Bulletin of Nexus
Multidisciplinary International Research Journal, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed, Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3065-7865 / Volume-3, Issue-5, May 2026

Original Article

Decolonial Theory: Significance and Limitations in the Indian Context

Sagar Naik
PhD Scholar, Department of History, Savitribai Phule Pune University Pune

Manuscript ID:
BN-2026-030506

ISSN: 3065-7865

Volume 3

Issue 5

May 2026

Pp. 34-41

Submitted: 06 Apr. 2026

Revised: 21 Apr. 2026

Accepted: 10 May 2026

Published: 31 May 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.23386083

DOI link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23386083

Abstract

Decolonial theory is one of the most important and most debated ideas in the humanities and social sciences today. It started mainly with thinkers in Latin America and later spread to scholars across the Global South. At its core, it questions the idea that Western knowledge and ways of thinking are the only valid ones, and it tries to make room for other ways of knowing and living. This paper looks at how well decolonial theory works when applied to India and where it doesn't quite fit. I look at the work of thinkers like Quijano, Mignolo, Wynter, and Fanon, along with Indian scholars such as Ambedkar, Chatterjee, Chakrabarty, Guru, and Teltumbde. I argue that decolonial theory gives us useful tools for understanding how colonialism shaped knowledge, government, and culture in India. But simply applying it as-is creates real problems. Three issues stand out. First, the theory doesn't pay enough attention to caste, even though caste is one of the deepest forms of oppression in India. Second, it tends to treat all colonized people as one single group, ignoring real differences between them. Third, it sometimes paints an overly rosy picture of life before colonialism. Because of this, I argue that any real decolonial thinking about India needs to start with Ambedkar's ideas, Dalit thought, and subaltern history not just borrowed theories from elsewhere. A true decolonial approach for India has to be built from scratch, one that takes caste, region, gender, and religion seriously as separate and important factors.

Keywords: *Decolonial theory, India, caste, Ambedkar, epistemic justice, coloniality, subaltern studies, postcolonialism*

Introduction

Over the past thirty years, decolonial theory has grown into one of the most ambitious ideas in global academia. It began with the "modernity/coloniality" research tradition started by Latin American scholars like Aníbal Quijano, Walter Mignolo, and Enrique Dussel. Unlike postcolonial theory, which mostly looks at culture and literature, decolonial theory goes further. Quijano (2000) called this deeper problem the "coloniality of power" the idea that racial, economic, and knowledge-based systems of domination didn't disappear when colonial rule officially ended. They simply continued in new forms. In other words, decolonial thinkers argue that colonialism didn't just rule over people it shaped how knowledge itself gets created, judged, and spread around the world.

India is a especially interesting case for testing these ideas. On one hand, it lived under British rule for almost two hundred years, and that experience shaped its politics, economy, and education system. On the other hand, India already had its own deep social hierarchies like caste and gender inequality long before the British arrived. This raises some tough questions. Can all of India's problems really be blamed on colonialism? Whose voices count as "marginalized" or "subaltern"? And is it always a good thing to revive pre-colonial traditions, given that some of those traditions upheld caste discrimination and other forms of inequality? These questions show both the value and the limits of using decolonial theory to understand India. This paper first explains the core ideas of decolonial theory and how it relates to but also differs from postcolonial and subaltern studies.

Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)
This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations ae licensed under the identical terms.

Address for correspondence:
Sagar Naik,PhD Scholar, Department of History, Savitribai Phule Pune University Pune
Email – sagarnaik4511@gmail.com

How to cite this article:
Naik, S. (2026). Decolonial Theory: Significance and Limitations in the Indian Context. Bulletin of Nexus, 3(5), 34–41. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23386083

Quick Response Code:

Website: https://bnir.us

OPEN ACCESS

Next, it looks at how decolonial thinking helps explain the lasting impact of colonialism on Indian knowledge, culture, and education. It then turns to some major criticisms of decolonial theory, especially its failure to seriously engage with caste and other inequalities that predate colonial rule. Finally, the paper makes the case for an approach to decolonization built specifically for India one shaped by Ambedkarite thought, Dalit perspectives, and feminist critique, so that it can actually speak to India's real historical and present-day problems.

