Swapnil Chaudhary
Research Scholar,
Department of Political
Science, Sarvodaya P.G.
College, Ghosi, Mau,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Reconciling contradictions: comparative political thought of B. R. Ambedkar and Mahatma Gandhi

Swapnil Chaudhary

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2025.v7.i8c.640

Abstract
Mahatma Gandhi and B. R. Ambedkar, two of the most influential leaders in India's political history, offered distinct frameworks for the nation's socio-political transformation. Gandhi envisioned a moral polity rooted in spiritual ethics, emphasizing *Swaraj* (self-rule), village republics, and non-violence as the foundation of political engagement. Ambedkar, in contrast, advanced a legal-rational model anchored in constitutionalism, social justice, and the annihilation of caste. While Gandhi sought reform within tradition through moral persuasion, Ambedkar advocated structural change through state intervention and legal safeguards. This paper critically compares their political ideologies, explores points of convergence and divergence, and evaluates their relevance in contemporary India—particularly in addressing caste-based discrimination, decentralization debates, and constitutional morality. By revisiting their political philosophies, the paper highlights how these competing yet complementary visions continue to shape democratic discourse in modern India.

Keywords: Gandhi, Ambedkar, political thought, Swaraj, constitutionalism, social justice, contemporary relevance

Introduction

The political history of modern India cannot be understood without engaging with the intellectual legacies of Mahatma Gandhi and B. R. Ambedkar. Both were architects of India's democratic trajectory, yet their visions for an ideal polity were fundamentally divergent. Gandhi, often referred to as the "Father of the Nation," advocated for a non-violent, decentralized political order rooted in spiritual and ethical principles (Parel, 2016) [13]. His idea of *Swaraj* went beyond political independence to encompass self-rule, moral regeneration, and economic self-sufficiency through village republics (Gandhi, 1938) [7]. For Gandhi, politics was inseparable from ethics and religion; he envisioned politics as a moral endeavor guided by the principle of *Sarvodaya* (welfare of all).

Ambedkar, the principal architect of the Indian Constitution, approached politics from a radically different standpoint. He believed that social democracy and political democracy were inseparable, and neither could survive without the other (Rodrigues, 2002) [15]. For Ambedkar, dismantling the caste hierarchy was a precondition for genuine democracy. His advocacy for constitutionalism, state intervention, and affirmative action stemmed from the conviction that legal frameworks and institutional safeguards were essential for ensuring liberty, equality, and fraternity (Ambedkar, 1936/2014). Unlike Gandhi's faith in moral transformation, Ambedkar relied on rational, legal, and institutional mechanisms to restructure society.

The intellectual encounter between Gandhi and Ambedkar was not merely a debate over methods; it represented a clash of two worldviews—one anchored in ethical idealism and the other in constitutional pragmatism. While Gandhi sought social harmony through spiritual reform, Ambedkar viewed such efforts as inadequate for eradicating entrenched structural inequalities. Their famous disagreement over the Poona Pact (1932) underscores the depth of their ideological conflict on the question of caste and political representation (Zelliot, 2013) [18].

In contemporary India, these debates have acquired renewed significance. Issues such as caste-based reservation, rural decentralization, ethical governance, and constitutional morality evoke the intellectual legacies of both Gandhi and Ambedkar. Political actors and social movements often selectively invoke their ideas to legitimize competing agendas.

Corresponding Author:
Swapnil Chaudhary
Research Scholar,
Department of Political
Science, Sarvodaya P.G.
College, Ghosi, Mau,
Uttar Pradesh, India

This paper aims to critically compare the political philosophies of Gandhi and Ambedkar, examine their points of convergence and divergence, and assess their relevance to India's current socio-political context.

The study employs a comparative political analysis of primary texts such as Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* and Ambedkar's *Annihilation of Caste*, supplemented by secondary literature in political theory and South Asian studies. Through this analysis, the paper argues that while Gandhi and Ambedkar embodied conflicting visions of politics, their ideas remain complementary for sustaining a democratic, inclusive, and ethical polity in contemporary India.

