

GREATNESS THRUST UPON B. R. AMBEDKAR

Dr. Vinayak Purohit

I INTRODUCTION

They say that some people are born great, that some achieve greatness in course of their lives, and some have greatness thrust upon them.

B. R. Ambedkar (1891-1956) falls obviously in the third category.

Human beings do make history, but they make it as history itself provides. Both, the human mind that is interacting with history is conditioned by its social surroundings, and the social setting itself is historically determined. Thus, man is a brainwashed child attempting to transform the past into the future as a mere link in the vast historical chain.

Man cannot think or fantasise anyhow, any which way, as the idealist philosophers posit. Man thinks within strict limitations. All science fiction novels, films and videos prove our point. The external circumstances described in such works, are all shown to be, logically or illogically altered, but the protagonist is invariably our contemporary.

When the protagonist is shown to have changed selectively in a certain direction, it is no longer Sci-fi, but then it becomes the Anti-Utopian novel, like Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* or George Orwell's *1984*.

That is the limit of human imagination. Sci-fi or Anti-Utopia!

We cannot escape from our environment, just as we cannot escape from gravity!

Provided we align our thoughts with the movement of history, and the gearing is simple and basic, we may be able to accelerate or retard historical societal

evolution. That is all!

We cannot alter the past, which gestated us. We cannot change the present, which envelops us. Therefore we cannot change the future, except as it tends. We can only accelerate or retard the arrival of the future. To this extent, and

THE C.A. OF 1946-49: THE POLITICS

- (i) The British imperialist army was in occupation of India when the C.A. of 1946-49 met. This is ridiculous, for a truly free C.A cannot function under a British jack-boot!
- (ii) Indian pseudo-independence was achieved by an act of foreign parliament. The House of Commons in London passed the India Independence Act in 1947 creating the two dominions of India and Pakistan.
- (iii) India remained a member of the British Commonwealth and accepted the Queen of England who heads the Anglican Church as head of the Commonwealth.
- (iv) India remained a member of the Sterling Bloc.
- (v) India under Nehru devalued the rupee unnecessarily in 1949 and frittered away Sterling Balances that were equivalent of \$ 4.7 billion to suit British interests.

if interpreted in this way, Makkhali Goshala was right. All is *Niyati*! And Buddha was right too. All possess Conditioned Origination! To come into being, to be, and to cease to be! That is our human lot and that is our human fate, and above all, that is our human existence, within this vastness that is this universe.

As they say, if monkeys or lions could create mythologies, they would make their gods and heroes monkeylike or lion-like. Just as our Hanuman and Narasimha are, all said and done, merely anthropomorphic, half human, very human, quintessentially human!

It is because of the inherent limitations

of humans in history-making, that liberal bourgeois opinion makes the three distinctions that are given at the beginning of our article.

Some men are born great, they say, meaning thereby that some men display the qualities of will and determination from early days of childhood and youth.

Some men are supposed to acquire greatness later in life. Actually, this is the universal case. No one except those belonging to aristocratic and royal families, descendents of a blue-blooded lineage or, in a caste society those belonging to *Brahmin* and *Kshatriya* or *Dwja* castes can make empty boasts of having been 'born to greatness'. Such racialist, communalist, upper class, higher caste and aristocratic families alone can make such spurious claims. As a matter of fact, life moulds everyone, and everyone can attain greatness, provided circumstances are favourable.

In the third bourgeois category are placed those upon whom greatness is thrust. The majority of heroes recognised by liberal bourgeois society as heroes, belong to this third class.

Take the case of the Greeks. They were the scum of the earth, the riff-raff of the Eastern Mediterranean, raiding each other's settlements or colonies, and enslaving each other's citizens, mercenaries available for hire to Persian Kings, or Egyptian rulers, or to any other paymaster who was willing and able to pay. However, after the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, when the Europeans were in frantic search of some ideological props, it became necessary to

convert the scum into "heroic material". All of South Europe and East Europe had been conquered by Arab-Berbers, Turks and Mongols. The Islamic armies had reached Poitiers in Central France, Marseilles, Sardinia, Sicily, Malta and Rome in Central Mediterranean, upto Vienna in South-east Europe and upto Poland, Prussia and Scandinavia in eastern Europe. The Islamic armies had to be beaten back. The Crusades had failed. World Trade had remained centered on the Indian Ocean. Arab, Turk and Mongol middlemen had to be eliminated in order to provide European access to

cheap and profuse Indian imports. Therefore, a way had to be found. Therefore, weak and petty European feudalism had to be

shattered. Therefore, finally, incipient bourgeois Communities, Cities and Ports had to be developed based on an ideology inherited from the supposedly Classical Slave Societies of Greece and Rome. This path logically and correctly led to greatness being thrust upon all sorts of petty tyrants and little minds of the European Ancient World. In short greatness had to be thrust upon them.

We can give hundreds of such examples from European history. All that the European historiographers needed was to attach the appellation "The Great" to any Tom, Dick and Harry; or Fredrick, Louis, Charles; Catherine or Elizabeth, and hey presto you have a great guy or gal, all finished and shining!

That is the way of bourgeois historians, who are forever making such post-facto, fantasy-based, reconstructions. They are not concerned with the real movement of history, the real life changes in modes of production, and in the true transformations that societies undergo.

Men change as societies gestate and change. Men change history as stages in the expansion of productive forces arrive, stabilise and disappear.

From this flight of historical philosophy, let us return to the earth.

II

THE TIMES

Let us briefly review the socio-historical setting, that unfolded as the 19th century was ending in India.

Drain of Wealth

1. A dramatic reversal of fortunes had taken place in 1765, when the East India Company acquired the *Diwani*, or land revenue collection rights, from the last Mughals for Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and the Northern *Circars*.

Hitherto, from 1601 to 1765 there had been a drain of wealth from England and Europe to India.

DEFECTS OF CONSTITUTION

The defects of the present Constitution of India, as framed by a self-appointed Dominion Status Assembly of 1946-49, are obvious and may be briefly stated:

1. It has entrenched Executive Irresponsibility.
2. It has provided for extreme and overt Corruption, which has gone absolutely unpunished, and for Cost and Time Overruns for all State Undertakings.
3. It has provided for total absence of real Parliamentary Control over the *Naukarshahs*.
4. It has sanctified a system of built-in Legal Delays that has negated the Rule of Law.
5. It has allowed for absence of Right of Information.
6. It has permitted supremacy of English (as extended from time to time).
7. It has sanctioned no Right to Work or Living or Social Security for "We, the people" (our Preamble too)
8. It has granted unlimited powers to the Congress Speakers, who have thwarted even discussion rights to MPs, on the grounds, mainly, of something being a State Subject, or being *Subjudice*, or being Defamatory in Implications, and, generally, of being inconvenient to the Establishment.
9. It has usurped all State Rights and Revenues, making India, a super-centralised administrative entity.
10. It was called into being whilst India was still under the imperialist iron heel in 1945-6.
11. It has perpetuated a highly biased and elitist educational system, and a regime where healthcare is essentially available to only those who can afford it. Over 30 crores of Indians eke out an existence below the poverty level.

THE C.A. OF 1946-49: A FOREIGN GRANT, NOT AN INDIAN ACHIEVEMENT

How can any body of persons call themselves the Constituent Assembly? How can any set of people, generally brokers, commission agents, banians, *kala gumastas*, *dubashes*, title-holders by imperial grants, how can any such body ensure the liberties of the Indian people? It is a fantastic presumption!

Under Jawaharlal Nehru's rule, India remained a member of the British Commonwealth, and as a Republic accepted a Monarch as the Head of the Commonwealth and as a symbol of the Commonwealth's unity. A true Constituent Assembly has to be given by a Free People to themselves. It can not be granted by an outside force or agency.

As we have written earlier, "India continued to be a sink of precious metals. Van Twist writing on the wealth of the kings of Hindustan says that "although there were no gold or silver mines in India, large quantities of both were imported from foreign countries, and it was forbidden to export them". (Brij Narain, *Indian Economic Life*, Lahore, 1929, pp. 56-7). "India is rich in silver," writes Hawkins, "for all nations bring coyne and carry away commodities for the same; and this coyne is buried in India and goeth not out" (*Ibid*, p.57). Terry estimates that "an Indian ship returning from Red Sea was usually worth two hundred thousand pound sterling, most of it in gold and silver" (*Ibid*). He adds, "many silver streamers runne thither as all rivers to the sea, and there stay, it being lawful for any nation to bring in silver and letch commodities, but a crime less than capital to carry any great summe thence."

From England alone India imported in 50 years from 1708 to 1757 twenty-two million pounds worth of bullion. (Balkrishna, *Commercial Relations Between England and India, 1600-1757*, p. 208). Only a fraction of the large imports of specie was used for coinage, the rest went into private hoards and manufacture of jewellery.

"The complaint that India hoards the gold supply of the world is as old as Pliny." (*Historical Naturalis*, VI, 26). The early Muhammadan historian Shahab-ud-Din notices it. (Elliot and Dawson, *History of India*, Vol III, p.583). Bernier complains: "It should not escape notice that gold and silver, after circulating in every other quarter of the globe, come at length to be swallowed up, lost in some measure in Hindustan." (*Travels*, 1914, p. 202). Dr. Fryer similarly writes, "So that though it be not of the growth of this country, yet the innate thrift of

the Gentiles and the small occasion of Foreign expenses, and this humour of their laying up their talent in Napkin, burying the greatest part of the Treasure of the world in India." (A New Account of East Indies, Hakluyt Society, p. 283). "The love of Indians for precious metals and their hoarding habit attracted the attention of early British Officers." (See Foster, *Letters Received IV*, Introduction XXXIII, *Mankind*, Vol.2, No. 1, October 1996, p.10).

After 1765, the surplus, that is, the balance after meeting all the administrative expenses, became 'investment', in the hands of the E.I. Company for its commercial transactions. No longer was bullion brought in from England. The investments were utilised to buy Indian goods: textiles, foodgrains, spices, tea and anything else that was allowed to be manufactured in India or which went out as raw produce.

After 1858, when the East India Company was taken over by the British Government the so-called investments became "Home Charges", "Expenses incurred by India Office in London" and other Invisible Transfers.

Drain of Wealth from India continued unabated.

India was de-industrialised, ruralised and pauperised.

With this Primitive Accumulation along with other items of the same nature, like Slave Trade, Genocide of Amerindians, Secondary Piracy involving Spanish Treasure Fleets returning from the Americas, Protective Tariffs against Indian Manufacturers, and such other Theft and Robbery, Britain completed its First Industrial Revolution (1765-1860).

This Drain of Wealth was the Paramount Economic Development of the entire period of British Imperialist rule over India, 1765 (Partial) to 1860 (Complete) and to 1947 (when direct colonial rule ended and indirect neo-colonial rule commenced).

