

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

B.R. AMBEDKAR AND HIS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Karnika Dubey

Ph.D, Department of History, Barkatullah University, Bhopal, India

E-mail Id: karnikadubey@gmail.com

**Dr. Karnika Dubey , B.R. Ambedkar And His Political Philosophy, Palarch's Journal Of
Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(9), ISSN 1567-214x,**

Keywords: Moral community, Democracy, Liberalism, Conservatism, Liberal Bourgeoisie.

Abstract

As a renowned social reformer and an eminent intellectual, Dr.B. R. Ambedkar was truly concerned about the plight of the untouchables at the beginning of his career. His entire life was devoted to socio-economic development (Bakshi, 2009). Ambedkar's revolutionary ideology helps to renegotiate in particular the crisis of western political theory and leads people's struggles. Ambedkar emerged with the advent of a Dalit movement in modern times, Ambedkar emerged as a major political philosopher (Bakshi, 2009). In the early 1920s, he became prominent in the socio-political scenario of India. He played a pivotal role in the upliftment of the lowest level of so-called untouchable Indian society in respect to social, economic, political and religious perspectives. Besides, he made an outstanding contribution as an economist, sociologist, legal illuminator, educationist, writer, parliamentarian, advocate and human-right activist. He was an iconoclast and researcher who effectively mobilized, energized, unified the untaught Indians against all social and political suppressions and oppressions. This study encapsulates the political philosophy of Ambedkar.

Introduction

Ambedkar featured as a significant political philosopher during a Dalit Movement. The philosophy of this versatile leader is always pursued in different norms and spheres. Due to diverse and inconsistent theoretical assessments of Ambedkar's philosophy, the academics and scholars are predominated by uncertainty and disputes. In the appraisal of thinkers, the social background of scholars and their subjective roles play a significant role, and more frequently, scholars' opinions elicit highly strong- and degrading reactions from Ambedkar [1-5]. He had a considerable impact on Indian politics in the backdrop of the nationalist movement upto 1980's, yet no fruitful intellectual discussion had taken place on his efforts [6]. All his endeavours and influences as a theorist and social scientist have been either overlooked or marginalised. In modern Indian philosophy and philosophical speeches, Ambedkar is not quoted anywhere. The implicit politics of the Indian philosophy authors must

consider this exclusion of Ambedkar. Quite interestedly, he has been taken into the forefront by common masses of the deprived Indian community. It's not an exaggeration to claim that without an Ambedkar statue, there is no big village in the world [7-10]. He is India's most prominent icon in modern times. Because of the symbolic link between masses/Dalit and Ambedkar, the conservative and progressive political and academic parties have been compelled to investigate Ambedkar [11-15]. The Ambedkar celebration upholds that the Indigenous Democratic State does not hit the bulk in this country and that the ignored groups are asserting themselves. In other terms, the theory of Ambedkar is a pursuit of the philosophies of Indian society's societal redevelopment [16-19].

Political Philosophy

There is no single connotation of the word politico-philosophy, and we do not name any political philosopher who reflects on public living. We assume Plato has become a political philosopher and so also John Rawls in recent years. In modern times, MK Gandhi, Aurobindo Ghose, Rabindranath Tagore and Allama Iqbal in *The Restoration of Theological Thinking in Islam* were some of the theorists who neared to become political philosophers (Iqbal 1930: 2003). Gandhiji was opposed to fundamental modernity and propounded a different idea of freedom as swaraj. Aurobindo Ghosh sought to reconcile people with their selves and focused on a distinct view of country and cosmos. Iqbal blamed Western modernity for its unilaterality and considered Islamic thoughts as an incentive to turn modernity into new foundations.

The key definitions or principles, which are the backbone of our public existence, are taken into account by political philosophers who relate than with one another and raise claims that defend or contradict a concept and explain their relationship with different pictures. Proof of the shares may come from the worldly, scientific and metaphysical positions endorsing a principle. Such a rationale can imply that the population, policies and prerequisites, or the mechanisms for their execution, are beneficial and achievable, or are essential and commendable. It must be emphasised that a vigorous public life will make a substantial contribution to the prosperity of political philosophy, but not an engaged political philosophy is sufficient anywhere public life thrives. In the above situation, traditions, authority or influence could keep public life together. In particular, a political theory exercise will attract our attention to an area of public life that we have comparatively uneasy to consider and compare to the basic units of our political comprehension. It may also focus on common sense to show what aspects of it are defensible and why. Often the moral theory may recreate an argument or re-examine a principle when the new iterations are only insufficient. Such initiatives entail re-ordering objectives in the partnership between terms such as swaraj, justice, democracy, etc. More than one moral scientist has posed questions regarding the universality of political theory in recent years.

