

KARPOORI THAKUR AND THE NATIONALISATION OF A SOCIALIST LEGACY: FROM REGIONAL LEADER TO NATIONAL ICON

Kundan Kumar

Research Scholar

Department of Political Science, Jananayak Chandrashekhar University, Ballia, Uttar Pradesh, India

Dr. Punil Kumar

Assistant Professor

Kunwar Singh P.G. College, Ballia, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Karpoori Thakur occupies an important place in the history of Indian socialism and the politics of social justice. His political career was closely associated with Bihar, where he emerged as an influential voice for socially and politically marginalised communities and became particularly associated with backward-class representation, social equality and democratic participation. For much of the post-independence period, however, his political significance remained closely connected to Bihar's socialist and social-justice politics. The conferment of the Bharat Ratna in 2024 marked a significant change in the public recognition of his legacy and brought him more prominently into the national political imagination. This paper examines this transition from a predominantly regional political memory to the making of Karpoori Thakur as a national political icon. It develops the idea of the "nationalisation of a socialist legacy" to describe the process through which a political legacy rooted in a particular regional and social context is incorporated into a wider national narrative through state recognition, public commemoration and contemporary political discourse. The paper argues that this process involves both recognition and reinterpretation. National recognition has expanded the visibility of Thakur's contribution to social justice and democratic representation, but it has also created possibilities for selectively presenting aspects of his political legacy that are more easily accommodated within contemporary political narratives. Thakur's case therefore provides an important opportunity to examine the relationship between political memory, national icon-making and the contemporary appropriation of historical legacies in India.

Keywords: Karpoori Thakur; political memory; socialist legacy; nationalisation of political legacy; social justice; national icon; Bharat Ratna; political appropriation

INTRODUCTION

Karpoori Thakur occupies a distinctive place in the history of Indian socialism and the politics of social justice. His political career developed largely within the social and political conditions of Bihar, where questions of caste, representation and unequal access to political power were central to public life. Associated with the socialist movement, Thakur became an important political voice for sections of society that had historically remained underrepresented in political institutions. His politics connected democratic representation with social equality and challenged the assumption that formal political democracy alone could overcome deeply rooted social inequalities.

Thakur's political significance was particularly associated with the politics of backward-class representation. His support for reservation and greater access to education, government employment and political institutions reflected a broader understanding of social justice in which formal equality

was insufficient to address historically produced inequalities. His political image was also shaped by his relatively simple lifestyle and his accessibility to ordinary people. These characteristics contributed to his enduring popularity, especially among social groups that identified with his politics and personal style.

For several decades after his political career, however, Thakur's public memory remained strongly rooted in Bihar. His significance was widely understood through the state's socialist tradition, backward-class mobilisation and struggles over representation. This regional location did not make him politically insignificant at the national level, but it did shape the dominant framework through which his legacy was remembered. Unlike political figures whose careers had been centred in national institutions, Thakur remained strongly associated with the political and social history of Bihar.

This began to change significantly with the conferment of the Bharat Ratna in 2024. The award provided Thakur with formal recognition within India's national commemorative framework and contributed to a substantial increase in public attention to his political legacy. His name became more visible in national political speeches, commemorative events and discussions concerning social justice and representation. A leader whose political identity had long been associated with Bihar was increasingly presented as a figure whose contribution belonged to the national history of Indian democracy.

The significance of this development extends beyond the question of recognition. It raises a broader question about what happens to a political legacy when it moves from a regional context into a national political narrative. Political figures are not remembered in precisely the same manner across different historical periods. Their legacies are interpreted in relation to the political concerns of the present, and some aspects of their political thought may become more prominent while others receive less attention. National recognition can therefore expand the reach of a historical figure while simultaneously changing the terms through which that figure is remembered.

This paper examines this process through the concept of the nationalisation of a socialist legacy. Nationalisation here does not refer simply to the expansion of public recognition from one geographical region to the country as a whole. It refers to the incorporation of a political legacy rooted in a specific regional, social and ideological context into a broader national narrative. State honours, public commemorations, political speeches and contemporary political claims can all contribute to this process.