Decolonial Theory: Core Tenets and Intellectual Genealogy

To understand the significance of decolonial theory, it is important to first understand what it challenges. Decolonial scholars argue that the influence of colonialism did not end with political independence. According to Walter Mignolo, Western modernity is not just a period of progress and development. It is closely connected to the history of colonial domination. He uses the concept of "coloniality" to describe the power structures that continue to shape societies even after colonial rule has ended. These include inequalities in knowledge, culture, race, labour, and gender. Mignolo argues that Western ideas often present themselves as universal truths, even though they emerged from specific historical and cultural experiences in Europe. (Mignolo, 2000, p. 23).

One of the most important ideas in decolonial theory is Aníbal Quijano's concept of the "coloniality of power." Quijano argues that colonialism did more than establish political control; it also created new systems of social hierarchy that continue to influence the modern world. According to him, ideas about race became a major basis for organizing societies and economies, placing Europeans in positions of power while marginalizing colonized peoples. This process was closely linked to the domination of knowledge. European ways of thinking were presented as superior, while the knowledge and traditions of colonized societies were often ignored or dismissed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos describes this process as "epistemicide," meaning the destruction or silencing of indigenous and local knowledge systems through colonial rule (Quijano, 2000, pp. 533-580).

Sylvia Wynter argues that the Western idea of the "human" is not universal, as it claims to be. Instead, it is based on a particular historical and cultural model shaped by European experiences. According to Wynter, this narrow definition has often excluded many groups from being recognized as fully human. She therefore calls for a broader understanding of humanity that includes diverse ways of being and knowing. This idea is especially relevant to India, where social hierarchies such as caste have historically determined people's status, dignity, and access to rights. From this perspective, decolonization involves challenging both colonial and social structures that deny full humanity to certain groups (Wynter, 2003).

Although Frantz Fanon wrote before the emergence of decolonial theory as a distinct field, his work remains highly influential in shaping its ideas. His analysis of the psychic dimensions of colonial domination the way colonialism restructures the colonized subject's very sense of self resonates across postcolonial societies. For Fanon, decolonization is not merely political but existential; it requires what he calls a "complete calling in question of the colonial situation" (Fanon, 1963, p. 37). This existential and psychological dimension of decolonization has been taken up by Indian scholars working on caste oppression in ways that both extend and complicate Fanon's framework.

Decolonial theory is closely related to postcolonial studies, but the two are not the same. Postcolonial studies developed mainly through the work of scholars such as Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak, who examined how colonialism shaped culture, language, and representation. However, some critics argue that postcolonial studies focus too heavily on texts and discourse, giving less attention to economic and political structures (Ahmad, 1992). Decolonial theory builds on these insights but places greater emphasis on the continuing systems of power, knowledge, and inequality created by colonialism. In the Indian context, Subaltern Studies scholars such as Ranajit Guha, Dipesh Chakrabarty, and Partha Chatterjee have also played an important role by highlighting the experiences and voices of marginalized groups.

The Significance of Decolonial Theory in the Indian Context

Challenging Colonial Epistemologies

One of most important contributions of decolonial theory to Indian intellectual life is its insistence on taking seriously the question of epistemic justice. Colonial education in India was explicitly designed to produce, as Macaulay's 1835 Minute famously put it, a class of persons "Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, opinions, morals, and in intellect" (Macaulay, 1835, as cited in Viswanathan, 1989, p. 3). The consequences of this project were far-reaching: English became the language of prestige and upward mobility; Indian classical learning was systematically marginalized within the institutions the British built; and the very

criteria for what counted as valid knowledge were Eurocentric.

Decolonial theory provides a language for naming and analyzing this epistemic violence. It allows scholars to interrogate why Indian universities continue to teach predominantly Western social theory as universal theory, why academic journals based in the Global North remain the primary venues for validating Indian scholarship, and why development policy in post-independence India has so often been organized around imported frameworks modernization theory, neoliberal economics rather than indigenous understandings of well-being and flourishing. As Raewyn Connell has argued in her concept of "Southern theory," the global sociological canon is not a representation of world society but of a particular, metropolitan perspective that has been universalized (Connell, 2007). Chakrabarty's landmark work Provincializing Europe, while operating within a broadly postcolonial rather than strictly decolonial framework, shares this concern. Chakrabarty argues that European thought remains indispensable yet inadequate for understanding the history of non-Western societies. His call to "provincialize Europe" to treat European thought as one tradition among many rather than the universal horizon of historical understanding resonates deeply with decolonial sensibilities. The task, as he frames it, is not to reject European thought but to relocate it, to make visible the ways in which it is particular even as it presents itself as universal (Chakrabarty, 2000).