(For Drain of Wealth, the interested reader may consult the following works: R.C. Dutt, *Economic History of India* Vols I & II, 1901 and 1903; Dadabhai Naoroji, *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, 1901; William Digby, *Prosperous British India*, 1901; B.D. Basu, *The Ruin of Indian Trade and Industries*, 1935; Congress Select Committee, *Report on the Financial Obligations between Great Britain and India*, Vols 1 & 2, 1931; and Tarachand, *History of the Freedom Movement in India* Vols 1, 2, 3 & 4, 1965, 1967, 1972 and 1972 respectively.)

2. Famines and Demographic Nadir

As Drain of Wealth continued from India, and as India was Deindustrialised, Ruralised and Pauperised, an unending series of British-made Famines of Purchasing Power stalked the land.

British imperialism instituted a regime of genocidal famines as their tentacles spread over the various regions of sub-continental India. From 1765 when for the first time the British acquired the *Diwani* (i.e., revenue collecting rights) of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and the Northern Circars to 1775, in just ten years they wiped out one-third of the population i.e., approximately one

and half to two crores of the Indian poor. (The so-called Dastak Famine of 1769-70 was the major culprit). In 125 years from 1775 to 1900 the mortality from starvation and its consequences was 40,000,000. In 44 years, from 1900 to 1944 the number of famine deaths have been placed at 30 million. In short, something like eight and half crores of Indians were killed by British-made famines from 1765 to 1947 (Wadia and Merchant, *Our Economic Problem*, 1959, p. 88).

All these famines were famines of purchasing power. Foodgrains and oilseeds remained the principal items of export from India, from the beginning of India-wide direct, British rule in 1860 to the Second World War. (Vera Anstey, *The Economic Development of India*, 1942, Table XVII, and R.C. Dutt, *The Economic History of India. The Victorian Age*, tables on pp. 162, 347 and 532).

"Instead of absolute lack of food, famine under the new conditions assumed the form of a sharp rise in prices and the development of a large export trade in grain ... India experienced for the last 40 years of the 19th century, a boom in the grain market and a continuous depression in the labour market". (B. M. Bhatia, *Famines in India, 1860-1965*, 1967, pp. 9, 24).

Four Famine Commissions were appointed by the imperialist administration in quick succession. The First, under Sir George Campbell, reached the strange conclusion that Indians were excessively dependent on agriculture and until the occupational pattern was diversified, famines were bound to recur. This was a vicious conclusion since the British had deliberately followed a policy of de-industrialisation and ruination of crafts so that India had perforce developed a monoculture of agriculture.

The Second Famine Commission of 1878-80 was presided over by Sir Richard

Strachey, Sir John Strachey's elder brother. Sir John had suggested in 1874 a Famine Insurance plan as he considered that famines in India were "normal periodic calamities". Accepting John's ideas, Richard actually instituted a regular department of famine relief and went on to suggest "that the greater and necessary efforts to save all possible lives would go far to render the future government of India impossible. The embarrassment of debt and the weight of taxation, consequent to the expenditure thereby involved, would soon become more fatal to the country than the famine itself." (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1973 edition, Vol. 9, p. 58B. See also *EB*, 73, Vol. 12, p. 149.)

In other words, genuine famine relief was incompatible with British rule. That is to say, for British rule to continue, Indians must continue to die in famine so paternalistically organised for them by the benevolent imperial administration!

A Third Commission appointed in 1898 under Sir James Lyall, confirmed the principles enunciated by the Second.

THE C.A. OF 1946-49: THE ELECTORATE AND VOTES

The C.A. of 1946-49 consisted of 389 members of which 93 were nominated by the princelings (almost one quarter of the total).

Of the remaining 296, 74 or 25% were held by the Muslim League who did not join the C.A.

The remaining 222 members were all indirectly elected by the Provincial Assemblies.

The Provincial Assemblies were elected on the basis of a 14% franchise by more than a score of communal electorates. **The C.A. of 1946-49 was a travesty, a joke, a betrayal, a farce and an absurdity.**

The total number of actual votes cast for the Provincial Assemblies was about 1.9 crores in a nation of 40 crores.

The C.A. of 1946-49 was composed of *dajais*, brokers, commission agents, *dubashes*, barians, and title holders who were not entitled to frame any kind of constitution for the free people of India.

The Constitution of free India must be framed for the first time by a new C.A. elected on the basis of universal, adult, equal and direct vote.

The Fourth Famine Commission of 1901 went one better* and placed special emphasis on the importance of moral strategy since moral depression led to physical deterioration." (E.B., 1973 edition, Vol. 12, p. 149.) It was suggested that Famine Relief consisted of Moral Suasion!

All these calamitous and genocidal horrors were bound to have their impact on Indian demography. Let us look at the data on Expectation of Life at Birth.

We are not concerned here with the post-1947 data.

EXPECTATION OF LIFE AT BIRTH

Year	(Years)		
	Expectation of life at birth		
	Male	Female	Combined
I Mainly British Period			
1901-11	22.6	23.3	22.9
1911-21	19.4	20.9	20.1
1921-31	26.9	26.6	26.8
1931-41	32.1	31.4	31.8
1941-51	32.4	31.7	32.1
II Mainly Post-Independence Period			
1951-61	41.9	40.6	41.3
1961-71	46.4	44.7	45.6
1971-81	50.9	50.0	-
III More Recent Data			
1960	-	-	42.0
1975	-	-	50.0
1985	-	-	56.0
1994	-	-	62.0

Sources : C.M.I.E., *Basic Statistics Relating to the Indian Economy*, Vol. 1, All India, August 1986, Table 2.2 for data in I & II

World Bank, *World Development Reports*, 1976, 1987 & 1996, for data in III, Tables 17, 1 and 1.

We request the reader to focus upon the data for 1911-21 in Section I, Mainly British Period. The expectation of life at birth during this decade sank to 20.1. Indians refused to live under imperial dispensation. They just couldn't live! An average expectation of life of 20 years is an obvious absurdity for the Indian people!

As far as Indian demography is concerned, a point of no return had been reached. The nadir had been attained! An Indian could not averagely live to adulthood, if adulthood is defined as 21 years.

The drain of wealth from India caused the deindustrialisation, ruralisation and pauperisation of the country. This in turn resulted in famines of purchasing power. Genocidal killing of over 8 crore Indians led to the attainment of the demographic nadir. All these developments were bound to cause and did cause Nationalist Resistance, which we will examine now.

Nationalism was a life and death matter for the masses of India. In order to live, the people of India had to turn to Nationalism and expel British Imperialism.

3. Nationalist Resistance

The cumulative distress by the Drain of Wealth, by the processes of Deindustrialisation, Ruralisation, and Pauperisation, from the Dastak famine of 1760 that carried away one-third to one-half of the population of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, and onwards to the series of famines which were deliberated by the Four Famine Commissions, famines that stretched upto the end of British imperial rule, were cumulatively bound to and did cause National Resistance.

This National Resistance was directed into three channels

A) Heroic, armed attacks upon British imperialism, and its institutions and personnel.

"The first rising occurred in Bengal in 1858-60, when the indigo cultivators revolted against the tyranny of the planters. Then riots occurred in Patna in 1873. In 1874 came the riots of the peasants in some of the districts of the Deccan-Poona and Ahmednagar. Complaints of oppression against rack-renting were carried to the government by the riots of Barrackpur and Paikpara in 1878-79." (Tara Chand, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Volume II, p.306)

The Anushilan and Jugantar underground formations arose in Bengal. The Ghadar Movement developed in Punjab and amongst the emigres to U.S.A and Canada. The Ghadar was a successor to the Kuka Movement in Punjab. Aurobindo Ghosh returned from abroad and established a revolutionary cell in Baroda. Later he and his brother Barindra took up the same activity in Calcutta. In Nasik, V.D. Savarkar developed a group which sought to carry forward the work of Vasudev Balwant Phadke.

Hundreds of small and big groups with diverse revolutionary programmes came into being all over the country.

It is impossible in the short space available in this essay to even present an adequate outline of the revolutionary activity that was carried on in India and abroad, to realise freedom from colonial rule.

The interested reader may follow the story in R.C. Majumdar's *History and Culture of the Indian People*, Volumes 9&11 as well as in Tara Chand's 4 Volumes of *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, R.C. Majumdar's further three volumes with the same title, the *Sedition Committee Report*, 1918, and in the relevant bibliographical references given in these works.

The names of India's heroic freedom fighters are a legion. Vasudev Balwant Phadke, Ashfaqullah Khan, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar; Aurobindo and Barindra Ghosh; Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru; Chandrashekhar Azad, Ramprasad Bismil and Mahavir Singh; Jatin Das; Khudiram Bose; Surya Sen; Kalpana Dutt; Pritilata Wodekar; Champaka Raman Pillai; Sayed Ahmad of Rai Bareilly; Dudhu Mian of Faridapur and Titu Mian of Chandpur; Maulvi Quasim; Rupa Naik alias Roop Singh of Panchmahals; the leaders of the Santhal rebellion of 1855 and the Bhil rebellion of 1845; Honya Koli; Hari and Tatyia Makaji; two Ramoshi brothers; Vaikkom Khader; and hundreds and thousands of revolutionaries and martyrs can be listed.

We have no space for all of them. These genuine freedom fighters have been maligned as "anarchists and terrorists".

B) In order to divert the Nationalist movement into safe channels, Viceroy Dufferin and his home secretary A.O. Hume formed the Indian National Congress in 1885.

The history of betrayals by this comprador organisation are well known to Indians and we have dealt with them in the preceding issues of *Mankind*. A convenient summary of our position may be found in the Executive Editor's reply to Sri

Kashinath, in *Mankind*, Nov'96, pp.42-44)

C) Gradually, a left radical and militant ideology began to emerge.

From within the INC, gradually a radical tendency separated itself. This was led by Subhash Chandra Bose who was twice elected Congress President, and who left India to form the Indian National Army and Azad Hind Government with Japanese help, during the Second World War.

Another tendency to emerge was that the Socialist elements led by Jayprakash Narayan and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. These leaders took an active part in the August 1942 Movement.

III

AMBEDKAR AND HIS RESPONSE TO THE TIMES

What was Ambedkar's reaction to the momentous events that were unfolding around him?

What was his attitude towards the Drain of Wealth from India?

NOTHING ! Apparently he was not even aware of the problem !

What did he have to say about De-industrialisation, Ruralisation and Pauperisation of the nation ?

NOTHING ! He had not thought about these things.

How did Ambedkar react to British-made Famines of Purchasing Power, that carried off eight crores of our countrymen?

NOTHING ! He behaved exactly like the upper-caste *dwijas*, and was blind to the hunger and misery of the poor *dallits* living around him.

What about the Demographic NADIR reached by Indians in the decade 1911-1921?

