



---

**AMBEDKAR AND INDIAN NATIONALISM: AN OVERVIEW**

**Dr. C. Vinod Kumar**

**Academic Counselor, Dept. of Political Science, Centre for Distance Education,  
Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjunanagar, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh.**

**ABSTRACT:**

The term 'nationalism' was first used by the anti-Jacobin French priest Augustin Barruel in 1789. In India, political nationalists of Congress left too many socio-political gaps that must be bridged. After that, Dr. Ambedkar rose to the occasion and filled these gaps theoretically and in a real politico-legal sense. Ambedkar's idea of political nationalism about the communitarian concept of communal and minority rights, particularly given the communitarian idea that nation is too distant an identity for communal members to identify themselves with. Therefore, it is an expendable identity. Dr. Ambedkar secured out his 'nationalism', which took the historically oppressed 'social groups' like minorities, women, untouchables and so on into account. But while making differences among identarian social categories, Ambedkar also took sufficient care to make his nationalism socially inclusive. In this connection, this article gives an overview of Dr. Ambedkar Indian Nationalism.

**KEY WORDS:** Nationalism, Ambedkar Social Philosophy, social cohesion, social change, political nationalism, Democratic Indian Nationalism.

**INTRODUCTION:**

The style of politics and "civic nationalism" Ambedkar in colonial India has dramatically enriched not only all anti-colonial nationalism but also contributed to the healthy creation of the newly arrived Indian state. Political nationalism in colonial India was far from being included without the intervention of Ambedkar, while Congress nationalists left too many socio-political gaps, which required to be filled. Ambedkar came to the occasion and has filled these gaps not only in a theoretical sense but also in a political-legal

sense. Theoretically, congress nationalism invoked Western-universal-abstract categories and was insensitive to particular and obscures Indian social contexts. It did not recognize, at least in colonial times, the reality of the difference or social identity, and instead of treating the original population uniformly.

Nationalists like Ambedkar have taken pains to make their nationalism socially acceptable. From then, his political nationalism turned into a balanced and defensible Indian state, adopting a particular notion of "universal citizenship"



and naming it collective rights. He also saw the Indian state as a nationalist pantheon in which all of India's many cultures might coexist with equal respect and participate in a national process.

This research begins by defining nationalism as a broad but problematic notion to identify Ambedkar's nationalism in the anti-colonial sphere. To separate the West's nationalism from the East's neo-colonialist nationalisms was equally critical. Second, throughout the colonial period, numerous anti-colonial nationalist ideologies engaged in internal battles, sometimes challenging the power structure and other times seeking to fulfil their ideological aspirations independent of a future India.

Ambedkar wanted the Indian state to create pleasant social conditions for the vulnerable sections to voluntarily encourage them to participate in the nation-building process. It is this nationalist element sensitive to the difference in Ambedkar's conception of nationalism that has remained remarkably unrepresented in congress nationalism and which this study would seek to emphasize.

Dr. Ambedkar's desire to conceive nationalism among the lower classes is one of the particular uniqueness of anti-colonial nationalism in India that is absent in Western conceptions of nationalism and any other Afro-Asian nationalism. Dr. Ambedkar points out that "nationality is a social sentiment; it is a feeling of unity that makes those responsible feels like parents." As a national sensibility, it is both a sense of belonging to one's own and a sense of solidarity with others. On the one hand, a sense of "Consciousness of nature" unites individuals who have it to the point that economic or social disparities no longer matter. At the same time, on the other, it creates a longing to be outside of any other group. The core of nationality and the national sentiment is what Ambedkar referred to when he made the above remark.

Ambedkar's nationalism plays a bridge between the two mutually exclusive spheres of official nationalism of inclusion and radical communism/feminism. Ambedkar does not collapse individual autonomy with the community's independence or, in addition, the community's independence with the freedom of the nation. In its broader picture of nationalism, these normative and empirical categories obtain their own space without aspiring to hit each other. Ambedkar's notion of "difference", opposing communitarians and radical feminists, is not opposed to the "nation" but relatively comfortably based within its framework of nationalism. In his idea of nationalism, the majority community does not insist on minorities; meanwhile, Ambedkar provides constitutional guarantees to minority groups and emphasizes the creation of an inter communicative space for all. A community changing the communal mentality, man does not include women, and majority culture does not become a national culture. Ambedkar would insist on the difficulty of the issue of women within the framework of nationalism rather than without it. In short, nationalism, for Ambedkar, is not a bad idea but a creative imagination. In this sense, this article aims to examine in detail all the components of Ambedkar's "nationalism" and how he presented himself in a discourse different from his competing nationalisms.