Recovering Marginalized Knowledge Traditions

Decolonial theory also provides resources for recovering and legitimating intellectual traditions that colonial epistemology suppressed or dismissed. In the Indian context, this takes several forms. There is a renewed interest in classical Indian philosophical traditions Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Buddhist logic, Carvaka materialism as sophisticated systems of thought that can contribute to contemporary philosophical and scientific conversations. There is also growing scholarly attention to local ecological knowledge, indigenous medicine, and non-Western cosmologies as genuinely rigorous forms of knowing (Visvanathan, 1997).

Shiv Visvanathan's concept of "cognitive justice" develops this argument in an Indian frame. Cognitive justice, for Visvanathan, means the right of different forms of knowledge to coexist, to be taken seriously by the state and by academic institutions, and to be treated as legitimate resources for addressing contemporary problems (Visvanathan's (1997). This is not a nostalgic return to the past but a genuine democratization of the epistemological field. Decolonial theory, with its insistence on "pluriversality" rather than universality (Mignolo, 2011), provides a theoretical scaffolding for this project. The Indian environmental movement has been particularly generative in this regard. Scholars and activists like Vandana Shiva (1988) have documented how colonial and post-colonial development projects systematically destroyed local ecological knowledge systems, particularly those held by women and tribal communities, in the name of scientific forestry and agricultural modernization. The recovery of these knowledge traditions not as museum pieces but as living resources for sustainable practice is a genuinely decolonial project, even when it has not always been articulated in those terms (Shiva, 1988).

Decolonizing the Political Imagination

Beyond epistemology, decolonial theory offers tools for analyzing the colonial structuring of political life in India. Partha Chatterjee's influential argument about the "colonial difference" in Indian nationalism that nationalist thought in India remained trapped within the very epistemological frameworks it sought to resist resonates with decolonial critiques. Chatterjee shows how Indian nationalists divided the world into a "material" domain (economy, technology, statecraft) where Western superiority was conceded, and a "spiritual" domain (culture, religion, family) where India's distinctiveness was preserved. This division, Chatterjee argues, was itself a product of the colonial encounter and its categories (Chatterjee, 1993).

Decolonial theory helps us understand that the end of colonial rule does not necessarily mean the end of colonial ways of thinking and governing. After independence, India inherited many institutions, laws, and administrative structures that had been created during British rule. While these institutions helped maintain continuity and stability, they also carried forward certain colonial assumptions and practices. Decolonial scholars argue that this reflects the continuing influence of coloniality in postcolonial societies (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). This issue is particularly visible in the state's relationship with Adivasi communities. In many instances, development projects have been planned without adequately recognizing the rights, knowledge, and aspirations of indigenous peoples. As a result, Adivasi communities have often faced displacement and loss of access to their traditional lands and resources. These experiences suggest that some patterns of governance established during the colonial period continue to influence state policies in contemporary India (Sundar, 2016).

Limitations of Decolonial Theory in the Indian Context

The Silence on Caste: A Foundational Critique

Despite its important contributions, decolonial theory has certain limitations when applied to the Indian context. One of its major weaknesses is its limited engagement with caste. Most decolonial scholars focus on race as the main basis of social inequality and domination under colonialism. While this approach is useful for understanding the experiences of many societies in Latin America and Africa, it does not fully explain the complexities of Indian society. In India, caste has been one of the most powerful forms of social hierarchy for centuries. It existed long before British rule and continued to shape social relations after independence. Therefore, any attempt to understand oppression and inequality in India must pay close attention to caste alongside the legacies of colonialism.

While decolonial theory offers valuable insights into the lasting effects of colonialism, it has some limitations when applied to India. One of the most important concerns is its limited attention to caste. Most decolonial scholars focus on race as the main system through which colonial power created inequality and exclusion. This perspective is highly relevant for understanding the experiences of many societies in Latin America and Africa. However, the Indian situation is more complex. Long before the arrival of British colonial rule, Indian society was already shaped by caste-based hierarchies that determined social status, access to resources, and human dignity. Although colonialism influenced and reshaped these structures, it did not create them. As a result, explanations based only on colonialism can overlook the deep-rooted role of caste in Indian society. As Ambedkar argued, caste is not merely a division of labour but a division of labourers that creates a system of graded inequality and social exclusion (Ambedkar, 1936, p. 65). Therefore, any analysis of oppression in India must take caste into account alongside the legacies of colonialism.