NOTHING ! His attitude was that of a selfish careerist, who was accepting scholarships from native princelings and joining State Service. For the mess of pottage that was thrown at him !

What was Ambedkar's attitude to the National Resistance Movement that was mushrooming all around him?

NOTHING ! There was not a single Nationalist bone within his body ! He never felt any sense of National Outrage ! He had no notion of National Self-respect ! He just did not care !

Ambedkar was entitled not to sympathise with the hypocritical patriotism of the upper castes. But surely there was solid reason for nationalist protest ! British-made famines were selectively killing the poor of the country, and the average expectation of life had come down to twenty years ! Surely, the Drain of Wealth, the De-industrialisation, Ruralisation and Pauperisation drives were affecting the common people, whose cries of pain and protests should have reached the ears of Ambedkar ! They never did !

He continued in his narrow groove of lower caste compradcrism as promoted by native princelings and foreign imperialists !

IV

LIFE AND CAREER

We pick up the relevant data from W.N. Kuber, B.R. Ambedkar, Builders of Modern India Series, Publications Division, 1978, pp. 9-10 :

*Maloji Sakpal, Ambedkar's grandfather, came of a good *Mahar* family from Ratnagari district. He was a retired military man. His son Ramji, who also was a retired military man, had 14 children. The last child Bhimrao was born at Mhow in Central India on April 14, 1891. Ramji rose to the rank of Subedar-Major and was a head instructor in a military school for about 14 years. After retirement in 1891 on a pension of Rs. 50 per month he settled in Dapoli in Ratnagari district. In 1894 he was re-employed as a store-keeper in the Public Works Department, Ratnagari, and was later transferred to Satara.

*Bhimrao entered the Government High School, Satara, in 1900 in the first standard. His name in the school was Bhiva Ramji Ambavadekar. Original name of his family was Sankpal. But his ancestors preferred to call

themselves after their ancestral village Ambavade which is in Khed taluka in Ratnagari district. One teacher named Ambedkar in the Satara High School loved Bhimrao very much and often fed him. He was obliging and kind. As a mark of love and respect to this teacher, Bhimrao began to call himself Ambedkar and throughout his life, remained grateful to this teacher who treated him so kindly

THE CA OF 1946-49 : THE FRAMEWORK

Ninety - five clauses of the colonial Constitution of 1935, were carried bodily into the New Dominion Status Constitution of 1946-49, which itself has been amended about ninety-five times!

Is it now being proposed that we, first of all, pass a hundred amendments to get rid of the Colonial Provisions, and further that we pass seven hundred more amendments to make the constitution fit the requirements of our people?

It is absurd to suggest such a scenario.

The present constitution must be totally scrapped. It needs to be reworked from the roots upwards. A democratic nationalist philosophy must *de novo* inform the entire framework of the New Constitution. **It must be recast on entirely fresh thinking by a free people electing for the first time a Constitution making body, that is based on Universal Equal Adult Direct Franchise exercised by all citizens of India above the age of 18.**

Madhu Dandavate has recently suggested that the present Constitution be accepted. This is sheer treachery, for the Socialist Party had itself published an alternative Draft Constitution, way back in 1948! Indira Jaisingh suggests that Directive Principles be made enforceable, and that we should thereafter carry on.

This is simply foolish! No amount of piecemeal tinkering will suffice! The Directive Principles do not deal with the Right of Information, do not refer to Accountability and Ministerial and Bureaucratic Corruption, Legal Built-in Delays, which are the prime concerns of today! Centre State Relations are basically awry!

Many countries of the World have had several Constitutions in the last fifty years, both in the First World and in the Third World; apart from the fundamental changes that have taken place in the Second, or Stalinist, World.

There is no shame, or novelty, in concluding our experiment and experience with the 1946-49 Constitution, which is totally out of date and redundant.

As a free people, let us boldly march forward and give to ourselves a New Constitution, which truly and really guarantees to all of us - "Justice..... Liberty.... Equality..... Fraternity.....etc."

Why are we afraid ? What are we afraid of ? Are we all cowardly compradors and *naukarshahs* ?

Why do we not trust the people of India ?

That is what Democracy means! To trust the collective wisdom of the adult citizens of India, to fashion for themselves a socio-legal instrument that will serve the needs of the Indian people marching into the 21st century!

during his school days.* (See also Dhananjay Keer, *Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission*, 1991, where the same facts are reiterated.)

In other words, *Bhakti* not only towards Kabir, the family *Panth*, but also towards British imperialism was a long standing family tradition with the Sankpal-Ambavadekar-Ambedkars.

It is not exactly a matter of heredity. No generation inherits imperialist ideology, like the birds who inherit typical nest-building and migratory instincts.

Imperialism is an ideological construct. It is not inheritable. At same time, the family atmosphere of loyalty and identification with the British Raj must have been a factor in Bhimrao's upbringing, like the chosen villagers in Satyajit Ray's *Pather Panchali*, who identify themselves with British war-planes flying overhead; and like the village boy in Ray's *Shatranj-ke-Khiladi*, who loved the "lal vard" of the Britishers. Similar, habitual familial identification and love with things British must have come naturally to Bhimrao.

I am not knocking Ambedkar's pro-empire nurture. I am merely saying that they came naturally to him, just as anti-imperialist attitudes became ingrained in me, even before conscious thinking and ratiocination began. My father was a nationalist and both parents had become Khadder-wearers by the time I had become four. My father used to help financially the underground revolutionaries, who used to line-up every month outside my father's little officeroom in our residential bungalow. I used to sit in the laps of these "terrorists and anarchists" and once even picked up, or the youngman showed me and allowed me to play with, his pocket revolver, for which, my father appearing suddenly at the office door, sternly reprimanded the man. I cannot say whether they belonged to the *Anushilan* or the *Yugantar* group. Such distinctions were beyond my grasp then, but I have clear childhood impressions of the nationalist ambience that prevailed in my home.

Ambedkar's perceptions were obviously different and diametrically opposite. The caste discriminations practised against him turned him into a porcupine like ball of resentment.

From infancy, Ambedkar was made aware of his scheduled caste origins. He was not allowed to drink from the common

water pot of the classroom. He was made to open his mouth and someone would pour water into it. There was a strange encounter with the upper-caste cartman of the village, who refused to transport Bhimrao and his brother, as soon as he came to know that the boys were Mahars. The cartman got off and walked beside the cart which Bhimrao's elder brother had to drive. Bhimrao could not play the normal school games, since the upper-caste boys would not play with him. Till he migrated to Bombay and to a

Government-run school, he missed out on a "playful childhood."

Even in later life, after he had returned from USA and UK with high degrees, and when he was in government service in a high post, the caste-discriminations continued. Illiterate peons used to throw files on his table instead of handing them over, since the *Mahar's* touch was supposedly polluting. In courtrooms and lawyers' libraries, hotels and restaurants, and in railways and buses he found the same idiotic discriminations.

But here is the rub! Bhimrao belonged to the lowly and the poor, who were the hardest hit by imperialist policies. It was the poor who were dying in the British-made Famines. It was the lowly who were most fiercely exploited by the Britishers, who were simultaneously pampering a thin layer of upper-caste brown *sahibs*, who facilitated the imperialist oppression of India.

Instead of turning into a "rebel with a cause", Bhimrao Ambedkar took the selfish and easy way out, by feathering his own nest and becoming a careerist. This is the tragedy of Ambedkar's life. At every point in his life, instead of joining hands with the masses, and organising them to throw off their oppressors, political, economic and social, Ambedkar chose the path of collaboration and of colluding with the suited, booted,

polished upper-caste and imperialist masters.

One can sympathise with Spartacus, who had led the slave revolt in Rome. One's heart goes out to the Negroes in America and in Apartheidist South Africa. But all the tales of caste discriminations visited upon Ambedkar leave us cold, because the man was not a fighter, he was just a smooth operator. He just took money from the Gaikwad of Baroda and the Kolhapur Raja and made a career for himself, flippant and clever in speech,

MUHAJIRISTAN

Mankind has earlier proposed and now reiterate the demand for a separate Muhajiristan. The Muhajirs estimated to number about 1.5 crores, have been fighting for an autonomous state of their own for the last few years. Thousands of them have been killed by the Pakistan Army, Police and Intelligence Agencies. **The plight of the Muhajirs who are the refugees that migrated from India proves that religion cannot make a nation.** Just as the Muhajirs could not be absorbed by West Pakistan, similarly, the Biharis, who sided with the Pakistan Army during the Liberation War of 1971, and the Chakmas, who were Buddhists living in the Chittagong Hill District, could not be absorbed by Bangladesh, the successor state to East Pakistan. **We propose that Muhajiristan should extend from the East bank of the Indus to the borders of Rajasthan and Kutch. And from the Arabian Sea to the Sindh-Punjab border in the North.** Karachi could continue to be used by both Sindh and the new State of Muhajiristan. It should be declared a Free-Trade Zone and recognised as such by both India and Pakistan. Both NRI and NRP from all over the world, especially from UK, USA, Singapore and Hongkong, should be invited to invest in the Muhajiristan FTZ. Genuine manufacturers of this FTZ, and not shells assembled by screwdriver technology, should be allowed to enter custom-free by India and Pakistan. This will satisfy a persistent demand by Indians and Pakistanis of the development of a FTZ within their countries (Mumbai, Kandla, Karachi and other centres have been repeatedly proposed).

With their immense pools of skilled labour, both Pakistan and India will benefit from the creation of the Muhajiristan FTZ, which will open the way for further collaboration between the peoples of India and Pakistan.

spineless and compromising in action.

We may even wonder in amazement that the person and the community that he represented, who had the most to lose under continuation of imperialist rule, actually turned into such a fawning *enfant terrible*, who cared not a jot for the plight of his people and who, when the time came for making concrete constitutional proposals for the betterment of the people, actually had the temerity to discriminate against the tribals.

"The most prominent feature of Ambedkar's plan was that the Depressed Classes were to hold the Balance of Power, and the aboriginals were not to get any representations, as, according to Ambedkar, they were devoid of political sense. The plan regarded the proposal for a Constituent Assembly as absolutely superfluous, as act of superarrogation and a dangerous proposition that might involve the country in a civil war. Much of the Constitution was ready under the 1935 Act The plan was severely criticized by the Press... Thakkar Bapa attacked Ambedkar for denying representation to the aboriginals, and Ambedkar said in reply: 'I have never claimed to be a universal leader of suffering humanity. The problem of Untouchables is quite enough for my slender strength ... I don't say that other causes are not equally noble. But knowing that life is short, one can only serve one cause and I have never aspired to do more than serve the Untouchables.' He added that he did not include the aboriginals in the scheme because they had not yet developed the political capacity which was necessary to exercise political power for one's own good. These very arguments were used by the higher classes when they opposed the enfranchisement of the lower and specially the Depressed classes!" (D.Keer, *Dr. Ambedkar Life And Mission*, pp. 369-370).