Ambedkar's notion of nationalism is socially inclusive and relies entirely on social unity that would not exclude any social group in the Indian subcontinent. Ambedkar undoubtedly gives importance to society and social philosophy and the revolution over politics and political philosophy or process. According to his statement, his social philosophy is consecrated in three words: Liberty, equality and fraternity, and they have absolutely nothing to extract from the French Revolution; on the contrary, they have taken essentially from the teachings of Buddha. Ambedkar's belief in social cohesion is closely linked to his belief in social change. There is no doubt that the two could go together without dividing into social unity and therefore introduced the means of nonviolent persuasion to preserve cohesion which advocates a healthy state.

Social cohesion does not refer to people as a homogeneous mass. Still, Ambedkar's social cohesion considers the many markers of identification of a social group. Still, he maintains that these indications of identity should exclude the fundamental notion. When it comes to socially inclusive nationalism, Ambedkar suggests that "shared participation" is organised at the household level between Hindus and untouchables.

Ambedkar's concern for organic unity in society is at the heart of viable nation-building. Only by exploring further in the same direction we would have a more picture of Ambedkar's grave concern for social

revolution and its significant role in building a healthy organic nation. The idea of an "organic nation" should not be confused here with Gellner's concept of "homogenizing the nation from above by the political elite that creates a high culture." Ambedkar's idea of organ city progresses from the masses below and is finally reflected in national politics. Social reformers and rational intellectuals could play a crucial role in this transition phase.

According to Dr. Ambedkar, there can be no democratic existence without an ideal society. He explains to us, "There must be many ways for a chance to spread from one person to another in a perfect community". In an ideal society, everyone's hobbies are openly discussed and shared. As a result, social endosmosis is a must. In Ambedkar's view, democracy could not be built on a single set of political rights. It must be founded on respect, love, and decency. That's not all he has to say "The law cannot bind the touchable and the untouchables together, and it surely can't do so with election legislation that divides voters into distinct groups. The only thing keeping them together is their love for one another.

Dr. Ambedkar wanted social change through "peace" and "persuasion," not through "force" and "pressure." He did not subscribe to the idea that "social harmony" could be obtained by violent means. Dr. Ambedkar argues that political institutions must consider social forces to reform or refine existing social institutions. Dr. Ambedkar supports the cause of a socialistic society, which will nevertheless preserve the individual's freedom. His concept of state socialism is not of the doctrinal type; instead, it is a mixture of profound moral idealism and social realism. Dr. Ambedkar suggests that the common good should include standard models and "common norms" and the harmonious functioning of people, in the absence of which society can not be a unified whole. Dr. Ambedkar has suggested in common with Indian thought leaders that the spread of mass education and the establishment of a "two-party system" are essentially good for the proper functioning of both democracy and legislature. Dr. Ambedkar felt that three or more parties confused the problems and that only one party is not a democracy. Dr. Ambedkar stood up and fought not only for social cohesion but also for social transformation through active channels of peace, persuasion and above all of the state machinery.

Dr. Ambedkar's idea of nationalism is far from complete without establishing the solid foundations of secularism, which interacts with the religious-communal division of Hindus and Muslims and the Aryan-Dravidian racial division. In his work, he says Pakistan or partition of India, Ambedkar offers enough space to address the issue of community and poses the harmonious solution of the "uniform nation" with various communities having rights over constitutional guarantees. It could, of course, flow from his argument that "two nations and one state is a pretty plea". It has the same appeal that a sermon has and can lead to the conversion of Muslim leaders, but instead of being proclaimed discourse if this is intended to issue it as a prescription for Muslims to obey, it will be a foolish project which no man of goodwill accept. Dr. Ambedkar believed in spiritualism, at least in the private sphere and had great esteem for the values that religion in the stills of humanity had never grown in two minds on the issue of a nation Secular and a uniform civil code. "Ambedkar's idea of secularism was clear and never opposed "nationalism".

It was Dr. Ambedkar's duty as the first globally acknowledged advocate for subaltern politics to demonstrate that even the historically oppressed identity could be reconciled with the self-confident nationalist cause without descending into separatist gratification. When it comes to nationalism, even Ambedkar had to face a series of nationalist issues before expressing his nationalist feelings. "Gandhiji, I have no Homeland; how can I call this place my homeland and this religion my own whereby we are treated worse than animals and dogs, and we cannot obtain water to drink?" Ambedkar concluded in a talk with Gandhi. Perhaps the Dalit leadership preferred social reforms above political independence, or at least they needed to fight two urgent battles on both social and political fronts—the colonialist state being one of the opponents, the other being an unfair pyramidal Brahmanical social system.

