Reappraising B. R. Ambedkar’s Thoughts of Inclusive Indian Nation

Kunal Debnath

Abstract

Dr B. R. Ambedkar, one of the makers of the Indian Constitution, is known best as the emancipator of the untouchables. Ambedkar’s effort to make India as a nation through ‘breaking the internal differences’ is much debated and not widely recognized as he has still been confined only to his identity as a ‘liberating leader of the Dalits’. Ambedkar’s ideas—caste annihilation, securing rights to the depressed class, representation of the oppressed in political affairs, egalitarian economic arrangement, women’s rights and thoughts on democracy—all have the potential to be linked with his ideas of a nation, which is inclusive in nature.
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Introduction

Dr B. R. Ambedkar, a well-known Indian socio-political thinker and activist, has an immense influence on modern India for his efforts to give India a new orientation. He is known best as the ‘emancipator of the untouchables’. But as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee that was formed to frame the Indian Constitution, he was, along with Dalit\(^1\) liberation, keenly interested in making India an inclusive nation, which is much relevant in recent times, less addressed and not widely recognized. He was, the author of this article is of the opinion, a liberating leader of the Dalits and, on the other hand, a thinker of an inclusive Indian nation, though, in general perception, both are to a great extent incongruous to each other. Nevertheless, it claims that Ambedkar’s efforts towards ‘the annihilation of caste’ were no longer contradictory to his ideas of modern Indian nation-building (Debnath, 2018). His foremost concern was that how India would become a nation without a large number of people who are ostracized and regarded as untouchables. It was undeniably a great challenge for Ambedkar to conserve a symmetry between his own exertions to annihilation of caste and to make India an inclusive nation, which is discussed in this present article by integrating diverse thoughts of Ambedkar.

\(^1\) Department of Political Science, Rabindra Bharati University, Kolkata, West Bengal, India.
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Inclusive Nation and Ambedkar

Indian society might be examined by three theoretical contexts—exclusivism, inclusivism and pluralism. Indian society is traditionally multicultural, multilingual, multi-ethnic and multi-religious. Exclusivism promotes these inner divisions in the society by marginalizing ‘the others’, whereas inclusivism provides a shelter to all the differences, either through assimilation or through amalgamation, under one umbrella. Assimilation refers to the process in which minority groups are supposed to give up their own identity, while amalgamation is a process where minority and majority groups combine to form a new group. On the other hand, pluralism recognizes the differences by allowing all equally sidestepping all the normativity where each sect retains its own identity and culture. It is an arguable case whether Ambedkar was an adherent to inclusivism or pluralism. Since Ambedkar was keen to identify the degree of exclusion of the oppressed section, and he called for annihilation of caste through social amalgamation, then it qualifies that he spoke of inclusivism instead of pluralism. Because, to identify the nature, types and dimensions of exclusion is crucially important to develop some schemes of inclusion, which can be formulated and implemented in order to eliminate the exclusion and reduce its intensity (Oommen, 2014, p. 1) and exactly what Ambedkar tried to do so.

Apropos of the ideas of nation, it can lightly be defined as the nation is a politically oriented social collectivity in which members are psychologically bound together by shared traditions and values. Though nation and state tend to be combined as ‘nation-state’, the two have different connotations: state is a politically organized institution having monopoly of exercising power over the inhabitants within a definite territory. It is not necessary that every citizen has a nationalist feeling to this politically organized institution of a given territory. Nation, on the other side, is a spirit of homogeneity towards the fellow habitants, sharing a common culture, ethnicity, race, religion and language or any one of these. Benedict Anderson conceptualized the nation as ‘imagined community’ since all the members physically never meet others but imagine a nation as a sovereign community, and it is grown largely with the development of print media and, thus, written language (Anderson, 2006). According to Walker Connor, a nation must be ‘self-defined’, while ethnicity may be ‘other-defined’. Connor was of the opinion that a nation is a mass phenomenon, and it would be called as a nation when majority of the people become nationally aware. The essence of a nation may be intangible but psychologically tightened (Connor, 1973). The idea of nation-state has been popularized after the emergence of the concept that a nation should possess a territory for its own with a sovereign authority, and it became widespread between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe. Although a nation comprises different connotations mainly divided into two forms—cultural and political—culturally homogeneous and politically sovereign. A group of people may achieve political right to self-determination on the basis of cultural homogeneity, but it would be hard to retain this right if that group is not internally tightened together. Therefore, nation-building has two primary wings: a political authority and an integrated community. Ambedkar, however, ‘did not believe that nations had to be necessarily based on a common religious-cultural identity; there were in fact several examples of multicultural nations’ (Omvedt, 2008, p. 96); nevertheless, he tried to fasten people in India together through his exertion to ‘annihilation of caste’.