Consider the man and his self-centredness! Just because he has voluntarily decided to limit his advocacy to Scheduled Castes, does it entitle him to make uncharitable and false statements about the interests of the tribals?

What is the meaning of his arrogance?

Does he think that just because he does not advocate the tribals' cause, that it is going to remain unheard for ever?

If the tribals have suffered discrimination, especially the tribals who were condemned and called Criminal Tribes, then their just demands must be projected whatever be their own retarded level of consciousness. How dare Ambedkar suggest that they have not attained a certain arbitrary level of consciousness or "Political Sense" and therefore their interests should be neglected and bypassed? What kind of an authoritarian mind did Ambedkar possess?

As a member of the suffering Scheduled Castes; as a man who had been forced to tolerate all sorts of discriminations throughout his life, Ambedkar should have been extremely sensitive to the plight of those who were even lower down the

social ladder than the Scheduled Castes! Ambedkar was behaving in the same rotten way towards those lower down, as the so-called higher-ups were behaving towards him and his Mahar community.

Indian Castes

We shall now make a small diversion and make a few remarks about the overall situation with regard to Indian Castes, and we shall return to the allegedly great Constitution—making prowesses of this Chhota and bogus Manu at a later stage.

An immense number of books have been written about Indian castes, roughly three thousand in number, and a lot of ink and paper has been wasted in the production of this descriptive and trite literature.

The term caste etymologically is derived from the Portuguese term *castas* and means three things:

1) A regional hierarchical arrangement

There is no sense in belonging to any caste if it is not supposedly higher or lower than some other! The essence is to pretend to be Superior to some other group of men by calling oneself a member of a fictitious upper or higher caste group! Everything is fictitious, arbitrary and ideological. The truth is that: All Men and Women are Equal. No one has a right to call himself superior or higher than anyone else, be it a SC, and OBC or a ST.

This is a self evident truth and I will not waste my time to enter into any argument about it!

2) Caste is a self perpetuating group. Rules are framed to ensure that by endogamy, or by any similar device, a group of people manage to retain their group identity and presume themselves to be superior to some other group that is discriminated against.

This is a typical feudal situation, where the king or the priest stands at the top of the social hierarchy, and all sorts of concentric circles are made to surround him.

India experienced the highest and richest development of wealthy, strong, powerful feudalism in the entire world, stretching from the rise of Buddhism in the 7/6th century BC to 1765 AD, when British imperialism overthrew Indian feudalism after the Battle of Plassey (1757) and acquired the *diwani* or revenue collecting rights of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. During these 2500 years, India had the longest time available to perfect its instrument of feudal exploitation. Through this device certain groups were excluded from land ownership totally (See Girish Kasarvalli's film *Chomana Dudi* for a vivid portrayal of the everlasting unfulfilled urge of a lower caste man to acquire just a small plot of land to till.)

By the same token, some Brahmins in the Agrahara villages acquired exemptions from land revenue and received other privileges. Even interest rates were dependent upon the castes

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

India should agitate, in every international forum, three demands:

1. The Constitution of an International Human Rights Commission on Indo-Pak Partition of 1947, which resulted in the largest single migratory movement in human history of over 17 million human beings. This Commission should include Jewish experts who have forced Germany to pay billions of marks as reparations to Israel against the Holocaust, and East and South-East Asian experts who have made similar demands against the Japanese.
2. Britain must be made to pay for inflicting this enormous tragedy upon the peoples of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh.
3. Pakistan must be compelled to pay India billions of dollars, for the crimes against the minorities and for the ethnic cleansing carried out by Pakistan since 1947, reducing its minority population of nearly 33% in 1947 to just 2 or 3% today, and as the bulk of the expelled minorities from Pakistan had to be absorbed by India in the last five decades.

of the giver and the receiver. Higher castes got loans at lower rates of interest, and the lower castes had to pay more interest for their borrowings.

All in all, the caste arrangement enabled the feudal lords and their hangers-on to more fiercely exploit the masses.

3) In order to perpetuate such an iniquitous system, all sorts of measures of psychological terror were employed. Certain OBCs were excluded from communal meals and feasts. Certain groups were called "Untouchables", e.g., washermen, barbers, sanitary workers and sweepers, cobblers, butchers, hunters and such others whose touch was supposed to be polluting.

There were further levels of discriminations. There were certain groups of human beings, who were not allowed to approach the Brahmin or Rajput, to a distance of eight paces or sixteen paces or twenty-four paces. There was even a group found near Madurai by the Census Enumerators in 1931, who were supposed to be "invisible". They were not supposed to emerge out of their houses during daylight hours. Their duty was to enter the Brahmin and upper-caste village only at night, and sweep the streets, clean the latrines and carry away the dead carcasses.

All these psychological terror devices helped the Brahmins and the Dwijas to brain-wash the mass of the people and strengthen their hold over the exploited peasants and craftsmen.

The terror and divisive tactics of the dwijas went so far as to split the craftsmen into two factions, one "left-hand-side" group or *Vedakalai* and the other the "right-hand-side" or *Tenkalai*. The latter was a little more favoured.

Similarly, a dress code was imposed. Whether the bridegroom should approach the bride's residence on horseback and with a music-party or not was also prescribed. The minutest detail of diet, divorce, re-marriage, inheritance, legacy, gift, will, mortgage, ritual, degree of approachability to the temple and its *sanctum sanctorum*, and so on and so forth, were all laid down.

It was all prescribed, ruthless and barbaric.

It was also extremely stupid and idiotic.

But it was all socially very useful as it enabled the ruling classes of the feudal times to screw the maximum out of the hapless ryots.

All caste regulations in all the regions of the country will be found to fall in one of the three categories mentioned above:

* Those that established internal hierarchy.

* Those that sought to perpetuate this social hierarchy by marriage and *sanskara* regulations.

* Those that psychologically terrorised the people into submission, that insulted them, that made them feel small, that brainwashed them into believing that they were inferior.

The extremely rigid, self-perpetuating, hierarchised brainwashing / terrorising caste system was inherently self-destructive. It was self-defeating and unviable over any length of time. Society cannot be bound so hard and fast, and so barbarically. Such a culture would die.

Therefore in order to live long the Hindu civilisation adopted certain self-correcting devices. These have taken so far in our history, three major forms: The Feudal Way-out, the Bourgeois Way-out and the Socialist Way-out.

1) The Feudal Way-Out

There are several sub-paths within the broad Feudal Way of liberation from the rigidities of the caste system. They may be briefly summarised as

- a) Bhakti Cult/ Sect Formation
- b) Religious Conversion to Islam
- c) Assumed Alienation
- d) Self-Elevation by Collective Group Action.

a) Bhakti Cult / Sect Formation

Various Devotional Cults and Sects were formed in order to restore social mobility and upward mobility to various social strata. Various Cults/Sects were evolved, like Kabir *Panthis*, Ramanandis, Nath *Sampraday*, Satnamis, Lingayats, Chaitanyas, Swaminarayanists, Tantriks, Mahanubhavs, Aghoris, Naga

Bawas, Kapaliks and so on and so forth. Scores and scores in different sub-regions of India. Generally all these Cults-Sects did not accept the rigidities of the caste system. Sometimes they evolved their own separate priesthoods, e.g. Jangams and the Ragis (among Sikhs, about whom see further below). Sometimes all the Hindus visiting a pilgrimage centre like Jagannath Puri, and for the duration of the pilgrimage (*Jatra* or *Yatra*) they were placed outside the caste system and mixed freely with each other. Sometimes one child from each family was dedicated to a martial cult, as in the case of Sikhs.

Both Sikhs and Hindus hailed from

the same families and bloodlines in the Punjab. Each family was supposed to sacrifice one son to the militarist order. It is only British imperialism which, *post facto*, between 1919 and 1935 made the Sikhs into a separate religious community. Prior to 1919, the Sikhs used to vote with the Hindus in separate non-Muslim electoral constituencies. But in order to meet the rising tide of nationalism amongst the Hindus and the Sikhs, British imperialism divided the Sikhs from the Hindus, so as to consolidate communal elements in both sections. The Sikhs had already demonstrated their militancy and extremism by throwing up the Kuka Movement, the Akalis, the Nirankaris and the Ghadar. The Britishers were in dire need of controlling the Sikhs and therefore resorted to the well-tryed method of divide and rule and of bribing the Sikhs. That is how the Sikhs became from a Hindu Sect a Separate Religious Community between 1919 to 1935.

In fact, in all probability, Ambedkar got the idea of Conversion to Buddhism from the pattern followed by British imperialism in relation to the Sikhs. The 1935 Constitution for the first time identified the Scheduled Castes as a distinct Hindu sect and had British imperialism lasted a decade longer as Ambedkar had hoped and striven for, the next Constitutional instalment in 1955, and thereabouts, might have seen the genesis of Kabir *Panthis*, Ramanandi and Nath *Panthis*, Mahars into one or more separate religious entities!

REUNIFICATION OF SUBCONTINENT DEMANDED BY INDIAN MUSLIMS

It may be just a straw in the wind, but it is significant that the *United Muslim Forum* of Bombay has demanded the immediate reunification of India,

Pakistan and Bangladesh. This demand and the launch of a non-violent movement to realise this aim were announced by Sayed Basharat Shikohe of the *Forum* on 8.8.1995 (*Samakalin*, 9.8.95). Shikohe has asked for

1. Right to free movement by the peoples of the three countries, without passports and visas.
2. Right to free choice by citizens of the sub-continent, of residence and jobs in the three countries.
3. A single president, parliament and supreme court for all the three countries.

Ambedkar's assumption was not baseless. The Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 had established separate electorates for Muslims. The Montague-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 had extended the separate electorate status to the Sikhs. The so-called Federal Constitution of 1935 had begun the process of dividing the Scheduled Castes from the main body of the Hindus, and this might have culminated in an arrangement beneficial to B.R. Ambedkar, who was negotiating till the end with the Sikhs. The Sikh Central Organisation had been induced to open the Khalsa College in Bombay with Ambedkar's support. But Ambedkar's offer of conversion to Sikhism, was naturally conditional upon his bargaining for Supreme Position with established Sikh leaders like Tara Singh, Sant Fateh Singh, Baldev Singh (who was already entrenched as Defence Minister in Nehru's Cabinet) and other prominent Sikh leaders.

Ultimately, Ambedkar opted for Buddhism, though he knew precious little about the tenets and philosophy of Buddhism. He had no need to go into such abstruse religious minutiae. For him conversion was a political ploy that would be entitled to receive imperialist support.

Unfortunately for Ambedkar and his career as the "Saviour of the Mahars", British imperialism could not last out. Four series of events precipitated the abrupt British retreat from India.

