existed, they did not translate into upward mobility because access was controlled by caste mechanisms. He argued that unless the structural roots of inequality were uprooted, economic growth would benefit only the dominant classes. This perspective forms the core of Ambedkar's argument for social democracy—an economic system built on justice, equality and shared prosperity.

## **2. Caste as a System of Economic Exploitation**

For Ambedkar, caste was not simply a cultural or religious ideology but an economic institution engineered for labour control. The caste system determined one's occupation by birth, thereby eliminating competition, suppressing innovation, and confining productive capability within hierarchy. Those belonging to oppressed castes were historically forced into degrading manual labour, denied education, and excluded from skilled work or entrepreneurship. Meanwhile, privileged castes held control over land, trade, administration, and political power.

This analysis continues to resonate in contemporary India. Even with legislative reform, caste correlates strongly with access to land, education, markets, and credit, especially in rural areas. Dalits continue to form a disproportionately high share of agricultural labourers and a disproportionately low share of landowners and formal sector employees. Ambedkar's insight therefore offers a timeless interpretative framework: eliminating inequality requires dismantling the caste-based economic order, not merely redistributing income.

### **3. Labour and Wage Inequality**

Ambedkar's contribution to labour policy remains one of the most significant pillars of his economic legacy. His tenure as Labour Member in the Viceroy's Executive Council led to landmark reforms including:the eight-hour work day,establishment of maternity benefit laws,regulations for industrial safety and compensation,the Mine Labour Welfare Fund,and equitable wage standards.

Ambedkar believed that fair wages and labour dignity were not negotiable, as labour was the foundation of production. For him, raising wages was not only an economic necessity but an ethical one—labourers were entitled to the wealth they helped generate. In modern India, informal sector workers, especially SC/ST labourers, often remain outside formal protections. Strengthening wage laws, union rights, and welfare provisions is therefore consistent with Ambedkar's original economic mandate.

### **4. Education as the Weapon Against Poverty**

If labour rights and wages address economic symptoms, Ambedkar believed that education addressed the root cause. He described education as the "weapon of social transformation" because it challenges ignorance, breaks caste-imposed occupation boundaries, and enables participation in higher-skill economic activity. Education builds self-respect, agency, and the capacity to question injustice.

His scholarship funding initiatives, hostels for Dalit students, and advocacy for publicly funded schooling show his belief that poverty will persist unless marginalised groups gain intellectual tools to contest inequality. Education, for Ambedkar, was not merely literacy—it was empowerment. In the 21st century, gaps in learning access, digital literacy, and higher education enrollment among SC/ST populations indicate the continuing relevance of Ambedkar's vision.

### **5. State Intervention for Redistribution**

Ambedkar's economic philosophy diverged sharply from laissez-faire capitalism. He argued that unregulated markets reinforce existing power structures, allowing the wealthy to accumulate resources at the expense of the poor. For development to be equitable, Ambedkar proposed active state responsibility through:redistribution of land and nationalisation of key industries,public investment in education, irrigation, health, and housing,affirmative action for historically oppressed communities,strong

labour laws and minimum wage guarantees.

He favoured a welfare-oriented state not as charity, but as compensation for historical injustice. His arguments align with modern social democratic development models practiced in Scandinavia, where redistribution supports prosperity without sacrificing growth.

## **6. Social Democracy as Economic Development**

Ambedkar asserted that political democracy cannot survive without social and economic democracy. Elections alone do not make a society just; justice emerges when every citizen has equal access to resources, opportunities, and dignity. Therefore, reducing poverty was not only an economic objective for Ambedkar—it was a democratic necessity.

His interpretation frames poverty eradication as a constitutional responsibility, not a welfare gesture. Unless redistribution happens, he believed, democracy becomes a privilege instead of a right. Thus, in Ambedkar's framework, economic empowerment completes the meaning of citizenship.

### **Policy Directions for the 21st Century Inspired by Ambedkar**

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's economic and social philosophy offers a transformative foundation for contemporary public policy. In the 21st century, poverty and inequality remain deeply tied to caste-based exclusion, limited access to education, labour insecurity, and unequal ownership of land and capital. To address these structural imbalances, Ambedkarite policy directions must be centred on affirmative action, redistribution, education, labour justice, and expansion of the welfare state.