This raises an important challenge for decolonial theory in India. In the Indian context, marginalized groups cannot be understood only in terms of the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Groups such as Dalits, Adivasis, women, and the poor have also faced oppression within Indian society itself. Therefore, decolonization must address both colonial domination and internal social hierarchies. The call to recover indigenous knowledge and pre-colonial traditions is valuable, but it also requires caution. Not all pre-colonial traditions were inclusive or egalitarian. Many forms of knowledge were controlled by upper-caste groups, while Dalit, Adivasi, and other marginalized communities were excluded from intellectual and social life. As Gopal Guru argues, what is often presented as a single "Indian" intellectual tradition frequently reflects the perspectives of dominant castes, leaving alternative traditions invisible (Guru, 2012). A meaningful decolonial approach in India must therefore include the voices and experiences of historically marginalized communities. Anand Teltumbde (2018), building on the ideas of Ambedkar, argues that caste remains a central factor in understanding inequality and oppression in India. According to him, caste and economic exploitation often work together, creating forms of discrimination that cannot be explained by class or race alone. This is an important challenge for decolonial theory, which tends to focus primarily on colonialism and racial hierarchies. While these issues are important, they do not fully capture the everyday realities of caste-based exclusion and violence faced by Dalits in India. Therefore, the limitation of decolonial theory is not simply that it overlooks caste as an additional category. Rather, the Indian experience suggests that the framework itself needs to be reconsidered and expanded so that caste becomes a central part of understanding power, inequality, and social justice (Teltumbde, 2018).

The Problem of the Unified Postcolonial Subject

A related limitation of decolonial theory is its tendency, at times, to posit a unified colonial or postcolonial subject "the colonized," "the subaltern," "the indigenous" that elides the profound internal differentiations within colonized societies. This is a critique that Spivak leveled at subaltern studies, but it applies with equal force to decolonial theory. In India, the category of "the colonized" encompasses not only the Dalit agricultural laborer and the tribal forest dweller but also the Brahmin intellectual who collaborated with colonial administration while simultaneously positioning himself as the authentic voice of Indian civilization (Spivak, 1988).

A major challenge arises when decolonial theory's call to move away from Western models of knowledge and development is applied to India. Walter Mignolo argues that societies should seek alternatives to the dominance of Western modernity and create space for diverse ways of knowing and living. However, the Indian experience shows that different social groups have very different relationships with modernity. For many marginalized communities, especially Dalits, constitutional rights, reservations, anti-discrimination laws, and access to public education have provided important opportunities for equality and social mobility. These institutions have played

a significant role in challenging caste-based discrimination (Mignolo, 2011).

At the same time, some critics of modernity emphasize the importance of returning to indigenous traditions and cultural values. Gail Omvedt warns that such arguments must be approached carefully because traditional social structures in India were often shaped by caste inequalities and social exclusion. Therefore, a broad rejection of modernity may unintentionally undermine the democratic and constitutional protections that have benefited marginalized groups. The Indian context suggests that decolonization should not mean rejecting modern institutions altogether but rather critically examining both colonial legacies and indigenous hierarchies (Omvedt, 1994). The writings of Ashis Nandy highlight an important debate within decolonial thinking. Nandy criticized Western modernity and argued that traditional Indian culture could offer alternative ways of understanding society and human values. His ideas have influenced many scholars who seek to challenge Western dominance in knowledge and culture. However, critics argue that such approaches can sometimes overlook the inequalities that existed within traditional Indian society itself (Nandy, 1983). As Gopal Guru points out, discussions of Indian tradition have often reflected the experiences and perspectives of upper-caste groups, while the voices of Dalits and other marginalized communities remain less visible. This suggests that recovering pre-colonial traditions should not mean treating them as entirely egalitarian or free from oppression. A meaningful decolonial approach must critically examine both colonial domination and the social hierarchies that existed within indigenous traditions (Guru, 2012).