(i) Hitler had battered British Imperialism to near collapse. At the end of Second World War in 1945, Britain was in no position to spare the manpower and money to sustain its rule over the Indian Sub-continent. According to Sir Stafford Cripps, speaking in the House of Commons, it would have needed five million British Soldiers and five hundred million pounds annually to retain its hold over the Indian sub-continent. This "sacrifice" the British people were loath to make. Had the Dutch been in power here, they might have tried, as they attempted in Indonesia till 1949. Had the French been in power, they too might have tried as they attempted in the case of Indo-China till 1954. Had the Portuguese been in power here they might have also attempted, as they did in all their overseas colonies till 1975. But the Britishers were cowardly bullies, and ran away at the first chance.

(ii) Subhash Bose had formed his Indian National Army in 1942-43, in Burma & Malaya, out of the prisoners of war captured from the British Indian Army, which was thus proved to be disloyal.

(iii) The trial of the "traitors" - Sehgal, Dhillon, and Shah Nawaz Khan - which was held in the Red Fort, Delhi, at the end of 1945, caused a tremendous uproar all over the country. The hundreds of demonstrations and public outcry forced the Court Martial judges to merely remove the trio from the Indian Army. They could not be punished with either the death penalty or even imprisonment.

(iv) In February 1946, the RIN Mutineers surrendered, not to the CNC of the Navy but only to Sardar Patel who was flown in

from Delhi.

It is a different story that Sardar Patel comprehensively betrayed the Naval Ratings. But the shift in authority was obvious.

Thus the Britishers let down Ambedkar. They could not wait until Ambedkar had matured his plans.

(b) Religious Conversion to Islam

This path was availed of by millions of Indians, under Islamic domination from the time of Delhi Sultanate (thirteenth century to advent of the British as a territorial power from 1765 A.D.)

Theoretically, Islam did not recognise any caste, but in practice in India, the lower castes remained distinct. In effect, the converted local rich either began to call themselves as separate sects, like the Memons, the Bohras, or the Aga Khanis, or elevated themselves into Sayyids or Sheikhs, and in effect reproduced the Indian Caste system within Islam. As the common saying goes among the Muslims "I have had only two years of prosperity and therefore, I am just an ordinary Muslim, but who knows, with a few more years of good times, I might become a Sayyid or a Sheikh!"

At the same time, syncretic castes developed which sought to distinguish their tenets from both Hinduism and Islam. For example, the Kabir Panthis and Sikhs sought to fuse Sufi Islam with Bhakti Hinduism and build bridges between the two religions.

All in all, Sect Formation and Religious Conversion as feudal strategies of combating caste rigidities, overlapped and merged with each other.

c) Assumed Alienation

Another device was to create a mythology of foreign origin for the caste or sub-caste. For instance, the Rajputs were assumed to be new arrivals from Central Asia or some vague "outside" region.

Since they were supposed to have hailed from some distant place outside India, it was propagated that they were outside the caste system. Thus, Bhils became Rajputs as soon as they had acquired a small territory and a kingdom. In fact, the Rajputs themselves claimed to be of some vague foreign origin, who had been purified by fire. They began to call themselves as groups who had taken birth from Agni Kula. Some of the Rajputs also claimed to be Muslims.

The Jats claimed to have come from Central Asia, and the Kokanasth Chitpawan Brahmins, stranded on the Konkan coast after a ship-wreck, proclaimed themselves to be affiliated to the Jats! At the same time, Shahanav Kuli (96 families) Marathas, who were nothing but ordinary low caste cultivators, began to assert themselves as Rajputs, sanctifying their bogus genealogies with the help of bribed Brahmin priests, hailing from Jaipur and Varanasi. (See Vinayak Purohit, *Twenty-Five Essays in Indian History*, in press, and particularly the essay on Samant Feudalism published in *Mankind*, Vol 1, No 2, Nov.1995, where

MY CREDO

I am a simple rationalist and atheist. I do not respect religion, which is "a sigh of the oppressed" and "the opium of the people."

I respect the religious feelings of my countrymen.
Mankind wants to patiently argue with all the militants.
Mankind stands for revolutionary nationalism.
Mankind believes that the future belongs to the Dalits who in their overwhelming majority are the OBCs, SCs and STs.

I hate my class enemies who are the local brown capitalists as well as the foreign white multinationals organised as G-7, WB, IMF and WTO.

But I hate even more the *agent-provocateurs*, the infiltrators, the collaborationists and the fifth columnists in our ranks.

I hate the horrible brahminical, feudal order. I also hate the horrible capitalist order. I stand for the destruction of both.

I know that both will fall together, as they are standing up together supportive of each other!

the bogus claims of the Rashtrakutas and the Chalukyas have been exposed)

d) Self-Elevation by Collective Group Action

The last of the four major feudal strategies for overcoming the negative effects of caste rigidity was the technique of self-elevation by Group Consensus.

For instance, right around my residence in Bombay, there are a number of Bungalows belonging to Choukaishi and Pachkaishi Wadvals, who were originally low-caste carpenters and boat-builders. They possessed small plots of land along the coast-line of the Salsette Island (which became Bombay, where they used to build the boats for the Koli fisher-folk). As land prices in Bombay soared, they became rich landlords holding prime urban land. Naturally, they aspired to higher caste rank, commensurate with the newly acquired wealth. They began to call themselves "Surya-vanshi" Kshatriyas, and built a marriage hall under the "Suryavanshi" Kshatriya label in order to seal their claim.

In the same manner, in hundreds of cases all over India, the lower castes (OBCs and SCs) began to assert their rights to higher social status by this device of becoming *Dwijas*. Sometimes, they would merely change their dress, say by abandoning the *koli rumal* for the usual cultivator's dhoti; or the women would leave behind their *nav vari* sarees (nine yards sarees) for the more popular urban middle class *saha vari* (six yards) sarees; or the Nayar women of Kerala would begin to wear blouses over their *vettus*, in place of the earlier topless nudity.

Or the lower caste group might begin to accept vegetarianism. Or they might begin to forbid easy divorce or widow remarriage.

Or they might begin to alter the marriage and funeral rites.

Or, in a thousand different ways, modify their group behavioural pattern along the line that MN Srinivas, the liberal bourgeois sociologist, has termed "Sanskritisation".

Srinivas does not have the common sense to grasp, that it is not a linguistic phenomenon at all, but a social status change effected within feudal limitations.

2. The Bourgeois Way-out

The bourgeoisification process in India occurred under Imperialist aegis. Thus the process was botched up and compromised.

India had to undergo Forced Underdevelopment, i.e. it was De-industrialised, Ruralised and Pauperised. Therefore, true

partial liberation, under the Bourgeoisification process, was not possible. No "English Revolution of 1640-1660" could take place. Neither could the "French Revolution of 1789-1815" occur. The degree of liberation in India had to match the exigencies of imperialist rule.

First of all, forty percent of the territory and twenty-five percent of the population, had to remain under the continued feudal rule of the princelings, over whom the British merely established suzerainty.

Secondly, under the British land tenure system, all sorts of feudal relics were given a new lease of life, as Zamindars, Watandars, Khots, etc.

Thirdly, a bloated bureaucratic straitjacket was imposed, suited to the needs of an alien administration.

Within these semi-feudal over-arching limitations, a sort of semi-bourgeoisification process was carried through.

As such, liberation from caste restrictions was aborted. Three strategies were adopted.

a) Religious Conversion to Christianity.

b) Encouragement to *Gurugiri* and *Buwabaji* and to Cult/ Sect formations with foreign and NRI support.

c) Promotion of separate communal electorates supposedly to safeguard minority interests.

a) Religious Conversion to Christianity

Religious conversion to Christianity was supposed to Westernise and modernise the Depressed Classes, as they were known earlier, or the Scheduled Castes, as they became known later.

As a matter of fact, Christianity had reached the shores of India much earlier than it had reached the British

Isles. The British were converted to Christianity in the Anglo-Saxon period, in the 5th and 6th century AD, whilst Christianity had reached India via Syria, Iraq and Persia much earlier. The Syrian Christian Church survives to this day in Kerala.

The Portuguese had attempted forcible conversion wherever they had established their outposts. They used to throw pieces of beef in the village well and then claim that all those who had partaken of the water were automatically Christianised. Further, St. Francis Xavier had been active in the proselytising movement. Francis Xavier had arrived in Goa in 1542, and made two further visits to India in 1548 and 1551. His activities were spread Asia-wide from India to Japan and he died in 1552, whilst awaiting clearance to visit the Chinese mainland.

However, these forays were of merely marginal interest. The

DOWN WITH RIGHTISTS FORWARD WITH LEFTISTS

During World War II, not only Ambedkar but also V. D. Savarkar and his Hindu Mahasabha, and the Stalinist-Communists had collaborated with British Imperialism.

Genuine leftists must separate themselves from this collaborationist chaff.

Amongst the genuine fighters for freedom of India, both Muslims and Dalits "OBCs and SCs and STs" were very well represented in the ranks of the so-called anarchists and terrorists of the Old Period as well as in the ranks of the Subhasist Forward Bloc and the INA, the Socialists and the RIN mutineers.

We must carry forward this fighting, non-communal and non-casteist militant tradition of Revolutionary Nationalism and Revolutionary Socialism.

We must sharply distinguish ourselves from collaborators with whites and browns of all shades and tints, whether they be Mahars in Maharashtra or Dusads in Bihar or Pariahs in Tamil Nadu.

We want a free India that truly elevates the down-trodden, the despised, the deprived, the exploited and the oppressed of the country, who in their overwhelming majority are Dalits, i.e., they are the OBCs, SCs, and STs of this country.

We want Socialism with Democratic Planning and Workers' Control And, of course, a Free India, that ends Neo-Colonial control by the G7, OECD and NATO of the First World!

British E.I. Company introduced Anglican missionaries from 1813. This Ecclesiastical Department was taken over by the British Government in 1858, and till the end of the British rule in India, the Government officially supported the Anglican Church in India. The Queen of England, as Head of Church is till today interfering in the religious life of India, and appoints Anglican Bishops to carry out all sorts of nefarious subversive activities in the name of missionary effort.

However, as we have seen above, Indian feudalism was never completely destroyed and lingered on in a hundred different compromised forms. Therefore, the caste structure of society which was concomitant with Indian feudalism, remained active and influential. Ultimately, it prevailed over half-hearted and botched up attempts at bourgeoisification.

Just as Islam in India developed castes, similarly the Christians too were permeated by castes. In the recent period, we have seen the dispute, regarding the reservation policy for Dalit Christians, snowball into a major political controversy. The higher caste Christian converts in Goa have separate pews assigned to them, distinct from the pews allocated to "Untouchable Christians" in churches.

In general, the caste structure has triumphed over religious conversion, just as Ambedkarite Bauddhas remained basically Mahars enjoying all the privileges of the "Reservation Policy".

