Ambedkar and the Algorithm

Imagine a world where your future is not decided by your family, your caste, or your social standing—but by a machine. What if *Ambedkar* were alive today, facing a system not built on human prejudices, but on the invisible biases coded into *artificial intelligence?* Would he fight the system again, not with words, but with *algorithms?*

When we think of *B.R. Ambedkar,* we usually picture the man with the blue suit and the *Constitution* in hand. But what if we placed him in today's world—where decisions are made not in courtrooms or *Parliament*, but by *algorithms?*

It might sound like a stretch, but honestly, it's not.

Ambedkar wasn't just a freedom fighter or a reformer. He was a system-thinker. He understood how invisible structures control lives. Back then, it was *Caste.* Now? It's *Code.* And the scary part is, this new system might seem neutral—but it's not.

Take *algorithms* used in h*iring.* A few years ago, *Amazon* had to shut down an *AI* recruiting tool because it was quietly rejecting resumes from women. Why? Because the model learned from past hiring patterns where men dominated tech roles. So it assumed that's what "qualified" looked like.

Sounds familiar, doesn't it? Like how *Caste* once decided who was "fit" to be a teacher, or a priest, or even to read.

Then there's the *COMPAS* tool in the U.S.—used to predict which prisoners are likely to re-offend. Studies found it flagged *Black* defendants as "high risk" way more often than *white* ones, even when their actual records didn't back it up. It's like a digital version of social profiling. If that doesn't scream structural bias, I don't know what does.

Even the *AI* we use for daily things—*Google Translate,* for example—once defaulted to gender stereotypes. Translate "They are a doctor" from a gender-neutral language, and boom: "He is a doctor." "She is a nurse." Same old ideas, just running quietly in the background.

Now, imagine *Ambedkar* seeing all this. He'd probably raise the same questions he did back then: Who is writing these rules? Who benefits? Who gets left behind?

But he wouldn't stop at critique. He'd learn the system. Master it. And then—rewrite it.

Ambedkar saw education as the path to liberation. Today, that might include learning to *code,* understanding *algorithms,* and making tech inclusive from the ground up. If he built the *Constitution* to protect the rights of all, today he'd be pushing for *digital laws* to do the same.

This isn't just about tech—it's about *power. Ambedkar's* fight was always about *dignity, access,* and *representation.* And just like *caste* rules were once treated as "normal," algorithmic bias today often hides behind the label of "efficiency."

But here's the truth: *code* is not neutral. *Data* is not neutral. And the systems we trust can't be trusted blindly.

Ambedkar doesn't just belong in history textbooks. His legacy belongs in *boardrooms, data labs,* and *policy meetings.* Especially now, when invisible systems are deciding who gets hired, who gets a loan, and who gets seen.

He might not write *Python,* but he'd definitely make sure it's *ethical.*

And maybe—just maybe—that's the kind of debugging our world still needs.

-Garv Gupta
(Westzone-2)