On 8 August 1930, in preparation for the First Round Table Conference, Ambedkar convened a Conference of Depressed Classes from all India in Nagpur. Resolutions at the conference demanded the status of immediate dominance, rejected the Simon Commission's report and called for adult suffrage with safeguards

for the untouchables, which included representation on legislative council and reservation in the public service. This approval of reserved seats with a general electorate distinguished with the demands of other untouchable Indian leaders, who at that time were asking for separate constituencies. British imperialism has been blamed for India's disadvantage and the exploitation of peasants and workers by his harsh assertion of imperialism. Finally, his reference to "capitalists" and "landowners" and his designation of Congress leaders as "feudalists" show the rising impact of socio-economic radicalism on his thought.

Ambedkar's 1930 speech reveals him to be a socially conscious nationalist. His nationalism was based on the idea that building an equal and caste-free society required independence from British authority. Like the anti-caste movement leaders Phule, Periyar, and others, this nationalism has concentrated on constructing the country as a democracy rather than just handing power over to the Indians. It's a "national building," if you will. Enlightenment ideas were articulated in the French revolution trinity of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, and he was uniquely qualified to give this notion a modernist impetus.

Ambedkar's ideological outline is far from complete unless its socio-political trinity - liberty, equality and fraternity is taken into justification. This political sadness could easily be confused with the borrowing of the French Revolution. But despite all the inspirations which Ambedkar derived from the French Revolution, and more precisely from the sacrifice which the privileged ruling class of 18th century France dared to make, it cannot be clearly stated that this political expression was Outside and outside of an import in Europe. Ambedkar re-examined the sentence and redesigned it, which gave a more profound social significance than the French revolutionaries in a castes society like India.

Ambedkar sees both caste and country as a point of conflict or division between the actual and the ideal and between the present and what will come. Caste and nation are opposed in the eyes of Ambedkar. They don't mix because they are based on two distinct social structures. It's in this disjunction that Ambedkar's final explanation of nationalism may be found. Nationalism seeks openness, and casteism seeks confinement. One seeks progressive disparity, while another seeks homogeneous equality, yet both are rooted in firmness India's. Dr. Ambedkar's nationalism, which he rightfully claimed to represent the submissive masses.

The concept of culture, tradition and place of Ambedkar in the project of nationalism; is inevitable to understand the idea of a nation of Ernest Renan, who proved to be the author most often cited in the nationalism by Ambedkar. The concept of Ambedkar of a democratic nation and nationalism seems unprecedented in the Indian subcontinent in colonial times. The genesis of the terms "Democracy" and "Nation" resides in Europe, and the rest of the world has imported them according to their needs and adequacy. Ambedkar believes that for the success of modern machines and civilization or rational economic relations, democracy is essential. A society that does not believe in democracy can be indifferent to logical human relations.

According to Ambedkar, 'Nationalism' in the context of a nation requires a strong feeling of social solidarity and human brotherhood. There would be no tyranny or menace to the society or country under this nationalism that is full of the democratic spirit. Community and country are different entities. According to Ambedkar, "A community has the right to protect; a community has a right to demand separation".

In this regard, it is essential to understand the subtle differences between "nationality" and "nation" in Ambedkar's view. While "nationality" indicates "the knowledge of family members, the awareness of the presence of this kinship," "nationalism" "implies the yearning for a unique national life for individuals who are tied by this kinship. Ambedkar's philosophy can't survive without a sense of national identity. Nationality, on the other hand, does not always lead to nationalism.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar advocated for eliminating casteism and other forms of discrimination in India. Specifically, he claims that casteism works against nationalism and has suffocated the population. A feeling of civic compassion has been shattered, morality has become caste-bound, and virtue has become a caste. To him, nationalism meant denying the caste spirit, another word for the deeply embedded communalism,

which he understood to imply. However, in India, nationalism has taken a new turn in the majority and minority control. Be observable in the face of religious and nationalist hypocrisy and dominance.

The introduction to the Indian Constitution opens with the term "We, the People of India," which some politicians objected to during the discussion in the Constituent Assembly and preferred "The Indian Country." India is not a nation, but every caste in India is. Against this, Ambedkar answered by questioning how a group of people separated into thousands of castes could be considered a country. He also warned that the sooner we grasp that we are not a nation in this social and psychological sense, the better off we would be.