GANDHI, BJP AND COMMUNISTS, ALL STEEPED IN COMPRADOR POLITICS.

Mankind has been critical of Gandhi for the following weighty reasons:

1. Gandhi did not support any black liberation struggle whilst in Africa, though this was the main contradiction in the Republic of South Africa.
2. Gandhi supported White British Imperialism in the Zulu wars of 1890s, as well as in the Boer War 1898-1901.
3. Gandhi supported British Imperialism in the First World War (1914-19), and for his activities as a recruiting sergeant for British imperialism, he received the Kaiser-e-Hind medal.
4. Gandhi launched the Khilafat movement in association with the All brothers (1921). Khilafat was a non-issue in India and Gandhi inflamed the communal spirit by lending his support to it.
5. Gandhi withdrew the 1921 Civil Disobedience Movement even before launching it, because of the minor Chauri-Chaura incident, which might have been the work of some British *agent provocateurs*.
6. Gandhi deliberately sacrificed Bhagat Singh and associates whilst negotiating the Gandhi-Irwin Pact of 1931.
7. Gandhi advised the peasants of U.P. to pay rent to the Zamindars, even while withholding land revenue from the British Raj.
8. Even though Gandhi was not a member of the Congress, he interfered with the re-election of Subhash Bose as President of the Congress, and campaigned against Bose, ultimately forcing Bose's resignation.
9. Gandhi defended the action of K.M. Munshi in firing upon unarmed textile workers of Bombay during the rule of the Congress Ministry, 1937-39.
10. By his style of functioning, repeated fasts at the behest of an "inner voice", and by holding his daily Prayer Meetings, Gandhi gave a religious turn to political activities, and thus strengthened the forces of communalism and religious obscurantism.
11. Gandhi repudiated the 1942 Movement and blamed the people of India for their violent activities.
12. Gandhi accepted the Partition of 1947, and helped Nehru and Patel to overcome popular opposition to Partition. (Gandhi had accepted Partition from 1943, when he met Jinnah with Rajagopalachari in Bombay). Our criticism of both Ambedkar and Gandhi is from the point of view of consistent nationalism, logical rationalism and revolutionary socialist politics.
13. At the same time we have been totally opposed to the fundamentalist line of the Bharatiya Janata Party, which was earlier promoted by the Jan Sangh and the Hindu Mahasabha. We also believe that the BJP should be openly defeated in popular democratic elections, and its rotten deals like the Revived Enron Project in Maharashtra should be thoroughly exposed. Furthermore, the BJP does not stand for Reunification of India, which *Mankind* believes in, just as Dr. Lohia did. In fact, *Mankind's* approach to Muslims is a friendly one, parallel to its approach to the progressive wing of the Ambedkarites.
14. We are also anti-Stalinists, and consider their slogan of secularism to be a bogus one. The Communist Party of India had supported the Partition of the country in 1947 which gives a lie to its "secularism", and has committed innumerable crimes on the people of India at the behest of its Stalinist masters in Moscow. Even whilst they admit to many errors like opposition to Subhash Bose, support to Partition, support to Indira's Internal Emergency and so on, they have failed to make a genuine confession about the sources and reasons for their blunders of the past. *Mankind* has repeatedly attacked the Stalinist policy towards Kashmir and towards many other policies of the day.
15. *Mankind* is making its position clear so that no misunderstanding can arise. *Mankind* stands squarely by its credo of Nationalism, Socialism and Revolutionism.

b) Encouragement to Gurugiri and Buwabaji and to Cult/ Sect Formation with Foreign and NRI Support.

Scores, if not hundreds, of *gurus* and *buwas* have sprung up in all the regions of the country, like Hare Ram Hare Krishna movement, the Rajnesh Cult, the Maharshi Yogi University, Sai Baba, Anand Margi, Bal Yogi and so on and so forth. It will take a volume to name all of them.

All these *gurus* and *buwas* are financed by huge foreign funds, especially the off-shore funds channelised through the NRIs. All of these Cults/Sects have thousands of white-skinned foreign followers, together with hundreds of thousands of brown-skinned ones (See Geeta Mehta, *Karma Kola*, 1980, for a laboured and boring proof of the phenomenon).

All these newfangled Cults/Sects are collectively having an impact, and are loosening the bonds of castes within Indian society. However, it is a very slow creeping process, and would probably take several centuries to make a significant impact. After all, there are ninety-three crore Indians, and at fifteen percent, even the Scheduled Castes number is no less than fourteen crores. Only a grand socio-economic programme of upliftment can touch and transform the lives of hundreds of millions!

c) Promotion of separate communal electorates supposedly to safeguard minority interests

The British strategy of *Divide and Rule* was implemented through Limited Franchise with Separate Electorates. This merely perpetuated minute

divisions within society without solving any problem. We must here understand that Separate Electorates are different from reservations. Under Separate Electorates, voters in the same Constituency vote in distinct communal blocs. Under a system of Reservation of seats, all the people in a Constituency vote for one of the candidates belonging to the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes. The voters may belong to any community. The winning candidate has to belong to the caste/tribe for which the seat has been reserved.

The British introduced Communal Electorates for local bodies and municipalities at the end of the nineteenth century, and extended the principle to the Legislative Assemblies formed under the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909. The Separate electorates were perpetuated under the Montague-Chelmsford reforms of 1919 and the Feudal Constitution of 1935. Ultimately, they resulted in the partition of country in 1947, and the communal riots of the entire period 1920-1948.

In short, Separate Electorates were a mirage and in fact resulted in the criminalisation of politics in India. The goondas gathered the votes and delivered them to the party that paid most, using communalist slogans to whip up religious frenzy.

3. The Socialist Way-out

The Socialists, particularly those led by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia have advocated a two-pronged approach to the caste problem.

As a short term measure, they suggested that, those who had been exploited and discriminated against for centuries, including not only Hindus but poor Sikhs, Christians, etc. should be provided with *Vishesh Avsar* or Special Opportunity for a Transitional Period. Those who have been hungry, ill-

educated and medically uncared for, should not be suddenly placed on an equal footing with the privileged English-speaking Westernised Fat Cats. It is unfair, unjust and inhuman to do so. Let them have special facilities for a Transitional Period to overcome their backwardness and catch up with the hitherto privileged groups.

AMBEDKAR CRITICISED FROM THE LEFT

Our criticism of Ambedkar is from the Left. We are fully with Ambedkar in his criticism of upper caste Hindu society. *Mankind* believes in the growth, prosperity and happiness of the *Dalits* of this country. In fact, *Mankind* believes that only when the *Dalits* rule the country, that India will become prosperous and happy.

I personally consider myself a dalit of the dalits, whatever may be the nature of the family into which I was born, and for which no one had asked my prior permission before my birth. Birth is an accident or a chance happening. By deeds, thoughts and writings or Karma, I am a dalit, and proud to be one.

We have criticised Ambedkar for his close identification with British Imperialism and for his pursuit of anti-labour policies of the Viceroy's Executive Council in 1942-46, and for his close association with Nehru's comprador Congress govt. as Cabinet Minister in 1947-1951.

Whatever may be his grievances against the upper castes, Ambedkar should not have allied himself with either British imperialism, or with its successor comprador Congress regime.

Mankind believes in principled politics and abhors the politics of compromise, opportunism and careerism.

We are not interested in the personal reasons which might have provoked Ambedkar to go astray.

Since we are atheists, we have nothing to say about Ambedkar as a neo-Buddhist religious cult leader. That is a non-political matter, entirely between Ambedkar and his cult followers.

We have written about Buddhism separately in *Mankind* (MK, Jan 1997 issue), and considered it therein as a religious philosophy that was iconoclastic, atheistic and dialectical.

Mankind believes in Revolutionary Nationalism (MK, Dec 1996).

Mankind's Credo has been fully explained in our Oct 1995 and Oct 1996 issues. *Mankind* fully adheres to the Lohiaite theory of *Vishesh Avasar* or Special Opportunity which must be accorded to the Dalits in order to help the *dalits* and *pidits* of this country to make the transition to an egalitarian social order.

Mankind desires that the anti-imperialist, nationalist, equality-aspiring, progressive, forward-looking elements from within the ranks of Ambedkarites should distinguish themselves from the reactionary, communalist, casteist, compradorist, religio-cultist, careerist and opportunistic elements within the same movement. Without this separation of the Left wing, Ambedkarite politics will remain condemned to sterility.

This was to be combined with a long term development programme which would uplift the whole mass of poor and down-trodden in India. Without such a mass development programme the strategy of *Vishesh Avsar* would itself become futile. The under-privileged would become chaotically and selectively "privileged", as has happened with those upper caste men and women, who are obtaining bogus OBC and SC certificates from District Collectors and are fraudulently entering educational institutions and obtaining jobs in the Reserved category. In other words, the Socialist solution of *Vishesh Avsar* for a Transitional Period is being transformed into a permanent racket!

In the foregoing paragraphs we have analysed the peculiarities of Indian caste, and discussed the Feudal, Bourgeois and Socialist solutions to the problem.

It appears that Ambedkar was largely unaware of the social roots of the problem. And he was uninterested in finding a solution to the caste crisis. All that he was interested in was the perpetuation of the caste rigidities and in exploiting to his own advantage as a Mahar political leader, the depressed conditions of the SC masses.

He was a pre-figuration of the present day Kanshi Ram line. Kanshi allied himself with Mulayam Singh's Samajwadi Party in 1993 to defeat BJP in Uttar Pradesh. He then joined hands with the BJP to overthrow Mulayam Singh and induct his protégé, Mayawati into the CM's

gaddi. Most recently he has aligned himself with Congress in UP, and in Punjab to serve his utterly selfish and self-defeating caste ends. The latest is that Kanshi has entered into an alliance with the BJP—and has formed a BJP-BSP coalition government in UP.

We shall now briefly examine Ambedkar's educational career.

V

NARROW-MINDED VISION

Ambedkar joined the Elphinstone College on a scholarship granted by Maharaja Sayaji Rao of Baroda. After his graduation in 1912, without any class in any subject, he joined the Baroda State Service. The Maharaja of Baroda then sent Ambedkar to the Columbia University in 1913. He was the first Mahar to study in a foreign university. In 1916, Ambedkar submitted his thesis for the degree of Ph.D. It was published eight years afterwards, under the title *"The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India"*. Ambedkar left Columbia to join the London School of Economics, but had to return to India upon the termination of the scholarship grant by Sayaji Rao. In 1917, Ambedkar became Military Secretary to the Maharaja of Baroda. With the help of the Maharaja of Kolhapur, Shahu Chhatrapati, he rejoined the London School of Economics in 1920. In 1921, after a rehash of his Columbia University thesis, now entitled *"Provincial Decentralisation of Imperial Finance in British India"*, he manoeuvred to obtain an M.Sc. (Econ.) degree. It is academically dishonourable and shameful, to seek to obtain a Ph.D. as well as a M.Sc. on the basis of more or less the same material. That is not all! (Kuber, *op.cit.*, pp.15,19)

It shows the extreme limitations of Ambedkar's vision. The subject that he chose had no lasting value. It was merely a narrow-minded careerist choice. British imperialism was ephemeral; the British Provinces were not going to last forever; the details of financial transactions between such temporary institutions, of what significance can they be?

