

The Notion of Equality in the Thought of Lenin and Ambedkar

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

ChinmayaMahanand



**Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies
School of International Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi - 110067
2014**



JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

School of International Studies
New Delhi-110067

Tel.: 2670 4365
Fax: (+91)-11-2674

1586

Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies

Date: 17/12/2014

DECLARATION

I
the
own
of this


I declare that the dissertation entitled "*The Notion of Equality in the Thought of Lenin and Ambedkar*" submitted by me for the award of degree of **Master of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is my work. The dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of University or any other university.


Chinmaya Mahanand
Center for Russian and Central Asian Studies
School of International Studies
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATE

re the examiners for

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before
evaluation.


Dr. K. B. Usha
Supervisor


Prof. Arun Mohanty
Chairperson,
Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies

Dedicated to.....

The martyrs who fought bravely against injustice and exploitation to establish equality in society!!!

Acknowledgements

My dissertation on Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality would not have been possible without the active support, sympathy, guidance, love and encouragement by many of my friends and well-wishers.

Firstly, I would like to thank my guide Dr. KB Usha for her motherly guidance and encouragement while doing research on this topic. I am so thankful to Dr. KB Usha for her consistent guidance and support with great affection and patience since beginning to the end of dissertation work. It would have been not possible to complete this work successfully without her active support and sympathy.

Special thanks to my dear friend BibekSuna for his valuable support and helping me complete the research work. Bibek, I have used your laptop during the whole period of my research. Thank you so much my dear friend for your cordial support. Your continuous company, encouragement, guidance, debate and discussion have a great impact on my research.

It would be difficult to proceed ahead without thanking my dear friends JituSuna and Meghwanfor their company during the entire period of my research. It would

have been difficult to complete this task without the emotional support provided by friends like you guys!

I would really like to thank Bhupali for her sincere support in making my dissertation complete and successful. I would also like to thank Afreen, Buno, Divya, Manisha and Munni for their active encouragement and cooperation while writing my research.

I really thank to Purna, Shamla, Srirupa and Ban for their help on a very short notice, it indeed helped me strengthen my work. I would like to thank Dinesh, Jadumani and Kshirod for their continuous debate and discussion and cooperation in doing my research. I thank all my UDSF friends for their encouragement and inspiration to complete my research.

I would like to thank the JNU library and library staff, Periyar hostel mess workers, support staff such as sweepers, cleaners and migrant workers without whom it is difficult to have student friendly and academic environment on campus.

Finally, I would extend my gratitude to my parents and each and every member of my family for their continuous support and encouragement in my life to study and struggle.

ChinmayaMahanand

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	(Pages iv-v)
Chapter1: Background	(Pages 1- 14)
Chapter2: The Notion of Equality in the Thought of Lenin	(Pages 15-34)
Chapter3: The Notion of Equality in the Thought of Ambedkar	(Pages 35-65)
Chapter4: Similarities and Differences in the Notions of Equality in Lenin and Ambedkar and their Contemporary Relevance	(Pages 66-106)
Chapter5: Conclusion	(Pages 107-112)
References	(Pages 113-127)

CHAPTER 1

Background

The proposed study intends to examine the concept of equality in the thought of Lenin and Ambedkar. Lenin's revolutionary ideology of Marxism-Leninism which stands to established equality influenced the building of Soviet socialist society. The main goals of his ideology were to make the Soviet society egalitarian in terms of gender and class. Lenin's concept of equality is based on the principles of class struggle, violent revolution and the dictatorship of proletariat. In the case of Ambedkar he fought against the caste system based on the Brahmanical Hinduism which perpetuated social and gender inequality in India. Ambedkar's concept of equality is based on the principle of caste equality, political and social democracy, Cultural Revolution or scientific Buddhism and state socialism. The notion of equality in the thought of Lenin and Ambedkar acquires many similarities and differences. The legacy of the thoughts of Lenin and Ambedkar to establish social equality has contemporary relevance in Russian and Indian societies. Hence the study examines the contemporary relevance of the concept of equality contributed by Lenin and Ambedkar. The study also looks into the similarities and differences of Leninist-Ambedkarist thoughts taking into consideration of the nature of Russian and Indian societies.

The concept of equality provided by Lenin and Ambedkar cannot be studied in isolation of the nature of societies they lived. Russian society was a feudal society with class based hierarchy at the time of Lenin. Organising principle of the Russian society was mainly the class based without any strong immobility and graded inequality like India which helps the oppressed people to make a common front against the common enemies. The tiny upper classes were living on the labour of working masses by controlling them with the means of religion and threat of violence. The poor peasantry and the industrial working constituted majority (one fourth) of the Russian population. According to historian Michael Lynch, the 1897 census divided Russian population into three broad class

categories. The upper classes those are royalty, nobility and higher clergy constituted 12.5 percent of the Russian population. The middle classes like merchants, bureaucrats, professionals constituted 1.5 per cent. The working classes including the soldiers were 4 per cent while the peasants (both landed and landless) alone constituted 82 per cent of the total population.

In such a social condition V.I. Lenin emerged as a revolutionary in Russia and led the Bolshevik revolution. Lenin was a revolutionary who was influenced by the thought of Karl Marx and Engels who advocated the theory of scientific socialism and proletariat violent revolution with the philosophy of historical materialism and dialectical materialism which fascinated many revolutionaries throughout the world. George Plekhanov was one among those who upheld the legacy of Marxism to the Russia for the first time. Therefore he is called as the father of Russian Marxism. Lenin was the product of that ideological legacy, had been inspired and influenced by the G. Plekhanov, an outstanding leader of the new revolutionary organisation. Lenin emerged as a revolutionary leader in a period when the Czarist Russia was going through acute socio-political and economic crisis because of the First World War. Taking advantage of the condition, Lenin led the Bolshevik revolution in October overthrowing the Menshevik government after the February revolution. Lenin for the first time materialised Marxism by applying it to the Russian society. He enriched Marxism with the experience of Bolshevik revolution, theorising new form of challenges and their solution. He also led the international communist movement in his period. Even after the disintegration of USSR, there are many communist parties in the world and in Russia are taking the legacy of Lenin.

B.R. Ambedkar, on the other hand, was a product of that society which was caste based divided into thousand castes with graded inequality without having any mobility where everything was determined by the caste. The society was divided into four groups, Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. Untouchables were considered as the outcaste by the Hindus. They were deprived of basic human rights or dignity, historically oppressed by the Hindus. According to Dr B.R. Ambedkar, the system of caste is not only the division of labour, but also the

division of labourers. Among systems of stratification, the Indian caste system is unique and worse. It never let those at the bottom of the hierarchy to climb up the ladder and live a better life. In India one has to take birth and die in the same caste irrespective of the economic status. Everything in India is caste-based; for good things or bad things, people are organised on the basis of caste. Therefore the organising principle in India is caste unlike class in Russia. The upper three groups of castes, i.e., Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaishya varnas constitute the minority of the Indian population who have been exploiting the vast majority of Shudras, untouchables and tribes.

Being born in untouchable community, Ambedkar struggled hard in his life and established himself not only as the leading intellectual of his time but also as a radical social revolutionary who launched an uncompromising struggle against the Brahmanism in India. He was the first person to give a concrete scientific analysis of the Indian caste system long before the origin of communist movement in India. He dedicated his entire life fighting for the untouchables, women and other oppressed. India the land of Caste witnessed a prolonged struggle against caste in the history starting from Buddha to Ambedkar. Kabir, Tukaram, Guru Ravidas, Bhim Bhoi, Jyotirao Phule, Sabitribai Phule are some of the social revolutionaries who waged a relentless struggle against caste based exploitation. Ambedkar was the product of that revolutionary legacy that was deeply influenced by the thoughts of Kabir, Tukaram, Jyotirao Phule and Buddha. Ambedkar in India is recognised for two things, one is for his struggle against caste or Brahmanism and other is for his drafting the constitution of India.

There are some of the important factors which emphasise the necessity to understand the notion of equality by Lenin and Ambedkar. Some of those factors are given bellow.

As far as the nature of society is concerned, Russia and India differ both qualitatively and quantitatively. The organising principle of Russian society has been the class while caste in India is proved to be the organising principle. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia was a class based revolution which united the whole oppressed people to make a common front against the common enemies.

But in India castes being the self-enclosed classes with graded inequality prevent the oppressed people to make a common front against the common enemies. Starting from the independence struggle to the election pattern or from civil society movement to the people's movement or others, all have been strongly influenced and organised on the basis of caste.

Lenin and Ambedkar represent two leading social revolutionaries of the two different kinds of societies who have toiled and dedicated their lives for the social transformation. Both of them share common objectives in their thought and action and have similar understanding on several issues with some differences imposed by the respective social conditions.

According to Lenin, private property is the source of power which is responsible for the exploitation and inequality in society. But Ambedkar said that not only the private property, but also the social status and religion are the source of power responsible for exploitation of man by man. Lenin held the view that economy or private property determines the social status, but Ambedkar declared that social status is not necessarily determined by the private property; rather private property is also determined by the social status.

Lenin said, economy is the base of every society which determines the politics, government, art, literature, culture, education, way of life, etc. but Ambedkar considered religion and culture as the important sources of power which has determined the economy, politics, art, literature, way of life, habits, etc. He demonstrated that religion in India has not only determined the economy, but also surprisingly it determined the rulers and ruled hereditarily, generation after generation.

Lenin rejected religion as the opium of people, while Ambedkar adopted religion (Scientific Buddhism) as a means social transformation. Similar to the Lenin's notion of class struggle, Ambedkar declared that Indian history is nothing but the history of struggle between Hinduism (Brahmanism) and Buddhism, a form of class struggle.

Ambedkar has shown that the caste which was initially a part of culture (superstructure according to Marxism-Leninism) of the Aryan people became the determining factor in the later period. It not only determined the Indian society but also determined the economy and politics of India for thousand years. This has challenged the fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism where base will be the economy and determine everything. These are some philosophical gaps between the thoughts of Lenin and Ambedkar which need to be studied seriously to strengthen the theories of equality.

The study has the following aims and objectives.

- To examine the notion of equality in the thoughts of Lenin and Ambedkar.
- To study the similarities and differences between Lenin and Ambedkar on the concept of equality.
- To analyse the contemporary relevance of the ideas of equality advocated by Lenin and Ambedkar in Russia and India.

The study has two hypotheses:

- In Russian and Indian societies religion and culture are found to be important forces that determine the character of society, its stratification, structure, values and norms that perpetuate social inequality generation after generation.
- Although the ideas of equality advocated by Lenin and Ambedkar influenced the social transformation in Russia and India, equality in terms of class/caste and gender is yet to be achieved in both societies.

Understanding the Notion of Equality:

The idea of equality has a long history of struggle in human civilisation. It has been evolving simultaneously with the hegemonic ideas of inequality which is rooted in the age old unequal social structure. Perhaps equality as a value or idea is age old as the history of inequality. Human civilisation witnessed many wars

and battles for the idea of equality. Many social revolutionaries like Buddha, Jesus Christ, Muhammad and many others preached and advocated the ideas of equality. But the slogan of equality was vibrantly raised in the modern period. It started in the 17th century and culminated in 18th and 19th centuries. French revolution marked the turning point for the idea of equality in the human history. It smashed the hegemonic feudal structure of inequality raising the slogan of equality, liberty and fraternity. After this the struggle for equality and freedom gained momentum throughout the world taking inspiration from the struggles in Europe. In the early twentieth century Russian revolution strived for the social equality which was rejected the modern democratic republics. People started considering all these republics as the system of wage slavery and capitalist exploitation. Following this civil war broke out in China and other parts of the world in middle of 20th centuries for equality and freedom.

With the changing of society and passing of time, the idea of equality has also undergone changes and been interpreted differently at different periods with new vigour and aspiration. Today there are various conflicting ideologies interpreting equality from different angles. Equality now has become a correcting principle and a slogan against all kinds of inequality in society. The inequality of wealth, power and prestige which remained as the basic social structure since long time was challenged in the modern period. For a long time inequality among men has been generally accepted as an unalterable fact in the human history. Ancient and medieval writers, when they discussed about the social hierarchy, always provided a rationalisation and justification of the established order in terms of a religious doctrine. But since the American and French Revolutions, the social class who represented inequality and exploitation become an object of scientific study and widespread condemnation (Bottomore 1965).

It's a fact that scientific and rational thinking about the social structure led to the demand of social change. Before the demand of equality became a strong force, many scientific studies were developed on social structures which questioned the existing structural inequality. One of the great scholars of that period, J.J. Rousseau (1755) theorised two kinds of inequalities found in social life. One is

natural inequality and other is conventional or manmade inequality. Natural inequality represents the inequality of age, physical strength and mind. On the other hand conventional inequality consists in the difference of privileges on the basis of wealth, prestige and power. This is a manmade social inequality created by the social order deliberately designed by the men themselves. The French Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizen (1789), was strongly inspired by the revolutionary thought of Rousseau. He said that men are born free and equal in rights. However these days with the devolvement of science, some of the natural inequalities are being reduced like a physical disability, blindness and others. But this is also conditioned with the economy in a capitalist social system. On the other hand the large part of the humanity is deprived of their basic human rights of the modern civilisation because of the prevailing social inequality and discrimination which is not natural but manmade. Thus unlike an abstract idea the demand of equality was raised to accelerate the process of social change against the social inequality, injustice and exploitation. As John Rees in his *Equality* (1971) has explained that it is when man saw certain inequalities as unjust and alterable, then only equality as an idea becomes a potent force in political life. Therefore the idea of equality developed as ideal of social transformation phase by phase in the society with the growth of scientific study and literature on inequality and social structure.

Many sociologists and political scientists believed that there was equality in the primitive stage of human civilisation. The society was very simple unlike the present without any distinction on the basis of property, social status and power. There was no such structural violence on people based on gender, class, caste, religion or identities. The great sociologist Friedrich Engels (1884) said that the society was matriarchal without class and exploitation in the primitive communism. For millions of years the human race lived in primitive communism without having inequality in their social life. But at a particular point of the human history with the development of forces of production, private property or stable property emerged which created inequality in the social relationship. With this the society and class structure went on changing creating different kinds of social structure with divides such as master-slave, landlord-serf and capitalist-

worker. Inequality of different kinds emerged with the division of society into haves and have-nots based on private property and social status. This has been the reason for many revolts and civil war in the human society. With the passing of time, the forms of inequality is also changing according to the increasing demands and struggle for equality in society.

In ancient period, in Greek philosophy two different traditions emerged. One represented by Plato and Aristotle who defended inequality and the others represented by Pericles, the Sophists, Antiphon, Lycophron, Euripides and the Stoics who upheld the idea of equality. Plato classified men into men of gold, silver and iron and the Greeks were regarded superior to other races (*The Republic*). Aristotle justified the slavery and maintained the superiority of master over the slaves (*Politics*). Women and slaves were regarded inferior by birth. During this period, stoic philosophers like Zeno, Cecero and Seneca gave the idea of equality, universal brotherhood and citizenship which was based on natural law and reason. The revolutionary struggle for equality was waged under the leadership of Spartacus during Roman period. Two centuries before the Christ, another leader of slaves, Aristonicus declared the establishment of the "State of Equals".

During medieval period, Christianity raised the voice of equality in the beginning but soon it got converted into equality before God. It preached that in the eye of God all are equal but there can be inequality in the earth. During this period feudalism emerged in Europe and rules of aristocracy developed. This was the period when inequality and exploitation of many kinds were sanctioned and legitimised through many institutions ideologically through religion. During this period society was broadly divided into two classes, one represented the tiny minority of clergy, nobility and landlords who had monopoly over everything while other represented the vast majority of serfs and slaves who had only duties. Fighting against these privileges of the oppressor class, the modern concept of equality before law and equality by birth emerged.

Modern period starts with the emergence of a new property owner class at the later phase of feudalism due to the changes occurred in the production system of

the society. This class challenged the existing privileges of the feudal order and revolted against it in every sphere. This period is known as the period of renaissance and reformation which established the bourgeois humanism against the feudal values and norms. The world witnessed many important socio-political transformations happened throughout the world for the idea of equality. The English revolution of 1649 and 1688, the American declaration of independence (1776) and French revolution of 1789 are the famous socio-political developments for the idea of equality.

The concept of equality was backed by rationalism and enlightenment of the 18th century, especially in England and France. The middle classes started demanding their economic, political and legal equality which led to the downfall of the feudal order. Various thinkers of enlightenment strongly raised the voice of equality. Rousseau (1755) was one among them who strongly pleaded for equality and declared that inequality developed because of the private property and civilisation (*Discourse on Inequality*). However, the concept of equality in the 18th century was more legal and political, i.e. to abolish special privileges and less economic and social. But there were also the voices for the socio-economic equality developing side by side with the legal equality. Liberal Condorcet and revolutionary Babeuf emphasised the economic aspect of equality. Babeuf was a French political agitator and journalist of the French revolutionary period who was killed in 1797 because of his radical slogan of socio-economic equality.

Eighteenth century witnessed the development of political and legal equality but in the 19th century the demand for socio-economic equality was strongly raised by the emerging working class. Economic disparities increased because of the profit making capitalism. The working class realised that the 18th century liberalism that the legal and political equality would not lead to economic and social equality. Therefore working class movements started in Europe demanding economic and social equality which led to the development of a radical working class philosophy i.e. Marxism which advocated the theory of violent revolution and proletariat dictatorship for the real emancipation of the workers and real

equality (1969: 98-137). The demand for economic equality was also raised by the humanists, utopian socialist and positive liberals. In 19th century the demand for adult franchise became the battle cry, as a result many Reforms Act of 1832, 1867, and 1884 were implemented in Britain. In America the civil war (1861-66) led to the abolition of slavery.