Gandhi's Political Thought-

Mahatma Gandhi's political philosophy cannot be understood in isolation from his ethical and spiritual convictions. Gandhi viewed politics as a moral enterprise, deeply intertwined with truth (*satya*) and non-violence (*ahimsa*). His famous assertion, "Those who say religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means" (Gandhi, 1938) [7], reflects his conviction that politics without morality degenerates into power struggles devoid of ethical considerations.

Swaraj: Beyond Political Independence

The cornerstone of Gandhi's political thought is *Swaraj*—a concept often misunderstood as mere self-government. Gandhi (1909/1997) clarified in *Hind Swaraj* that Swaraj implied not only liberation from British rule but also the moral and spiritual self-rule of individuals and communities. For Gandhi, true freedom lay in self-discipline and self-restraint rather than unbridled assertion of rights. This idea extended to his vision of a decentralized political order based on autonomous village republics (*Gram Swaraj*), which he considered the building blocks of Indian democracy (Parel, 2016) [13]. Gandhi envisaged a society where governance was localized, participatory, and rooted in traditional village structures, thus minimizing state intervention.

Decentralization and Village Republics

Gandhi's preference for village-based governance stemmed from his critique of modern industrial civilization, which he saw as exploitative and morally corrosive. He opposed centralization of power, whether political or economic, arguing that it inevitably leads to inequality and domination. In his model of *Gram Swaraj*, villages would enjoy substantial autonomy, managing their affairs through panchayats and ensuring self-sufficiency in production. This emphasis on decentralization resonates in contemporary Panchayati Raj institutions, though its practical implementation remains contested (Gupta, 2009) [9].

Non-Violence as Political Strategy

Gandhi elevated non-violence (*ahimsa*) from a personal ethic to a powerful political tool. His technique of *Satyagraha*—literally "holding on to truth"—was designed to resist injustice without inflicting harm on the oppressor. Non-violence, for Gandhi, was not mere tactical expediency but the essence of ethical politics. He argued that ends and means are inseparable; unjust means cannot produce just ends (Parekh, 1997) [12]. This principle distinguished Gandhi from other nationalist leaders who viewed political violence

as a legitimate strategy against colonial rule.

Economic Ethics: Trusteeship

Gandhi's political philosophy was complemented by his economic theory of trusteeship, which proposed that the wealthy should hold their resources in trust for the welfare of society (Gandhi, 1941) [8]. This was neither socialism nor capitalism but a moral framework that sought to harmonize wealth and welfare without coercive redistribution. Critics argue that trusteeship was utopian and lacked enforceability, yet it reflected Gandhi's effort to humanize economics through ethics (Bandyopadhyay, 2000) [4].

Religion and Politics

Gandhi's integration of religion and politics has often attracted criticism. While he insisted that his politics was spiritual rather than sectarian, critics like Ambedkar contended that such an approach could reinforce caste hierarchies and inhibit social justice (Ambedkar, 1936/2014). Gandhi's advocacy of *varna dharma* as a functional division of labor, though stripped of hierarchical connotations in his reinterpretation, was seen by Ambedkar as legitimizing caste (Zelliot, 2013) [18]. Despite these criticisms, Gandhi's vision of politics as moral service continues to inspire ethical governance discourses globally.

Ambedkar's Political Thought

B. R. Ambedkar's political philosophy represents a rationalist, constitutionalist, and socially transformative vision that contrast sharply with Gandhi's moral idealism. While Gandhi emphasized ethical reform within traditional structures, Ambedkar sought to dismantle these structures through legal and institutional frameworks. For Ambedkar, social justice was the foundation of political democracy, and the eradication of caste was essential for the realization of liberty, equality, and fraternity (Rodrigues, 2002) [15].