To waste the best years of one's youth for petty careerist gains in Colonial India, does this show any breadth of vision? We will not elaborate further.

The whole of Ambedkar's life was frittered away in this manner running after short-term narrow-minded goals.

Like Kanshi Ram, he also made an opportunistic alliance with the Praja Socialist Party in 1951-52, and lost again in a by-election in 1954. Prior to that, he had joined hands with British Imperialism and served as a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council from 1942 to 1946. He also joined hands with the Congress to be a member of Nehru's cabinet from 1946 to 1951.

Kanshi Ram should have learnt from Ambedkar's life that reckless opportunism does not pay. Ultimately he may prove to be as big a loser as Ambedkar.

VI

THE 1946-49 CONSTITUTION AND AMBEDKAR

In our Open Letter to Anna Hazare and others in *Mankind's* last issue, Feb./Mar'97, we have shown that 1946-49 Constitution was a Dominion Status Constitution and was completely worthless. We had characterised it as a sham, as a joke, as a farce, as a travesty and as a betrayal.

We need not repeat the arguments here.

We had called for the formation, for the first time, of a new Constituent Assembly based on a Direct, Universal, Equal, Adult Franchise.

Much has been made of Ambedkar's contribution to the

formulation of this rotten Constitution.

First of all, it was a collective effort. He was merely the chairman of the Drafting Committee consisting of N.Gopala Swami Ayyangar, Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar, K.M. Munshi, Sir Muhammad Sadulla, N. Madhava Menon and S.P. Khaitan. Sir B.N. Rau was the Constitutional Advisor.

It may be that as Chairman Ambedkar took a more active role in drafting. But this was a mere technical procedural matter.

Ambedkar's personal approach is completely exposed by his *Writings and Speeches* of which we quote from *Communal Deadlock and Way To Solve It*, 1945: "I must state that I am wholly opposed to the proposals of a Constitution Assembly. It is absolutely superfluous. I regard it as a most dangerous project, which may involve this country in a civil war. In the first place, I do not see why a Constituent Assembly is at all necessary. Indians are not in the same position as the fathers of the American Constitution of the United States. They had to evolve ideas, suitable for the Constitution for a free people. They had no constitutional patterns before them to draw upon. This cannot however be the case for Indians. Constitutional ideas and Constitutional forms are ready at hand. Again room for variety is very small. There is not more than two or three constitutional patterns to choose from. Thirdly, it is agreed that the future Indian Constitution should be federal. It is also more or less settled what subjects should go to the Centre and what to the Provinces. There is no quarrel over the division of revenues between the Centre and the Provinces, none on Franchise and none on the relation of the Judiciary to the Legislature and the Executive. The only point of dispute, which is outstanding, centres round the question of the Residual powers—whether they should be with the Centre or with the Provinces. But that is hardly a matter worth bothering about. Indeed, the provision contained in the present Government of India Act should be adopted as the best compromise". (Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, *Writings and Speeches*, Vol I, 1979, pp 360-361.) Many more quotes to the same effect can be given.

But the above long quotation will suffice.

Can one call a man with such a mind-set a Manu, unless Manu is himself thought to be a small fry!! The real embarrassment in the case of Ambedkar was that he had become a comprador, pampered by the Princelings and Imperialism, though he belonged to the lower castes and classes.

But compradors have no castes. They have merely ideologies. They mediate between the foreign interests and the masses! Ambedkar was a mere *Kala Gumasta* (Black clerk) belonging to the Mahars, who was useful to both his white and brown masters (As aforesaid Ambedkar had been a member of Viceroy's Executive Council, 1942-46, and Nehru's Government, 1946-51).

Naturally, out of the mountainous labours of the Drafting Committee only a mouse could be produced. Ambedkar admits as much:

"That the Constitution has produced a good part of the provisions of the Government of India Act of 1935, I make no apologies. There is nothing to be ashamed of in borrowing. It involves no plagiarism. Nobody holds any patent rights in the fundamental ideas of a Constitution." (Keer, *Op.Cit.*, p 409).

For good measure, Ambedkar added: "People always keep on saying to me 'Oh you are the maker of the Constitution'. My answer is that I was a hack. What I was asked to do, I did much against my will..... Then he burst out explosively: 'Sir,

my friends tell me that I made the Constitution'. But I am quite prepared to say that I shall be the first person to burn it out. I do not want it. It does not suit anybody" (Keer, *Op.Cit.*, p.449.)

VII FLIPPANCY

Ambedkar had no deep understanding of Economics, unless devolution of provincial finance is assumed to be a serious enquiry!

Ambedkar had no understanding of the sources of law as is revealed by his remarks on the Constitution.

Ambedkar had no understanding of social history as is revealed by his contradictory statements about the origins of the Scheduled Castes. At one time, he called them degraded Kshatriyas (Ambedkar quoted by Keer, *op.cit.* p.386) and at other times as outcaste Buddhists (Ambedkar quoted by Keer, *op.cit.* p.407). He spoke and wrote without much thought. He defended himself by saying: "We lawyers defend many things." (as quoted by Keer, *op.cit.* p.449)

He reached a sort of climax of absurdity by disclaiming responsibility for his own statements! One wonders whether he thought himself to be crazy, or halfmad or just a megalomaniac, who is not to be taken seriously.

Look at the following:

"These are some of the proposals, I have had in mind for the solution of Communal Problem. They do not commit the All-India Scheduled Caste Federation. **They do not even commit me**". (Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, *Writings and Speeches*, Vol I, 1979, p 378)

What more can one say?

Ambedkar took a flippant attitude towards most serious things in life.

Flippancy is a *Sthayi Bhava* (basic proclivity) of the comprador mind. Most basics like foreign debt, exchange rate, technology, English in education, superiority of Western cultural values, etc., are to be taken care of by the foreigners. Indians are merely to concern themselves with clerical details and snigger at silly jokes made by office bosses.

Throughout his life, Ambedkar behaved in this fashion. He advocated the Partition of India and the Formation of Pakistan with utmost vigour. He wanted even Partition of Kashmir and complete exchange of populations between India and Pakistan.

Did he think that the matter was as easy as changing his fancy suits and boots?

The Partition of India was one of the greatest tragedies that befell humanity in the course of its entire history.

The 1947 Partition of India involved the killing of at least 600,000, and the forced migratory movement of 1.7 crores (17 millions or 17,000,000) of human beings, the largest single migratory movement known in human history

Let us all remember that the crime of supporting the Partition of India is NO ORDINARY CRIME! It is the greatest crime that a human being can commit in the middle of the 20th century!

It is comparable only with the imperialist crime of 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, of forcing man-made famines of purchasing power upon the people of India and killing about eight crores of Indians, from the Dastak Famine of 1770 to the Bengal Famine of 1943, as part of the drive of De-industrialisation, Ruralisation and Pauperisation of India.

Comparable only to the genocidal massacres of the Amerindians carried out by the Spanish, English and the French

imperialists in the two Americas in the 16th to 20th centuries. Comparable only to the trade-enforced narcotics drive imposed through the Opium Wars in China of 1839-42 and 1856-60.

The 1947 Partition of India, was one of the four or five greatest crimes against humanity committed by imperialism.

Who could support such a crime except a true comprador?

Ambedkar was often flippant!

At a rally of thousands of women of Kolhapur, Ambedkar stated that "If they wanted to have their Hindu Code Bill passed, they should find two fat women to fast!" (Quoted by Keer, *Op.Cit.*, p 446)

"As regards Goa, Ambedkar said that it could be annexed or purchased, or India could take Goa on lease" (*Ibid*, p 456).

Hundreds of such irresponsible and flippant statements and actions can be cited from Ambedkar's life.

"At this juncture in 1952, Ambedkar appeared in the Supreme Court on behalf of Zamindars of U.P. in connection with the UP Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act. Ambedkar's argument was that there was lack of legislative competence and public purpose in enacting the law. The Supreme Court, however rejected the appeal." (*Ibid*, p.442)

"Dealing with the suggestions for village Governments, Ambedkar said that the village was a sink of Localism, a den of ignorance, narrow-minded communalism and added that the village republics had been the ruination of India" (p.410)

VIII SOPHISTRY AND PERVERSITY

We have seen that Ambedkar could go to any length in order to defend his own prevarications and legal legerdemain. If he contradicted himself, he would come out with the glib excuse:

"We lawyers say many things." (Source given above) If he had earlier made a commitment, he would come out with the excuse that this was his personal opinion and:

"this does not commit the Scheduled Caste Federation" (Source given above)

Ambedkar went to the fantastic length of stating that what he had just said:

"did not even commit me" (Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, *Writings and Speeches*, Vol I, 1979, p. 378)

This kind of sophistry reached almost schizophrenic levels!

Ambedkar came from the ranks of the poor and from those discriminated against. And yet he defended the indefensible. He not only supported British imperialism in every way, but supported American imperialist and neo-colonialist machinations. He supported the formation of SEATO, and attacked the Nehru Government FROM THE RIGHT. Ambedkar stood for the infinite vivisection of India and stated in July 1947:

"that Berar would revert to the Nizam as the treaty by which it was ceded to the British would lapse." (Ambedkar quoted by Keer, *Op.Cit.* p. 394).

"Ambedkar had proposed Partition with the complete transfer of populations of Hindus and Muslims from their respective zones" (Ambedkar quoted by Keer, *Op.Cit.*, p. 398)

Now persistent sophistry had become real perversity! The Partition of India in 1947 was NO ORDINARY CRIME as we have stated earlier. The 1947 Partition resulted in the massacre of 6 lakhs and the forced migration of 1.7 crores, the largest single such event in World History! How light-minded and glib it was, on the part of Ambedkar, to suggest such a horrible thing at imperialist behest!

Let us remind our readers that no "leader" of India whose hands have been bloodied by such a horrible deed, as the Partition of the country, can ever escape the judgement of history. He cannot hope to lead the Dalit masses of the country. The Ambedkarites and the general body of intellectuals belonging to the lower castes of India, should ponder over this matter very seriously. The Progressive Dalits of our country must distinguish themselves from Ambedkar, who was a stooge of the British, as Viceroy's Executive Council member from 1942-46, and was Congress Party's comprador stooge from 1946-51.