The paper asks two related questions. First, how has Karpoori Thakur's political legacy moved from a predominantly regional political memory to a national political symbol? Second, what happens to the socialist and social-justice dimensions of his politics when his legacy is incorporated into a wider national narrative?

The central argument is that Thakur's nationalisation involves both recognition and reconstruction. His elevation to national symbolic status has brought greater visibility to a political tradition associated with social justice, representation and democratic inclusion. At the same time, the process creates possibilities for selective remembrance, in which particular aspects of his political identity are emphasised according to contemporary political concerns. The nationalisation of Thakur's legacy is therefore neither simply the recovery of a neglected historical figure nor necessarily a distortion of his politics. It is a continuing process through which the meanings attached to his political life are negotiated in the present.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Existing scholarship provides important foundations for understanding Karpoori Thakur's political significance. Studies of Indian socialism and the politics of the lower castes have highlighted the transformation of political representation in North India and the growing importance of backward-class mobilisation. Scholarship on Bihar has similarly examined the state's distinctive political development, including the relationship between caste, political mobilisation, socialist politics and democratic representation. These studies help place Thakur within the broader political transformations of post-independence North India.

The existing literature is particularly useful in understanding Thakur as a socialist politician whose politics was closely connected with questions of social equality and representation. His political career cannot be understood independently of the social structure of Bihar or the wider development of socialist politics in India. His advocacy of backward-class representation reflected a political argument that democratic institutions could not become genuinely inclusive when historically disadvantaged communities continued to experience limited access to education, employment and political power.

A second body of literature relevant to this paper concerns political memory. The work of Maurice Halbwachs, Pierre Nora and later scholars of collective memory demonstrates that memory is not simply a passive preservation of the past. Political communities continually reconstruct the meaning of historical figures and events in response to contemporary concerns. Commemorations, public institutions, memorial practices and political narratives contribute to deciding which aspects of the past become publicly visible.

The concept of political memory is particularly useful for analysing Thakur because his public image contains several overlapping dimensions. He can be remembered as a socialist, a champion of backward-class representation, an advocate of social justice, a democratic leader and a politician associated with simplicity and accessibility. None of these identities is necessarily false or contradictory. The analytical issue is instead which of these dimensions becomes dominant in a particular political context.

A third relevant area concerns national identity and the construction of political icons. National political memory is not produced by the state alone. Political parties, social organisations, communities, intellectuals and ordinary citizens all participate in defining the significance of historical figures. State recognition can nevertheless be particularly important because awards and official commemorations give historical personalities a more prominent place within national public memory.

The literature therefore provides useful concepts for understanding Thakur's political legacy, but there remains scope for examining the specific transition from a regional political memory to a nationally recognised political symbol. The question is not simply why Thakur deserves national recognition, but how the meaning of his legacy changes when it enters a wider national political discourse. This paper addresses that question by bringing together scholarship on Thakur's socialist and social-justice politics with the literature on political memory, commemoration and national icon-making.

RESEARCH APPROACH AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This paper adopts a qualitative historical and interpretive approach to examine the changing representation of Karpoori Thakur. It draws on existing scholarship on Thakur and Bihar's political history alongside literature on socialism, social justice, political memory and national identity. Particular attention is given to the changing public representation of Thakur following the conferment of the Bharat Ratna in 2024.

The analysis is organised around three related concepts: political memory, nationalisation of political legacy and political appropriation.

POLITICAL MEMORY

Political memory refers to the ways in which societies remember and reinterpret political figures and historical experiences. Memory is not fixed. Later generations may attach new meanings to political figures depending on the political and social concerns of their own period. Consequently, remembering a political leader involves both preservation and interpretation.

In Thakur's case, the contemporary expansion of his public visibility needs to be understood in relation to this changing process of remembrance. His earlier political identity was strongly connected to Bihar's socialist and backward-class politics. His present representation increasingly places him within a national story of democracy, equality and social justice.