He knew that any nationalism founded on social justice could only exist as fiction if it weren't formally tied to constitutional forces. Ambedkar worked tirelessly to transform his vision of social justice and nationalism into legal terms in this spirit. Ambedkar proposes a democratic nationalism based on a unified civil code for India to achieve nationality. The Hindu Code Law and the Uniform Civil Code were both acknowledged by Nehru, who was in the majority administration but failed to pass the bill despite its ideological recognition by Nehru's contemporaries, including Nehru himself.

There was a time in India when Ambedkar's central idea was that of nationalism, citizenship, and the creation of a uniform civil code, which would indicate that Ambedkar's starting point was also Community rights, but that these differential rights Groups had to be reconciled with the main idea of citizenship and nationalism.

When Ambedkar examined the issue of languages and their ramifications, the Indian federation's states found their structure and organisation. "One state, one language," according to Ambedkar, is a universal trait of almost all states, including the United States, France, Germany, England, Italy, and many more. When this rule has been broken, there has been an immediate threat to the state's safety. There is always the risk of linguistic and cultural decline in countries with many official languages. He claims that if India remains a conglomeration of several states, it will not avoid this destiny. As a result, a multilingual society is unstable, whereas a monolingual society is steady. According to Ambedkar, states based on "fellow-feeling" are founded. It's a "Corporate sensation of oneness" kind of emotion. For this reason, as well as others, a state must have a single official language. Ambedkar is sure about the need for the "one state, one language" norm for two further reasons.

To be democratic, one must feel as though they are part of something greater than themselves. For a democracy to work, the sense of unity must be matched by an opposition. If the resistance is replaced by a "faction" in a bilingual state, it might lead to racial prejudice in the government. Democracy cannot coexist with these elements inherent to a hybrid form. It's the sole solution for ethnic and cultural issues, which is why their authority was implemented. People who speak various languages when they enter a government have to travel in distinct directions when they join. There is no hope for reconciliation since their racial and cultural perspectives are divergent.

Ambedkar believes that India should follow the example of linguistic states. Because of Ambedkar, local dialects are not recognised as state languages. A supporter of unity in variety, Ambedkar argues for a single national language to unite all the states of the Indian Union, citing the independence of regional cultures in states created on a linguistic basis. The control of people's lives and cultures was anathema to Ambedkar. As a result, he sought to instil a strong feeling of national pride among the people of Indian states. When Ambedkar says, "Any Indian who does not accept this proposal as part and parcel of a linguistic state, has no right to be an Indian," he reveals the true nationalist spirit of a nationalist: "The Indians first and last will disappear if they do not accept this proposal as part and parcel of a linguistic state."

Ambedkar seems to have a thorough knowledge of the need for a common language, notably Hindi, for national cohesion. People may share ideas and work together toward a single objective using a shared language. And yet Ambedkar's nationalism never conflicts with the premise that state and governance only make sense in light of society's actual circumstances.

**CONCLUSION:**

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's idea of nationalism notes economic liberalisation and multicultural citizenship in the advanced era of the scientific revolution. Ambedkar has also progressively become an iconic sign of resistance against the Dominant Brahminical oppression and the perfect image of almost every social movement in India since independence. Ambedkar's thoughts, like - 'affirmative action' for depressed classes, political identification of community rights, strong bonding of difference-friendly citizenship and ultimately the idea of a 'democratic Indian nation' to be constituted by the self-convinced masses from lower, rather than imposed by the political elites from above - are still standing high and being progressively merged by the policy-makers of the Indian state as well as by the academicians in academic matters.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Ahir, D.C. Dr. Ambedkar and Indian Constitution, Buddha Vihara, Lucknow, 1973.
2. Akhtar, Majeed, Nation and Minorities, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 2002.
3. Barry, Brian. "Justice and Democracy: Essays for Brian Barry", edited by Keith Dowding, Robert E. Goodin, and Carol Pateman, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
4. Latava, D. R. The Political Philosophy of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Phoenix Publishing Agency, Agra, 1965.
5. Lodhka, S.S. Communities and Identity, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2001.
6. Kadam, K.N., The Emancipation of the Oppressed, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1993.
7. Keer Dhananjay, Ambedkar Life and Mission, popular Prakashan, Vol. II, Bombay, 1961.
8. Dr. Ambedkar, B.R., "Writings and speeches" Vol. II, Government of Maharashtra publication, 1982.
9. Dr. Ambedkar B.R., States and Minority, Writing and Speeches Vol. I Govt, of Maharashtra, 1979.
10. Moon Vasant, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Higher Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai, Vol-2, 1982.