Ambedkar was the Kanshiram of the 40's and 50's. As we all know, Kanshiram was the ally of the Samajwadi Party, to oust the B.J.P. government of U.P. He then became an ally of the B.J.P., to oust Mulayam Singh. And now he is an ally of the Congress in U.P. and in Punjab. And now (27.3.97) he has formed a coalition government in UP with BJP ! Kanshiram swears by Ambedkar in every major speech that he makes. Does this kind of opportunism and utter selfishness deserve any support from the thinking and concerned intellectuals of India?

Ambedkar reached heights of sophistry on the issue of Linguistic Provinces.

"A Linguistic Province produces what Democracy needs, namely, social homogeneity, and makes Democracy work better than it would in a mixed Province. **There is no danger in creating Linguistic Provinces. Danger lies in creating Linguistic Provinces with the language of each province as its official language.**" (Ambedkar quoted by Keer *Op. Cit.* p.406)

What he meant by this piece of sophistry, nobody knows ! Did he mean that Gujarat should have Marathi as its official language, and the Hindi provinces should have Bengali, Oriya and Assamese as their official languages? Did he mean that Tamil Nadu should have Telugu, that Andhra should have Kannada, that Karnataka should have Malayalam, and that Kerala should have Tamil, as their official languages?

Ambedkar suddenly became a Red-baiter after U.S.A. gave the signal. He opposed an alliance with the Peasants and Workers Party in Maharashtra, because Shankarrao More was allied to the Russian ideology, though both Ambedkar and the Communists were supporting British imperialism in 1942-45. (Ambedkar quoted by Keer *Op. Cit.*, p. 438)

At the same time he declared at an election rally in Bombay :

"That it was Subhash Bose who won independence for India and not the Congress party." (Keer, p. 439)

He was such a staunch Cold War warrior against Russia that he felt :

"It was the duty of USA and Britain to liberate the ten countries of Eastern Europe that Russia had swallowed" (*Ibid.* 454-5)

Ambedkar's support to the Colonial Government was beyond limit and beyond sense :

"My submission to the House is this : that you cannot devise a better form of government than the one we have" speaking in the Central Assembly, 18.9. 1942.(Ambedkar-*Writings & Speeches*, Vol X, 1993 p. 26)

Now look at this piece of marvellous sophistry :

"Labour's Conception of liberty is very positive. It involves the idea of Government by the people. Government by the people, in the opinion of Labour, does not mean Parliamentary Democracy." (*Ibid.* p. 37)

Also, consider this extraordinary praise of the aristocracy.

"But neither idealism nor free thought is possible for the

middle-class. The middle-class does not possess the liberality of the Aristocracy, which is necessary to welcome and nourish an idea." (*Ibid.* p. 43)

A poor Mahar boy who had been insulted and humiliated at every turn, suddenly decides to praise the Aristocracy, because he wants to defend the British against the people of India !

One rubs one's eyes in wonder ! What kind of a 'freak' was this man? How can a sensitive and intelligent Dalit defend, such anti-people statements of Ambedkar?

Ambedkar defended every draconian anti-labour measure of the war-time Colonial Government. For instance, he defended the lifting of ban on employment of women in underground work in coal mines. (Ambedkar, *Writings & Speeches*, Vol X p.p. 139-44)

He considered Labour Organisations and Trade Unions as forms of "organised loot." He defended the absolute right of the employers to hire and fire the worker. (Ambedkar, *Writings & Speeches*, Vol X, p.p. 245,249.)

It is not necessary to go on !

Almost every page of his *Writings & Speeches* is full of sophistry rising to the heights of perversity.

Ambedkar hailed from a poor Mahar family which was disadvantaged in many respects, but instead of becoming a champion of the poor and downtrodden of the country, he chose to side with the rulers - the White Sahibs upto 1946 and the Brown Sahibs thereafter upto 1951. He opposed Village Panchayats, Parliamentary Democracy, "Linguistic State With Its Own Single Official Language," Integration of states within the Indian Union, and so on. He favoured Repressive Legislation against the working class and American Policy in Asia. He attacked Russia and the Indian Communists most bitterly.

Ambedkar has acquired a high reputation after his death, especially during the last two decades. We can only say that Greatness Has Been Thrust Upon Him !

ANTI-LABOUR POSITION OF AMBEDKAR

All the war time repressive measures of the colonial administration were enthusiastically welcomed by Ambedkar. All the workers' strikes in support of the 1942 Freedom Struggle were denounced by Ambedkar, and the arrest of labour leaders was condoned on the ground that the labour leaders were also nationalists and occasionally they were socialists belonging to the Revolutionary Socialist party, the Congress Socialist Party and the Hindustan Republican Socialist Association (*Writings and Speeches*, Vol.10, p.244). Ambedkar singled out the notes seized from Jayaprakash Narayan, whilst Narayan was in Deoli Prison Camp, for particular mention. As a freedom fighter, I distinctly remember the abhorrence we felt for Ambedkar and his pro-imperialist stance when we were in jail. Ambedkar went so far as to say "If Indians are wanting a government which is democratic, then my submission to the House is this: that you cannot devise a better form of government than the one we have." (*Writings and Speeches*, Vol 10, p.26)

At the same time, he had the temerity to state that

"This House is almost in a diseased state. It was elected for three years, but it has been sitting for almost nearly nine years... Until we get a communal settlement, it is quite impossible to refashion this House." (*Writings & Speeches*, Vol.10, pp. 28-29)

Ambedkar suffered from such delusions of grandeur that whilst discussing the repressive policies of the government, "That every member of the Executive Council is a colleague of the Governor General." (*Writings & Speeches*, Vol 10, p.25)

Ambedkar was so blinded by his *bhakti* to British imperialism that in the year of the Bengal Famine which carried away over 6 million poor Indians, that is in 1943, he was quite oblivious of the responsibility of the Government of India for the rampant hoarding of and speculation in food-grains, and the destruction of the river crafts in the Bengal-Assam region for fear of Japanese seizure, which led to total destruction of the grain movement in the North East!

It was the careerist streak in Ambedkar which led him astray. He stuck to his seat in the Viceroy's Executive Council till the last. He did not resign even when reactionaries like M.S. Aney, Homi Modi and N.R. Sarkar resigned.

It was the Viceroy who finally removed him in order to form a new Council headed by Jawaharlal Nehru.

And he was so pliable that very soon he was back in the Nehru-led Council, without any remembrance of things past.

Ambedkar had no social conscience or ideological vision. The war years were fateful years. They were the last years of direct British rule. The 1942 Movement occurred led by the Socialists. The INA was formed by Subhash Bose in 1942 and in 1943 the Bengal famine occurred. There were terrible food shortages and an excruciating inflationary spiral was unleashed upon the economy. Thousands of Freedom Fighters were jailed (when Labour leaders were jailed, Ambedkar facetiously defended their jailing by saying "They were not jailed because they were labour leaders, but because they were nationalists, Socialists and radicals")

At the end of 1945, a trial of leading INA officers was conducted by the foreign government on grounds of "treachery"! Ambedkar did nothing. He did not resign his seat from the Viceroy's Executive Council. The RIN rebellion occurred in Feb 1946. That didn't move him! Nothing could!

The most draconian anti-labour measures were enforced by the Viceroy throughout the period when Ambedkar was the Labour Member.

As for the trade union movement of the country, Ambedkar had the following opinion.

"The policy followed by most of these labour organisations is nothing else but a policy of organised loot... In the way in which our industry is organised, it is the employer who has, rightly or wrongly, the right to dismiss a worker whom he thinks is of no service to him." (*Writings & Speeches*, Vol 10, p.245-49)

His admiration for the white man and the Britishers went to almost unbelievable lengths. When the ban on employment of women underground in mines was lifted, he came out with the

strangest defence of the indefensible.

"In our own country is it not a fact that up to 1937 women did work in coal mines? Is it not a fact that women in this country were working in coal mines till eight years ago? Can anybody in India say as people in England say that our women have ceased to work underground for a century and that therefore this is a new departure?" (*Writings & Speeches*, Vol.10, p.257)

If the British colonial administration did not extend the safety and health protection measures to Indian women coal miners, which they had extended 100 years earlier to English women coal miners, is that racialist delay to be made a ground for lifting of the ban on underground work by women, in 1945, in India?

Mankind is simply aghast!

Mankind calls upon the sensitive and forward-looking *Dalits* to differentiate between Ambedkar as a religious leader of the Neo-Buddhist cult and Ambedkar the pro-imperialist and anti-labour and anti-nationalist political figure.

We should also remember that Ambedkar collaborated with the fundamentalist Hindus, in that his cabinet colleague in the Nehru govt. was Shyama Prasad Mookerji, a founder of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Jan Sangh.

Ambedkar's behaviour was exactly like that of Kanshi Ram. Kanshi Ram joined up in turn with the Samajwadi party, the BJP, and the Congress. He had won 3 parliamentary seats from Punjab in the 11th Lok Sabha elections of mid-1996, and now in Feb 1997, he has won exactly one seat in the Punjab Assembly. From May 1996 to Feb 1997, Kanshi Ram came down from three Parliamentary seats to one Assembly in 9 months! And now Kanshi has formed a coalition government with the BJP in UP (end-March 1997)! Exactly similar was Ambedkar's fate. From Viceroy's Executive Council member (1942-46) and Nehru's Cabinet Minister (1947-1951), he lost in the first Lok Sabha election and even in the By-election. Opportunism and careerism do not pay, even in the relatively short runs!

LONG LIVE THE UNITY OF THE MASSES OF THE INDIAN SUBCONTINENT !

FORWARD TO A NEW FEDERATION OF THE SOCIALIST STATES OF INDIA, PAKISTAN AND BANGLADESH !

LONG LIVE THE UNITY OF THE DALITS & PIDITS OF INDIA!

DOWN WITH ALL COLLABORATORS OF WHITE IMPERIALISM AND BROWN COMPRADORISM !

LONG LIVE THE TRIPLE UNITY OF NATIONALISM, SOCIALISM AND REVOLUTIONISM !

WESTERN BRAIN-WASHING EXPOSED

THE WESTERN TECHNIQUE IS QUITE WELL-ESTABLISHED.

- 1. GENOCIDALLY MASSACRE THE AMERINDIANS.**
- 2. DE-POPULATE AFRICA AND PROMOTE SLAVE TRADE TO REPLACE THE MASSACRED AMERINDIANS.**
- 3. WHEN SLAVERY BECOMES UNTENABLE, REPLACE THE SLAVES WITH INDENTURED LABOURERS FROM INDIA AND ASIA.**
- 4. WHEN INDENTURED LABOURERS BECOME IMPOSSIBLE TO RECRUIT, UNLEASH RACIALISM (HOLOCAUST, APARTHEID, ZIONISM), LIMITED WARS, NARCOTICS TRAFFIC, ANTIQUES SMUGGLING, INDIAN LOOT, DEVALUATIONS, AND OTHER DEVICES UPON THE THIRD WORLD !**