Constitutionalism and Democracy

Ambedkar's greatest contribution lies in his role as the principal architect of the Indian Constitution. His political thought was grounded in liberal democratic principles— parliamentary governance, rule of law, and protection of fundamental rights (Austin, 1999) [3]. He envisioned the state as a neutral arbiter that would secure justice for marginalized groups through legal safeguards and affirmative action policies. In his speeches in the Constituent Assembly, Ambedkar (1948) repeatedly stressed the importance of constitutional morality, warning against the dangers of hero-worship and extra-constitutional authority. He argued that democracy in India must be rooted in social and economic equality, not merely in formal political structures.

Annihilation of Caste

Ambedkar's most radical critique of Hindu society centered on the caste system. In his seminal work *Annihilation of Caste* (1936/2014), Ambedkar denounced caste as an oppressive institution incompatible with democracy and human dignity. Unlike Gandhi, who sought to reform caste by eradicating untouchability while retaining a functional *varna* order, Ambedkar demanded its complete destruction. He viewed caste not as a division of labor but as a division of laborers, perpetuating inequality and humiliation (Jaffrelot, 2005) [11]. Ambedkar argued that without social

equality, political democracy would be a mere facade: "Political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy" (Ambedkar, 1948, p. 38).

State Intervention and Social Justice
Ambedkar believed that legal and institutional measures were indispensable for dismantling entrenched social hierarchies. His advocacy for reservations in education and public employment for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes reflected his conviction that formal equality could not correct historical injustices. For Ambedkar, rights without remedies were meaningless; hence, he emphasized the role of the state in securing socio-economic rights alongside civil liberties (Galanter, 1984) [5].

Secularism and Religion
Ambedkar's approach to religion in politics diverged fundamentally from Gandhi's. While Gandhi spiritualized politics, Ambedkar insisted on secular constitutionalism. His critique of Hinduism culminated in his historic conversion to Buddhism in 1956, which he saw as a rational and egalitarian faith compatible with modern democracy (Queen, 1996) [14]. For Ambedkar, religion could play a constructive role only if it upheld liberty, equality, and fraternity—principles that he argued were inherent in Buddhism but absent in Brahmanical Hinduism.

Economic Democracy
Ambedkar's political thought also included an economic dimension. He warned that political democracy would fail without economic justice. In his writings and speeches, he advocated state-led industrialization and land reforms to prevent economic exploitation (Bandyopadhyay, 2000) [4]. Unlike Gandhi's emphasis on village self-sufficiency, Ambedkar favored large-scale industry and urbanization as means to break caste-based occupational rigidity and promote economic modernization (Jaffrelot, 2005) [11].

Critique of Gandhian Model
Ambedkar strongly criticized Gandhi's reliance on moral persuasion and his insistence on maintaining elements of the caste order. He accused Gandhi of romanticizing the village system, which Ambedkar saw as "a sink of localism, a den of ignorance, and a breeding ground of narrow-mindedness" (Ambedkar, 1948, p. 33). While Gandhi idealized village life as a repository of virtue, Ambedkar considered it a site of oppression for Dalits and other marginalized communities.

In sum, Ambedkar's political thought sought to reconstruct Indian society through constitutional democracy, social justice, and secularism. His emphasis on institutional safeguards and state intervention reflects a modernist vision aimed at ensuring substantive equality. Unlike Gandhi's reliance on individual morality, Ambedkar trusted in the power of law to engineer social change—a conviction that continues to shape India's constitutional framework and affirmative action policies today.

Points of Convergence and Divergence
The political philosophies of Mahatma Gandhi and B. R. Ambedkar represent two of the most significant ideological streams in modern Indian thought. While their approaches were fundamentally different, their visions intersected on certain ideals. Understanding both convergence and divergence is crucial for comprehending the trajectory of Indian democracy.