Although non-Christian scholars have charged political theory with closeness to the Judeo-Christian paradigm, others have regarded it as an "imperialism of categories." Scholars from the global South as well as postcolonial societies have come together to discuss an alternate / different definition of policy which can talk closely about interactions and cultural occurrences.

- **Political Philosophy of Ambedkar**

"Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy. What does social democracy mean? It means a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life."-B. R. Ambedkar

Ambedkar was influenced by many of the major political practices of his time. His political thought originated from the three great political ideologies, namely left, conservative and radical. He has transcended both of these practices, which is his particular attribute. The theories of John Dewey, the realistic American and his instructor had inspired him. The Edwin R. A. Seligman of Fabian had a significant influence upon his philosophy. He also cited Edmund Burke, the British Conservative Intellectual, while Ambedkar can not be called a Conservative.

The ideology of Ambedkar is principally theological and ethical. He researched Indian beliefs and metaphysical structures closely in an unmatched manner. Centred on his interpretation of Indian culture and its institutions' action for moral purposes, he introduced political ideas including freedom, fairness, state and privileges. He is critical of the caste institution, which affects all aspects of the existence of the individual and the Indian society as a whole. It explains more how the person is associated with the community and how other social powers restrict the independence of the citizen. He criticises the Hindu authoritarian social order and supports a democratic culture. He questioned India's spiritual and social pillars and brought life to poor citizens with a newer sense. His approach was logical. In his writings and speeches, Reason plays a part. The method he used is not only speculative but also very scientific. The assumptions of modernity affected him. In several fields of Indian heritage, governance, community, anthropology and philosophy, he is well educated. In his essays, he mentions several philosophers who inspired him.

His theory focuses on the notion of culture. It is trivial to claim that citizens constitute culture; society often consists of groups. To affirm the principle of conflict between classes may be an exaggeration, but it is a reality that such courses of community exist. An individual still belongs to a study in society. An enclosed class is on caste. Caste is developed by the Brahmins and spread to other servile groups. Caste is an endogamous and a municipal unit as well. He advocated for a religious culture focused on his philosophical philosophy. It was ideal to accomplish. He hated the Hindu social system so strongly. He insists that Hinduism is not a community. Buddhism has been projected as the ideal that is founded on morals. He claims that Buddhism has sought, on "reason" and "morality," to found civilisation.

His group conception is relatively recent. Neither the Hindu ideal community nor the Marxist definition of community focused on involvement in the development process is verified by him. He has a spiritual and ethical conception of the community. They are not eligible immediately for popular relations engagement. He propounded a concept of culture that must be built through a problematic and torturously transformative moral method.

1. Ambedkar: Social-political approaches

“Democracy is not merely a form of government. It is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. It is essentially an attitude of respect and reverence towards fellow men.” -B. R. Ambedkar

Ambedkar's thinking is very significant in tracking India's past and development in the social sphere as evidenced in his writings and lectures. The ideology of Ambedkar must recognise the fundamental basis of the Dalit movement. In two of his remarks, the centre of Ambedkar's political philosophy is reflected: interests are not secured by legislation but by society's social and moral consciousness, and democracy of government means a democratic society. In essence, he had views on democracy as a type of community or related mode of life, and the only protection of this freedom is social consciousness. In civil ties, in terms of the lives of the individuals who are cultured. According to him, the secret of freedom is social ties. In spirit and reality, Ambedkar is a liberal democrat. The unique contribution to democratic philosophy rests in its integrating rights, liberty and fraternity with the idea of social democracy. He tells us even of the boundaries of the regular life of liberal democracy. "Political democracy cannot survive unless the basis of it resides in social democracy," which is a way of life that accepts rights, equality and solidarity as the values of life," categorically stated in the house by him while addressing the Constituent Assembly (November 25, 1949). In this context, it is described that the democratic framework as mode and way of governing whereby transformative economic revolutions are a fact.