The 20th century witnessed many militant struggles for equality. The most significant and glorious revolution occurred in Russia and China in twentieth century for social and economic equality. Working class government were established for the first time which rejected the bourgeois democracy as a system of wage slavery. The nineteenth century's dreams of the working class movement was materialised in the 20th century which aimed to establish equality in its real sense abolishing private property in the society. Working class movement defined equality with regard to the abolition of classes and exploitation in society.

Another significant development happened in this century was the national freedom struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism. That was a historical movement against the national oppression throughout the world. This movement also abolished the feudal monarchy in their respective states and adopted bourgeois democracy. That was a phase of freedom, equality and liberty. This period also witnessed many radical social movement against social oppression. Black movement emerged in USA and Africa against racism and for socio-economic equality. The "Black Panther" movement militantly raised the slogan of social and economic equality. In October of 1966, in Oakland California, Huey Newton and Bobby Seale founded the Black Panther Party for Self-Defence. The Panthers practised militant self-defence of minority communities against the U.S. government, and fought to establish revolutionary socialism through mass organizing and community based programs. During this period India has also witnessed many anti Brahminical and anti-caste movement. Ambedkar was one of the leading figures of the anti-caste and anti Brahminical movement who strongly raised the demand of social and economic equality. Taking inspiration the "Black Panther" movement, "Dalit Panther" movement started in India against the Brahmanism and capitalism raising the slogan of

social equality. Dalit panther founded in April 1972 in Mumbai by Namdev Dhasal, Raja Dhale and Arun Kamble, a militant Dalit youth organisation raised radical slogan against injustice and inequality.

Therefore this is the era of social and economic equality because the demand for socio-economic equality is gaining momentum throughout the world. Working masses have realised that the capitalism cannot provide them the real equality.

The concept of equality is many a times confused the words like identical, same, similar and equitable. But in political terms, equality as a concept is totally different from all these. Equality cannot be defined as an abstract concept. Equality demands a progressive reduction of inequality; it does not imply literal equalisation. The word inequality may be thought to be right or wrong according to the prevailing idea of social justice. This is fact that in ancient, medieval period including in the modern capitalism inequality was justified by the various intellectuals form time to time. But with the development of the socialist ideas particularly after the Marxian views, inequality was regarded as unjust and exploitation. Marx (1818-83) and Engels (1820-95) have declared that the division of society into classes – haves and have-nots involves exploitation which is detrimental for the development of the condition of human happiness. The idea of equality does not represent the view that all the material resources should be distributed equally to all the member of the society. But the man who is different in their mental and physical capacity, talents and resources should be provided proper opportunity for the development of their personality. R. H. Tawney in his *Equality* (1938) said that the sentiment of justice is satisfied not by offering to every man identical treatment, but by treating different individuals differently accordingly to their choices and capacity.

Laski says that no idea is more difficult in the realm of political science than equality. Similarly Tawney said that the word equality possesses more than one meaning. As far the real meaning of equality is concerned, it is not an absolute or abstract term. It does not mean that all man must be treated alike in all respect. By nature there are certain inequality among one man and others. Rousseau

termed it as the natural inequality. However the most important inequalities are those which are created by the man. Rousseau termed it as the conventional inequality. Inequality on the basis of economy, caste, colour, sex, place of birth, religion are the manmade inequality much more detrimental than the natural inequality and these inequality can be removed by social action. Equality does not imply identical treatment to all. It means proportional equality i.e. equality among equals and inequality among unequal. Injustice arises not only because of treating unequal but also because of treating equals unequally. Equality must be understood and analysed with reference to the society and social structure. Equality means the absence of all form of exploitation of man by man, community by community or nation by nation. Privileged should not be treated equal to the unprivileged. Equality means the availability of opportunity to each and everyone for the fullest development human personality. But mere equal opportunity will not work in a society which is full of inequality and exploitation on the basis of property, social status, power and authority. According to Laski, equality means the following things,

- 1) End of special privileges in the society.
- 2) Adequate opportunities are laid down to all and each must develop his/her personality.
- 3) All must have access to social benefits and no one should be restricted on any ground. The inequality by birth is unreasonable.
- 4) Absence of economic and social exploitation.

Most of the rational and practical definitions of equality conform this meaning of equality. However equality has its various dimensions like legal, political, social and economic. The ideas of equality was first raised as the demand of legal equality, that is grant of equal legal status to all irrespective of their birth, physical and mental capacities or other difference. J.J Rousseau, in his Social Contract (1762) said that instead of destroying natural inequalities, a moral and lawful equality must be imposed upon men so that all become equal by convention and legal right. Ancient societies did not even entertain the idea of

legal equality. Manusmriti in India classified the degree of punishment for the same crime on the basis of grade of caste. There was a long reign of legal inequality in the human society. On the idea of legal equality or equality before law, J. R. Lucas, in his *Principles of Politics* (1976), has observed that equality before law does not guarantee equal treatment by the law but equal access to the law.

Political equality stands for the political rights of the citizens. It implies the rights of the people in politics, government and in administration. The demand of the political equality originated along with that of that legal equality in 19th century. As D.D Raphael has observed that the French revolutionaries while demanding equality also demanded a removal of arbitrary political privileges to the rich and the well-born. (*Problems of Political Philosophy*:1976). Political equality evolved as revolutionary ideas which led to the establishment of democracy through the world, but it failed to achieve the aspiration of the common masses which was much more social.

Social equality stands for the equality on the basis of social position, prestige and status. It implies that no individual should be discriminated or deprived of anything on the basis of class, caste, colour, sex, languages, etc. It is an established fact that people are not only exploited on the basis of class but also on the basis of colour, caste, gender and other social factors. The demand for social equality was raised in 19th century because of the growing working class movement and the black movement which echoed in different parts of the world. It got strengthened in 20th century with the militant movement of socially oppressed people throughout the world.

The most generally accepted meaning of economic equality is that no individual should be deprived of his or her mental, moral, physical and social development because of the economy. It means individual should not be discriminated or exploited because of the economy. Economic plays the determining factor in every kind of equality. Therefore Marxist or socialist scholars considered economic equality as the social equality. Lenin in his liberal professor on equality, said, social equality means the abolition of classes. Moreover the

Russian and Chinese Revolutions of 20th century were the battles for the economic equality. Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-59) postulated that the difference between political equality and economic equality would not be indefinitely accepted by the democratic people, in his *Democracy in America* (1835-40). Therefore he said the first phase of democratic world revolution, political in nature will inevitably lead to the second phase that is economic and social. Economic equality has been the historic demands of the oppressed and working people. Economic equality stands for the abolition of classes and private property which is the root cause for the exploitation. S.I. Benn and R.S. Peters (1975) have said that the term social equality has been adopted by socialists largely to distinguish their objective from the earlier egalitarian ideals of the French revolution (*Social Principles and the Democratic State*).

CHAPTER 2

The Notion of Equality in the Thought of Lenin

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin was a great social revolutionary and a pragmatic leader of Russia. He led the famous Bolshevik revolution of 1917 and established worker's government for the first time in the world. He was also a great philosopher of the early 20th century who has had significant impact and contribution in the field of social science and international studies. He implemented the theory of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels on ground for the first time. He successfully established the proletarian dictatorship in Russia after going through a process of violent revolution, as Marx had theorised. Lenin's notion of equality is not detached from the theory of Marx and Engels, nor is it a simple adoption; rather he enriched and updated the theory with the changing time and context.

Lenin devoted his entire life for the cause of social transformation. Therefore his notion of equality cannot be studied in isolation of the larger socio-economic conditions and his political activism therein. His idea of equality is interdisciplinary in its nature, as it covers politics, economy, sociology, history, anthropology and other subjects. Economic equality occupies a central position in Lenin's thought unlike liberal intellectuals who generally emphasise on political equality and rights. Lenin's notion of equality is associated with basic three concepts without which we cannot understand Lenin's perspective holistically. These three concepts are violent revolution, dictatorship of proletariat and withering away of state (Lenin's *The State and Revolution*, first published in 1918, Moscow). The three are organically interrelated stages of transformation, and therefore cannot be separated and studied in abstraction. In other words, the conceptualisation is such that one event follows the other systematically; for instance violent revolution is immediately followed by the dictatorship of proletariat which gradually leads to the withering away of class and state. The

transformation realised through these events and organised working class actions is further intrinsically linked with Lenin's notion of equality. According to Lenin, there cannot be equality in society without socialism (complete workers' ownership over the means of production) and there can be no socialism without the violent overthrow of bourgeois by the proletariat. Again, he said that without dictatorship of proletariat, there will be no real socialism and the withering away of state. He considered state as a means of subjection of one class by another. He said that so long as state remains, there can be no real freedom and equality in society. Therefore according to his theory state will wither away along with class and inequality, and this will not happen without going through the process of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin (1972: 144-147) highlighted the basic idea about equality in his article 'Liberal Professor on Equality'. In this article Lenin responded to Tugan-Baranovsky who rejected Marxism by saying that equality, or the process of overcoming inequality cannot be deduced or established from experience and reason. Here he equated social inequality with natural ability or similarity. Lenin countered him by saying that overcoming natural inequalities, that is dissimilarities in terms of strength and ability (physical and mental), is not the concern of socialists. However on the basis of natural dissimilarities, social inequalities are *naturalised* (rather than natural) in our experience and reason, and breaking that is the programme of establishing socialism. In rejecting the liberal idea of absolute equality, Lenin defined equality in terms of rights – social, political and economic. Such an understanding was rooted in the idea that inequalities in society is entrenched and perpetuated through unequal distribution of rights, dignity, privilege and ownership of means of production among different classes.

By political equality, Lenin meant the equal political rights of all citizens. This right implies the rights of citizens to elect and to be elected i.e. to form the government. Lenin said that these rights were demanded not by proletariat but by the bourgeoisie against the medieval, feudal, serf-owner and caste privileges. He said that these rights are assured by most of the democratic republics throughout

the world. But Lenin clearly declared that the mere political equality would not bring equality in society where there are classes based on private property. Therefore he said that economic equality is necessary to establish real equality in society. By economic equality he meant the abolition of classes in society. He demonstrated that the human history has witnessed always class based oppression where a tiny ruling class exclusively control the production system and live on the labour of the oppressed masses, exploiting the whole humanity. He said that equality cannot be established in a society where there is inequality based on the ownership over the means of production. As far as the social equality is concerned, Lenin said that social equality means equality in social status (Lenin 1972). But he did not speak much on social equality as something different from the economic equality. His notion of social equality is directly linked with the economic equality. Economic equality occupies a prominent position in the thought of Lenin so far equality in society is concerned.

Lenin's notion of equality does not end here with the mere assumption of abolition of classes. Lenin's notion of equality revolves around the concept of dictatorship of proletariat that is followed by the overthrowing of landlords and bourgeois by the proletariat and peasants through the means of violence revolution. Lenin stands for the idea that equality cannot be established without going through the process of dictatorship of proletariat which immediately follows the violent revolution of the proletariat and peasants that leads to the withering away of state at the end (1972: 144-147). This process is not just a replacement of one class by another in positions of privilege, but a systemic socio-economic transformation. Therefore Lenin defined equality not in isolation of the condition required. The project of Lenin's notion equality will remain incomplete without going through the prerequisite conditions necessary for it, which are violent revolution, dictatorship of proletariat and withering away of the state.

Lenin referred to Engels (1947) and said that the concept equality is moulded from the relations of commodity production (*Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*). He holds the view that equality becomes fake

and rhetorical if it does not mean the abolition of classes in society. He considered this distinction as very elementary which must not be forgotten. He said that if equality is understood as the abolition of classes, then the overthrowing the bourgeoisie by the proletariat becomes decisive step towards the abolition of classes (Lenin 1965: 107-117). Therefore he declared that in order to abolish the classes proletariat must wage its class struggle and capture the state power for combating bourgeoisie and the vacillating petty bourgeoisie (Lenin 1965).

Lenin declared two truths in his thought on equality. One is that the oppressor and the oppressed cannot be equal. Lenin considered it as the essence of socialism. Another truth is that there can be no real equality until all possibility of the exploitation of one class by another has been totally destroyed (<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1918/prrk/equality.htm>). Showing the reason behind his two truths, Lenin said that the oppressor since generations have been powerful because of their property, education and habits while the oppressed people have been historically oppressed, ignorant and disunited.

For Lenin equality and true democracy are coterminous and contingent on each other. He said that the importance of the proletariat's struggle for equality and democracy can only be realised if it is understood as the abolition of classes. He viewed that the present day democracy means only formal equality whereas the moment true equality can be achieved in society with regards to the ownership over the means of production. Lenin (1918) further explains that, that will be the phase when society will transition from the principle of each-according-to-his-ability to each-according-to-his-needs. He further said that the struggle of the working class, for a true democracy is of even greater importance as it is a larger fight against the exploitative capitalist system in general. He said that democracy is not something static and closed that cannot develop or move forward. He understood it as a road from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism to communism (Lenin 1918: 381-492).

Democracy occupies a prominent position in the Lenin's notion of equality. He said that democracy is not equal to the subordination of the minority to the

majority. To him democracy is a state which recognizes the subordination of the minority to the majority that is an organization for the systematic use of force by one class against another, by one section of the population against another. But he said that the ultimate aim of socialism is to abolish all organized and systematic violence of man against man. That would be the day of equality for Lenin that will lead towards communism where the subordination of one man to another and of one section to another will not be observed. People will be accustomed to live a social life without subordination and violence. Regarding this new life, Lenin referred Engels and said that the new generation reared in new and free social conditions will be able to throw out the entire yoke of the state including the democratic-republican state (Lenin 1918: 381-492). That would be the day of communism as viewed by Lenin where there will be no classes, no exploitation and no state.

Therefore Lenin's notion of equality encapsulates concepts like violent revolution, dictatorship of proletariat or proletarian democracy and withering away of the state which are organically associated without which we cannot even think of equality. Now I would like go through these concepts to explain the Lenin's notion of equality.

Violent Revolution:

Regarding the concept of violent revolution, Lenin referred Engels' historical analysis of the role and necessity of violent revolution. He said that that force plays revolutionary role in the history of the world. He considered it as the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with a new one. He advocated the view that force is required to overthrow of an economy based on exploitation (Lenin 1964: 398-421). But he has said that all use of force is not revolutionary. Lenin said that without a violent revolution the overthrow of bourgeois state is impossible. But he didn't apply it to the proletarian state because such abolition would be impossible; the proletarian state will wither away as society progresses towards communism. He held the view that violent revolution is the first step towards the struggle for equality.

Lenin said that violent revolution for capture of state power in a bourgeois-democratic society is inevitable. He referred to both Marx and Engels and said that the bourgeois state cannot be superseded by the proletarian state through a gradual withering of the former. He said that it can only be abolished by a violent revolution. To him without the violent destruction of the bourgeois state machinery, the proletariat revolution is impossible. Defending the concept of violent revolution by Marx and Engels he said that this principle was not derived out of any speculation or dogma. These views were given by Marx and Engels after studying each particular revolutionary situation and its experiences (Lenin 1918).

So the point here is there can be no real socialism or equality in society without the violent overthrow of the bourgeois state. Again the violent revolution cannot create real socialism by itself according to Lenin. Lenin said that in order to have real socialism, the violent revolution by proletariat must be developed into proper mechanism of proletariat dictatorship to protect the revolution and to establish real socialism. Lenin said that without dictatorship the proletariat cannot disarm the bourgeois and crush their resistance. Now I will go to the second concept, 'dictatorship of proletariat' that is followed by the violent revolution, organically associated with the concept of equality in the Lenin's thought.

Dictatorship of proletariat:

Regarding the concept of the proletariat dictatorship, Lenin said that it is a big word and big words should not be thrown haphazardly. He said that proletariat dictatorship is an iron rule in which the revolutionary government suppress both exploiters and hooligan ruthlessly (Lenin 1972: 235-77). He considered it as a new form of the class struggle which aimed to create proletarian democracy by destroying bourgeois democracy. Lenin said that bourgeoisie can be defeated by a revolution even without the dictatorship of the proletariat. But that revolution cannot crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie to maintain its victory without the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Lenin 1965)

Lenin said that to crush the counter-revolutionary resistance of the bourgeoisie and to curb the influence of petty bourgeois reactionaries, authority of armed people has to be maintained. These are the basic objectives of the dictatorship of proletariat (1918). Lenin countered Kautsky who argued that there was no need of dictatorship when the party (Bolshevik) itself was in majority. Lenin highlighted the need of dictatorship of proletariat, cautioning that soon after complete military suppression of the bourgeoisie the danger of petty-bourgeois anarchy might emerge. He strongly believed that propaganda, persuasion or cultural programmes cannot fight against these forces alone. He takes coercion as a legitimate means to fight against them (Lenin 1972: 235-77).

Suppressing the resistance of the landlords and capitalists who have been overthrown is the important part of the dictatorship of proletariat. Besides this, organising all the working people to rally behind the proletariat and build up the army of the revolution against foreign enemies or imperialism are also the basic purposes of this dictatorship (Stalin 1953).