Ambedkar said, many politicians and historians tend to speak of the ‘Indian nation’ without speaking of ‘the people of India’ (Ambedkar, 2014g, p. 308) and ponder India as ‘a nation firstly because India has a geographical unity of the country and secondly because of the fundamental unity of the culture’ (Ambedkar, 2014g, p. 309). For Ambedkar, however, this line of thinking of India as a nation is ‘really to cherish a delusion’ (Ambedkar, 2014g, p. 309) because, he wrote:

A nation is not a country in the physical sense of the country whatever degree of geographical unity it may possess. A nation is not people synthesized by a common culture derived from common language, common
religion or common race. ... Nationality is a subjective psychological feeling. It is a feeling of a corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those who are charged with it feel that they are kith and kin. This national feeling is a double edged feeling. It is at once a feeling of fellowship for one’s own kith and an anti-fellowship feeling for those who are not one’s own kith. (Ambedkar, 2014g, p. 309)

Taking into consideration the last sentence of the above-mentioned statement, it goes without saying that religious, caste and class cleavages might appear as anti-fellowship feelings towards those who are outside of the groups. Ambedkar was aware of the demand of Pakistan based on the ‘two-nation theory’, and he thought ‘as a matter of historical experience, neither race, nor language, nor country has sufficed to mould a people into a nation’ (Ambedkar, 1946a, p. 16). Then, the religious plurality, annihilation of caste and egalitarian economic arrangements might be the foundation of an Indian nation. Ambedkar also perceived, Gail Omvedt underlines, ‘the process of creating a nation as linked to a thorough critique of the Brahmanic aspects of Indian tradition and a recognition of non-Brahman contributions, such as those of Buddhism, as a basis for religious plurality’ (Omvedt, 2008, p. 100). He chose Buddhism because not only that it is free from any types of profanity within and revulsion towards other religions at least in theory but also ‘for Buddhism is a part and parcel of Bharatiya culture’ [and his] ‘conversion will not harm the tradition of the culture and history of this land’ (Keer, 1971, p. 498). He did not choose Islam and Christianity because conversion to any of these two ‘will denationalise the depressed Classes’ (for details, Jaffrelot, 2005, pp. 120–123). The Ambedkarite notion of inclusive nation was, therefore, primarily based on ‘breaking the internal differences, division and barrier’ from the Indian society, and, also, it had an adherence to the Indian tradition, culture and history. Once he said, ‘my confident hope is that we can be a nation provided proper process of social amalgamation can be put forth’ (Government of Maharashtra, 1982, p. 31). The ‘missing link’ between Ambedkar and inclusive Indian nation can be considered in three parts:

**Political Nationalism or Social Nationalism?**

Arun Shourie, an eminent journalist in India, distrusts Ambedkar’s role in the Indian freedom struggle against the colonial power in his widely marketed and burnt book *Worshipping False Gods: Ambedkar and the Facts which have been Erased* (1997). Shourie has a recurrent argument that Ambedkar and Dalits did not participate in the freedom struggle and Ambedkar had intended to send the message that the Dalits in this country must live under the compulsion of the Hindus who, supposed widely, achieved the independence for India. Shourie intensifies his writing to break two popular myths: first, Ambedkar and the Dalits had participated in the nationalist movement, and second, Ambedkar played a crucial role for drafting of the Indian Constitution, and Shourie calls him ‘the false Manu’. For Shourie, Ambedkar, being flattered into self-importance, became not just an accomplice of imperial politics but also became the best of agent of the British (Shourie, 1997, p. 229). Here, however, Gopal Guru finds ‘author’s extra-academic intention and the serious distortions in the book of Ambedkar’s understanding of national movement’ (Guru, 1998, p. 156). Christophe Jaffrelot examines the judgement of Shourie on Ambedkar as ‘primarily a response to the increasing popularity of Ambedkarism and to the recent rise of power of Untouchables who question the social status quo’ (Jaffrelot, 2005, p. 150). Ambedkar, with intent, dropped the Congress version of national movement, which was more politically organized rather than socially integrated. Since a large number of profane people in India, called Dalits, are socially peripheral, how could India fight unitedly against the colonizers demanding the right to self-determination as a nation! Ambedkar always laid emphasis on the social solidarity as a means of the anti-colonial struggle. Unless realizing social solidarity among different religions, castes and communities, the struggle for
political independence will be unproductive. Then, one identity is to be created for a nation, that is, Indian, by transgressing the differences among various identities. A statement of B. T. Ranadive, an Indian communist leader, might be relevant here as he says ‘the anti-imperialist struggle, the growing sense of national unity, the anti-caste agitations and the revolt, were all parts of single process—the formation of a modern nation, with its different sections demanding equality and common status in new polity’ (Ranadive, 1979, p. 337). During the freedom struggle, while a sizable number of Congress leaders focused on political aspects of nationalism, Ambedkar laid emphasis on social aspects of nationalism by securing citizenship, equality, justice, etc. (Guru, 1998, p. 157). The Ambedkarite version of nationalism that demanded freedom from internal serfdom, oppression, subjugation and exploitation was not less significant than the freedom from British rule since ‘freedom from an alien rule was no more significant than the freedom from internal forms of slavery, oppression and exploitation’ (Gaikwad, 1998, p. 516). Though Ambedkar was not as much active as Gandhi or Nehru, his very idea of social solidarity by breaking the internal differences is not ignorable as well as no longer least in the history of struggle against colonialism and to build India as an all-inclusive nation. A few lines might be interesting here:

During the British rule, issue of political independence got precedence over the social reform and therefore social reform continued to remain neglected. He [Ambedkar] calls upon the Hindus to annihilate the caste which is a great hindrance to social solidarity and to set up a new social order based on the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity in consonance with the principles of Democracy. (Chitnis et al., 2014, p. xiv)

Notwithstanding, Ambedkar favoured the British rule, but he favoured till that point that was required for the progress of the then stagnant, superstitious, caste-based Indian society. He did not support the British rule forever (Debnath, 2018).

**Inclusive Development Policy**

Taking lead from the previous point, it is noteworthy that Ambedkar understood that the development of all, particularly of the oppressed section in society, is needed for India to be a true nation. Thus, development policy should be inclusive. Definitely, Ambedkar’s conception of nation-building was associated with the development policy, which was inclusive. It was inclusive since all the sects of Indian society were included in this mechanism, which had four components.

**Claim for Equal Rights for All and Equity in Opportunities**

For upliftment of the oppressed sects of society, there should be some rights and constitutional safeguards to protect these rights. The oppressed sects are oppressed by their distressed economic, educational and, of course, social conditions and non-accessibility to the opportunities. They are discriminated as they face discrimination to access the socio-economic and educational opportunities as accessed by the ‘entrenched castes’. Therefore, rights are to enabling the oppressed socially, educationally and economically. Safeguards are to ensure enjoying the rights. Ambedkar was keen to confirm equal rights for all, which he called ‘citizenship rights’. Ambedkar had his own mechanism of social reformation for ensuring equal rights for the unprivileged that was totally different from the path of the then caste Hindus. Ambedkar wrote:

the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal, I was given to understand, to be an organization of Caste Hindu Social Reformers, with the one and only aim, namely to eradicate the Caste System from amongst the Hindus. As a rule, I do not
like to take any part in a movement which is carried on by the Caste Hindus. Their attitude towards social reform is so different from mine that I have found it difficult to pull on with them. (Ambedkar, 1945a/2014a, p. 27)