In many of Ambedkar's speeches and writings, the core subject is social reformism. He also explored and tackled the subject of social predominance over political problems. The government must be tied to social matters inevitably. Democracy itself is focused on the corresponding culture. With the problem, he differs from the Congress and the socialists in giving social priority over politics. In all his works, 'Caste's annihilation,' and What the Congress and Gandhi did to untouchables' in particular, what is well expressed.

The established political and social philosophies had a new significance since 'castes' became understood theoretically and designated as the Indian social truth. Through his academic conceptualisation of the caste institution and its operation in Indian culture, Ambedkar became an influential thinker. To transform the lives of the Dalit masses who are caste system casualties, he interpreted the Indian social world. The condition calls for a thorough evaluation of the political theory of Ambedkar in comparison to other relevant political streams at the period. In the Marxian context, Ambedkar is a genuine philosopher. To alter it, he has interpreted Indian social truth. The thesis would look at the following issues in estimating the political theory of Ambedkar: What is the concept of man and society? How do his opinions flow from his thinking and behaviour as far as rights, equality and fairness are concerned? What are the cultural and historical origins of his ideas? How will democracy and social injustice be connected? How will the citizen and group issues be resolved? What sort of hypothesis would he recommend in defining the connection between state and religion? What perceived his position in the political future of India as the Dalit (Depressed Class) Movement?

- **Crisis of Western Political Theory**

"For a successful revolution, it is not enough that there is discontent. What is required is a profound and thorough conviction of the justice, necessity and importance of political and social rights."

-B. R. Ambedkar

Let's have a glance at the core liberal philosophic traditions before we move on to Ambedkar's political theory. Political theorists attempted (often within a historical context) to analyse societal phenomena and democratic behaviour, to explain complex ideas, to assess current structures and advocate for social values. The critical reflection of strategy and its practices are concerned with political theory. It is a matter of a far more crucial comprehension of the values that control a culture. It seeks to philosophise society's ideals, beliefs, activities and structures. Philosopher viewed the essence of public life and the values guiding good cultures from various viewpoints. The moral importance of culture and the way organisations work are a subject of political philosophy. Socio-economic growth and the resulting societal tensions are the foundation for new social and political ideas to arise. Political theory tends to occur from both the thinker and his society's political background. Political philosophy is essentially the systematisation of our actions' spiritual and political decisions.

Greek philosophy has traditionally adopted the natural rule of Christianity. In the west, the individualism of the 17th century weakened Christian natural law. This individualism is the central aspect of the ensuing liberal tradition. The notion of social initiative and social regulation gave way to individual industry and control. As stated, new environmental circumstances gave rise to new social ties and new theory formed to explain the contemporary society rationally. This latest ideology was called populism. In multiple national organisations, liberalism developed diverse flavours. The challenges of liberal philosophy lay in their underlying origins of the individualism of the seventeenth century and their own quality. There is a fundamental presumption that an individual is free and makes his own identity as a human. This making the identity of his own and the formation of human society are ultimately a series of commercial ties. This concept was profoundly rooted in the foundations of 17th century philosophy. Society inherent in the business is confusing itself. The class differentiation is carried spontaneously by business culture. The class having property requires the subordinate levels to exercise control over them. In pursuance of the decision of the business, the fact that persons are no longer treated as equals. Thus, business structure alternatives have arisen.

A severe blow was offered to liberal politics by the articulation of proletarian politics. Man and culture have entirely different assumptions. The culture has substituted one with another. Marxist philosophy attempts to transform culture and its interpersonal ties dramatically. From a class point of view, human culture sees humankind as a creator in the first place. His interactions are affected by his role in social production. There is a conservative political philosophy besides the Marxist notion which wants to see society from a community point of view. For culture, faith, and ancient custom Conservatives admire. One example of the conservative practice is Edmund Burke. Burke treated policy with a sense of religiosity rather than any author in the eighteenth century. The traditional political perspective is regarded as conventional politics. The

state and culture, in general, must function concerning practices and values. In this specific community, the interests of individuals are respected. In the institutional structure of current structures, conservative viewpoint operates within the constraints of the order granted accepting modes of democratic action.