Areas of Convergence
Despite their well-documented disagreements, Gandhi and Ambedkar shared some broad normative commitments:

1. **Commitment to Democracy:** Both leaders envisioned India as a democratic polity after independence. Gandhi believed democracy should be grounded in moral responsibility and participatory governance at the grassroots level (Parel, 2016) [13]. Ambedkar, while focusing on institutional design and constitutional safeguards, equally emphasized democracy as a way of life encompassing social and economic dimensions (Ambedkar, 1948). Their shared commitment ensured that democratic ideals became central to India's constitutional order.

2. **Social Justice as a Priority:** Gandhi and Ambedkar were both deeply concerned about the plight of marginalized communities, particularly the so-called untouchables (later known as Dalits). Gandhi campaigned vigorously against untouchability and promoted the concept of *Harijan* (children of God), urging upper-caste Hindus to accept Dalits as equals (Gandhi, 1938) [7]. Ambedkar, however, considered these measures insufficient but did not dispute the need to eradicate caste-based discrimination. Thus, while differing on methods, both acknowledged social justice as an essential condition for national progress.

3. **Non-Materialistic Political Vision:** Both thinkers rejected materialism as the ultimate goal of politics. Gandhi advocated a spiritualized politics centered on moral values, while Ambedkar emphasized liberty, equality, and fraternity as guiding principles over mere economic advancement (Rodrigues, 2002) [15]. Their visions, though divergent in implementation, sought to humanize politics.

Areas of Divergence
The most profound differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar lay in their methods, foundational assumptions, and vision of the ideal social order.

1. **Ethics versus Law:** Gandhi approached politics as an extension of ethics, asserting that moral persuasion and self-purification were sufficient for social transformation. His reliance on *Satyagraha* exemplified this belief in the power of non-violent resistance to awaken the conscience of the oppressor (Parekh, 1997) [12]. Ambedkar, by contrast, distrusted reliance on morality alone; he insisted that enforceable rights and institutional mechanisms were indispensable for ensuring justice. For Ambedkar, law, not morality, was the true instrument of social change (Galanter, 1984) [5].

2. **Decentralization versus Centralization:** Gandhi's vision of *Swaraj* rested on autonomous village republics as the foundation of democracy. He idealized the village as a site of simplicity and communal harmony (Gandhi, 1938) [7]. Ambedkar rejected this romanticization, famously describing the village as "a sink of localism" and a "den of ignorance" (Ambedkar, 1948, p. 33). He advocated for a strong centralized state capable of enforcing constitutional rights and dismantling oppressive social structures.

3. **Religion and Politics:** Gandhi integrated religion into

politics, considering it a moral force essential for public life. However, Ambedkar viewed such an approach as dangerous in a society riddled with caste-based inequalities. He argued that religion, especially in its Brahmanical form, was a source of oppression, and therefore politics must remain secular and rational. His eventual conversion to Buddhism was a rejection of Hindu orthodoxy and an affirmation of egalitarian values (Queen, 1996) [14].

4. **Caste Reform versus Caste Annihilation;** The sharpest ideological conflict between Gandhi and Ambedkar concerned the caste system. Gandhi opposed untouchability and sought reform within the *varna* framework, reinterpreting it as a non-hierarchical division of labor (Zelliot, 2013) [18]. Ambedkar dismissed this reinterpretation as cosmetic, insisting on the complete annihilation of caste through legal, social, and cultural revolution (Ambedkar, 1936/2014). Their clash over separate electorates during the Poona Pact (1932) epitomized this divergence (Jaffrelot, 2005) [11].

5. **Economic Models;** Gandhi envisioned a self-sufficient rural economy based on handicrafts and minimal industrialization, while Ambedkar favored large-scale industry and state-led modernization as prerequisites for breaking caste-based economic structures (Bandyopadhyay, 2000) [4]. This divergence reflected their broader disagreement over tradition versus modernity.

In sum, the convergence between Gandhi and Ambedkar lay in their normative ideals of democracy and justice, while their divergences arose from contrasting strategies and philosophical foundations. Gandhi's politics of ethics and Ambedkar's politics of rights represent two complementary yet contested paradigms of democratic transformation in India.