Lenin said that the transition from capitalism to communism is a historically important period and till capitalism is finished off, the exploiters will hope for the restoration. Contextualising this reality in the case of Russia with the reaction of exploiter after Bolshevik revolution, he said the exploiters who had not expected their defeats, have now developed their energy tenfold with furious passion and hatred searching for a battle to recover their paradise.

Regarding the nature of petty bourgeois he said that behind the capitalists there are thousands of petty bourgeoisies. He said that they vacillate from one camp to the other. One day they take the side of proletariat and the other day they fear the difficulties of the revolution (Lenin, Vol. XXIII, p. 355). Lenin stressed the clear possibility of bourgeois restoration and said that even after the Bolshevik revolution; the bourgeoisie remained stronger than the proletariat. He has explained some of reasons for their restoration. He highlighted some of the important sources of power for the bourgeois which make them powerful than the proletariat even during the period of dictatorship. First there is the strength of international capital and its international connections of the bourgeoisie.

Secondly, even after revolution, they will have numbers of political advantages like properties, education, organisation, etc. Lenin said that money cannot be abolished all at once. He said that the bourgeois will have movable property, habits of organisation and management knowledge on customs, methods, means and their immense potential. Besides these he said that superior education, close connections with the higher technical personnel as well as their greater knowledge and experiences in the field of war makes them powerful. The third source of power of bourgeois lies in the habit of small production. Lenin viewed that the small production is still widespread which promotes capitalism. He said that abolition of classes not only stands for elimination of landlords and capitalists but also for the abolition of the small commodity producers. He said that the small scale producer cannot be suppressed. He advised that the small scale producers must be educated properly with great patience through long term organizational work (Lenin, Vol. XXV, pp. 173-189). After all, for Lenin the dictatorship of the proletariat is most ruthless against the more powerful bourgeois whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow. Therefore Lenin said that proletariat dictatorship it is not only a violent, bloody and military act but also a peaceful, bloodless, educational, administrative and economic act against the forces of the old society (Lenin, Vol. XXV, pp. 173, 190).

Lenin was aware of the difficulties to fight against the mass petty bourgeois influences. He said that millions of peasants, officials and bourgeois intellectuals that under the dictatorship of the proletariat need to be re-educated to subordinate them all to the proletarian state and to proletarian leadership to overcome the bourgeois habits and traditions. He has also said that even the proletariat do not leave their petty-bourgeois prejudices at one stroke. They must be sensitised in the course of prolonged mass struggle against the mass petty-bourgeois influences.

So the dictatorship of proletariat is not all about the forceful suppression of bourgeois, it is also a protracted ideological struggle to re-educate the proletariat and workers for the revolutionary transformation of society as a whole. Lenin's notion of equality therefore, lives with the idea of dictatorship of proletariat to

smash the resistance of bourgeois after the violent proletarian revolution in order to create a condition for the realisation of real equality in society. Now I would like to discuss the idea of proletarian democracy or the relative existence of both equality and inequality even in the era of dictatorship of proletariat.

Equality at the era of dictatorship of proletariat:

Soon after the Bolshevik revolution under the leadership of Lenin, dictatorship of the proletariat was carried out in Russia. Lenin said that for the first time, the working people emancipated themselves from their age old oppressors. He said that this revolution has been ignored by the supporters of the bourgeoisie who rhetorically speak about freedom and equality. Lenin said that the dictatorship of working people after revolution is a correct step towards real equality and freedom. He considered parliamentary bourgeois democracy as a false democracy and claimed that the working people have rejected it by supporting the Soviet government, which in turn will work towards real equality and freedom.

Regarding the achievement of peasants after the revolution, Lenin said that peasantry were the first to gain from the dictatorship of the proletariat. He said that under the rule of landowners and capitalists, the peasants in Russia were dying of hunger and starvation. The peasants never had any chance to work for themselves. They were exploited severely and starved while producing and giving millions of tons of grain to the capitalists. He said that for the first time the peasants were working for themselves under Soviet government and were free from starvation. He said that maximum equality was established in the distribution of the land where the peasants were dividing the land according to the number of mouths to feed (Lenin 1965: 107-117).

While pointing to the inequality among workers and peasants even during the dictatorship, Lenin said that socialism means the abolition of classes and in order to abolish classes it is necessary to abolish the difference between the factory worker and the peasant. He said that unless and until all become workers, socialism could not be realised. He said that socialism cannot be realised at one stroke. He said that to abolish the difference between workers and peasants is

more difficult and will take a long time that could not be solved by means of coercion.

Lenin said that this problem could be solved by the organisational reconstruction of the whole social economy, that is, individual commodity production must be transformed to large-scale social production. He said that this process needs to be protracted, where assistance must be provided to the peasants to improve their farming techniques to reform it radically. He said that to do this the proletariat after the revolution must take its policy towards the peasantry. Lenin provided some of the fundamental lines to be followed while implementing this important task. He said that the proletariat must demarcate the working peasant from peasant profiteers. He said that the whole essence of socialism lies in this demarcation.

Liberal intellectuals accused Lenin for creating this demarcation of worker from the peasant. They also accused Lenin of violating freedom, equality and democracy pointing to the dissolution of Assembly, the forcible confiscation of surplus grain, restriction on bourgeois, so on. But Lenin replied that nowhere in the world so much has been done to eliminate the actual inequality like Bolshevik government. He said that recognising equality with the peasant profiteer is no way different from recognising equality between the exploiter and the exploited.

Regarding the abolition of classes and inequality, Lenin declared that classes cannot be abolished at one stroke even under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He said that when classes will disappear in society the dictatorship of proletariat will become unnecessary. He said that without the dictatorship classes will not disappear. But he said that each class undergoes changes during the dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Lenin under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle does not disappear rather it takes different forms. Therefore inequality does not disappear completely at the era of dictatorship of proletariat. When inequality disappears among classes the dictatorship of proletariat ceases to exist (Lenin 1965: 107-117).

Equality at the first phase of communist society:

Lenin, referring Marx (Marx/Engels 1970 13-30), rejected the Lassalle's idea that under socialism the worker will receive the full product of his labour (*The Critique of the Gotha Programme*). Lenin like Marx upheld that a reserve fund must be deducted from the whole of social labour. He said that this will be the fund for the expansion of production. Further, from the means of consumption, a fund must be deducted for administrative expenses like schools, hospitals, old people's homes and so on. Lenin defended the theory of Marx that the communist society emerges from capitalist society which is in every aspect, morally, intellectually and economically stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it comes.

Therefore the communist society which has just taken birth from the womb of capitalism cannot stand for the full product of the labour. Marx termed this phase as the first or lower phase of communist society. (Lenin, 1918)

Lenin said in this phase of the communist society the means of production will no longer be the private property of individuals. It means it will belong to the whole society. He said that every member of society doing a socially-necessary work will receive a certificate from society, through which he can access consumer goods of corresponding quantity. After that a deduction is made so that the amount of labour every worker gets from society, is as much as he has given to it. But he said that the Lassalle's idea of equitable distribution, that is, equal right of all to an equal product of labour, does not work. Rejecting the idea of equal rights at this phase Lenin referred to Marx in stating that equal right is a bourgeois law which implies inequality. Therefore he said that 'equal rights' in class divided society is an injustice and violation of true equality. He said that people are not alike, one is strong and another is weak, one has more children and another has less, one is married and another is not, and so on. He said that with an equal labour and an equal share in the social consumption fund one will receive more than another. As a result it will create inequality. Therefore Lenin (1918: 381-492) said that the Right instead of being equal has to be unequal to check inequality.

Lenin upheld Marx's idea of inevitable inequality of men in this phase. He said that mere conversion of the means of production into common property of the whole society does not remove the defects of distribution. He declared that so long as products are divided according to the amount of labour performed, the inequality of bourgeois laws will continue to exist. He said that these defects are inevitable in this phase as it has developed from the capitalist society. He said that law can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development is conditioned thereby (Lenin 1918: 381-492). Therefore Lenin (1965) said that in this phase, the bourgeois law cannot be abolished completely. But in socialism, what was considered as private property under bourgeois law is abolished and means of production are converted into common property ("Economics and Politics in the Era of The Dictatorship of The Proletariat").

Lenin said that it is utopian to think that after overthrowing capitalism people will learn to work for society without any rules of law. He said the abolition of capitalism will not immediately create the economic prerequisites for communism. Therefore he emphasised the need of state in this stage to safeguard the social ownership of the means of production. He said that state is required to safeguard equality in labour and in the distribution of products. He said that the state will wither away when there will be no capitalists and no classes to be suppressed.

Therefore in this stage the state is not withered away which by its very definition safeguards bourgeois law which sanctifies actual inequality. Therefore he said that there will be no real justice and equality in the first phase of communist society. But he said that the exploitation of man by man will become impossible in this stage because the means of production are no longer private property. Thus Lenin rejected the Lassalle's ideas about equality and justice. Lenin (1918) said that the communist society at its first phases will bound to abolish the injustice of the means of production but cannot eliminate the other injustice resulting from the distribution of consumer goods according to the amount of labour performed and not according to needs (*State and Revolution*).

Lenin said that so far as the distribution of products and the allotment of labour is concerned bourgeois law does exist in society. He said that the socialist principles, "He who does not work shall not eat" and "An equal amount of products for an equal amount of labour", are realized in this phase. But this is not communism.

Second or highest phase of communist society and withering away of the state:

While explaining the higher phase of communism, Lenin referred to Marx and said that when the subordination of the individual to the division of labour and the antithesis between mental and physical labour vanish, the higher phase of communist society will come. He said that in this stage, labour will become not only a livelihood but will become life's prime want and all productive forces will increase and all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow abundantly. He said that the bourgeois law will be left behind and society will realise the principle of equality and transition from each-according-to-his-ability to each-according-to-his-needs in this phase (Lenin 1918).

He said that the economic basis for the complete withering away of the state is a high state of development of communism where the antithesis between mental and physical labour disappears. He has said that the social inequality based property will also disappear in this phase because the social ownership over means of production could not be removed.

He said that the overthrow of capitalists by workers will make it possible for the productive forces to develop to a great extent. Observing the incredible progress of productive forces under capitalism, he was confident that the expropriation of the capitalists will inevitably lead to a significant development of the productive forces. But he said that how rapidly this development will happen, how soon the division of labour will end with the antithesis between mental and physical labour and transforming labour into life's prime want is not known.

That is why he confined himself to speak only about the inevitable withering away of the state realizing the protracted nature of this process. He said that this

stage depends on the rapidity of development of the higher phase of communism. He left these questions to the time because there is no material to speak on those questions. He said that people will be accustomed to observing the fundamental rules of social intercourse in this stage. Lenin said that the people will work voluntarily as per their ability when the labour will become productive. This would be the phase where the bourgeois law which maintains the inequality will vanish. He said that there would be no need of state to distribute the products and to regulate the quantity. He said that each will take freely according to his needs in the highest stage of communist society.

However Lenin declared the need of a strong control by over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption till the higher phase of communism is reached. But he said that this control must begin with the expropriation of the bourgeois as well as the establishment of the workers government which would be run by a state of armed workers and not by bureaucrats.

He spoke about the scientific distinction between socialism and communism. He referred to Marx and said socialism means the first or lower phase of communist society. He said that as the means of production becomes common property in the socialism, the word “communism” is applicable here. But he clearly said that this is not complete communism. He defined socialism and its stages as the economic maturity of communism (Lenin 1918).

According to Lenin the remnants of the old society always survive in the new, for a period, which is found both in nature and society. He said that Marx did not randomly placed “bourgeois” law in communism. Lenin said that it is inevitable in a society which is developing from capitalism.

Lenin declared that democracy means equality and equality must be understood in relation to the abolition of classes. He presented that as soon as equality is achieved for all members of society in relation to ownership of the means of production, humanity will inevitably move forward towards actual equality (Lenin 1918). He believed that democracy at a certain stage of its development welds the proletariat class which wages a revolutionary struggle against

capitalism and smash the republican-bourgeois state machine, the standing army, the police and the bureaucracy by forming a militia of entire population. Regarding nature of democracy in this stage, Lenin said that democracy has a greater importance to the working class for its emancipation against the capitalists. He considered democracy as a step from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism to communism. He said that democracy is a form of the state which recognised the organized use of force against persons. At the same time he said that it recognizes the equality of citizens regarding determining the structure the state and to administer it.

He said that in the higher stage of the communist society democracy undergoes qualitative changes after the socialist reorganization by crossing the boundary of bourgeois society. Lenin said, that will be the society of real equality and democracy. There will be no classes because there will be no distinction among people with regards to the means of production. Lenin (1918: 381-492) said that the people will be free from the capitalist slavery and will be accustomed to observe the fundamental rules of social intercourse without force, without subordination and without the state.

Lenin said that the development of capitalism has already created the preconditions for the communism. Some of the preconditions Lenin has mentioned are the universal literacy, training of millions of workers, socialized apparatus of the postal service, railways, big factories, large-scale commerce, banking and others. Therefore Lenin said that it is quite possible to proceed immediately for a socialist system of production and distribution by the armed workers after the revolution. He said that the scientifically trained staff of engineers, agronomists who are working today under capitalists will work better tomorrow under the wishes of the armed workers.

He has emphasised the need of accounting and control for the smooth working in the first phase of communist society. In this stage all citizens will be transformed into hired employees consists of the armed workers. They will work equally and will get equal pay. He said that any literate person can perform the accounting and control that is of supervising, recording and others in this stage. He believed

that majority of the people in this stage will begin independently to keep such accounts and will control over the capitalists and intellectuals who preserve the capitalist habits. He viewed that this control will really become popular and universal. He said “the whole of society will have to become a single office and a single factory, with equality of labour and pay” (Lenin 1918).

Lenin said that the proletariat after overthrowing the exploiters will extend this “factory discipline” to the whole of society which is necessary step for cleansing capitalist exploitation and for further progress. Therefore he said when the vast majority of society will have learned to administer the state controlling over the reactionaries, the need for government will begin to disappear. He declared that the more complete the democracy, the nearer the moment when it becomes unnecessary. He said that the “state” of armed workers which is no longer a state in the real sense of the word will replace every form of state.

Lenin said there people will have the ability to administer the state and the social production. He said that the people will keep accounts and control over the parasites. They will observe the fundamental rules of the social intercourse which will become a habit. Then the process of transition from the first phase of communist society to its higher phase will begin with the complete withering away of the state.

However, Lenin does not deny the possibility of excesses on the part of individual persons in this stage. Lenin said that there will no special machine required to suppress the excesses. He visualised two mechanisms to check these problems. Firstly the excesses will be checked by the armed people themselves as simply as any crowd even in present day try to stop a conflict or prevent the woman from being assaulted. Secondly the fundamental social cause of excesses like poverty and others that is responsible for the exploitation of the people will be absent there. He said that the human excesses will begin to wither away with the removal of this chief cause which again will lead to the withering away the state. But he said that that will happen sure but nobody knows how quickly and in what succession that will happen (Lenin 1918: 381-492).

Lenin on right to self-determination:

Lenin said that the right of nations to self-determination stands for the right to political independence from the oppressing nation. This implies the right to free and political secession from the imperial nation. He said that this as the democratic demand of the people which legitimises their complete right and freedom to carry out agitation in favour of secession. He said that this right also stands for settlements of the question of secession by means of a referendum. However, he did not equate it with the demand for the formation of small states. Lenin (1972) said that right to self-determination is the logical expression of the struggle against national oppression (“The Right of Nations to Self-Determination”).

Lenin said that socialism stands for the abolition of present division of mankind into small states and national isolation. He said that socialism not only will bring the nations closer to each other and but also will merge them. He said that in order to achieve this aim the liberation of the oppressed nations must be demanded not in empty declamations, but in a clearly formulated political programme. He said that only by going through the phase of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, mankind will achieve communism and so also the merging of nations can be achieved only by passing through the transition phase of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede.

Lenin rejected the idea of a peaceful union of equal nations under imperialism. He said it as an opportunist utopia to deceive the people. He highlighted about the inevitability of the division of nations into oppressing and oppressed under imperialism.

Regarding the proletarian internationalism relating to the idea of self-determination of the nations, Lenin said that raising voice against annexations and for the equal rights of nations should not be the jobs of the proletariat of the oppressing nations. He said that proletariat must stand for the self determination of the oppressed nation and fight against the forcible preservation of the oppressed nations within the boundaries of a given state. He said that the

proletariat must struggle for political secession for the colonies as well as for the nations that its own state oppresses. He declared that without this the class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible and the idea of proletarian internationalism will be meaningless. He said that the socialists must maintain complete, absolute organizational unity between the workers of the oppressing nation and oppressed nation in order to class solidarity and an independent proletarian policy (Lenin 1972: 393-454).

Lenin said that the right to self-determination is a very democratic demand without which there cannot be any socialist revolution. He said the socialist revolution is a long intensified class conflicts on all front covering politics and economics which culminates in the abolition of bourgeoisie. He said that the struggle for self-determination or for democracy will not divert the proletariat from the socialist revolution. Further he said that socialism cannot be achieved without securing complete democracy, and the proletariat cannot defeat the bourgeoisie unless it wages a consistent revolutionary struggle for democracy from all sides.

Lenin on Gender Equality:

Lenin during the whole period of his revolutionary activities often wrote and spoke for the emancipation of women in general and working and peasant women in particular. He said that the emancipation of women is entirely conditioned with the struggle for workers emancipation, for socialism.

