

[Dr. Ambedkar on Islam](#)

Dr. Ambedkar on Islam

Dr Vivek Arya

Dr. Ambedkar views on Islam are like an eye opener especially for dalits who for their political vested interests are singing the glory of Dalit-Muslims unity. In reality few Dalit leaders are thinking that by this illogical and incompatible association between Dalits and Muslims they could votes on name of secularism. But the ground reality is totally different. Since centuries Dalits faced the wrath from Islamic rulers. They were given two options. Either to convert to Islam or to carry human excreta on their head. The readers will be surprised to know that they choose to carry excreta rather than Kalma and Kuran. We Hindus today must show deep respect to those ancestors for who accepted maltreatment but didn't left their faith in Vedic Dharma. We are honor them for their great devotion and loyalty in Rama and Krishna.

Dr Ambedkar was aware of this Historical maltreatment by Muslim rulers. He was given multiple incentives by Muslims to accept Islam. The nawab of Hyderabad offered him billions of rupees to accept Islam. But he simple refused his offer. Because he was viewing the intentions behind that offer. The offer to convert to Islam instead of helping the Dalits would have made the conditions of Dalit more and more worse. Dr Ambedkar writes his thoughts about Islam in his book "Pakistan or the Partition of India" Ambedkar writes, "The Muslim invaders, no doubt, came to India singing a hymn of hate against the Hindus. ... Its (Islam's) growth is so thick in Northern India that the remnants of Hindu and Buddhist culture are just shrubs. Even the Sikh axe could not fell this oak. Sikhs, no doubt , became the political masters of Northern India, but they did not gain back Northern India to that spiritual and cultural unity by which it was bound to the rest of India before HsuanTsang."

Ref. "Pakistan or the Partition of India", Chapter 4 It is interesting to note that despite his views on casteism in Hinduism, Ambedkar saw Hinduism, Buddhism and Sikhism as ONE Indian culture, at the same time, categorically calling Islam an alien culture. He writes, "From a spiritual point of view, Hindus and Musalmans are not merely two classes or two sects such as Protestants and Catholics or Shaivas and Vaishnavas. They are two distinct species... For them Divinity is divided and with the division of Divinity their humanity is divided and with the division of humanity they must remain divided. There is nothing to bring them in one bosom."

Ref. "Pakistan or the Partition of India", Chapter 6 Ambedkar had unequivocally advocated for a population exchange in case of division. Hindus and Sikhs from Pakistan come to India, and Muslims from India, got to Pakistan. In fact, both Savarkar and RSS were trying to keep India undivided, but Ambedkar, had other views which he articulated in same book. Some of these observations can be in sync with the reality today. "That the transfer of minorities is the only lasting remedy for communal peace is beyond doubt. .. there is no reason to suppose that what they did cannot be accomplished by Indians. After all, the population involved is inconsiderable and because some obstacles require to be

removed, it would be the height of folly to give up so sure a way to communal peace... The only way to make Hindustan homogeneous is to arrange for exchange of population. Until that is done, it must be admitted that even with the creation of Pakistan, the problem of majority vs. minority will remain in Hindustan as before and will continue to produce disharmony in the body politic of Hindustan.”Ref.“Pakistan or the Partition of India”, Chapter 6 Ambedkar condemned Mahatma Gandhi on his double standards he adopted on Hindu killings v/s Muslim killings. Ambedkar, in the same book, has severely criticized Gandhi for his duplicity and double standards he adopted on Hindu killings v/s Muslim killings. He writes, “But Mr. Gandhi has never protested against such murders. Not only have the Musalmans not condemned these outrages but even Mr. Gandhi has never called upon the leading Muslims to condemn them. He has kept silent over them. Such an attitude can be explained only on the ground that Mr. Gandhi was anxious to preserve Hindu-Muslim unity and did not mind the murders of a few Hindus, if it could be achieved by sacrificing their lives. This attitude to excuse the Muslims any wrong, lest it should injure the cause of unity, is well illustrated by what Mr. Gandhi had to say in the matter of the Moplah riots. The blood-curdling atrocities committed by the Moplas in Malabar against the Hindus were indescribable. All over Southern India, a wave of horrified feeling had spread among the Hindus of every shade of opinion, which was intensified when certain Khilafat leaders were so misguided as to pass resolutions of ” congratulations to the Moplas on the brave fight they were conducting for the sake of religion”. Any person could have said that this was too heavy a price for Hindu-Muslim unity. But Mr. Gandhi was so much obsessed by the necessity of establishing Hindu-Muslim unity that he was prepared to make light of the doings of the Moplas and the Khilafats who were congratulating them. He spoke of the Moplas as the “brave God-fearing Moplas who were fighting for what they consider as religion and in a manner which they consider as religious