To begin with, strengthening affirmative action is essential to dismantle institutional discrimination. Despite decades of reservation in public employment and education, marginalised communities continue to face unequal opportunities and under-representation. Policy intervention should therefore involve extending reservations to the private sector, ensuring stronger implementation mechanisms in higher education and public institutions, and establishing monitoring systems to track caste-based hiring, wage discrimination, and market access. These measures align with Ambedkar's belief that justice must be legally safeguarded and institutionally enforced.

Next, universal and inclusive education forms the foundation of sustainable poverty eradication. Ambedkar considered education the most powerful equalising force capable of breaking caste-imposed occupational boundaries. Therefore, public spending on education should be increased to a minimum of 6% of GDP, digital infrastructure must be expanded to bridge rural ICT gaps, and targeted scholarships should prioritise SC/ST, OBC, and economically vulnerable groups. Skill training centres aligned with labour market demands and vocational streams should be strengthened to promote employability and entrepreneurship among rural youth.

Similarly, labour market and social security reforms are central to Ambedkar's vision of economic democracy. A universal minimum wage legislation across states would prevent wage exploitation, while expanding social protection systems including health insurance, pensions, and maternity benefits—would reduce vulnerability to economic shocks. The formalisation of informal sector labour through digital workers' IDs and simplified registration mechanisms would ensure legal safeguards for the majority of India's workforce. In addition, special support for Dalit and Adivasi entrepreneurs, through credit subsidies, procurement quotas, and incubation programmes, would promote equitable asset ownership and upward mobility.

A major pillar of Ambedkar's economic reasoning is land, credit, and asset redistribution. Landlessness continues to be a primary determinant of poverty among oppressed castes. To counter this, governments must implement transparent land redistribution, strengthen tenancy rights, and develop community land banks for cooperative cultivation. Institutional credit access must be expanded through priority lending to SC/ST households, reducing dependence on informal moneylenders. Ensuring affordable housing rights, especially in urban areas, would further support asset accumulation among marginalised groups.

An important but often overlooked area is the need for caste-sensitive poverty measurement. Contemporary poverty metrics typically focus on income, consumption, or occupation, overlooking caste-based discrimination as a structural determinant. Therefore, poverty surveys like NSSO and NFHS should include caste-wise data, labour discrimination markers, and asset ownership mapping to enable targeted policy planning. Such indicators would allow poverty alleviation schemes to directly address structural social inequity rather than only economic symptoms.

Building on Ambedkar's advocacy for a welfare-oriented state, expansion of welfare programmes must prioritise food security, employment guarantees, health services, and income stabilisation. Strengthening Public Distribution System (PDS) and MGNREGA will reduce hunger and rural unemployment, while urban employment guarantee schemes may address rising informalisation and migration. Investment in public healthcare especially primary and community-level hospitals—is essential to protect vulnerable populations from medical-induced poverty.

Lastly, Ambedkar's concept of social democracy and constitutional morality must guide governance. Constitutional values such as liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice can become living principles only when citizens are educated and institutions remain accountable. Civic education should be included in schools and colleges to nurture democratic awareness. Institutions like the SC/ST Commission, Human Rights Commission, local self-governing bodies, and Panchayati Raj institutions must be strengthened to protect rights, decentralise power, and ensure inclusive participation in decision-making.

### **Conclusion**

Ambedkar's insights into poverty and inequality remain profoundly relevant for the 21st century. His economic philosophy centred on structural analysis, rights-based equality, and the moral foundations of democracy. He demonstrated that poverty is inseparable from caste-based exclusion and that market forces alone cannot resolve deep social inequalities. As India navigates complex developmental challenges, Ambedkar's principles education, state intervention, social justice, labour protections, and constitutionalism offer a comprehensive framework for inclusive growth. The policy directions outlined in this paper aim to connect Ambedkar's historical vision with contemporary developmental needs, ensuring that the struggle against inequality continues in the spirit of social democracy and human dignity.