Ambedkar’s method for safeguarding equal rights for the untouchables were included to, first, elevating the position of the untouchables with respect to the other castes; second, securing equal rights of the untouchables; and, third, the methods of ensuring equal rights for all sections. ‘Annihilation of caste’ by obliteration of endogamy could only be a way for ensuring equal rights for all. Ambedkar said, ‘origin of Caste in India for, as I have established before, endogamy is the only characteristic of Caste and when I say Origin of Caste I mean The Origin of the Mechanism for Endogamy’ (Ambedkar, 1916/2014b, p. 14). Unless equity in opportunities is ensured, equal rights will not be adequate. In other words, disparities in society in terms of enjoying rights ultimately pervert equal rights guaranteed in substantive level. Thus, he was keen for, first, legal safeguards against discrimination and, second, reservation for the discriminated groups. Because, unless legal safeguards are put in place, discriminated people would remain discriminated.

Provisions of Rights in the Constitution and in Other Statutory Forms

How can the rights of the people be ensured to those who are unprivileged or ‘the other’? Ambedkar truly understood that it can be done only through the codified law. For nation-building, rights of the unprivileged or underprivileged must be ensured, and it can only be achieved through constitutional safeguards. The more legal safeguards for extermination of discrimination would be done, the more rights of the underprivileged would be ensured. That is why Ambedkar once wrote:

Soon after it became definite that the framing of the future Constitution of India was to be entrusted to a Constituent Assembly, the Working Committee of the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation asked me to prepare a Memorandum on the Safeguards for the Scheduled Castes for being submitted to the Constituent Assembly, on behalf of the Federation. I very gladly undertook the task. (Ambedkar, 1947/2014e, p. 383)

In the Memorandum titled ‘States and Minorities’, Ambedkar expressed his worry concerning constitutional safeguards of the minorities and Scheduled Castes (Ambedkar, 1947/2014e, p. 391). For Ambedkar, the Scheduled Castes are no longer the creamy layer than the minorities. He said, ‘Those who hold the view that the Scheduled Castes are not a minority might say that in this matter I have gone beyond prescribed bounds’ (Ambedkar, 1947/2014e, p. 383). Since the Scheduled Castes largely undergo social, economic and educational backwardness than other citizens and minorities, ‘Scheduled Castes are more than a minority and that any protection given to the citizens and to the minorities will not be adequate for the Scheduled Castes’ (Ambedkar, 1947/2014e, p. 383), and the minorities and Scheduled Castes require safeguards against ‘the tyranny and discrimination of the majority’ (Ambedkar, 1947/2014e, pp. 383–384). He focused more on the minorities and women. As the first law minister of independent India, he guided the Hindu Code Bill as an approval of women’s rights like property rights even of married and widow female successor. So, Ambedkar, besides a leader of the Dalits, a true liberator of all the oppressed.