Soon after the October revolution he declared that in Russia there was no longer inequality of the sexes and the denial of rights to women. Lenin (1965: 371-72) said that the feudal and medieval women subjugation is still preserved by the bourgeoisie in all most all countries without exception (*To the working women*). In 1913, Lenin exposed the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie. As Kollontai (1984) has revealed, Lenin discussed about the problem of prostitution and expressed that the bourgeoisie was promoting slave traffic, raping girls in the colonies, and hypocritically pretending as fighting against prostitution (Alexandra Kollontai: *Selected Articles and Speeches*).

Regarding the importance of the role of women to protect socialism, metaphorically Lenin once said, even the courageous fighter on the civil war fronts get influenced after listening everyday grumbles and complaints of his wife when he returns home. He said that wife being politically not conscious becomes an opponent to the continuing struggle for Soviet power and even warrior who does not surrender to the enemy may surrender to his wife coming under her harmful influence. Therefore Lenin said that the women must become a source of Soviet power against the counter-revolution. Lenin (1950) advised that woman must support the fighting against counter revolution and feel that the fighting for Soviet power is the fighting for her rights and her children (*Women and Communism*).

Lenin said that capitalism like feudalism exploits women which is seen almost all the capitalist countries. He said that capitalism produce social inequality by combining formal equality with economic equality. He says that this is reflected in the inferior position of woman compared with man in all most all the capitalist countries. He demonstrated that not even a single bourgeois state has brought about complete equality of rights. But he declared that the Soviet Republic of Russia has destroyed all kind of legal inequality of women and in a direction to establish gender equality in law and in practice.

He said that the cultural standard of a society is reflected by social position of woman. He declared that all most all the bourgeois countries recognized gender inequality in law and in practice. The social position of women in those countries is very low. Lenin declared that the gender equality cannot be achieved without socialism or dictatorship of the proletariat. He expressed that the USSR has achieved that culture of gender equality to a higher degree because of the proletarian dictatorship. Therefore he emphasized the need of proletarian dictatorship for real emancipation of women from the exploitation (Lenin 1965: 161-163).

He demonstrated that the Soviet system has achieved real democracy by raising the social position of women in general and both the working class and the poor peasants in particular. He advised that the women should fight for the social and

economic equality instead of formal equality. He said that the objectives of women movement must be to free women from the "domestic slavery" that is from the exploitative atmosphere of the kitchen and nursery. He realized that the emancipation of women is a long struggle which requires a radical transformation of both of social thinking and customs. He said that this struggle will end with the complete triumph of communism (Lenin 1950).

CHAPTER 3

The Notion of Equality in the Thought of Ambedkar

B.R. Ambedkar was a leading social revolutionary of the modern India who waged the historical anti-caste revolution against Brahmanism and feudalism. Though the anti-caste revolution in India has a long history, it took a very radical shape under the leadership of Ambedkar. He was a forerunner of the Indian democratic revolution who gave the slogan of annihilation of caste. He took forward the great revolutionary legacy of Phule, Tukaram and Budhha for the cause of equality and social transformation. His entire life long struggle is based on the idea of annihilation of caste, class and exploitation. Being an untouchable, he had to suffer a lot in his entire life. He has experienced the brutal caste based structural exploitation and inequality. In spite of the huge obstacles in his life, he could establish himself as the leading revolutionary intellectual of modern India. He emerged in a time when the entire world was witnessing a struggle against both feudalism and imperialism. As the socio-political situation of his period was very complex, he had to change his strategies from time to time in accordance with the changing condition. He was the lone radical voice of the oppressed who was struggling for their emancipation throughout his life. Dr. Ambedkar was a strong opponent of the then political party Indian National Congress and its main leadership that included Gandhi, still he participated and took the major role in Constitution drafting to protect the rights of the marginalised and historically oppressed communities and to check the Hindu imperialism. He had also intervened in the constitution writing to check the Hindu imperialism from taking hold, taking into consideration the whole socio-political situation of his times.

He considered Brahmanism much more dangerous and detrimental for the common masses than the British imperialism. He gave priority to the anti-caste movement over the anti-British movement for the reason that the later will give

slavery to the people without the former. He held Brahmanism responsible for all kinds of exploitation and degeneration of the Indian people. Therefore Ambedkar's notion of equality is much more social than political. He said that without social equality, political democracy will not last long. Ambedkar's notion of equality is based entirely on his theory of annihilation of caste. His notion of equality stands for the annihilation of all kinds of hierarchies based on social status, property inheritance and gender. He realised that so long as the oppressed people are divided on the basis of their social hierarchy, they cannot uproot either Brahmanism or capitalism. The social gradation of the depressed classes made Ambedkar's notion of equality much more social with an objective to abolish all kinds of exploitation. Ambedkar's notion of equality cannot be studied in isolation from his whole socio-cultural and political programme he adopted to bring about equality in the society. Ambedkar's notion of equality encapsulates two organic parts. One is the programme of annihilation of caste and the other is the programme of annihilation of class. These two programme are organically associated and cannot be isolated from one another. The programme of annihilation of caste will remain incomplete without the programme of annihilation of class while the programme of annihilation of class is impossible without the annihilation of caste. Again the programme of annihilation of caste and class consists of following parts:

1. The programme of uprooting Hinduism.
2. The programme of scientific Buddhism
3. The programme of state socialism.
4. The programme of right to self-determination of the depressed classes.
5. And the programme of women emancipation.

Therefore Ambedkar's notion of equality cannot be understood without realising his whole programme of equality. Now I will discuss Ambedkar's notion of equality phase by phase.

The programme of uprooting Hinduism:

This part constitutes one of the important aspects of Ambedkar's notion of equality. Ambedkar said that without uprooting the Hinduism, there cannot be the annihilation of caste. He said that caste is the foundation of Hinduism. Therefore in order to annihilate caste, Hinduism needs to be uprooted. However, the importance and the gravity of the programme cannot be understood without going through the nexus between caste, Hinduism, inequality and exploitation. In order to show the relation of inequality in Hinduism, I would like to highlight some of the basic ideas of Ambedkar on caste and Hinduism.

Ambedkar was the first person to give a proper analysis of the origin and mechanism of caste in India. Caste is a reality in Indian society which denies the existence of equality, liberty and fraternity. There can never be an individual without caste. Caste is a very complex problem that many philosophers including the Marxist failed to understand it. Highlighting the complexity of caste, Ambedkar said before writing the origin and genesis of caste "I need hardly remind you of the complexity of the subject. Subtler minds and abler pens than mine have been brought to the task of unravelling the mysteries of caste; but unfortunately it still remains in the domain of the "un-explained", not to say of the "un-understood" (Ambedkar 1916). Caste problem is both theoretically and practically a vast one. Though it is a local problem confined to India, it has much wider significance. He said that as long as there is caste in India, a Hindu will not intermarry or will have any social intercourse outside his/her social net. If a Hindu migrates to other parts of the earth, it will become a world problem (Ambedkar 1916).

Caste as the Parcelling of Homogeneous Unit:

Ambedkar said, Indian society in its beginning was a mixture of different races like Aryans, Dravidians, Mongolians and Scythians. They came from different directions thorough out centuries and settled down peacefully as neighbours after going through many conflicts among themselves. Gradually they developed homogeneity among themselves through the unity of culture though they were

ethnically heterogeneous. Regarding the unity of culture from past to present, Ambedkar said that there is no country parallel to the Indian Peninsula with respect to the unity of its culture. The unity is much deeper and fundamental which makes the problem of caste so difficult to be explained. He said that if the Hindu society had been a federation of mutually exclusive units, the matter would have been something different and simple enough. But caste is the parcelling of an already homogeneous unit and the explanation of the genesis of this process of parcelling is the explanation of the genesis of caste (Ambedkar 1916).

Caste as the superimposition of endogamy on Exogamy:

While conceptualising caste, Ambedkar had to deal with the definitions of caste given by scholars like Senart, Nesfield and Dr. Ketkar. Ambedkar examined three important points from these three intellectuals in defining caste. Those are the idea of pollution, absence of commensality, and prohibition of intermarriage by Senart, Nefield and Dr Ketkar respectively. He said that the idea of pollution is not peculiar to the caste. The idea of pollution is attached to the caste only because the caste has its religious sanction. The caste group which enjoys the highest rank is the priestly caste and purity and priest are old associates (Ambedkar 1916). On the point of absence of commensality, Ambedkar said that it is not the cause, rather it is the effect of the caste. He said that caste being the self-enclosed unit, it is bound to limit the social intercourse, including commensality etc., of the members within it. The absence of commensality is a natural result of caste which acquired the prohibitory character after religious sanction. However he appreciated the point of Dr. Ketkar as something very essential for the existence of caste system. The point was the prohibition of intermarriages and membership by endogamy. But he said that these two points are the two aspects of the same thing and they are not two different things as supposed by Dr. Ketkar. He said “if you prohibit intermarriage, the result is that you limit membership to those born within the group”. He concluded that the absence of intermarriage is the essence of caste. But while making his conclusion, he did not deny the existence of endogamy in other parts of the world where it could not produce caste. He has given a very scientific reason for this

peculiarity of caste. As it has been discussed earlier, the people of India were a homogenous category as far as their cultural unity is concerned. Therefore he said that caste is an artificial chopping off of the homogeneous population into fixed and definite units where each unit is self-enclosed and separate through the custom of endogamy. However, Ambedkar (1916) has shown another interesting point that there is still the practice of the custom of exogamy in the caste system (“Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development”). Indian society still possesses the practice of clan system though there is no such clan which is generally found in matrimony. In India it is not only that the sapindas (blood-kins) cannot marry, but even marriage between sagotras (of the same class) is considered a crime. Therefore he established that endogamy is foreign to the people of India. He said that various gotras of India are exogamous with totemic organisation. He narrated that in spite of the practice of endogamy of the castes, the exogamy in India is strictly observed. Even there are more rigorous penalties for violating exogamy than for violating endogamy. Hence Ambedkar (Vol. 1, *Caste in India*) argued that the superimposition of endogamy on exogamy means the creation of caste.

Caste or Endogamy - Mother of Sati system, enforced widowhood and child marriage:

Ambedkar discovered some of the challenges that are faced by caste while maintaining the custom of endogamy. Caste being the parcelling of the homogeneous populations, there will always be a tendency to assimilate and consolidate between groups who are in close contact with one another (Ambedkar 1916). But to prevent intermarriage was also not very easy due to the fact that in every normal group the two sexes are more or less equally distributed. Therefore the maintenance of equality between sexes became the ultimate aim of the groups that were trying to be a close-knit caste. In order to preserve endogamy, conjugal right of the people have to be provided, otherwise they will be forced to break the

circle to take care of themselves in ways they can. But the conjugal right cannot be assured without preserving a numerical equality between the marriageable units of the two sexes within the group. But this numerical equality cannot be realised unless a couple dies at the same time which is very rare. What will happen if husband passes away and creates a surplus woman (his widow) who will be the potential threat to the principle of endogamy. The same way the wife may also die creating a surplus man and can break the endogamy. So the surplus women and surplus men posed a greatest challenge to the caste. They will violate the principle of endogamy if they do not get suitable candidate within the group. Ambedkar came across two kinds of solution adopted by the caste forces to deal with the surplus women. The first solution was to burn her on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband. But it may not work in some cases because it is hard to materialise. Again if the surplus woman (Ambedkar: *Caste in India*) is not “disposed of” and remains within the group, she may disturb the sex ratio or may marry outside the group breaking the endogamy. So the second solution was to enforce widowhood on her for the rest of her life (Ambedkar 1916).

The problem of surplus men was very difficult than the problem of surplus women. In the history of human beings man as compared to woman has always had the upper hand. He is the dominant figure in each group and has the greater social prestige. Therefore the group can't treat the man the same way it treated the surplus woman. The burning of surplus man was dangerous because of the fact that he is a man and a “strong muscular soul” and asset to the group but if he remains as a widower within the group, it is a danger to the morale of the group. On the other hand the endogamy is also to be preserved without disturbing the sex ratio. There was one remedy of imposing celibacy on man, but it failed both theoretically and practically. Under this situation, the surplus man can be provided a bride who is not yet marriageable in order to tie him to the group. That was the best possible solution in the case of surplus man. Ambedkar found out four means by which the numerical disparity between the sexes was successfully maintained. The first was the Burning the widow with her deceased husband (sati), second was the compulsory widowhood – a milder form of burning, third

was the imposition of celibacy on the widower and the fourth was the wedding of a girl (not yet marriageable) to the surplus man.

Ambedkar said, without these customs, strict endogamy could not have been preserved while caste without endogamy is a fake (Ambedkar 1916).

Caste as an "enclosed class":

According to Ambedkar a society is always composed of classes and the existence of classes in a society is a fact. The basis or nature of the classes may vary. He said that the classes may be social, economic and intellectual. But he made it clear that an individual is always a member of a class in a society. He demonstrated it as a universal fact and general phenomenon to all society and argued that class in India made itself into caste. He said that class and caste are next door neighbours and it is only a span that separates the two. Therefore to him a caste is an enclosed class (Ambedkar: *Caste in India*). It means there was a class within a homogenous group which for the first time enclosed itself to form a caste. It implies that there are various numbers of castes within a class because the homogeneous group was divided into castes. Now the point is which class for the first time enclosed itself into the caste.

Brahmin, the father of Caste:

Ambedkar said that the existence of inhuman customs like sati, enforced widowhood and child marriage were the common features of the Hindu society. But the degree of strictness of those customs varied among the castes. He said that these customs are found only in the Brahmin caste that enjoys the higher social status in the caste hierarchy of the Hindu society. He said that the prevalence of these customs among the non- Brahmin castes is derivative which is neither complete nor strict. He went on to say that if the prevalence of these customs in the non- Brahmin caste is derivative, then they are not the father of the institution of caste. On the other hand he observed that the strict observance of the customs like sati, child marriage, widowhood among the priestly class who occupies a superior social position prove that Brahmin was the father of this

“unnatural institution” founded and maintained through these unnatural means (Ambedkar: *Caste in India*).

Imitation, Mechanical Nature of Caste:

Regarding the growth of caste in Indian society Ambedkar rejected the following reasons as the basis for the growth of caste. Those are occupation, survival of tribal organization, the rise of new belief, cross- breeding and migration.

He said that this features were common to the world and not peculiar to India. Therefore he raised the question why it could not produce caste outside India. He also rejected the view that the caste system has been imposed by a law giver upon people as a divine invention. He has also rejected the view that it has grown according to some law of social growth. He claimed that the famous law giver of Hindus, the Manu had not created law of caste. He said that caste existed long before the arrival of Manu. He explained that Manu did the codification of the already existing caste rules by preaching caste dharma and philosophised it. Regarding the role of Brahmin in spreading the caste, he said that Brahmins are the creator of many evils but penetrating caste system among the non- Brahmin population was beyond their capacity. According to him, the Brahmins have helped this process by their philosophy. Now the question comes what is the reason for the growth and spreading of caste in India. According to Ambedkar there were four classes before the caste. They were Brahmins the priestly class, Kshatriya the military lass, the Vaishya the merchant class and the Shudra, the artisan and menial class that was socially detached from the other three. Ambedkar maintains that at some point in the history, the priestly Brahmin class socially detached from the rest of the people and formed a caste through endogamy or close door policy. As a result he said, the other classes being subject to the social division of labour underwent differentiation into larger and minute groups. He expressed that the sub division of society is natural, but the unnatural sub- division is peculiar to the caste where the earlier prevailing homogeneous groups lost the open door character of the class system and became self-enclosed units called castes. Ambedkar asserted that some closed the door and others found it closed against them. Again he has shown that those who

found others doors were closed against them, they closed their door for others and the process went on creating thousands of castes. He said that the endogamy or closed door system became the fashion in the Hindu society. He has provided the reason behind this saying it had originated from the Brahmin caste that was considered to be the supreme, known as Bhudeva, the god of earth. And this was followed blindly by the non- Brahmin classes. Ambedkar termed it the “the infection of imitation” that converted all non-Brahmin classes into castes. He quoted Walter Bagehot and Gabriel Torde to substantiate the process of imitation. These two scholars hold the view that imitation always flows from higher to lower consciously and unconsciously based upon the values and beliefs of the people. Therefore Ambedkar contended that castes were formed mechanically through imitation. The status of a caste in the Hindu fold varies according to the strictness in the practice of the customs of sati, enforced widowhood and child marriage. He said that caste cannot exist in the singular number. Caste always exists only in the plural number, because in the formation of castes others were closed in, and as a result closed out. For example A, B, C, D are the four castes and if the first three enclose themselves, then D is directly closed out but indirectly closed in. Hence he concluded it is mechanistic because it is inevitable (Ambedkar 1916).

Fissiparous Caste:

Fissiparous nature of caste system is another important reason for the growth of caste in India. This happens as a consequence of the self-duplication of the caste that is inherent in it. It means if any section in a caste does not follow the caste rules, they are punished with the means of ex-communication (Ambedkar: *Caste in India*), which creates a new caste. So each caste has an inherent tendency to duplicate itself by the process of excommunication if the caste rules and regulation are not observed strictly. This is the reason for which we find many sub-castes within the same caste. For example, there is also gradation among the Brahmin caste itself. This is also prevalent among the Kshatriya and Vaishya castes (Ambedkar 1916).