Traditional democratic philosophy is known as imperfection politics. They find the limits of human beings and assume that by their random efforts, individuals would not be able to establish a civilised order. People are jealous and egotistical. There is a need for a state to govern them. Might is stated. In conservative thinking, establishment plays a critical role. It is an essential part of social order and authority which guarantees social hierarchy. The intrinsic imperfections in human existence need a solid-state according to conservative beliefs. It is essential to regulate the individual's anti-social tendencies. According to the conventional conservative opinion, the free play of human actions, as liberals and Anarchists say, cannot and will never naturally create social order. Social stability must be upheld by the practical guidance of the national representatives. It doesn't imply the sole organisation to maintain civil order. Conservators highlight the significance of the long-standing communities and organisations' culture, habit, and network, which are both social necessities.

"My social philosophy may be said to be enshrined in three words: liberty, equality and fraternity. Let no one, however, say that I have borrowed by philosophy from the French Revolution. I have not. My philosophy has roots in religion and not in political science. I have derived them from the teachings of my Master, the Buddha."

-B. R. Ambedkar

In the late 1970s, the political scientist Fried R. Dallmayr echoed Peter Laslett's argument, that the grand tradition of theoretical literature stretching from Hobbes to Bosanquet had been broken and that for the moment, anyway, political philosophy is dead." Western democratic ideology was defined throughout the twentieth century by protecting social democracy and the tradition of human liberties against authoritarian or oppressive powers. In developed countries, business policies and empirical reasoning in the west have multiple significances. The culmination of western technology and business contributing to exploitation in other areas of the planet in modern times contributes to economic rivalry and conflict. This has prompted the west to focus on and reformulate its central metaphysical principles and its idea of "reason." At the same time, it is necessary to understand what 'subjectivity' and its cognitive activity constitutes critically. This dilemma appears to have been correctly captured by Fred Dallmayr, 'In the realm of political theory, the contemporary dilemma can be articulated in general terms in terms of the relation between 'contract' and 'group.'² The society consists of collectives which establish a political community.

- **Ambedkar's Political Queries**

"A people and their religion must be judged by social standards based on social ethics. No other standard would have any meaning if religion is held to be necessary good for the well-being of the people."

-B. R. Ambedkar

Ambedkar has proposed or updated various principles and associations concerning the conception that supports a strategy full and coherent design of what life as a public

entails, and what it means to do in a somewhat different way from the west. What does it mean to be human, and to be a person were the questions he asked? How did a custom live? How will the modern public maintain its cohesion over time, intergenerationally, if it is an independent sphere with free and equitable members? Is faith a place in our public culture, and if so, what is its nature? In cultures in which various types and degrees of injustice are not based solely on exploitation but dynamic modes of domination, what is the foundation of social cooperation? How does a shared public live together having plurality centred on diverse principles of ultimate values which are expressed in behaviours and individual institutions? How do we communicate with a big enough community who claims to adopt their different forms and philosophies of life? What are the function and control limits? These issues are strongly related to some critical democratic principles such as authority, representation, legitimacy, individual, democracy, independence, equity, liberty and justice. However, these concerns are raised by many or at least several political theorists in particular metaphysical and social contexts as well. Ambedkar achieved the same thing. The sense of his philosophy was the context of illumination and his social atmosphere in the colonial meeting, and postcolonial works were the Indian culture. The narrow emphasis on Ambedkar as a social community symbol also does not draw attention to the philosophical context that justifies and prioritises his concerns. In Ambedkar, as a political philosopher, there are specific philosophical questions we have to address: he is overcome by so many issues that political philosopher should not necessarily include him. His methods of presenting, disputing and debating are mostly not metaphysical but sociological, law, moral, political and sometimes rhetorical.

Furthermore, many political-philosophical problems in the national revolution in India, such as democracy, human dignity and representativeness, have become regular issues of interrogation, rendering it hard to differentiate his participation from others. At the same time, while Ambedkar did not consistently indulge in pursuit of political theory, it is necessary to underline his writings and activities. There were tremendous clarity and consistency in the principles and relationships which he used. Furthermore, although he exchanged many thoughts with the anti-colonial theorists, he is differentiated by many.