Egalitarian Economic Arrangement and Education

For Ambedkar, social solidarity among the Indians would never be built up unless equal access to income, capital assets and economic opportunities for poor, including all discriminated groups. The prosperity of any nation depends on the economic foundation of the society. Uneven economic development or accumulation of capital in the hands of a few people may lead to a collapse of the development of a nation. Since India was, at that time, primarily an agrarian country, he focused on the agricultural problems. He was also concerned about the industrialization because the industrial sector is
for the progress of the nation. According to Ambedkar, holding of lands by a few people or concentration of the land property in the hands of limited sections is an acute problem of the Indian agricultural sector, and for this reason, various disadvantages may arise like economic disparities, utilization of resources, maximization of cost, low productivity, inadequate income and poor standard of living. A set of future plans of Ambedkar regarding economic reformation were reflected in the manifesto of the Independent Labour Party (ILP), a political party formed by Ambedkar himself in 1936. These are, as Gail Omvedt (2008, pp. 74–75) underlines, ‘principle of state management and ownership of industry wherever it was in the interest of the people’; ILP assured to change or modify the economic system that caused unjust treatment to any class or section of the people; it also promised to ‘bring legislation to regulate the employment of factory workers, including fixing their work hours, making payment of adequate wages, providing bonus and pension schemes’; ILP promised to bring legislation for providing social insurance and to protect the agricultural tenants from the exploitations carried out by the landlords. According to Ambedkar, concentration of land or ‘monopoly’ in agricultural capital might affect the productivity of agriculture, which is related to the size of holdings of land, capital, labour and other factors. With this thought, the ‘Land Ceiling Act’ was passed after Independence. Slavery and exploitation of Labour must be abolished because these are tied with the caste system and affect economic development. The idea of democratic socialism has been echoed in his prescriptions for solving the economic problems. These were collective farming according to rules, regulations and directions issued by the government, agriculture should be the state-owned industry, nationalization of industries, economic holding of land or equal distribution of land, minimum wages to the labourers, life insurance policy to the farmers, etc. Ambedkar was keen to analyse taxation policy of the then India. His formula regarding taxation are as follows: there must be an equity in taxation; tax should be based on the taxable capacity or income; tax exemption may be provided till a certain limit; tax should be imposed on payers’ capacity and not on income; land revenue tax should be more flexible and subject to revise time to time (Ambedkar, 1925/2014f, p. 231). Then, the strategies of the economic development, prescribed by Ambedkar, were for upliftment of the downtrodden people based on egalitarian policy and no longer a small matter than the class conception of socialism as, for Ambedkar, caste system should not be treated merely as a division of labour, but it should also be treated as a division of labourers (Jaffrelot, 2005, p. 75).

Ambedkar also said that the emancipation of the depressed class rests upon ‘higher education, higher employment and better ways of earning a living’ (Keer, 1971, p. 229), since education and economic development are knottily linked. For advancement of education of depressed classes, he established ‘Depress Class Education Society’ in 1928. Besides education, he spoke of the character building of the people. An educated man without character, for Ambedkar, is not less dangerous than a beast and if the education of a person is injurious to the welfare of the poor, it would become a curse to the society. So, character is no less important than education (Keer, 1971, p. 305).

**Representation and Participation for the Unprivileged**

Ambedkar was also attentive in solving the question as to how individual opinion could be transmitted into public action. He tried to resolve the much-debated conflict between individuality and collectivity. According to him, unless it is a personal representation, democracy may be the government for the people but not the government by the people. In his words ‘popular Government is not only Government for the people but by the people’ (Ambedkar, 1919/2014d, p. 247). For that reason, he prescribed personal representation, and, in this way, a government will turn into a ‘popular government’. Ambedkar wrote:

> As the Government is the most important field for the exercise of individual capacities, it is in the interest of the people that no person as such should be denied the opportunity of actively participating in the process of Government. (Ambedkar, 1919/2014d, p. 247)
Ambedkar opined that the representation of the system should be according to the social division of the whole population of India. He said that the Indian population was divided into many groups on religious lines—Hindus, Mohammedans, Christians, Jews and Parsees, and the Hindus are further divided into—touchables and untouchables (Ambedkar, 1919/2014d, p. 250). Every group has its distinct interests. Popular government must reflect the interest of all the groups. Success of a popular government is subject to secure the interests of the groups. So, Ambedkar proposed a separate electorate for separate class as a true representation and participation of a system for the people in India. A separate electorate is not similar to a separate nation or separate state, but the people of a community will choose their representatives from their own community. This proposition of Ambedkar, however, has not yet been accepted. Apart from separate electorate, he preferred a reservation for the equal representation of various religions as well as Hindu untouchables in legislature, executive and public service. Moreover, Ambedkar sought to resolve the communal problems through representation in the legislature, executive and in services (Ambedkar, 1945b/2014c, p. 367).