Caste as the source of power:

Ambedkar demonstrated that social status and religion are the source of power which is responsible for exploitation and control the liberty of the people. He did not agree with the view that economy power as the only kind of power. He said that social status of an individual often becomes a source of power and authority. He raised the questions that why do millionaires in India obey penniless Sadhus and Fakirs? Why do millions of paupers sell their only property and go to Banaras and Mecca? He said that the supreme social status of Brahmins and their complete control over the life of common people proved that religion as the source of power. He further insisted said that the priest's control over the common man is much greater than the magistrate. He claimed that everything in India is religiously controlled by the priests. Even the strikes and elections so easily take a religious turn and can so easily given a religious twist. He criticised the socialists of India who were supposing property as the only source of power. But he never denied property as the source of power. He only claimed that religion, social status, and property are all source of power and authority which is responsible for the exploitation of one man by other. He said that one is predominant at one stage and the other is predominant at another stage. That is the only difference (Ambedkar 1936).

Caste as the division of labourers:

Ambedkar criticised the people who were defending caste system as the division of labour. He said that civilized society needs division of labours. But no civilised society needs the division of labourer accompanied by the unnatural division of labourers into 'water tight compartments'. He termed this as nothing but exploitation of the working people by the Brahmins with the means of caste which divides people. And he established that caste system is not merely division of labour. It is also a division of labourers (Ambedkar 1936: 47). He affirmed that the division of labour is neither temporary nor based on individual ability and wishes. It is permanent and predetermined which rejects the individual's ability and wishes. He said that caste has divided the working class into thousands of categories and as a result they are not united even for their own interest. According to Ambedkar (1936), the graded inequality among the workers

prevents them from forming a common front against their common enemies (*Annihilation of Caste*). He observed that the reason behind not having any armed revolution in India against Brahmanism is the existence of caste (Ambedkar 1936). He also said that there cannot be any proletariat revolution in India so long as the proletariats are divided on the basis caste. The graded inequality placed each caste one after another with the notion of superiority and inferiority. As a result each caste tries to maintain its social superiority by discriminating the castes that are placed below it. Thus the graded inequality with water tight compartment allows each caste to be the part of the system of inequality (Ambedkar, Vol. 1). This is the most dangerous aspect of caste against which Ambedkar struggled in his life till death.

Caste demoralised and disorganised the people:

Ambedkar said, caste has neither encouraged the economic efficiency nor has improved the race. Ambedkar (1936: 50) said that caste has completely demoralized and disorganised the Hindus (*Annihilation of Caste*). He demonstrated that the Hindu society is a myth and the name Hindu itself is foreign name given by Muslim invaders. Highlighting the nature of Hindus he said that the ideal Hindus are those who are like a rat living in its own hole refusing to have any contact with others. That is why he told that Hindus cannot form a society or a nation. He has also said that anti-social spirit is the worst feature of the Indian Caste system. He went on to argue that human beings constitute a society because they possess things in common. And he argued that to have similar things is totally different from having things in common. He has also declared that men possess things in common only by being in communication with one another. Therefore he said that a society continues to exist only by communication.

But he asserted that caste system prevented common activity which in return prevented the Hindus from becoming a society. Ambedkar (1936: 50) said that the anti-social spirit is the worst feature of Hindus which has destroyed mutual relations of the castes as well as sub-castes (*Annihilation of Caste*).

Hinduism denied equality:

Ambedkar said all the castes are not placed in the horizontal series. All the castes stand in a vertical series and placed one above the other with gradation. He remarked that Manu created the gradation of castes who preached Varna system which is the parent of the caste (Ambedkar 1987). He stated that Manu located Brahmins top in ranks in its programme of caste system. Below him the Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra and the Ati-Shudra (untouchables) were located respectively one after another with gradation. This system of rank and gradation undoubtedly established the fact that Hinduism recognised inequality. This inequality is not temporary or occasional but a permanent social relationship among the classes for all purposes and for all time.

Ambedkar has taken three institutions such as slavery, marriage and rule of law to prove that how Hinduism perpetuate inequality. He said that Manu recognized slavery but he confined it only to the Shudras. According to his rules, only Shudra could be made slaves of the three higher classes. But the higher classes could not be made the slaves of the Shudras. But interestingly Manu not only ordered Shudras to be slaves but also he declared other three classes to become slave. This new rule was enacted by a successors of Manu namely Narada (Ambedkar 1987: 39). "In the inverse order of the four castes slavery is not ordained except where a man violates the duties peculiar to his caste. Slavery (in that respect) is analogous to the condition of a wife" (*Philosophy of Hinduism*, p. 39). Narada did not recognize slavery in its inverse order to the Varna system. It means a Brahmin may be the slave of another Brahmin but he shall not be the slave of a person of lower varnas, the Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra and Ati-Shudra. But a Brahmin may hold slave anyone belonging to the four varnas. A Kshatriya can have a Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra and Ati-Shudra as his slave, but not the Brahmin. A Vaishya can have a Vaishya, Shudra, and Ati-Shudra as his slave, but not the Brahmin or Kshatriya. A Shudra can hold a Shudra and Ati-Shudra, but not the upper castes. And Ati-Shudra can have an Ati-Shudra as his slave but not the Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra.

Ambedkar claimed that if the rule of slavery had been left free to take its own course it would have destroyed the foundation of caste. In that condition an untouchable would have become the master of the Brahmins and Brahmin might have become the slave of the untouchable. Therefore he said that the Manu and his successors maintained inequality even within slavery to protect the foundation of the caste system.

Manu framed similar trend of rules and regulation for marriage. Of course Manu was opposed to intermarriage but he recognized marriage outside the defined class. Like the slavery, he also allowed it very carefully maintaining the graded inequality among castes. He did not permit inter marriage in the inverse order. Narada also did not permit inter marriage in the inverse order. It means a Brahmin may marry any women from any of the classes below him. A Kshatriya can marry a woman from the Vaishya and Shudra classes, but he cannot marry a woman from the Brahmin class. A Vaishya is allowed to marry a woman from Shudra class but he cannot marry a woman from the Brahmin and Kshatriya class. Manu's marriage system was completely based on the rule of inequality which is the foundation of caste system (Ambedkar, *Philosophy of Hinduism* 1987: 26-27). Manu's rule of law is very important to know the nature of Hindu society and its functioning.

1) For defaming a priest, a soldier shall be fined a hundred *panas*, a merchant shall be fined hundred and fifty or two hundred, but for such an offense a mechanic or servile man shall be shipped (VIII. 267).

2) If any Shudra or untouchable insult the twice born man with gross invectives, then his tongues must be slit and the lowest part of Brahma must be destroyed (VIII. 270).

3) If any lower caste man mention their name and disobeys or refuses any Brahmin, then an iron style, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red into his mouth (VIII. 271).

4) If any Shudra or untouchable, through pride, gives any instruction to priests concerning their duty, then the king must order some hot oil to be dropped into his mouth and his ear (VIII. 272).

5) If a low born man assaults or hurt a superior, then he must be slit, or cut more or less in proportion to the injury (VIII. 279).

6) If any Shudra or untouchable raises his hand or staff against another, his hand shall be cut and he, who kicks another in wrath, shall have an incision made in his foot (VIII. 280).

7) If a man of the servile class commit adultery with the wife of a priest ought to suffer death and the women or wives of all the four classes must ever be most especially guarded (VIII. 359).

8) Ignominious tonsure is ordained instead of capital punishment for an adulterer of the priestly class whereas the punishment of the other classes may extend to loss of life (VIII. 379).

9) The king shall never slay a Brahmin, though convicted of all possible crime; the king may drive out the Brahmin from his kingdom but with all his property secured and his body unhurt (VIII. 380).

10) No greater crime is known on earth than slaying a Brahman, and the king therefore must not even form in his mind an idea of killing a priest (VIII. 381).

These rules of Manu undoubtedly proved the brutal inequality of the Hinduism. Ambedkar said that the difference between Hindu and non- Hindu criminal jurisprudence is unmatched and incomparable. He asserted that Manu's system of punishment is completely irrational. The punishment for crime is inflicted on the organ such as belly, tongue, nose, eyes, ear, organs of generation etc. as if those organs are responsible for the crime. Manus penal code is inhuman on the ground that it is not in proportion to the gravity of the offense. Manu's penal code upholds naked inequality of punishment for the same offense. The inequalities are intended not only to punish the culprits but to protect also the dignity of three

higher classes and to maintain the social inequality on which the caste system is founded (Ambedkar 1987).

Manu not only maintained the social inequality but also preserved religious inequality. This is proved by the rituals of sacrosanct and ashrams made by him. Sacrament and ashrams are important parts of the Hinduism which were not allowed to the Shudras and untouchable. The sacrament is composed of three things, which are initiation, gayatri and daily sacrifice. The first is the initiation. The initiation is the process of wearing the sacred thread. As per the rule, a Brahmin child must go through this process at the age of eight while the Kshatriya and Vaishya child at the age of eleven and twelfth respectively (Ambedkar 1987: *Philosophy of Hinduism*). Those who do not go through this process in proper time become outcaste. This process is done by the principal Acharya who knows the whole Vedas (*Manu Smriti* II.36, II.39 and II.148). This is considered as the process where the child is given the mark of their class. The Shudras and untouchables are not allowed to perform this ritual. In this process the child is considered to have taken second birth from his mother Gayatri and his father Acharya (Ambedkar 1987).

According to the ashrama theory life is divided into four stages: brahmachari, grahastha, vanaprashtha and sanyasa. In the brahmachari stage a person is unmarried and gives his time towards education. After completion of this stage he enters the life of grahashtha where he marries and rears a family. Thereafter he enters the third stage known as vanaprashtha where he lives in the forest but not detaching himself from his worldly goods. Then he entered the fourth stage which is the last stage. This stage is called as the stage of complete renunciations of the world in search of God known as “sanyasa” (Ambedkar 1987: *Philosophy of Hinduism*). The two stages of Brahmachari and grahstha are natural and compulsory. But the last stages are not compulsory. These customs were only confined to the three upper classes and denied to the Shudra (Ambedkar 1987: *Philosophy of Hinduism*).

Manu neither allowed sacrament nor the ashram's to the shudras. Ambedkar noted that in the legal language, the sanyas is interpreted as civil death. But why

did not Manu applied the same to the Shudras? It would have been beneficial for them on the point of view that the shudras would go the process of civil death renouncing every material wealth. But Manu did not allow it to them. Manu said that the sacrament and sanyasa are the privilege of higher classes. By doing this Manu very consciously did not allow the religious equality. He preserved the religious inequality in Hinduism. Therefore Ambedkar asserted that both social and religious inequalities are embedded in Hinduism.

Beside these religious and social inequalities, Manu also advocated a deliberate debasement policy of human personality. Manu stated that beside the four original castes the rest are simply baseborn. They are the progeny of adultery between men and women of the four original castes. The immorality and loose character of the four higher castes is the cause for the origin of the other castes. For example Manu said the Chantal's (the old name for the untouchable) are the progeny of a Brahman female and a shudra male. Ambedkar rejected this by arguing that if it is so, then a large number of Brahman women were slut and every shudra lived adulterous life with complete freedom. Manu carried out the policy of the debasing different caste to pervade historical fact. Ambedkar cited two cases regarding this. In the first case the origin of the Magadha. Manu says that Magadha is a caste which is born from sexual intercourse between Vaishya male and Kshatriya female. In second case he said Baidehik is a caste which is born from sexual intercourse between a Vaishya male and a Brahmin Female. Clause II.31 of Manu Smriti Says that a Brahmin's name must denote something auspicious, a Kshatriya name must denote power and a Vaishya name with wealth, but a Shudras name should expressing something contemptible. But Panini who lived not later than 300 BC much before the Manu says that the Magadha means a person who is the residence of the country known as Magadha. On Baidehik Panini says that Baidehik means a person who is the resident of the country known as Bideha. Such was the role of Manu to degrade the people in society. Ambedkar termed it as naked cruelty of Manu and Hinduism. He said that when the religion everywhere was uplifting the people giving self-respect and dignity, Hinduism was degrading and debasing the people.

The debasement policy of Hinduism is also found in the naming of a Hindu child prescribed by Manu. On the occasion of naming, regarding the first name Manu says that a Brahmin name must denote something auspicious, a Kshatriya name must be connected with power and a Vaishya name with wealth, but a Shudras name should be expressing something contemptible. Clause no. II.32 of Manu Smriti says that the second part of name of Brahmins must denote happiness, Kshatriya's name should express protection and a Vaishya name expressing of thriving but a Shudra denoting service.

Regarding the second part of name he said, Brahmin name shall be a word implying happiness, Kshatriya's name shall be word implying protection and a Vaishya name expressing of thriving but a Shudras denoting service.

Hinduism denies liberty:

Ambedkar spoke about certain social conditions which are necessary for the existence of liberty in society. Those are the existence of both social and economic equality as well as the presence of education. He said that if liberty is to be realised in society there must be the existence of equality. He said that without equality, liberty cannot live. He was of the opinion that privilege always brings power in favour of its possessors. He affirmed that a man may have freedom to do any work but if he is deprived of employment, then he undergoes through both mental and physical starvation which is in fact against the spirit of liberty. The third social condition for the liberty is that knowledge must be made available to all. He said that the denial of knowledge is a deprivation of the power to use liberty for great ends. He said that as far as social and economic equality is concerned Hinduism does not confirm to it, which has already been discussed. It institutionalised and glorifies privilege and inequality. Therefore Hinduism denies the very first condition of liberty.

As far as the economic security is concerned, Ambedkar noted that three things are found in Hinduism. In the first place Hinduism prohibits freedom of occupation. In Hinduism, occupation of individual is preordained before he/she is born. Hinduism allows no choice and the occupation being preordained it has no

relation to ability and interest. Besides Hinduism forced peoples to serve others. Manu says that the shudras are born to serve the tree higher classes.

Manu (VIII.410 of Manu Smriti) declared that the king should order each man of his mercantile class to practise trade and each man of the servile class to act in the service of the twice born (Ambedkar 1987).

Ambedkar said that these rules have both spiritual as well as economic significance. In the spiritual sense it preserved the spirit of slavery. He understood slavery both in its legal form and its inner meaning. Regarding the inner meaning Ambedkar referred Plato and said slave is a person who accepts the purposes of life from other. In this sense a slave is a means for serving the ends of others. As far as the economic significance is concerned it contradicted with the economic independence (X.121 of Manu Smriti) of Shudras (Ambedkar 1987). Hinduism does not allow Shudra to accumulate wealth. Manu said that the upper three classes must pay to Shudra after considering his ability. He (X.124/125 of Manu Smriti) ordered that the three upper classes to give the remnants of their food, old clothes as well as the refuse of grain and the old household furniture to the Shudras (Ambedkar 1987).

Ambedkar condemned this wage law of Manu. Manu fixed it as an iron law where there is no fear of the Shudra's accumulating wealth and obtaining economic security. More than this Manu went to the extent of prohibiting the Shudra from accumulating property. He said, "No collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra even though he is able to do it, for a Shudra who has acquired wealth gives pain to Brahman."

Hence, Ambedkar concluded that neither there is economic security nor choice of occupation and economic independence in Hinduism (Ambedkar 1987).

In the third place Ambedkar realised the necessity of education as condition for the existence of liberty. These are the presence of formal education and literacy. He claimed that without these two conditions, knowledge cannot spread. In a complex society the realisation of all the resources is impossible without formal education. But there must be literacy in society for the proper realisation of the

formal education. Ambedkar said that the literacy and formal education, i.e., the practice of reading and writing go hand in hand. He said that without the existence of these two there can be no spread of knowledge (Ambedkar 1987).

Ambedkar stated that the scope of formal education in Hinduism was very limited. It was only confined to the study of the Vedas. He remarked that another feature of the Hindu formal education was that it was only confined to the three upper classes and the education system was under the control of the Brahmins. State was not responsible for the spreading of knowledge. Each class transmitted its knowledge to its members in the way it was traditionally done. The Vaishya class trained their young to know the arithmetic and some languages for their business purposes. The artisan class or the craftsmen who were part of the Shudra class also taught their children in the same way. Therefore the education was very limited and domestic. The study of Veda was only confined to the Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaishya. The study of Vedas was prohibited to Shudra and women. Manu said that the twice born must never read Veda in the presence of the Shudra (Ambedkar Vol. 3). He (IX.18 of Manu Smriti) said that the women and Shudras have no business with the text of the Veda (Ambedkar Vol. 3). The successors of Manu made the study of the Veda into an offence involving death penalties. For example Gautama says, if the Shudra intentionally listens to the Veda, than his ears should be filed with molten lead and lac. If he utters the Veda, then his tongue should be cut off. If he has mastered the Veda, then his body should be cut to pieces (XII.4 of Manu Smriti) (Ambedkar Vol. 3).

Ambedkar said that there is no society in the world which prohibited the study of the book of religion to its people except the Hindu society. Manu was the only divine law giver who kept common man deprived of education. Manu made education as the privileges of three high classes few and made illiteracy as the destiny of the low class millions. Therefore Ambedkar contested that Hinduism is a gospel of darkness, prevented common masses to access education. Taking this fact into consideration, Ambedkar pronounced that Hinduism is opposed to all the conditions in which liberty can live and therefore it denied the liberty.

Hinduism denied fraternity:

Ambedkar said that like the Christians and the Muslims, the Hindus believed that men are created by God. But unlike the Christians and the Muslims they believed that God created different men from different parts of his divine body. This belief is considered as fundamental and core principle by the Hindus. Ambedkar said that the Hindu social order is based on the principle of divine creation from different parts from the God. Therefore the Brahmin does not consider Kshatriya as his brother because the former is born from the mouth while the latter is born from the arms. The Kshatriya does not think Baishya as his brother because the former is born from the arms and the latter from his thighs. Ambedkar said that no one is brother to other in Hindu social order.