Analysis of his books:

In his book, *Annihilation of Caste*, he depicted as follows. This famous mail was no less demanded by one person than Mahatma Gandhi. Dr Ambedkar points to the misconception of the Hindus Reformers that restricted their attempts to abolish the imposing widows, child marriage, etc. and felt neither a need to riot nor courage to revolt against the abolition of castes. In the wake of democratic revolutions in India, it was reported the social and spiritual movements led by the saints. However, political independence prevailed under British rule over social change, but social development had still been ignored. As an insider's guide for the Socialists, he found that the socialists had to fight the caste beast before or after the revolution. He argues that caste does not rely on the division of labour. This is a separation of jobs. Caste is also a derogatory entity as an economic entity. The Hindus are being called upon to eliminate the caste that is a major barrier to social unity and to establish a new social order based

on democratic ideals, equality and fraternity. He is one of the solutions for intercaste marriage. Yet he emphasises that the root cause of castes is the belief in the Shastras. It says that every man and woman should be freed from the "Shastras" homage and clean up and combine their minds with the notions of "Shastras" and the atrocious practice of the caste system," he suggests.

In his news paper, 'Bahishkrit Bharat': Ambedkar's decisive challenge to Brahmanism as he penned can be analysed in the following way. He came to London in London to start school. Dr Ambedkar. - Dr Ambedkar. He studied law at the Gray's Inn, and he was admitted for study at the London School of Economics. While he was trying to study in England, Ambedkar managed to lead his colleagues in India. He witnessed his earnest piety for the cause in his letters during that period concentrating on the emancipation of the Untouchables. He also went to Germany to the University of Bonn to study Sanskrit. He appeared in a thought paper entitled 'Responsibilities of a Responsible Government in India' at the meeting of the Students association during his stay in London. British economist and political theorist Harold Laski stated the 'view of revolutionary existence of Dr. Ambedkar' in the present article. In April 1923, due to financial constraints, he was forced to move to Bombay. He returned his thesis paper and received his doctorate from London University (Moon, pp 23-24). In just two and a half years, he earned both MSc and DSc. He began appearing at the High Court in Bombay in July 1923. He did not vary as an athlete or an eminent citizen from his university graduates. The future of the untouchables and the ostracised one-third of India's population were his key concerns. Are they free to live with dignity? Will all Indians consider the ostracised equal? What do you ostracise to protect your rights? These worries led him to set up a party to fight for the ostracised's greater interests. Dr. Ambedkar was made the Executive Committee Chairman of the Bahishkrit Hitkarini Sabha on 20 July 1924 (Keer, pp 53-54). He launched his campaign with a goal set to free the untouchables through this cyanidation.

The year 1927 was a turning point in Ambedkar's life. At the beginning of this year he paid homage to the brave soldiers of Mahar, who beat the dust of Peshwa's army, at the Bhima-Koregaon War Memorial. Initiated in 1927. The Mahat Satyagraha was initiated in 1927. On 27 December of the same year he burned the Manusmriti. In the same year, he was subsequently appointed to the Bombay Legislative Council. It was this year in which he began a decisive fight against inequality, race, ethnicity, religion and democracy. This caused him a series of fierce assaults. Journals and magazines owned by Dwijis shot a volley of false claims at him. He felt he was able to dismiss the arguments of his critics in a journal of proof and logic. The launch of the Bahishkrit Bharat in Marathi on 3 April 1927 was to achieve this condition.

Conclusion

In this article, I have tried how Ambedkar formed his ideas and protested for free and fair public existence. Taken together, these ideas suggest a different political way of existence that reacts to the cultural meaning of one's membership at the same time. Ambedkar, contrary to conventional beliefs, does not adhere to disembodied modernity but provides a vital way of understanding society and customs. Instead of

interacting with a partisan other, he calls for critical cultural recovery. Interactive social ties are the agency that makes us the individual we are and set the preconditions. Man is not a superhuman being but humanly made. Democracy in such contexts is ultimately a critical requirement for the human self's fullest growth. Equality requires that all be granted equal treatment and equal chances to take part in public relations. Fair justice for persons will necessitate an expansion of equity, and the latter must take care of the concrete sense. Ambedkar sees faith as a foundation for this search, but in this phase, religion is simply redefined as this earthly affair. The measure of true religion is its potential to allow people to understand themselves. Emancipation is a world affair, and every man and woman is liable for the same.