**Democratic Framework for Making Indian Nation**

Democracy is, probably, the best way to initiate nation-building in every multicultural, multi-ethnic and multilingual state. But democracy should be against the ‘tyranny of the majority’ to protect the minority, that is, caste, religion, linguistics and ethnicity. According to Ambedkar, to protect minority rights, democracy would be the best form of socio-political ideology. That is why he opposed the ‘tyranny of the majority’ and any type of concentration of power since concentration of power is one of the major enemies of democracy. However, considering ‘tyranny of the majority’ in a liberal representative democratic state, the rights of the minority as well as all the oppressed can be protected by defining some rights as ‘fundamental rights’ in order to these rights could not be breached by the representatives, even by the majority of the representatives.

Democracy does not bear same connotations all the time. Democracy is as much a social doctrine as it is a political doctrine. The meaning of democracy changes from a ‘legal-institutional form of government’ to ‘a way of life’ when it is taken philosophically. John Dewey, an American philosopher, has been one of the philosophers who took democracy in latter sense. Ambedkar, like John Dewey, also took democracy as a way of life. Ambedkar said ‘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 fellowmen’ (Ambedkar, 1945a/2014a, p. 57). It was a major concern of Ambedkar ‘who always emphasized that political democracy would be incomplete without economic and social democracy’ (Drèze, 2014, p. xi), because, as he said, ‘social and economic democracy are the tissues and fiber of a political democracy. The together, the tissues and fiber, the greater strength of the body’ (Ambedkar, 1946b, p. 207). This connotation of democracy upholds social solidarity, shared interests and unremitting communication among people. Social solidarity can only be guaranteed through a new social order based on liberty, equality and fraternity assured by the principles of democracy. A society based on liberty, equality and fraternity is, for Ambedkar, an ‘ideal society’. Liberty ensures not only free movement, right to property or right to life, but it empowers people to choose their profession according to their choice. True liberty eliminates all forms of subjection, including caste, a form of slavery. The principle of equality treats equally all the ‘unequal’ in terms of physical heredity, social inheritance, knowledge and effort. Equality helps to survive the weaker sections in society because it ensures equitable distribution of resources. On fraternity, Ambedkar wrote:

An ideal society should be mobile, should be full of channels for conveying a change taking place in one part to other parts. In an ideal society there should be many interests consciously communicated and shared.
There should be varied and free points of contact with other modes of association. In other words there must be social endosmosis. This is fraternity, which is only another name for democracy. (Ambedkar, 1945a/2014a, p. 57)

Thus, Ambedkar accepted democracy as an associated living that enables every human being to develop their capacity to the maximum limit. Democracy means fraternity that ensures mutual trust and reciprocal relations between fellow-persons. An inclusive nation definitely rests upon democracy as a way of life.

**Conclusion**

In this concluding part, the thought of Mahatma Gandhi, father of the Indian nation, on nation-building process might be remarkable for the betterment of understanding Ambedkar’s viewpoint. Palshikar, like some other researchers, underlines the parallels between the two legends that Gandhi and Ambedkar both tried to imagine a community based on justice and fraternity, both took non-violence as their path for social transformation, and both laid emphasis on the question of emancipation (Palshikar, 1996, pp. 2070–2072). Yet, the ideological differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar are very pertinent in terms of their views on nation-building process, particularly building an integrated community. Gandhi never said about an integrated nation, but he had faith on philosophical anarchic and decentralized gram-swaraj based on sarvodaya or upliftment of all. Though Gandhi favoured the untouchables or the Harijans, and fought against untouchability as a corruption in Hinduism (for details, see Jaffrelot, 2005, pp. 60–61), but, for Gandhi, the Varna system was the cornerstone of the Indian nation. He expressed his anxiety pertaining to the negative effect of closing down the Varna system from the Indian society. Gandhi deemed that the process of nation-building might be affected if the Varna system is abolished from the Indian society forcefully, since the Varna system is the primordial characteristic of the Indian society. Despite Gandhi was in favour of the reformation of the Varna system, he did not think that the relation between the Varna system and the untouchability is sacrosanct. He was optimistic that the Varna system can be sustained without anathema of the untouchability. Ambedkar’s idea, on the other side, substantively different from the Gandhian ideology. Ambedkar believed that the curse of untouchability is rooted deeply in the Varna system, and it has been anathematized socially. Thus, ‘if Gandhi was Bapu, the ‘father’ of a society in which he tried to inject equality while maintaining the ‘Hindu’ framework, Ambedkar was Baba to his people and the great liberator from that framework’ (Omvedt, 2008, p. xv).