Ambedkar mentioned that the doctrine of divine creation gave birth to the belief among the classes that they should remain separate and distinct. He said that the belief of divine creation is the only reason for the Hindu to be different, to be separate and to be distinct from the rest of his fellow Hindus. He said that the caste system is the wild manifestation of the spirit of isolation and separation. According to him, caste cannot exist in singular number. Caste can only exist in plural number. He said that there are around three thousands castes in India. There are also sub-castes within a caste. He said that the total population of Brahmin caste during that time was about a crore and half. But there were 1886 sub-castes within Brahmin caste. In Punjab alone the Saraswat Brahmans were divided into 469 sub-castes and the Kayasthas were divided into 890 sub-castes. He stated that this splitting process has made a social life quite impossible. It has made the castes split into such small fragments that even the marital relationship within the caste becomes impossible (Ambedkar: *Philosophy of Hinduism*). Therefore he claimed that caste has destroyed the social life of the people. It limits friendship, love and affection within the caste. He contested that the guiding principle of caste towards one another is to be separate, do not inter marry, do not inter dine, do not touch.

Ambedkar has shown that the mutual relations of the castes are fratricidal. He voiced that there has been many a class war between Brahman and Kshatriya. The war lasted for several generations and it was a war of extermination. He said

that each class claims a separate origin to show their superiority (Ambedkar 1987). Each caste always tries to establish that it has superior social status than other. He announced that the Hindu social order is a ladder of castes placed one above the other together representing an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of content which has killed the spirit of fraternity. Therefore there is no space for fraternity in Hinduism.

Buddhism as a means to annihilate Hinduism:

Ambedkar advocated Buddhism as a means of social transformation to abolish social inequality and exploitation. He considered it as the most revolutionary philosophy of the human society. He said that Buddhism has advocated and practised communism long before the origin of Marxism. He has not considered it as a religious philosophy which preaches about heaven and god; rather he understood it as an emancipatory socio-political philosophy. He has not considered Buddhism less revolutionary than Marxism. He has compared Karl Marx to Buddha and said that there is nothing new in Marxism. He told that Buddha has told everything before two thousand years what Karl Marx advocates today. He found many similarities between Buddhism and Marxism and emphasised Buddhism than Marxism (Ambedkar 1987: *Buddha or Karl Marx?*). He has declared that Buddhism was the first revolutionary philosophy to counter the Brahminical philosophy. He said that Buddhism had already destroyed the Brahminism, but because of the counter revolution it revived again by killing thousands of Buddhist monks and Buddhist people in India (Ambedkar 1987, vol. 3: *Revolution and Counter Revolution in Ancient India*). He has provided two reasons for the downfall of Buddhism in India. One is the counter revolution of the Brahminism and other is the destruction of Buddhism by Islamic invaders. He said that untouchable were the Buddhist people of India. He traced the origin of untouchability to the counter revolution of the Brahminism at around 300 A.D. (Ambedkar 1948: *The Untouchables: Who Were They and Why They Became Untouchables*). He said that the hatred towards Buddhism by the Brahmins in the ancient India led to the development of the practice of social boycott and untouchability. Therefore Ambedkar adopted Buddhism not because of any

fantasy as an idealist but because of its historical legacy of fighting against Brahminism for the emancipation of the whole oppressed people. He has emphasised the two aspect of Buddhism in contemporary period for untouchable, both spiritual as well as material. In spiritual sense it is the source of morality for untouchable to fight against Brahminism and in the material aspect it will unite the whole untouchable and other oppressed for their larger political struggle for their emancipation (Ambedkar 1957, vol. 11: *Buddha and His Dhamma*).

The programme of State socialism:

This is one of the organic aspects of Ambedkar's notion of equality. Without this the programme of annihilation of caste and class will remain incomplete. Ambedkar was well aware about the economic aspect of the caste. He said that caste has ruined the untouchables and other oppressed classes socially, economically and politically. Caste since its beginning has its economic aspect. Caste has disarmed the oppressed people educationally and economically as a result they are neither in a position to trace out their slavery nor can revolt. Therefore Ambedkar felt that it is necessary to change the economic structure of the society to establish equality. He firmly believed that equality cannot be realised in society without socialism. He demonstrated that there can never be any social transformation without changing the economic structure of the society. Therefore he advocated the idea of state socialism (Ambedkar 1947: *States and Minority*). He said that all the key industries and the industries which may be declared to be key industries shall be owned by the state. He has also said that those industries which are not key industries but which are basic industries shall be owned and run by the State. He was not in favour of giving state industries to the capitalists. And he brought all the big industries under the control of state. He has also stated that insurance shall be a monopoly of the State and the State shall compel every citizen to take out a life insurance policy.

Besides these he told that the agriculture shall be a part of state industries. He proposed that the state shall acquire and hold its rights in every industry and agricultural lands held by private individuals paying them compensation. He told that in reckoning the value of land, no account will be taken of any rise therein

due to emergency of any potential or unearned value or any value for compulsory acquisition (Ambedkar 1947).

Ambedkar said that in this plan the state shall determine how and when the debenture holder shall be entitled to claim cash payment. He said that the debenture shall be transferable inheritable property but neither the debenture holder nor the transferee from the original holder shall be entitled to claim the return of the land. He further said that the debenture holder shall be entitled to interest on his debenture as may be defined by law, to be paid by the state in case or in kind.

He said that the agriculture industry must be organized in such a way that there shall be no landlords or no landless labourers. The state would divide the land into farms of standard size and lay out the farms for cultivation to residents of the village as tenants which will be made up of group of families. He said that the farm must be cultivated as a collective farm in accordance with rules and direction issued by government. The tenants will share among themselves the produce of the farm after the payment of charges properly leviable on the farm. He said that the land must be distributed to villagers without any distinction of caste or creed (Ambedkar 1947: *States and Minority*). It shall be the obligation of the state to finance the cultivation of collective farms by supplying water, drought animals, implements, manure, seeds etc. Ambedkar said that the state shall be entitled to levy some of the charges on the produce of the farm.

Ambedkar on right to self-determination:

The concept of right to self-determination of nation constitutes an organic part of Ambedkar's notion of equality. Ambedkar said that French revolution gave rise to two new principles, one is the principle of self-government and other is the principle of self-determination. According to Ambedkar, the principle of self-government expresses the desire of the people to be ruled by their own whether the rulers are absolute monarchs, dictators, or privileged classes. And the principle of self-determination expresses the desire of a people united by common ideals and common purpose to decide its political status whether

independence, interdependence or union with other people of the world without external compulsion which is called nationalism (Ambedkar 1987). Ambedkar said that the idea underlying self-determination has developed along two different lines. First it meant the right to establish a form of government in accordance with the wishes of the people. Secondly it has meant the right to obtain national independence from an alien race irrespective of the form of government. Regarding the right to self-determination, Ambedkar has said three important points. Firstly, nationality is not sacrosanct and absolute principle which can override every other consideration. Secondly, separation is not quite so essential for the preservation of a distinct nationality. The third point is self-determination for a nationality may take the form of cultural independence or may take the form of territorial independence (Aloysius 1999). Again which form it can take depends upon the territorial lay out of the population. If any nationality lives in contiguous areas, it may take the form of territorial independence but where there is intermingling of nationalities all over the areas which not easily severable, then territorial independence is impossible. It may either take the form of cultural independence or the only alternative remains for people is the migration. Ambedkar was the most leading intellectual and political leader of his period to raise the demand of self-determination of the oppressed nationalities. He contested that nationalism in India is imperialism because there are various nationalities in India (Ambedkar: *Pakistan and Partition of India*). He strongly criticized the transfer of power to the aggressive Hindu majority by the British to decide the fate of minorities by warning that it will lead to imperialism. Taking side of the Muslim nationality, he said: “the Muslims cannot be deprived of the benefit of the principle of self-determination” (Ambedkar: *Pakistan and Partition of India*). But he was not in favour of the territorial independence of the Muslim population or the complete separation of Pakistan from India warning that the Muslims of the non-Pakistan provinces would become helpless after the separation, which is proved to be right within these sixty years of so called independence. He was well aware of the fact that the complete separation of the Pakistan from India will strengthen the position of Brahminical ruling class to exploit the other oppressed nationalities. Therefore he could not demand for the

territorial separation of the untouchables considering every aspect of the Indian society. However he raised the demand of separate electorate and separate settlement for the untouchables as their right to self-determination. Ambedkar remarked, communal representation and self-determination are but two different phrases which express the same notion (Ambedkar 1987).

Separate electorate:

Ambedkar raised the demand of separate electorate for various minorities. He was of the opinion that without proper safeguard for the minorities, the Swaraj in India will become Hindu imperialism. He said that there is no political majority in India. Majority in India is a communal majority. (Ambedkar, communal deadlock in India) Therefore he said that for the protection of the interest of the minorities, there must be political safeguard for them. He demanded separate electorate for the untouchables for their political safeguard. He struggled a lot for separate electorate for the untouchables which was brutally opposed by the Hindu, the Congress and Gandhi. Gandhi on behalf of the Congress and Hindus went on fast unto death to oppose the demand of separate electorate for untouchables and compelled Ambedkar to sign the Poona pact for a joint electorate. However Ambedkar was the strongest opponent of the joint electorate. He said the joint electorate will not satisfy the untouchables. He said, things will be much worse under the system of joint electorates. He firmly believed that the scheduled caste will not be able to elect a man who is their best choice. Taking experience of the election which held in February 1946 under the system of joint electorate, he said, it has completely disfranchised the scheduled castes. He said that the not only the scheduled castes candidates were elected by the Hindus votes but also the candidates who were not elected by the scheduled castes in the primary election were elected by the Hindus. The main reason he provided behind this is the enormous disparity between the voting strength of the scheduled castes and the caste Hindus in most of the constituencies. Ambedkar referred Simon commission and said the situation is almost similar to the all over India (Ambedkar 1947: *States and Minority*). He said that the disparity cannot be ignored and it will remain so ever even under the adult suffrage. Therefore he

demanding for the abolition of the system of joint electorate in favour of the separate electorate. Gandhi, the Congress and the Hindus consistently opposed separate electorate for the untouchables on the ground that the scheduled castes are not a minority and are part of the Hindu. They criticised it as anti-national which would help British imperialism and will perpetuate untouchability. Ambedkar had countered all the above arguments of the opponents rationally with logic and proof. He rejected the logic of religious separation as the only test to determine minority. He said that social discrimination constitutes the real test for determining whether a social group is a minority or majority. He referred the Government of India Act, 1935 which provided separate electorate for the three Christian groups separately, though they belonged to the same religion.

On the third argument, he asked the opponents that under the joint electorate system, how the one day joint voting could bring unity among the untouchable and caste Hindus who for rest of five years live separately. In like manner, he asked, how the one day separate voting will create great separation between untouchable and caste Hindus than what already exist. He said that the Sikhs, Muslims and Christians, all have their separate electorates, but no one says that it will create anti national spirit. He affirm that national and anti-national feeling have nothing to do with the electoral system. They are the result of extra electoral forces (Ambedkar 1947). Ambedkar rejected the logic that separate electorate will perpetuate untouchability as nothing but escapism.

Ambedkar argued that the system of electorate being a devise for the protection of minority, the issue whether they will prefer joint or separate electorate must be left to the wishes of the minority. He also said the majority, being in a position to rule should have no voice in the determination of the electorates of the minority. In other words the majority should wait for the decision of the minority whether they want joint or separate electorate.

Separate settlement:

The demand of separate settlement for untouchables was one of the most important demands of Ambedkar which is directly related with the everyday life

of untouchables and for their existence. He said that without the separate settlement, the untouchables cannot be liberated from the exploitation of the caste Hindus. Therefore the agenda of separate settlement for the untouchables is one of the organic parts of the Ambedkar's notion of equality. He provided genuine reason for the demand of separate settlement. He said, the Hindus live in the village and the untouchables live in the ghettos. Therefore so long as the present village structure continues it is impossible for the untouchables either to free themselves from the yoke of the Hindu or to get rid of the untouchability. He said that it is the close tied association of the untouchables with the Hindus living in the same villages which marks them out as untouchables and which enables the Hindus to identify them as untouchable. He declared that India is the land of villages and so long as the village system provides easy method of marking out and identifying the untouchables they have no escape from untouchability. It is the system of the village plus the ghettos which preserve and perpetuate untouchability. Therefore he demanded that the nexus should be broken and the untouchables who are socially separated should be made separate geographically and territorially. He demanded for the "separate scheduled castes villages" exclusively of untouchables in which the distinction of touchable and untouchable will find no place.

The other reason for demanding separate settlement was the economic position of the untouchables in the villages. He said, untouchables, being a body of landless labourers entirely dependent upon the Hindus for their livelihood they cannot engage in any trade or occupation because of the untouchability. Therefore it is obvious that there is no means of earning open to the untouchables so long as they live in ghetto as dependent part of the Hindu village (Ambedkar 1947).

The economic dependence of untouchables over caste Hindus has other consequences besides the condition of poverty and degradation which proceed from it. The Hindus have a code of life which is part of their religion. This code of life gives them many privileges upon the untouchables which are incompatible with the dignity of human life. Ambedkar stated, the untouchables all over India are fighting against the injustice which the Hindus in the name of their religion

are inflicting upon them. He said that a perpetual war is going on every day in every village between the Hindus and the untouchables which do not see the light of the day. Because the press owned and controlled by Hindus is not prepared to give it publicity for the reason that it will cause injury to their freedom in the eyes of the world. He said that under the village system the untouchables found themselves handicapped in their struggle for free and honourable life. It is a war between the Hindus who are economically and socially strong and the untouchable who are economically poor and numerically small. He said that the Hindu most often succeed in suppressing the untouchables because of many reasons. The Hindus have the police and magistracy on their side. But untouchables have no one on their side except themselves. He said that the untouchables will never get protection from the police and justice from the magistrate in any conflict between untouchables and the Hindus. Naturally the police and the magistracy love their class more than their duty. But he said that the chief weapon in the armoury of the Hindus is the economic power which they have over the poor untouchables living in the village.

Ambedkar on gender equality:

The entire life long struggle of Ambedkar against Brahmanism and caste was nothing but his struggle for the emancipation of women and other oppressed classes.

Ambedkar considered women as the most oppressed category of the Indian caste based social system. He said that the Brahmanical forces are responsible for the degradation of women in Indian society. He told that the Brahmanism artificially constructed the exploitative gender relations and perpetuated them through their religious scriptures given by Manusmriti and upheld by Hindu religion. Some of his works like *The Riddles of the Hinduism*, *The Woman and the Counter Revolution*, *The Rise and Fall of Hindu Women*, *Castes in India*, clearly proved how women were degraded and exploited in the Indian society. Besides these, some of his journals like *Mooknayak* (1920) and *Bahishkrit Bharat* (1927) also speak volumes on the suppression of women by the Hinduism.

He said that Manu, the law giver of Hinduism degraded the position of women by codifying their slavery and exploitation (Ambedkar 1987: *Revolution and Counter Revolution in Ancient India*). He pointed out that the laws of Manu created and perpetuated the Hindu criminal attitude towards women through Hindu religious laws based on shastras, caste and endogamy. He attacked Manusmriti as a major source of exploitation of women which legitimized the denial of freedom, self-respect, right to education, property to women. He said that in the law of Manu the killing of a woman was a minor offence like the killing of Shudras and animals. Manu advises a man not to sit with women in a lonely place including his own sister, daughter or mother. Manu advised men to keep women always under their control throughout her life. Manu said that women must remain under the control of her father in childhood, of her husband in youth, and of her sons in old age. He said girl should not be given independence.

Ambedkar said that the caste system in India is based on the principle of exploitation of women in all sphere. Even the caste system itself is the product of suppression of women. Because without controlling the women the caste structure could not have been developed and maintained. It is the women on whom the entire caste structure stands. He has proved that the super imposition of endogamy over exogamy is the creation of caste (Ambedkar 1987: 7-15). Endogamy is nothing but the suppression of women and caste system cannot exist without endogamy. Therefore the entire pyramid of caste stands over the dead bodies of women. In order to protect endogamy the Brahmins created the inhuman barbarian customs of sati, widowhood and child marriage. Sati was a tradition of burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband to dispose the problem of surplus women to prevent exogamy. It was sanctioned and glorified by the Brahmins and Hinduism. Enforced widowhood was a practice where a widow is not allowed to remarry to prevent the inter-caste marriage. And child marriage was the tradition of arranging a bride (not yet marriageable) for the widower to solve the problem of surplus man to protect and maintain the practice of endogamy (Ambedkar 1987: *Riddles of Hinduism*). Besides, these women were not allowed to have property and were forced to live a life of

slavery by the Hinduism. She was considered impure by the religious scriptures. Manu prohibited education to women and kept her always away from the religious scriptures declaring her impure and dirty. All kind of brutal inhuman exploitation of women was sanctioned, glorified and perpetuated by the Hindu priests (Ambedkar 1987: *Philosophy of Hinduism*). Therefore Ambedkar was the dead enemy of the Hinduism and Brahmins.

Regarding women education, Ambedkar said that unless male education is pursued side by side with female education, the Indian society cannot progress. Ambedkar started his social movement in 1920 by launching his first journal Mook Nayak and stated countering the exploitative caste system and Brahmanism. He has launched his second journal Bahishkrit Bharat in 1927 along with many organisational and political programmes. Through these journals he raised the question of gender equality criticising all the anti-women traditions and customs of Indian society. He emphasised the need of education for the emancipation of depressed classes women in particular and all women in general.