After this discussion of the varied elements of his thought-process surrounding human beings, culture, government and the different relevant aspects, Dr Ambedkar assumed that democratic thinking and a framework of philosophy was not built remains confirmed and accurate. His curiosity in men throughout, though, prompted him implicitly to create philosophic thought. It was not an idle, sleeper ideology, established without regard for citizens and their interests. He discovered no theory is worthy of its name, if it has no origins in humanism, philosophy can represent individual needs, not the cosmos or the supernatural. He and humanism embrace naturalism. Naturalism rejects the presence of anything above or beyond history. Nothing is abnormal or abnormal. Naturalism is useless without humanism. It is only a mixture of the two, which will contribute to greater comprehension and human well-being. Of note, Dr Ambedkar would not differentiate between man and nature. The social and political theory of Dr Ambedkar has been highly inspired by the philosophy and the constitution, in particular by the Fourteenth Amendment, of the English Economists such as J and the inspiring professor John Dewey from Columbia University. M. Keynes. R. A. Tilghman. and the great English legislator Edmund Burke. Back home, he identified Mahatma Jotiba Phule as the greatest Shudra of modern India." Yet Buddha, the enlightened, was the most potent and permanent force on him. A significant component of his political ideology is Buddhism's values. He received more from Buddhism than from the French revolution the notion of independence, fair justice and brotherhood. Naturally, his thinking was visible in the impact of Western Populism. In his democratic and intellectual belief, we have always identified him as a social democrat. These effects on him helped to construct a theory focused on the synthesising of rationalism and empiricism, idealism and humanism, materialism and spirituality.

References

1. Gandhi, M. K. Harijan, July 11, 1936.
2. Joachim Alva, Men and Supermen of Hindustan, Thacker and Co., Ltd., Bombay, 1945, p. 26.
3. Wayper, C. L., Political Thought, Oxford, p. vii.
4. Jatava, D. R., The Political Philosophy of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Phoenix Publishing Agency, Agra, 1965, p. 2.
5. Rajasekhariah, A. M., B. R. Ambedkar - The Quest For Social Justice, Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1989, p. 15.
6. Ambedkar, B. R., Annihilation of Caste, 1937, p. 55.

7. Ambedkar, B. R., *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, Siddharth College, Bombay, 1957, p, 240.
8. Ambedkar, B. R., *Annihilation of Caste*, p. 44.
9. Kapoor, Kapil (2005): *Text and Interpretation: The Indian Tradition*, New Delhi, DK.
10. Kumar, Ravindra (1987): "Gandhi, Ambedkar and the Poona Pact, 1932," *Struggling and Ruling*, Jim Masselos (ed), New Delhi: Sterling.
11. Narasu, Lakshmi P (1946): *What Is Buddhism*, Colombo: Mahabodhi Society.
12. Parekh, Bhikhu (1989): *Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*, London: The Macmillan Press.
13. Parel, Anthony J (2006): *Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Harmony*, New Delhi: Cambridge.
14. Pyarelal (1958): *The Epic Fast*, Ahmedabad: Navjivan. Queen, Christopher S (1994): "Ambedkar, Modernity and the Hermeneutics of Buddhist Liberation," *Dr Ambedkar, Buddhism and Social Change*, A K Narain and D C Ahir (eds), Delhi, B R Publishing, pp 99–122.
15. Rao, Anupama (2010): *The Caste Question*, Ranikhet: Permanent Black.
16. Rathore, A S and Ajay Verma (eds) (2011): *Introduction, The Buddha and His Dhamma: A Critical Edition by B R Ambedkar*, New Delhi: Oxford.
17. Rawls, John (1972): *A Theory of Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. Rodrigues, Valerian (1993): "Making a Tradition Critical: Ambedkar's Reading of Buddhism," *Dalit Movements and the Meanings of Labour in India*, Peter Robb (ed), Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp 299–338