---

**References:**

1. Borooh, V. K., Diwakar, D., Naik, A., & Sabharwal, N. (2014). Caste, Inequality, and Poverty in India: A Re-Assessment. *Development Studies Research*, 1(1), 279–294. Available at MPRA Paper No. 75669. Munich Personal RePEc Archive
2. Chawda, S. (2025). Caste as an Economic Institution: Formalizing Ambedkar's Theory of Graded Inequality. *Research Review Journal of Social Science*, 5(1), 249–254. <https://doi.org/10.31305/trjss.2025.v05.n01.031> rrjournals.co.in
3. Deshpande, A. (2011). *The grammar of caste: Economic discrimination in contemporary India*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198072034.001.0001> OUP Academic+1
4. Dadasaheb Tandale. (2021). Caste, Economic Inequality, and Climate Justice in India. In G. MacNaughton, D. Frey & C. Porter (Eds.), *Human Rights and Economic Inequalities* (pp. 217–244). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009006545.009> Cambridge University Press & Assessment
5. Gautam, A. K. (2025). Caste Power, Land Politics, and Urban Inequality in Post-Liberalised India. *Economic & Political History Review*, 1(2). *Economic & Political History Review*
6. Gummadi, N. (2022). *B. R. Ambedkar, Economic Development and Dalits in Post-Independence India*. Routledge. Routledge
7. Joshi, K., & Joshi, C. K. (2019). Working women and caste in India: A study of social disadvantage using feature attribution. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.03092> arXiv
8. Munshi, (2024). Class in caste: Inequalities in human capital investments in children in India. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 106, 103004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.103004> ScienceDirect
9. Pal, S., & Kumar, S. (2025). Breaking the Social Chains: Ambedkar's Fight Against Patriarchy and Caste-based Oppression. *RESEARCH REVIEW International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 10(4), 215–224. <https://doi.org/10.31305/trijm.2025.v10.n4.023> Research Review Journals
10. Rawal, V., & Swaminathan, M. (2024). Income Inequality and Caste in Village India. *AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH / Rural Studies*. (paper). IDEAS/RePEc
11. Reddy, A. B., Vaidehi, R., & Banerjee, S. (2021). Explaining caste-based digital divide in India. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15917> arXiv
12. Rodrigues, V. (Ed.). (2002). *The essential writings of B. R. Ambedkar*. Oxford University Press. Routledge+1
13. Sanil, A. (2023). Revisiting Inequality and Caste in State and Social Laws: Perspectives of Manu, Phule and Ambedkar. *CASTE: A Global Journal on Social Exclusion*, 4(2), 267–287. <https://doi.org/10.26812/caste.v4i2.502> journals.library.brandeis.edu
14. Singh, J., A. K. Singh, B. Bhushan, S. Mishra & A. Singh. (2022). Unequal work: Gender, caste and the crisis of women's employment in Madhya Pradesh (1993–2017). *Journal of Social Review and Development*, 1(1), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.64171/JSRD.1.1.61-69> Dzarc Publications
15. Tandale, D. (2021). See DadasahebTandale chapter above. Cambridge University

Press & Assessment

16. Thorat, S., & Newman, K. S. (2012). *Blocked by caste: Economic discrimination in modern India*. Oxford University Press.Routledge+1
17. World Bank. (2012). *Poverty and social exclusion in India: Dalits*. World Bank Report. Cited in Chawda (2025) for context.rjournals.co.in+1
18. Working, P., Novosad, P., & Rafkin, C. (2024). *Intergenerational Mobility in India: New Measures and Estimates across Time and Social Groups*. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 16(2), 66–98. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20210686> rjournals.co.in+1
19. World Bank or NSSO surveys on rural development and inequality (various years). Frequently referenced in studies of caste-based poverty and inequality. E.g. data used in Deshpande's "Grammar of Caste." OUP Academic+1
20. Younger, S. Y., & Teltumbde, A. (Eds.). (2018). *The Radical in Ambedkar: Critical Reflections*. Penguin Random House India.
21. Vaidehi, R., Reddy, A. B., & Banerjee, S. (2021). See above on digital divide.
22. World Development. (2018). *Caste and development: Contemporary perspectives on a structure of discrimination and advantage*. *World Development*, 110, 422–436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.06.003>

**Funding:**

This study was not funded by any grant.

**Conflict of interest:**

The Authors have no conflict of interest to declare that they are relevant to the content of this article.

**About the License:**

© The Authors 2024. The text of this article is open access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.