He devoted his entire life for the emancipation of the depressed classes including women. He struggled for the ideals of equality, liberty and fraternity. Ambedkar started his movement from 1920 onwards; women actively participated in those movements and could develop themselves to speak on various issues in various platforms. Venubai Bhatkar and Renubai Shambharkar were the two among those women. Under the leadership of Ambedkar, women participated in satyagrahas and agitation. They also found Untouchable women's associations for spreading education and awareness among women. There were fifty women participated in the demonstration after the bonfire of the *Manusmriti* (Usha 2002: 365-80).

In 1928 a women's association was founded in Bombay and Ramabai, Ambedkar's wife became its president. Women had organised their separate conference along with the Depressed Classes Conference in Nagpur in 1930. Five hundred women participated in the Kalaram Temple Entry Satyagraha at Nasik in 1930 and many of them were arrested along with men.

The All India Dalit Mahila conference was organized in July 1942 where 25,000 women participated. That was the biggest gathering of women in modern India for their emancipation and for a radical transformation of society.

Ambedkar had struggled to pass the Hindu Code Bill in Parliament in 1947, which was strongly opposed by the Hindu orthodox and was defeated. In protest he resigned from the post of Law Minister. Hindu code bill was a revolutionary attempt of Ambedkar towards the emancipation of women from the clutches of Brahmins and exploitation, but it could not succeed because of the Brahmanical forces inside and outside the parliament (Ambedkar 1995: *Dr. Ambedkar and The Hindu Code Bill: General Discussion on the Draft (5th February 1951 to 25th September 1951)*).

Ambedkar's notion of equality stands for the idea that without the annihilation of caste there can be no emancipation of women. Therefore the struggle for the emancipation of women is not different from the struggle for annihilation of caste.

CHAPTER 4

Similarities and Differences in the Notion of Equality in Lenin and Ambedkar and their Contemporary Relevance

Lenin and Ambedkar on morality:

Lenin rejected the bourgeois propaganda that communists have no morality and ethics on grounds that it was an attempt at throwing dust in the eyes of the workers and peasants. Lenin was of the view that although communist ethics and morality existed, it wasn't based on extra-class and extra-human concepts which maintains inequality and perpetuate exploitation in society. He said that extra-human morality is a construction of the reactionaries for the exploitation of the workers and peasants in the interests of the landowners and capitalists (Lenin 1920, vol. 31).

Lenin said that communist morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the proletariat's class struggle for a radical transformation of society. He said that the communist morality originates from the interests of the proletarian class struggle. Lenin strongly rejected the morality based on god. He said that the old society created the god oriented morality which allowed the exploitation of all the workers and peasants by the landowners and capitalists. He said that the peasants and workers have been divided and exploited since generations by the landowners and capitalists. He declared that to destroy the system of feudalism and capitalism the unity of the oppressed is required and that is something God cannot do. Therefore he said that the morality that stands outside human society is a fraud (Lenin 1920, vol. 31).

While relating morality to the class struggle, Lenin said, class struggle means the overthrowing and abolishing the exploiters. He said, the class struggle is continuing and it is the task of a revolutionary to subordinate all interests to that

struggle. To him, morality is something which serves to destroy the old exploiting society uniting all the working people around the proletariat to establish a new communist society.

Lenin's morality is based on the struggle to unite the whole working people against exploitation, against all petty private property responsible for the inequality and subjugation (Lenin 1934).

Ambedkar also rejected the idea of eternal morality following the principle of Buddhism as everything is subjected to change in this material world according to the Buddha. Ambedkar's concept of morality is based on the principle of equality, liberty and fraternity. He rejected any morality which is at the cost of individual or social liberty, freedom and human dignity. He said that the Hindu morality is caste morality and virtue has become caste-ridden and morality has become caste-bound (Ambedkar 1936, *Annihilation of Caste*). Ambedkar's concept of morality is also entirely subordinated to the interest of annihilation of caste and peoples struggle against injustice, inequality, discrimination and exploitation of man by man, community by community and nation by nation. Ambedkar morality is based on the struggle to annihilate caste and class in society establishing equality, liberty and fraternity (Ambedkar 1957, vol.11: *The Buddha and His Dhamma*).

He has also said about the constitutional morality. In the Constituent Assembly itself, Ambedkar had to emphasize upon the constitutional morality to his best to check the influence of caste on the working of government. On November 4, 1948 while moving the Draft of Constitution in the Assembly Ambedkar referred Grote to highlight the importance of constitutional morality. He emphasizes on the diffusion of constitutional morality for the peaceful working of the democratic constitution. He said that there are two things interconnected with it which are not generally recognized. One is that the form of administration and other is the form of the Constitution. He said it is perfectly possible to pervert the Constitution by changing its form of administration and to make it inconsistent and opposed to the spirit of the Constitution.

Therefore on the question of morality both Lenin and Ambedkar do not differ much. Both of them subordinate morality to the struggle for equality and fighting against exploitation, discrimination and humiliation. The only difference is that Ambedkar considered Buddhism as the source of morality while Lenin left it entirely to the class struggle. However the programme of Buddhism for Ambedkar is a matter of caste struggle and annihilation of caste and inequality.

Lenin and Ambedkar on culture:

Lenin recognized the existence of two kinds of culture in society. One is the hegemonic exploitative reactionary culture of the ruling classes and the other is the revolutionary progressive culture of the oppressed classes. He said that these cultures are always in conflict because of the ongoing class struggle. He was advocating proletarian class culture, theorized by Karl Marx for the larger transformation of the whole society. He identified proletariat class culture as a consciousness of the proletariat for making a classless society and ending exploitation by the means of violent revolution and dictatorship of proletariat (Lenin 1920, 1965, vol. 31: "On Proletarian Culture"). Therefore, he said all educational work should be mixed with the spirit of the class struggle being waged by the proletariat for the successful achievement of the aims of its dictatorship for the elimination of all forms of exploitation of man by man. He demonstrated that the Marxist world outlook is the only true expression of the culture of the revolutionary proletariat. He said that without rejecting the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois, Marxism has assimilated and refashioned the values of more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture, and that the proletarian dictatorship is the final struggle against every form of exploitation which could be recognized as the development of a genuine proletarian culture.

Lenin always emphasized the need for a proletarian class culture without which there can never be any proletarian revolution or socialism. His concept of culture is always conditioned with the class struggle for the abolition of classes and exploitation. Lenin considered culture as part of superstructure that is determined

by the base, economy. He spoke about two cultures, i.e. individualistic culture and collective culture in relation to the private property.

However for Ambedkar, culture is as much more social than economic. He considered culture as the root of the society upon which the longevity and survivability of a political and economic structure depends. The Varna system which initially practised and maintained as a part of culture by the Aryan at the Indo-Aryan period later precipitated into caste (Ambedkar 1987, vol. 3: *Philosophy of Hinduism*). It became the foundation of society that started determining ruler and ruled hereditarily for thousands years (Ambedkar 1946). Again he highlighted the role culture as an important weapon at the hands of oppressor to exploit the people (Ambedkar 1987, Vol. 3: *Revolution And Counter Revolution In Ancient India*). He has also said about the revolutionary culture based on equality and for the transformation of society. He declared that culture as the source of power (Ambedkar 1936) and therefore culture occupies an important position in the thought of Ambedkar. Ambedkar said that the conflict Buddhism and Hinduism is nothing but the conflict between the culture of equality and the culture of inequality. Hinduism made inequality as the culture of Indian society through its religious dogma and superstition. Therefore Ambedkar understood Buddhism as source of new egalitarian culture, values and morality for the transformation of the Indian society.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar recognized the importance of the revolutionary culture for the social revolution. The difference is Lenin considered it as a part of superstructure while Ambedkar recognized it as the foundation of society which has a determining role on everything.

Lenin and Ambedkar on religion:

Lenin strongly advocated religion as one of the form of spiritual oppression of people by the ruling class. He said that the vast masses of slaves or working class are exploited by the tiny minority of feudal landlords or capitalists and in order to keep these masses in perpetual suffering the oppressor created religion to divert their attention towards their fate and "God". He made religion as private affair in USSR, but he did not apply it to the party (Lenin 1965).

Lenin like Marx considered Religion as the opium for the people. He said that the economic oppression of the workers inevitably brings every kind of political oppression and social humiliation. It is responsible for the darkening of spiritual and moral life of the masses (Lenin 1965). Lenin considered Religion as one of the forms of spiritual oppression which falls down heavily upon the masses everywhere. Lenin said that the impotence of the exploited classes in their struggle against the oppressors inevitably gives rise to the belief in a better life after death as the impotence of the ancient people in their battle with nature gave rise to belief in gods, devils, miracles and others. Lenin rejected religion on the ground that those who toil and live in poverty all their lives are taught by religion to be submissive and patient on earth to take comfort life in heaven. But those who live by the labour of others are taught by religion to practice charity (Lenin 1965: 83-87).

Lenin said that the modern class-conscious worker reared by large-scale factory undermines the religious prejudices and tries to seek a better life for himself here on earth. He said that the proletariat of today are in favour of socialism that takes science in the battle against the religion. This makes the workers free from their belief in life after death by binding them together to fight in the present for a better life on earth (Lenin 1973: 402-413).

Lenin demanded that religion must be declared a private affair. But he did not consider religion a private affair so far as his Party was concerned. He made it private affair as far as the state is concerned. According to him, religion will not have any connection with the state. He said that one can profess any religion or no religion as atheist. He declared that any kind of discrimination on the basis of religion would be intolerable in Bolshevik government. Even he stopped the practice of mentioning citizen's religion in official documents. He declared that subsidies and services would be provided neither to the church nor to any religious institution. He advocated complete separation of religion from the state.

Ambedkar also rejected the concept of god. But he embraced Buddhism as scientific religion to counter and uproot Brahmanism. He said Buddhism practices communism long before the origin of Marxism (Ambedkar 1987, vol. 3:

Revolution and Counter Revolution in Ancient India). He has also said that religion in India is the source of power for a class to exploit other class. He declared that Hinduism is responsible for the whole degradation of people in India (Ambedkar 1936: *Annihilation of Caste*).

Ambedkar's views on religion are quite different from the view of Lenin. Ambedkar did not consider religion as only the spiritual oppression like Lenin. He said that religion is also responsible for the social and material exploitation. Ambedkar witnessed a different kind of religion in India unlike Marx and Lenin, which is directly responsible for the social- political and economic exploitation. He has witnessed religion determining oppressors and oppressed hereditarily generation after generation. He has seen religion determining people's social status which is independent of economy and education. He has witnessed religion making people untouchable and unapproachable. He has said that religion is dividing working class or proletariat with graded inequality preventing them to create a common front against the oppressors. Therefore Ambedkar's views on religion are bound to differ with the views of the Lenin and Marx. India, the land of caste and Brahmanism has a bitter history of class struggle in the form of religion. Ambedkar has shown that how religion in India has been the root cause of exploitation, determined almost everything-society since some thousand years. He considered religion as an important means of the exploitation. He said that Brahmanism or Hinduism has been the sole means of exploitation at the hands of oppressors. But he has also considered religion like Buddhism as a means of emancipation at the hand of oppressed people to counter the hegemonic exploitative religion. Therefore Ambedkar did not consider all religion as the opium of the masses like Marx and Lenin recognising the objective limitation of the religion. Ambedkar said that the history of Indian society is the history of conflict between Brahmanism and Buddhism. The Indian caste based exploitation has challenged the classical Marxian-Leninist understanding of religion as something part of superstructure of the base (economy). Ambedkar himself converted to Buddhism to counter Hinduism in order to unite untouchables and others under a single platform. But he rejected the idea of god and extra human power. He has taken Buddhism as political philosophy and as the source of

morality to fight against injustice and exploitation in order to establish a society of equality, liberty and fraternity.

Lenin and Ambedkar on women:

Lenin maintained the theory of Marx that the emancipation of women is objectively conditioned with the abolition of private property and the classes. He said that the questions of sex and marriage gives rise to manifold problems in the system of private property or in the bourgeois social order prevail (Alexandra Kollontai 1934). Therefore Lenin advised women workers to overthrow the bourgeoisie system and to establish socialism for their emancipation (Lenin 1918). During his whole period of revolutionary life, Lenin has time and again written and spoken for women's emancipation and gender equality. He said that the emancipation of women is entirely conditioned with the workers' emancipation and that no kind of gender equality would be tolerated post the October Revolution in Russia, both in law and in practice. He said that gender inequality was practised in almost all the bourgeois states both in law and in practice without any exception. He said that feudalism and medievalism was surviving peacefully under the bourgeois democratic system. In 1913, he exposed the bourgeoisie hypocrisy on women question. He declared that the bourgeois were promoting prostitution, women trafficking and raping girls in the colonies and claiming hypocritically as fighting against prostitution (Kollontai 1934)

Regarding the importance of the role of women to protect socialism, Lenin said that when a courageous fighter returns home and listens day after day to the complaints of his wife, he gets influenced. He said that his wife being politically not conscious becomes indirectly an opponent to the continuing struggle for Soviet power. He has expressed that even a warrior who does not surrender to counter-revolution may surrender to his wife coming under her harmful influence. Therefore Lenin said that the female working masses must be converted into soldiers to fight against counter-revolution. He advised woman to realised that the fighting for Soviet power is the fighting her emancipation and for her children.

Ambedkar considered women as the most oppressed category of the Indian brahminical social system. He has explained that how the Brahmanical forces artificially constructed the gender relations and perpetuated women exploitation through their religious scriptures. Some of his works like *The Riddle of the Hinduism*, *Revolution and the Counter Revolution in ancient India*, *The Rise and Fall of Hindu Women*, *Castes in India*, etc are the historical documents which show how women was degraded and exploited in the Indian society. Besides these some of his journals like *Mooknayak* (1920) and *Bahishkrit Bharat* (1927) also reflects much on the suppression of women by the Hinduism.

In his “*Revolution and Counter Revolution*” and “*The Riddles of Hinduism*” Ambedkar has shown how the woman was degraded by the Manu. He pointed out that the laws of Manu created and perpetuated the Hindu criminal attitude towards women through Hindu religious laws based on shastras, caste and endogamy. He attacked *Manusmriti* as a major source of exploitation of women which legitimized the denial of right to education, denial of freedom and property to women (Ambedkar 1916: “*Castes in India; Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development*”). He said that in the law of Manu the killing of a woman was a minor offence like the killing of Shudras and animals. Manu advises a man not to sit with women in a lonely place be it his own sister, daughter or mother. Manu advised man to keep women always under his control throughout her life. Manu said that women must remain under the control of her father in childhood, of her husband in youth, and of her sons her sons in old age. He said girl should not be given independence.

Ambedkar was not only the first in modern India to trace the sufferings of Indian women historically but also to speak and do radically for their emancipation. He tried his best to introduce the famous Hindu Code Bill when he was the law minister of India. But he couldn't introduce the Hindu Code Bill because of the strong opposition of the Brahmanical forces. He gave a scientific analysis of the origin of sati system, widowhood and child marriage in India. He said that the domination of endogamy over exogamy was the beginning of caste and the objective of sati system, widowhood and child marriage was to protect the

endogamy or caste (Ambedkar 1916: *Castes in India; Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development*). Therefore Ambedkar said that the emancipation of women is conditioned with the annihilation of caste, social status and private property.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar do not differ so far as their struggle for the emancipation of women is concerned. Both of them considered women as the most oppressed category and the victims of multiple exploitations irrespective of location. Both of them traced the beginning of women subjugation in their respective societies. Lenin traced the beginning of women exploitation to the origin of private property and family. Ambedkar traced it to the origin of caste recognising the role of private property and family in Indian context.

Lenin and Ambedkar on class struggle:

Lenin said that class struggle is common to every class divided societies and this struggle started with the origin of classes based on the private property where one class who own the means of production exploit the other who do not own the means of production. Lenin said that revolution is the highest form of class struggle in society. He emphasized the need of a revolutionary theory and revolutionary organization to lead the revolution or class struggle. He gave the concept of vanguard party of the proletariat where there will be the professional revolutionaries to lead the class struggle or revolution (Lenin 1902). Lenin said that class struggle will continue to remain in society so long as there is inequalities and exploitation. He has also said that inequalities and exploitation will continue to exist in society so long as there is private property. Therefore Lenin declared to abolish all the institution of private property which is responsible for all sorrow and oppression. Lenin advocated violent revolution and dictatorship of proletariat as the means of class struggle to abolish the oppressors and oppression.

Ambedkar said that all political societies get divided into two classes-the rulers and the ruled (Ambedkar 1991: 106, vol. 10: *Labour and Parliamentary Democracy*). He said that man is not a mere machine, but a human being with the

feelings of sympathy and antipathy for others and this is also true with the great man of the society. Therefore he declared that the great men are also charged with the feelings of class sympathies and class antipathies. Considering this fact he said that the best man may turn out to be the worst from the views point of the servile classes. The difference between the oppressed classes and oppressors classes in their attitudes towards each other is same as the attitude of a person of one nation for other. He said the difference between the governing class and servile class in India towards communal reservation is of the same nature as the difference between Germany and French. He has considered each class as a nation (Ambedkar 1945: *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*). He stated that the conflict between nations is occasional, but the conflict between classes is constant and perpetual (Ambedkar 1957: *The Buddha and His Dhamma*).