NATIONALISATION OF POLITICAL LEGACY

The central concept of this paper is the nationalisation of political legacy. It describes the movement of a political legacy from a particular regional and social context into a broader national narrative. This movement does not erase the original context of the political figure. Instead, it changes the scale at which that legacy is presented and interpreted.

The Bharat Ratna is significant in this regard because it provides institutional recognition at the national level. Yet formal recognition is only one part of nationalisation. Political speeches, commemorative practices and contemporary political references can further expand the national circulation of a historical figure.

POLITICAL APPROPRIATION AND SELECTIVE REMEMBRANCE

Political appropriation refers here to the process through which contemporary political actors draw upon particular elements of a historical figure's legacy for present purposes. The term does not necessarily imply deliberate distortion. A complex political career contains multiple dimensions, and different actors may emphasise different elements.

Thakur's legacy offers several possibilities for such interpretation: socialism, social justice, backward-class representation, democratic participation, simplicity and popular leadership. The important question is therefore not simply who remembers Thakur, but which dimensions of Thakur's political identity are brought to the foreground.

Taken together, these concepts suggest a movement from historical legacy to regional political memory, institutional recognition, nationalisation and competing interpretations of national significance. The process is not linear. Different versions of Thakur's political legacy can coexist, overlap and compete.

KARPOORI THAKUR'S SOCIALIST LEGACY

Understanding the contemporary nationalisation of Thakur's legacy requires first establishing the character of the political legacy being nationalised. Thakur's politics emerged from the socialist tradition of post-independence India, but his socialism was closely connected with the social realities of Bihar.

For Thakur, political democracy could not be separated from social equality. Independence and constitutional democracy had established formal political rights, but social and economic inequalities

continued to shape access to power and opportunity. His politics therefore focused attention on communities that had historically remained distant from centres of political authority.

This dimension was particularly visible in his approach to backward-class representation. Reservation was not simply a policy question in his politics; it was connected to the broader issue of democratic representation. If certain communities had experienced historical exclusion from education, employment and public institutions, treating all citizens identically would not necessarily create equal opportunities. Representation therefore became an important component of his understanding of democracy.

Thakur's politics also reflected a broader challenge to the concentration of social and political privilege. His socialist orientation placed him within a tradition that questioned entrenched inequalities, while his engagement with caste made his politics particularly relevant to the social structure of Bihar. Social justice in this context involved not only economic concerns but also access to public institutions and opportunities for political participation.

Another important dimension of Thakur's legacy was his public image. His simplicity and accessibility became closely associated with his political identity. His connection with ordinary people strengthened the perception that he remained close to the social groups whose political interests he sought to represent. His popular image therefore cannot be separated entirely from the political content of his career.

At the same time, Thakur's legacy should not be reduced to backward-class politics or personal simplicity. At its core was an attempt to connect socialism, democratic equality and social representation. His politics raised a larger question about the meaning of democracy in a society marked by deep social inequalities.

This combination makes his contemporary nationalisation particularly significant. Equality, representation and social justice have a resonance that extends beyond Bihar. Yet the national circulation of these ideas also raises a question about whether the specific socialist context from which they emerged remains equally visible.

FROM REGIONAL POLITICAL MEMORY TO NATIONAL RECOGNITION

For much of the post-independence period, Karpoori Thakur's political significance was understood primarily through Bihar's political history. He was closely associated with the state's socialist tradition, backward-class mobilisation and struggles over representation. His influence extended beyond these issues, but his political identity remained strongly rooted in the social and political conditions of Bihar.

The Bharat Ratna in 2024 marked an important shift in this pattern of recognition. By placing Thakur within the country's highest civilian honours, the state gave his political legacy a more prominent position in the national commemorative landscape. The significance of such recognition lies not only in the honour itself but also in the way state recognition influences public memory.