Ambedkar’s alternative path for nation-building in India was no longer less valued than the way of nation-building conceptualized and practised by Gandhi and the leaders of the Indian National Congress because ‘while Gandhi fought for freedom from colonial rule, Ambedkar fought for a broader liberation from exploitation and oppression’ (Omvedt, 2008, p. xv). Ambedkar did not want merely to liberate the downtrodden people, but he tried to begin an ‘alternative subaltern discourse’ of nation-building vis-à-vis the approach of nation-building largely epitomized by the monolithic ‘elite discourse’. As his biographer Dhananjay Keer said, ‘Ambedkar has played the part of destiny in the liberation of suppressed humanity in India’ (Keer, 1971, p. xi); therefore, his inclusive development policy is not only for those who are suffering from the caste institution but also for those groups suffering from identity crisis like ethnicity, religion, gender, etc. For that particular reason, Ambedkar called for changing the social order based on social division like caste system. He said very passionately that:

> You cannot build anything on the foundations of caste. You cannot build up a nation, you cannot build up a morality. Anything that you will build on the foundations of caste will crack and will never be a whole (Ambedkar, 1945a/2014a, p. 66).
Now, in this age of social crises, India needs the inclusive development policy within a true democratic framework. So, his idea of annihilation of caste, economic planning, education and representation are for achieving the social equality and cultural and religious unity; in broader sense, devoted to the nation-building. If India wants to be a successful nation, then she needs to go beyond the tyranny of the majority and any types of concentration of power, which will ensure the liberty, fraternity, equality and justice in true sense among people, and thus her inclusive character. As the Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Indian Constitution, he was able incorporate such provisions in the constitution. Notwithstanding, many changes in the draft he presented, the Indian Constitution still maintains his dreams to be an inclusive nation (Debnath, 2018).
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Notes
1. The Varna system divides the Hindus into four main categories: Brahmins (teachers and intellectuals and supposedly came from the head of Brahma, the Hindu God of creation); Kshatriyas (the rulers and warriors, who are believed to have come from the arms of God Brahma); Vaishyas (the traders, who were supposedly created from God Brahma’s thighs); and Shudras (who were supposed to do all the menial works and came from Brahma’s feet) (Ghurye, 2016, pp. 23–59). These main Varnas were further divided into several castes and sub-castes, on the basis of their specific hereditary occupation. The word ‘caste’ comes from casta, a Spanish word, means race. In the Indian context, caste denotes a social hierarchy of status by birth among the Hindus based on Varna. The basis of caste are primarily endogamous marriage system and hereditary occupation. Though the caste system was grounded on the division of Varna, it cannot easily be captured only through the Varna model. The ground realities in the caste system in India is more complex than the textual Varna model of the caste system. The state takes the line of caste for classifying Indian population instead of Varna for the census (Jodhka, 2012, pp. 8–9). Outside of this Hindu Varna as well as caste system were the outcastes—the Dalits or the untouchables or the oppressed. Ambedkar introduced the term ‘Dalit’ in 1928 for the Scheduled Castes, keeping in mind the oppressed conditions they faced. The Indian state prefers to use the term ‘Scheduled Castes’ instead of the ‘Dalits’ (Oommen, 2014, pp. 46, 72–73).
2. For a detailed discussion on the similarities between Ambedkar and Dewey on democracy as a way of life, see an article written by Mukherjee (2009).
3. Attitudinal differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar on the Varna and Caste system in Hinduism are outlined in the work of Oommen (2014, pp. 38–39).
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