“
Ambedkar criticized Islam for Caste system And, while Ambedkar later renounced Hinduism due to caste system, he has elaborated how Islam too had an elaborate caste system (again in practice, even though Quran speaks against any division in Islam as an evil). “Islam speaks of brotherhood. Everybody infers that Islam must be free from slavery and caste. Regarding slavery nothing needs to be said. It stands abolished now by law. But while it existed much of its support was derived from Islam and Islamic countries... The existence of these evils among the Muslims is distressing enough. But far more distressing is the fact that there is no organized movement of social reform among the Musalmans of India on a scale sufficient to bring about their eradication. The Hindus have their social evils. But there is this relieving feature about them—namely, that some of them are conscious of their existence and a few of them are actively agitating for their removal. The Muslims, on the other hand, do not realize that they are evils and consequently do not agitate for their removal. Indeed, they oppose any change in their existing practices. It is noteworthy that the “Muslims opposed the Child-Marriage Bill brought in the Central Assembly in 1930, whereby the age for marriage of a girl was raised to 14 and of a boy to 18 on the ground that it was opposed to the Muslim canon law. Not only did they oppose the bill at every stage but that when it became law they started a campaign of Civil Disobedience against that Act. Fortunately the Civil Disobedience campaign of the Muslims against the Act did not swell and was submerged in the Congress Civil Disobedience campaign which synchronized with it. But the campaign only proves how strongly the Muslims are opposed to social reform.” He further writes, “Having been taught that outside Islam there can be no safety; outside its law no truth and outside its spiritual message there is no happiness, the Muslim has become incapable of conceiving any other condition than his own, any other mode of thought than the

Islamic thought. He firmly believes that he has arrived at an unequalled pitch of perfection; that he is the sole possessor of true faith, of the true doctrine, the true wisdom ; that he alone is in possession of the truth—no relative truth subject to revision, but absolute truth.”

Ambedkar Criticized Muslims for their aggression against Hindus And, Ambedkar also writes, “The third thing that is noticeable is the adoption by the Muslims of the gangster’s method in politics. The riots are a sufficient indication that gangsterism has become a settled part of their strategy in politics. .. So long as the Muslims were the aggressors, the Hindus were passive, and in the conflict they suffered more than the Muslims did. But this is no longer true. The Hindus have learned to retaliate and no longer feel any compunction in knifing a Musalman. This spirit of retaliation bids fair to produce the ugly spectacle of gangsterism against gangsterism.” In chapter 12, he observes, “Among the tenets one that calls for notice is the tenet of Islam which says that in a country which is not under Muslim rule wherever there is a conflict between Muslim law and the law of the land, the former must prevail over the latter and a Muslim will be justified in obeying the Muslim law and defying the law of the land.” Ambedkar talks in practical terms

“Islam is a close corporation and the distinction that it makes between Muslims and non-Muslims is a very real, very positive and very alienating distinction. The brotherhood of Islam is not the universal brotherhood of man. It is brotherhood of Muslims for Muslims only. There is a fraternity but its benefit is confined to those within that corporation. For those who are outside the corporation, there is nothing but contempt and enmity. ... In other words, Islam can never allow a true Muslim to adopt India as his motherland and regard a Hindu as his kith and kin. That is probably the reason why Maulana Mahomed Ali, a great Indian but a true Muslim, preferred to be buried in Jerusalem rather than in India.” It is for the Muslim scholars to rebut or validate what Ambedkar has written about Islam. But, the secular politicians, who invoke Ambedkar in everything relating to Dalit politics, and have formed a Dalit-Muslim alliance, should also clarify if they agree to what Ambedkar has written.