State recognition can help determine which historical figures receive sustained national attention. Awards, commemorations and official representations provide institutional legitimacy to particular historical memories. In Thakur's case, the Bharat Ratna created an important institutional basis for presenting his contribution as part of the wider history of Indian democracy.

The expansion of Thakur's national visibility can also be observed in the wider political discourse surrounding social justice and representation. His name has increasingly been invoked in discussions concerning backward-class politics and democratic inclusion. This has allowed different political actors to connect themselves with a historical tradition that carries considerable symbolic importance.

Yet increased visibility does not necessarily produce a single interpretation. Different political actors may emphasise different dimensions of Thakur's career. Some may focus on his commitment to social justice and backward-class representation; others may highlight his simplicity, accessibility or democratic credentials. These representations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but their coexistence demonstrates the selective character of political memory.

The movement from regional to national recognition therefore involves more than a geographical expansion of Thakur's reputation. It involves a change in the framework through which his politics is understood. Within Bihar, his legacy is closely connected with particular caste relations, socialist movements and political struggles. At the national level, these specific historical contexts may be translated into broader themes such as equality, inclusion, representation and social justice.

This process creates both opportunities and tensions. National recognition can bring wider attention to a political tradition that might otherwise remain associated primarily with a particular region. At the same time, broader national symbolism may detach a political figure from some of the historical circumstances that shaped his politics.

NATIONALISATION AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF POLITICAL MEMORY

The nationalisation of Karpoori Thakur's legacy demonstrates that political memory is an active process. Historical figures are repeatedly interpreted in response to the concerns of later periods. Their public identities can therefore change even when the historical record remains unchanged.

Thakur's contemporary representation illustrates this process clearly. His political career developed in a particular regional context, but his national representation increasingly places him within a broader story of Indian democracy and social justice. The shift expands the audience for his political legacy while also creating new possibilities for interpreting its meaning.

State recognition plays an important role in this transformation. The Bharat Ratna provides an institutional basis for including Thakur within the national pantheon of political figures. However, state recognition does not completely determine public memory. Political parties, social groups, scholars and civil society can all interpret his legacy differently.

This makes national political memory a contested space. The same historical figure can be used to represent different political values. Thakur's association with socialism, social justice, backward-class representation and democratic participation allows different groups to establish connections between his politics and present concerns.

The process therefore involves selective remembrance. As Thakur becomes a national symbol, some dimensions of his political life may become more prominent because they are easier to communicate within a broader national narrative. His commitment to social justice and representation can be presented as a widely shared national value. His socialist politics, however, may require greater historical explanation because it is connected to a specific ideological tradition and political context.

This does not necessarily mean that his socialism disappears. Rather, it may become less visible within representations that seek to construct a broadly acceptable national symbol. The same process can be observed in the representation of many historical political figures: complexity is often reduced when a figure is transformed into a symbol capable of carrying multiple contemporary meanings.

The nationalisation of Thakur's legacy should therefore be understood as a process of both preservation and reconstruction. His national recognition recovers and expands attention to a significant political figure. At the same time, the new national context provides opportunities for reinterpretation.

The central analytical issue is consequently not whether Thakur has become a national figure. His increased national recognition makes that clear. The more important question is what kind of national figure he is becoming and which aspects of his political legacy are carried into that new identity.

DISCUSSION

The case of Karpoori Thakur provides a useful lens for understanding the relationship between regional political histories and contemporary national political memory. His nationalisation demonstrates that national recognition is not simply an expansion of geographical visibility. It is a process through which the meaning of a political legacy can be reorganised.

Three observations emerge from the analysis.

First, national recognition can recover regional political histories. Thakur's elevation to national symbolic status has created greater space for discussing Bihar's socialist tradition, backward-class representation and the politics of social justice within a wider national framework. This is an important contribution because regional political histories have often occupied a secondary position in narratives centred on nationally prominent political leaders.

Second, nationalisation can involve selective remembrance. Thakur's political legacy contains several dimensions, including socialism, social justice, representation, democratic participation and simplicity. When these dimensions are brought into a national political narrative, they do not necessarily receive equal emphasis. The aspects most compatible with contemporary political discourse may become particularly prominent.