Epistemological Universalism in Reverse

A further limitation is what might be called the risk of epistemological universalism in reverse. Decolonial theory, in its critique of Eurocentric universalism, sometimes risks installing another universalism a "Global South" universalism that is equally inadequate to local specificity. The modernity/coloniality framework, developed in Latin America and primarily with reference to the colonial experiences of the Americas and the transatlantic slave trade, does not map neatly onto the Indian colonial experience, which involved a different racial logic, a different relationship between the colonial power and indigenous elites, and a different configuration of pre-colonial social structures. Boaventura de Sousa Santos's idea of the "epistemology of the South" has been influential in challenging the dominance of Western knowledge and highlighting the value of knowledge produced in formerly colonized societies. However, the concept can sometimes treat the Global South as a single and unified category, overlooking important differences between regions and societies. The Indian experience shows why these differences matter. Colonial rule in India did not simply impose foreign institutions; it often worked through existing social structures and local elites. British administrators relied on upper-caste groups in many areas of governance and used Sanskrit texts to define and codify what came to be understood as "Hinduism." Colonial census practices also played a role in fixing and categorizing caste identities (Santos, 2014). As Nicholas Dirks argues, colonialism reshaped and strengthened many social categories in new ways. Therefore, understanding India requires a more context-specific approach than broad decolonial frameworks alone can provide (Dirks, 2001, pp. 5-7). This is not a reason to reject decolonial theory but to insist on its provincialization in Chakrabarty's sense alongside the provincialization of European thought. Just as decolonial theory rightly insists that Western philosophy must acknowledge its particularity, so too must decolonial theory acknowledge that its own concepts are not universal but emerge from specific historical and geographical experiences.

The Academy and Co-optation

Another important limitation of decolonial theory concerns where and how much of this scholarship is produced. Many decolonial scholars criticize the dominance of Western knowledge systems, yet much of their work is written in English, published in international academic journals, and circulated through universities that are themselves part of global systems of knowledge and power. This creates a certain tension within the field. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o highlighted a similar issue when he called for the decolonization of language and encouraged African writers to use indigenous languages rather than English. His argument drew attention to the close relationship between language, power, and knowledge. However, the fact that his ideas became widely known through their English publication and translation illustrates the practical challenges of escaping the influence of global academic and linguistic structures. This remains an important challenge for decolonial scholarship today (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1986).

In India, this challenge appears in a particularly important way. Discussions on decolonial and postcolonial theory are often led by scholars who have access to elite universities, English-medium education, and international academic networks. While these scholars have made valuable contributions, their position also reflects

inequalities in access to knowledge and academic opportunities. At the same time, researchers working in regional languages, scholars from less privileged institutions, and many Dalit intellectuals often receive less recognition within mainstream academic spaces. As a result, there is a risk that debates about decolonization remain concentrated among academic elites rather than becoming accessible to a wider range of voices. For decolonial theory to be meaningful in the Indian context, it must not only critique existing power structures but also create greater space for diverse knowledge traditions, languages, and marginalized intellectual perspectives within academic and public life (Bhabha, 1994).

Toward an India-Specific Decolonial Practice

Ambedkar as Decolonial Thinker

Any genuinely decolonial project for India must begin not with Quijano or Mignolo but with Ambedkar. This is not to dismiss Latin American decolonial thought but to insist on the primacy of intellectual traditions that have emerged from within Indian experience of oppression and resistance. Ambedkar's intellectual project spanning political philosophy, economic analysis, constitutional design, and religious critique represents one of the most rigorous and comprehensive attempts to dismantle the colonial and Brahminical structures of Indian social life from within.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's engagement with Buddhism provides an important perspective on decolonization in India. Instead of looking to a glorified pre-colonial past, Ambedkar turned to Buddhism as a tradition that promoted equality, human dignity, and social justice. He saw it as an alternative to the caste-based hierarchy that had shaped Indian society for centuries. In 1956, Ambedkar, along with hundreds of thousands of his followers, embraced Buddhism as a way of rejecting caste oppression and asserting a new social and cultural identity (Ambedkar, 1957). This act was not merely a religious conversion; it was also a political and intellectual statement. It demonstrated that liberation does not always come from recovering the past but can emerge through the creative reinterpretation of historical traditions to build a more equal and inclusive future. Ambedkar's example therefore offers an important model for thinking about decolonization in the Indian context. Cornel West (1982) has written of the importance of prophetic tradition as a resource for emancipatory politics in oppressed communities; Ambedkar's neo-Buddhism functions in a similar way, offering what one might call an "internal transcendence" a critique of the dominant order that draws on resources available within the tradition of the oppressed. This is more genuinely decolonial than the appropriation of Latin American frameworks because it is produced from within Indian experience and responds to its specific structures of domination.