Contemporary Relevance
The political ideas of Gandhi and Ambedkar continue to shape contemporary India's socio-political discourse in profound ways. Despite being products of a colonial context, their frameworks address enduring challenges related to social justice, governance, and democratic ethics.

Caste and Social Justice
Ambedkar's emphasis on the annihilation of caste resonates strongly in contemporary debates on affirmative action, social inclusion, and Dalit empowerment. India's reservation policies for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes are direct legacies of Ambedkar's constitutional vision. Movements such as the Dalit Panthers and recent protests over caste-based atrocities draw inspiration from Ambedkar's insistence on structural change through legal and political means (Guru, 2011) [10]. At the same time, Gandhi's moral appeal for harmony and his advocacy of *Sarvodaya* inspire grassroots movements aimed at social cohesion, such as inter-caste marriage campaigns and community-based reforms.

Decentralization versus Centralization
Gandhi's advocacy of decentralized governance finds partial realization in the Panchayati Raj system, constitutionally mandated through the 73rd and 74th Amendments (Singh, 2008) [16]. These reforms embody his vision of local self-

government, though critics argue that true autonomy remains elusive due to state-level interference and resource constraints. Conversely, Ambedkar's model of a strong central state is evident in India's federal structure, where the Union government plays a pivotal role in maintaining social and political stability. Contemporary tensions between centralization and local autonomy—whether in resource allocation or fiscal federalism—echo the unresolved dialectic between their two models.

Ethics and Constitutional Morality
In an era marked by populism, corruption, and institutional erosion, Gandhi's insistence on ethical politics acquires renewed relevance. Movements such as the anti-corruption campaign led by Anna Hazare invoked Gandhian principles of moral persuasion and non-violent protest (Teltumbde, 2012) [17]. Simultaneously, Ambedkar's warning against "the grammar of anarchy" and his emphasis on constitutional morality serve as critical reminders for upholding the rule of law amid political polarization (Ambedkar, 1948). The growing discourse on judicial independence, constitutional safeguards, and democratic accountability reflects Ambedkar's enduring influence.

Religion and Secularism
India's contemporary challenges with communalism and identity politics underscore the continuing relevance of both Gandhi and Ambedkar. Gandhi's vision of a spiritually informed yet inclusive politics offers an alternative to sectarian nationalism, while Ambedkar's insistence on a secular state remains foundational for protecting minority rights. Debates on the Uniform Civil Code, freedom of religion, and caste discrimination laws demonstrate the persistence of these ideological tensions.

Economic and Developmental Questions
Gandhi's critique of industrial modernity appears prescient in the context of environmental degradation and the climate crisis. His call for simplicity, sustainability, and decentralized production aligns with contemporary discourses on ecological ethics and rural development. Conversely, Ambedkar's advocacy of industrialization and urbanization informs current state-led initiatives aimed at economic modernization and social mobility for marginalized communities.

The persistence of these issues illustrates that Gandhi and Ambedkar were not merely historical figures but architects of frameworks that continue to guide and contest India's democratic journey. Their ideas remain indispensable for negotiating the challenges of social inequality, governance ethics, and constitutional integrity in the twenty-first century.

Conclusion
The political philosophies of Mahatma Gandhi and B. R. Ambedkar represent two distinct yet profoundly influential visions for shaping India's democratic future. Gandhi approached politics as an extension of ethics, rooted in the principles of non-violence, truth, and moral responsibility. His advocacy of *Swaraj*, decentralized governance, and trusteeship reflected an aspiration to harmonize social relations through voluntary moral transformation. Ambedkar, by contrast, grounded his political thought in rationalism, legal frameworks, and the quest for social

justice through institutional intervention. His insistence on constitutional safeguards, state centrality, and the annihilation of caste underscored his commitment to equality and human dignity.