Third, national icon-making can create tension between historical complexity and symbolic accessibility. A national icon must often be represented through a relatively small number of recognisable qualities. This makes the figure accessible to a wider audience but can also reduce attention to ideological debates and historical circumstances.

These tensions suggest that nationalisation should not be understood either as an uncomplicated celebration of the past or as deliberate political distortion. It is better understood as a process of negotiation. Historical legacies are carried into the present, where they acquire new meanings through institutions, political actors and public memory.

Thakur's case is especially significant because his political legacy continues to speak directly to contemporary debates over representation and social justice. This makes his image politically useful, but it also means that the meaning of his legacy remains contested.

The concept of nationalisation therefore helps connect the study of Thakur to a broader question in Indian political history: how do regional political traditions become incorporated into national narratives, and what happens to their ideological content during that process?

CONCLUSION

Karpoori Thakur's emergence as a national political icon represents an important transformation in the public memory of a leader whose political identity was historically rooted in Bihar's socialist and social-justice politics. The Bharat Ratna in 2024 provided formal national recognition and contributed to the wider circulation of his political legacy. His increasing presence in national political discourse has brought greater attention to questions of equality, representation and social justice with which his political career was closely associated.

However, national recognition should not be understood simply as the correction of a historical omission. It also changes the context in which Thakur is remembered. As his legacy moves into the

national political sphere, different aspects of his political life can be emphasised according to contemporary concerns. His commitment to social justice and backward-class representation may receive wider recognition, while the particular socialist tradition and historical circumstances that shaped his politics may become less prominent.

This does not make national recognition inherently problematic. Rather, it demonstrates the dynamic character of political memory. Historical figures acquire new meanings when they enter new political contexts. Recognition can preserve a political legacy while simultaneously transforming the way that legacy is understood.

The nationalisation of Karpoori Thakur's socialist legacy should therefore be seen as an ongoing process rather than a completed event. His transformation from a predominantly regional political figure into a national icon expands the reach of his historical contribution, but it also opens his legacy to competing interpretations. The important question is not simply whether Thakur has achieved national recognition, but how his socialism, social-justice politics and commitment to democratic representation are being incorporated into contemporary understandings of the nation.

Thakur's case ultimately demonstrates that national political memory is neither fixed nor neutral. It is continually produced through institutions, commemorations, political discourse and struggles over the meaning of the past. His nationalisation thus reveals a wider feature of contemporary Indian political culture: regional political histories can become national political symbols, but in doing so, they may be preserved, reinterpreted and selectively remembered at the same time.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Rev. ed.). Verso.
2. Brass, P. R. (1965). *Factional Politics in an Indian State: The Congress Party in Uttar Pradesh*. University of California Press.
3. Brass, P. R. (1974). *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Frankel, F. R. (1989). *India's Political Economy, 1947–1977: The Gradual Revolution*. Princeton University Press.
5. Gillis, J. R. (Ed.). (1994). *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton University Press.
6. Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory* (L. A. Coser, Ed. & Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1950).
7. Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (1983). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Jaffrelot, C. (2003). *India's Silent Revolution: The Rise of the Lower Castes in North India*. Columbia University Press.
9. Kumar, S. (2018). *Post-Mandal Politics in Bihar: Changing Electoral Patterns*. SAGE Publications.
10. Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: *Les lieux de mémoire*. *Representations*, 26, 7–24.
11. Olick, J. K. (2007). *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. Routledge.
12. Shah, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Caste and Democratic Politics in India*. Permanent Black.
13. Singh, J. (2015). Karpoori Thakur: A socialist leader in the Hindi Belt. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(3), 54–60.
14. Singh, S. (2015). *Ruled or Misruled: Story and Destiny of Bihar*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
15. Singh, S., & Anmol, A. (2024). *The Jannayak Karpoori Thakur: Voice of the Voiceless*. Vintage Books.