Dalit Feminism and the Intersectional Imperative

A decolonial practice adequate to India must also center Dalit feminist thought, which has theorized the specific intersectionality of caste, gender, and class in ways that neither mainstream feminism nor caste studies has fully addressed. Scholars like Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai (2019) have argued for the importance of "experience" as an epistemological category in Dalit thought the insistence that the lived experience of caste oppression is itself a form of knowledge that cannot be assimilated to abstract theory developed from the outside.

Sharmila Rege (2006) argues that the experiences of Dalit women cannot be fully understood through either mainstream feminism or mainstream Dalit politics alone. According to her, much of Indian feminism has been shaped by the experiences of upper-caste women and often overlooks the role of caste in shaping women's lives. At the same time, Dalit political movements have sometimes paid insufficient attention to gender inequalities. Rege therefore advocates a Dalit feminist perspective that recognizes how caste, gender, and class interact to create unique forms of discrimination and exclusion (Rege, 2006). Drawing on the idea of intersectionality developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991), she emphasizes that different forms of oppression are interconnected and cannot be studied separately. This insight is important for decolonial theory in India. Any attempt to speak broadly about "the colonized" or "Indian women" without considering differences of caste and gender risks overlooking the experiences of marginalized groups and reproducing the very inequalities it seeks to challenge (Crenshaw, 1991, pp. 1244-45).

Subaltern Studies and Its Limits

The Subaltern Studies movement offers many useful ideas for developing a decolonial approach that is rooted in the Indian experience. Scholars such as Ranajit Guha argued that ordinary people, including peasants, tribal communities, and other marginalized groups, had their own political ideas and forms of resistance that were often ignored in colonial and nationalist histories (Guha, 1983). By focusing on the experiences of those excluded from elite narratives, Subaltern Studies helped recover voices that had long remained invisible in historical writing. In this sense, it made an important contribution to decolonizing Indian history. However, Subaltern Studies also has certain limitations. Critics have pointed out that some early

studies tended to treat the subaltern as a single and unified category, paying insufficient attention to differences within marginalized groups themselves (O'Hanlon, 1988). In reality, caste, gender, and class create significant inequalities even among communities considered subaltern. Therefore, a meaningful decolonial approach in India must go beyond recovering marginalized voices and also examine the internal hierarchies that shape their experiences. In particular, caste must remain a central category of analysis if decolonization is to address the realities of social exclusion and inequality in India.

The Pluriverse and the Constitution

Finally, an India-specific decolonial practice must reckon seriously with the Indian Constitution as a genuinely emancipatory document one that represents, in significant measure, the distillation of Ambedkar's decolonial vision. The Constitution's commitment to untouchability abolition, reservations, freedom of religion, and equal citizenship represents not a straightforward importation of Western liberal values but a creative synthesis that drew on multiple traditions including Buddhism, Western liberalism, and the specific experiences of India's oppressed communities to forge a new legal and political order. This is not to say that the Constitution has been adequately implemented or that constitutional modernity has delivered on its emancipatory promise. The persistence of caste violence, the economic marginalization of Dalits and Adivasis, and the growing threat of Hindu nationalist attacks on constitutional secularism all testify to the gap between constitutional aspiration and social reality. But the response to this gap cannot be a decolonial rejection of constitutionalism in favor of an imagined pre-colonial wholeness. Rather, as Ambedkar himself insisted, it must be the deepening and radicalization of the constitutional project making its emancipatory promises real rather than abandoning them for cultural nationalism (Ambedkar, 2014). Walter Mignolo's idea of the "pluriverse" refers to a world in which many different ways of thinking, knowing, and living can coexist, rather than being judged by a single Western standard. In the Indian context, this idea is most meaningful when it includes the diverse traditions that have challenged social inequality and exclusion. These include the Bhakti movement's criticism of caste hierarchy, the inclusive and syncretic teachings of Sufi traditions, the rationalist ideas associated with the Charvaka tradition, and the collective values found in many Adivasi communities. Such traditions demonstrate that India has long contained multiple intellectual and cultural voices, not just one dominant tradition. A genuinely inclusive decolonial approach should therefore recognize and engage with this diversity. By giving space to marginalized and alternative traditions, it becomes possible to imagine a more democratic and plural vision of Indian society (Mignolo, 2011).