While both leaders shared a normative commitment to democracy and social justice, their disagreements reveal deep philosophical divergences. Gandhi sought to reform caste within a spiritualized social order, whereas Ambedkar aimed to dismantle caste entirely as a prerequisite for democracy. Gandhi idealized village life and advocated minimal industrialization, while Ambedkar rejected this vision as regressive, favoring state-led modernization and economic transformation. These differences were not merely methodological but reflected fundamentally different understandings of human nature, social change, and the role of the state.

The continuing relevance of these ideas in contemporary India cannot be overstated. Gandhi's principles inform grassroots movements for ethical governance, sustainable development, and communal harmony, while Ambedkar's constitutional vision remains central to debates on affirmative action, minority rights, and social inclusion. Issues such as caste-based discrimination, federalism, secularism, and economic inequality highlight the enduring tensions between moral persuasion and legal enforcement, decentralization and centralization, tradition and modernity—tensions embodied in the Gandhian-Ambedkarite dialectic.

Rather than viewing Gandhi and Ambedkar as irreconcilable antagonists, their ideas can be understood as complementary resources for democratic renewal. Gandhi's insistence on ethical politics provides a moral compass in an age of corruption and populism, while Ambedkar's framework of constitutional morality offers institutional safeguards against majoritarian impulses and systemic injustice. The synthesis of Gandhian ethics and Ambedkarite rights-based politics remains vital for realizing an inclusive, just, and sustainable democracy.

In conclusion, engaging with the political thought of Gandhi and Ambedkar is not a matter of historical curiosity but an urgent intellectual task for addressing India's contemporary challenges. Their legacies invite a critical dialogue that transcends binaries, fostering a democratic ethos that combines ethical ideals with structural reforms—a vision as relevant today as it was during the struggle for independence.

References

1. Ambedkar BR. Annihilation of caste. Navayana; 2014. (Original work published 1936).
2. Ambedkar BR. Speech in the Constituent Assembly on November 25, 1949. In: Rodrigues V, editor. The essential writings of B. R. Ambedkar. Oxford University Press; 2014. p. 31-45.
3. Austin G. The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a nation. Oxford University Press; 1999.
4. Bandyopadhyay B. Social and political thought of B. R. Ambedkar. Deep and Deep Publications; 2000.
5. Galanter M. Competing equalities: Law and the backward classes in India. Oxford University Press; 1984.
6. Gandhi MK. Hind Swaraj and other writings. Parel AJ, editor. Cambridge University Press; 1997. (Original work published 1909).
7. Gandhi MK. Harijan: A journal of applied Gandhism. Navajivan Publishing House; 1938.
8. Gandhi MK. Constructive programme: Its meaning and place. Navajivan Publishing House; 1941.
9. Gupta D. Social stratification. Oxford University Press; 2009.
10. Guru G. Humiliation: Claims and contexts. Oxford University Press; 2011.
11. Jaffrelot C. Dr. Ambedkar and untouchability: Fighting the Indian caste system. Columbia University Press; 2005.
12. Parekh B. Gandhi: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press; 1997.
13. Parel AJ. Gandhi's political philosophy: A critical examination. Cambridge University Press; 2016.
14. Queen CS. Dr. Ambedkar and the hermeneutics of Buddhist liberation. In: Queen CS, King SB, editors. Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist liberation movements in Asia. SUNY Press; 1996. p. 45-72.
15. Rodrigues V. The essential writings of B. R. Ambedkar. Oxford University Press; 2002.
16. Singh MP. Decentralization and Panchayati Raj: Indian experiment and experience. Indian Journal of Public Administration. 2008;54(3):408-424.
17. Teltumbde A. Anna Hazare phenomenon: Changing contours of politics in India. Economic and Political Weekly. 2012;47(7):10-13.
18. Zelliot E. From untouchable to Dalit: Essays on the Ambedkar movement. Manohar Publishers; 2013.