Conclusion

This paper has looked at both the value and the limits of decolonial theory when applied to India. Decolonial theory offers real insight into how colonialism continues to shape knowledge, culture, education, and social institutions long after formal independence. By questioning the dominance of Western thinking and giving weight to marginalized ways of knowing, it helps explain how colonial legacies still linger in postcolonial societies. In India, these ideas have sparked new interest in indigenous traditions, vernacular languages, alternative histories, and the experiences of communities long left out of mainstream narratives. At the same time, this paper has pointed to some serious limits in applying decolonial theory to India without adapting it first. Most decolonial scholarship focuses heavily on race and colonial domination, but India's experience cannot be explained through colonialism alone. Caste, gender, and class have shaped inequality and exclusion both before and after British rule. A framework that does not take caste seriously risks missing one of the most fundamental dimensions of Indian society. This is why decolonial thought in India needs to engage seriously with Ambedkar, Dalit scholars, feminist thinkers, and subaltern historians those who have studied social oppression from within the Indian context itself. Their work expands what decolonization can mean, showing that real liberation means challenging not just colonial legacies but also homegrown systems of domination. In the end, decolonial theory's value lies in how it pushes us to think critically about power, knowledge, and justice. But for it to matter in India, it has to adapt to India's own history. A meaningful decolonial approach must include everyone, stay attentive to difference, and center the voices of those who have been silenced for too long. Only then can it help us truly understand India's past and build a fairer future.

Acknowledgement

The author sincerely expresses gratitude to all those who provided valuable guidance, encouragement, and support in completing this research paper on "Decolonial Theory: Significance and Limitations in the Indian Context." The study examines the relevance of decolonial theory to India, particularly its engagement with coloniality, knowledge

systems, caste, gender, subaltern experiences, and social inequalities.

The author gratefully acknowledges the intellectual contributions of scholars including Aníbal Quijano, Walter Mignolo, Sylvia Wynter, Frantz Fanon, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Partha Chatterjee, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Gopal Guru, and Anand Teltumbde, whose ideas have provided important theoretical and contextual foundations for this study.

The author is also thankful to the Department of History, Savitribai Phule Pune University, colleagues, teachers, researchers, and well-wishers for their valuable academic guidance, constructive suggestions, encouragement, and support throughout the preparation of this research work.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of thesis paper.

References

1. Ahmad, A. (1992). *In theory: Classes, nations, literatures*. Verso.
2. Ambedkar, B. R. (2011). *The Buddha and his dhamma: A critical edition* (A. Rodrigues, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
3. Ambedkar, B. R. (2014). *Annihilation of caste: The annotated critical edition* (S. Anand, Ed.). Verso.
4. Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
5. Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton University Press.
6. Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments: Colonial and postcolonial histories*. Princeton University Press.
7. Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Polity Press.
8. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299.
9. Dirks, N. B. (2001). *Castes of mind: Colonialism and the making of modern India*. Princeton University Press.
10. Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). Grove Press.
11. Guha, R. (1983). *Elementary aspects of peasant insurgency in colonial India*. Duke University Press.
12. Guru, G. (2012). Rejection of rejection: Recovering the human person. In G. Guru & S. Sarukkai (Eds.), *The cracked mirror: An Indian debate on experience and theory* (pp. 1-28). Oxford University Press.
13. Guru, G., & Sarukkai, S. (2019). *Experience, caste and the everyday social*. Oxford University Press.
14. Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 240-270.
15. Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton University Press.
16. Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
17. Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
18. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
19. O'Hanlon, R. (1988). Recovering the subject: Subaltern studies and histories of resistance in colonial South Asia. *Modern Asian Studies, 22*(1), 189-224.
20. Omvedt, G. (1994). *Dalits and the democratic revolution: Dr. Ambedkar and the Dalit movement in colonial India*. Sage Publications.
21. Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South, 1*(3), 533-580.
22. Rege, S. (2006). *Writing caste/writing gender: Narrating Dalit women's testimonios*. Zubaan.
23. Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers.
24. Shiva, V. (1988). *Staying alive: Women, ecology and development*. Zed Books.