He said, "Caste as an enclosed class". It implies that there are number of self-enclosed social classes (castes) within broader framework of oppressed class. These classes are enclosed in a water tight compartment with graded inequality which prevents them to make a common front against the common enemies. He has shown that caste war in India is a different form of class struggle. Ambedkar said that the history of Indian society is the history of conflict between Buddhism and Brahmanism which is a form of class struggle.

Describing the nature of class struggle in India in his time he said that the governing class is aware that a political campaign based on class ideology, class interests, class issues and class conflicts will tool its death knell. Therefore he said that the most effective way of side-tracking the oppressed classes and fooling them is to play upon the sentiment of nationalism. He has clearly declared that the governing class in India is a Brahmin Bania combine and congress was the best platform for these classes. Further he said that the so called independence was only the transfer of power from the British to the Brahmanical governing class of India. Therefore he demonstrated that Brahmanism which recognizes the suppression and degradation of the Shudras and the untouchables as the sacred

duty of the state will continue to be the philosophy of the state even if India became free (Ambedkar 1945).

Ambedkar while addressing the Bombay Presidency Untouchables Conference on 31st May 1936, at Bombay said that the problem of untouchability is a matter of class struggle. It is a struggle between caste Hindus and the Untouchables. He told that it is not a matter of injustice being done to one individual; rather it is an injustice being done by one class against another. He said that this class struggle has its relation with the social status which indicates how one class should keep its relations with the other class. He said that Hinduism as the political philosophy of a class to rule the other class (Ambedkar 1987: *Philosophy of Hinduism*).

Both Lenin and Ambedkar have similar stand on the class struggle. They agreed on the point that the history of human society is nothing but the history of class struggle in one form or in other form. The difference is that Lenin's idea of class struggle is much more economical based on private property while Ambedkar's idea of class struggle is much more social based on politically economically charged social status.

Lenin and Ambedkar on violent revolution:

Lenin said the ruling class cannot be overthrown without the violent revolution of the proletariat. Lenin spoke about the inevitability of a violent revolution for the emancipation of the whole oppressed (Lenin 1918). Regarding the concept of violent revolution, Lenin referred Engels' historical analysis of the role and necessity of violent revolution. He said that violent revolution is directly linked with the withering away of the state. He said that force plays revolutionary role in history of the world. He considered that force is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with a new one. He said that without force the economy based on exploitation cannot be overthrown. But he maintained that all use of force is not revolutionary.

According to Lenin the replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution and the abolition of the proletarian state is impossible except going through the process of withering away. Lenin said that violent revolution in a bourgeois state is inevitable. He referred both Marx and Engels and said that the bourgeois state cannot be superseded by the proletarian state through the process of withering away, but only through a violent revolution. To him the proletarian revolution is impossible without the violent destruction of the bourgeois state machine.

Defending the concept of violent revolution, he said that this principle was not derived out of any speculation and dogma. He said that the detailed and concrete elaboration of these views was given by Marx and Engels after studying each particular revolutionary situation and analysing the lessons of the experience of each particular revolution (Lenin 1918, vol. 25, *State and Revolution*).

However Lenin said that the abolition of the violence is conditioned with the elimination of division of mankind into classes and all exploitation of man by man and nation by nation (Lenin 1964: 398-421). It means so long as there is class based exploitation in society the violence and war will not be abolished. Lenin has considered war as an important feature of capitalism. Therefore he said that unless capitalism is replaced by socialism and all the conditions responsible for the exploitation of man by man is abolished, the possibility of violence and war cannot be avoided.

On the other hand, Ambedkar never theorized violence as an inevitable means for the social transformation as theorized by Lenin and Marx. But he recognized the use of force as an important means for any kind of social revolution. He said that when there has been any conflict between ethics and economics, history has witnessed the victory of economics unless there is sufficient force behind the ethics. He declared himself to be a believer in ahimsa, but in the sense defined by the great saint Tukaram. Referring Tukaram he said, ahimsa consisted of two things, first is the love and kindness towards all creatures and second is the destruction of all evil doers. He said the second part of the definition is most

important which is generally ignored. As a result he said that the doctrine of ahimsa becomes so ridiculous. This definition of non-violence by Ambedkar emphasised the necessity of destruction of evil doer as its important principle without which Ambedkar's idea of non-violence cannot exist. Here the destruction of evil doer stands for the use of force or violence for greater social purpose. He did not advocate to surrender before the force of violence and to stop all kind of war. He has said that the peace which is obtained by surrendering to the force of violence is no peace. He considered it as an act of suicide and a sacrifice of all values that are necessary for maintaining a worthy human life to the forces of savagery and barbarism. He said that war cannot be abolished by merely refusing to fight when attacked and to abolish war; one must win war and establish just peace (Ambedkar 1970). So he held the view that war or violence cannot be abolished just by refusing or ignoring, but by fighting and winning the war. While describing the notion of violence Ambedkar referred Buddha, which is quite different from the existing definitions. He said that a man who fights for justice and safety cannot be accused of violence. He said that when all the means of maintaining peace have failed then the responsibility for violence falls on the person who starts the war. He said that a war there may be but it must not be for selfish ends (Ambedkar 1987). Therefore Ambedkar was not against all war, he supported war for justice and safety of the human being.

Ambedkar highlighted three important prerequisites of an armed revolution. First is the existence of a sense of a wrong in society, second is the people's capacity to know that they are suffering because of the wrong and the third is the availability of the arms. He said, these three things are absent in Indian society from a long time. The reason behind this is Brahmanism in India always kept the lower caste deprived of education, wealth and arms since thousands of years dividing them in gradation. This is the reason for not having any armed revolution in India in spite of so much exploitation (Ambedkar 1987, vol. 3: *Philosophy of Hinduism*).

Ambedkar, in his last speech to the constituent assembly on the completion of draft constitution, he has referred to the violence method or unconstitutional

method for many times as a warning directly and indirectly as a means of social transformation, what people can adopt if the government fails to provide them justice. In one place he has justified unconstitutional methods for achieving economic and social objectives when there is no scope to achieve it by constitutional methods (Ambedkar's historical address on instability in democratic political system, last speech on 25.11.1949 in the constituent assembly, 2012). Here the unconstitutional methods no doubt stand for the use of force and violence. Regarding the class war he said in another place that the down trodden classes are tired of being governed and they are impatient to govern themselves. He said that this urge for self-realization in the down trodden classes must not be allowed to develop into a class war. He declared that it would lead to a division of the house and will be a day of disaster. Therefore he said that the sooner room is made for the realization of their aspiration, the better for the country, the better for the maintenance of its independence. He suggested that this can only be done by the establishment of equality and liberty in all spheres of life. The third one which is very important and a famous statement of Ambedkar is in which he declared openly the need for a violent revolution or social and economic equality if the system fails to provide it. He said that the depressed classes are entering into a life of contradictions. In politics they will have equality and in social and economic life they will have inequality. And he continued that if the state continues to deny it for long, then it would be danger for political democracy. He said that the state must remove this contradiction at the earliest possible moment or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy.

The last statement of his last speech in the constituent assembly is of great importance. It speaks about the new ideologies, protection of the constitution and the government for the people. He said that by independence we have lost the excuse of blaming the British for anything wrong. He predicted that there is a danger of things going wrong. He declared that times are fast changing and people are being moved by new ideologies. He continued further and said, they are getting tired of government by the people. They are prepared to have

government for the people and are indifferent whether it is government of the people and by the people. He indirectly warned the ruling class that if the constitution is to be preserved, then they must remove the existing evils which keep people in perpetual exploitation.

Here Ambedkar spoke for new ideologies. Though he has not mention the name of any ideology, it is important to infer which ideologies he referred. When he spoke about the people that they are in favour of government for the people, he made clear about the ideologies that it must also speak about government for the people. And as far the ideologies are concerned which talks about government for the people, violent revolution, complete destruction of the old system, real socialism and real equality, it is most probably the Marxism . So he completed his last speech to the assembly by showing the clear possibility of a structural destruction of the system if it fails to assure the social and economic equality to the people. It is very crucial to remember that he was addressing to the constituent assembly, fortunately, as a founding father of the Indian constitution as well as of the new political system. Therefore he was representing two character at one time, one as a representative of the new political system and other as the only unchallenged leader of the voiceless millions, the depressed classes (untouchable, tribal and other historically oppressed people). Unfortunately, he was representing both oppressors and oppressed at a time, the toughest job ever he did in his life. However, he did not fail to take stand on behalf of the oppressed millions who were waiting to the new government.

Much before the transfer of power from the British to the Indian governing class, while addressing the All India Depressed Classes Congress at Nagpur in 1930, he said about the revolution. He strongly condemned the people who were telling that that the settlement of social problem should wait till the political freedom of the country was achieved. He said this as a political trap and advised the untouchable not to allow power to sleep at the hands of Brahminical class. He asked them to be ready for another revolution. He said that the man in position is more powerful than the man who is out of position and the man in possession of power seldom abdicate in favour of those who are out of it. Therefore he said that

untouchable should not hope for the effectuation of the settlement of the social problem from those who stand to lose by the settlement unless they are prepared to have another revolution to dethrone those whom they have helped to capture the power (Ambedkar 1945: *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*).

Ambedkar found a self-defence organization, SSD (Samata Sainik Dal) for untouchable with an objective of a revolutionary transformation of the Indian society. The organizational structure of the SSD is no way less military than any military wing of a nation. Its constitution, training, naming are very radical, seems to be preparing for something which is not less than any armed revolution (Ambedkar 2003: 566). For example, 12 sainiks forms one section, two section form one platoon, four platoons make one company, four company make one battalion, three battalion make one regiment and 2500 such regiments make one division. There will be one company leader and one lieutenant for one company and one battalion respectively. The leader of the regiment is called as G.O.C. SSD was the most radical social organization ever had in India, for a revolutionary purpose.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar have recognized the necessity of force and violent revolution for the social transformation to destroy inequalities and exploitation. The difference is that Lenin's idea of violent revolution is "inevitable necessity" while Ambedkar's idea of violent revolution is "conditional necessity". Lenin's notion of socialism is conditioned with the violent revolution while Ambedkar's notion of violent revolution is conditioned with the fail ware of the system. Lenin has theorized violent revolution as unavoidable and inevitable while Ambedkar did not. Lenin concept of violent revolution is open and visible while Ambedkar's concept of violent revolution is hidden and submerged. However, they differ in their nature of understanding violence. Ambedkar said that oppressed cannot be accused of violence even if they resist, but Lenin called it as revolutionary violence. Ambedkar has taken this idea from the Buddha's theory of violence and non-violence.

Lenin and Ambedkar on democracy and dictatorship of proletariat

Lenin criticised the bourgeois democracy as dictatorship of bourgeois over the working class in the name of democracy. To Lenin democracy is a state which recognizes the subordination of minority to the majority that is an organisation for the systematic use of force by one class against another, by one section of population against another. He spoke for a democracy where subordination of minority to the majority, one man to another or one section of population to another will be abolished (Lenin 1968). Lenin countered Kautsky on the issue of democracy when Kautsky was defending western democracy as the pure democracy as something different from dictatorship. Lenin, in his pamphlet “The Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky” has discussed Kautsky's views regarding the concept of democracy and dictatorship in all the advanced capitalist countries. Lenin attacked the present day democracy by saying that it is deceiving the people and hiding the bourgeois character of present-day democracy. Lenin rejected the elections system held all capitalists countries declaring it as the means to confuse the poor working class. He strongly opposed the terminologies like “free”, “equal”, “democratic” and “universal” of the capitalist countries. He said these words are designed to conceal the truth so that the means of production and political power remain in the hands of the exploiters and that the real freedom and real equality for the exploited that is for the vast majority of the population will remain out of the question. Lenin while rejecting kautsky on bourgeois democracy Marx and Engels to explain that proletariat cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made bourgeois state machine and wield it for their own purpose, but they must smash it to create new one (Marx and Engels, Communist Manifesto, 1872 edn). Lenin said renegade Kautsky, in his dictatorship of the proletariat, has distorted Marxism. Lenin said that it is sheer mockery of the working and exploited people to speak of pure democracy, equality, freedom and universal rights when all working people are ill-fed, ill-clad and ruined because of the capitalist wage slavery. He referred Marxism highlighting historical limitation of the bourgeois democracy and advised workers to take advantage of bourgeois democracy which in compared with feudalism represents a great historical advance. But he warned them not to forget the bourgeois character of this democracy. He advised workers not to share the superstitious belief in the

state which is even in the most democratic republic is a machine for the suppression of one class by another. He said that the bourgeois who are compelled to describe pure democracy to the democratic republic in order to hide the reality and to confuse people. But in practice he said it as the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of the exploiters over the working people. To him, the democratic republic, the Constituent Assembly, general elections, etc, are nothing but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. For the emancipation of labour and workers from the yoke of capital, he declared, there is no other way but to replace this dictatorship with the dictatorship of the proletariat (Lenin1918). According to Lenin, the dictatorship of the proletariat alone can emancipate humanity from the oppression of capital, from the hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy and to establish democracy for the poor. Lenin while describing the nature of bourgeois democracy gave two examples; those are freedom of assembly and freedom of the press. He said that freedom of assembly and the press in the “democratic” republic is false and hypocritical. He said it as the freedom for the rich to buy and bribe the press and to confuse the people with poisonous lies of the bourgeois press. He stated that the dictatorship of the proletariat will take all these from the capitalists and hand over to the working people, the best buildings, printing presses and the stocks of newsprint. Lenin said that replacing dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat means replacing democracy for the rich by democracy for the poor. This means replacing freedom of assembly and the press for the minority (exploiters) by freedom of assembly and the press for the majority of the population, for the working people. Lenin described it as the historic extension of democracy and transformation from falsehood into truth with the liberation of humanity from the shackles of capital. Lenin referred Marx and said revolutions are the locomotives of history which will teach quickly (Lenin 1918).

Ambedkar said that the democratic form of Government presupposes a democratic form of society. He declared that the framework of democracy is meaningless social democracy. While describing the meaning of democracy he said that democracy is not a form of government, it is essentially a form of

society. He declared that democracy unmistakably involves two things. The first is an attitude of mind that is an attitude of respect and equality towards their fellows and the second is a social organization free from rigid social barriers. He said that democracy is incompatible and inconsistent with isolation and exclusiveness based on the distinction between the privileged and the unprivileged (Ambedkar, vol. 1: *Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah*).

He said that to have a democratic government, there need a democratic society. It means without a democratic society there can never be a democratic government. The democratic society to Ambedkar is a society where there will be attitude of self-respect and equality towards their fellows without exclusiveness and distinction resulting from the condition of privileged and unprivileged (Ambedkar 1943). He said that democracy cannot be equated with either republic or parliamentary form of government and the roots of democracy must not be searched in the form of government, or otherwise. To him, democracy is a mode of associated living which must be searched in social relationship in terms of the associated life between the people who form the society (Ambedkar 1936: *Annihilation of Caste*). He has defined three kind of democracy, political, social and economic. He gave importance to the social and economic democracy than political democracy because he firmly believed that political democracy cannot succeed without social and economic democracy. Again he said that social and economic democracies are tissue and the fibre of a political democracy. Ambedkar said that the prerequisite for the existence of democracy in society is the absence of inequality in all forms. For the successful working of democracy he declared that there must not be an oppressed class. It means there must not be any kind exploitation in a democratic society. Commenting on failure of parliamentary democracy, he said that it has developed a passion for liberty but it failed to realize the significance of equality and did not even try to make a balance between liberty and equality, as a result liberty swallowed equality and has made democracy a farce (Ambedkar 1991). He said that the parliamentary democracy came after a long and bloody struggle fighting against the feudal monarch and raised the slogan of equality, liberty and fraternity. But it failed to

achieve the social and economic equality in society which led to the emergence of revolt against the parliamentary democracy in many countries. Observing the experience of parliamentary democracy in western countries he warned: “beware of parliamentary democracy, it is not the best product, as it appeared to be” (Ambedkar 1991). He provided two reasons for the failure of parliamentary democracy. One is the wrong ideology and other is the wrong organization. The wrong ideology upheld the freedom of contract in the name of liberty creating economic exploitation in society by promoting capitalism and undermined the social and economic equality. Regarding the bad organization he said that the organizations or political parties in a parliamentary democracy are so arranged that always the rulers come from the ruling class and the ruled never becomes the ruling class. Therefore he said that parliamentary democracy has never been a government of the people or by the people and that is why it never been a government for the people. He demonstrated, “parliamentary democracy, notwithstanding the paraphernalia of a popular government is in reality a government of a hereditary subject class by a hereditary ruling class” (Ambedkar 1991).

Ambedkar’s emphasis on the socio-economic equality for the working of democracy is culminated in his historical speech during the adoption of the Constitution where he warned that the society is going to enter into a life of contradictions. In politics there will have equality and in social and economic life there will be inequalities. If the government will continue to deny the social and economic equality for long, then the people who are suffering from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy (Ambedkar 1949). He said that the political democracy cannot succeed where there is no social and economic democracy.

Regarding the dictatorship of proletariat, Ambedkar appreciated the communist dictatorship in Russia for its wonderful achievement and he said that Russian dictatorship would be good for all backward countries. But he opposed the permanent dictatorship. He said that humanity does not want economic values, it also want spiritual values to be retained. Again he said that dictatorship for a

short period may be good and a welcome thing even for making democracy safe. But he said that it must liquidate itself after it has done its work, after it has removed all the obstacles and boulders in the way of democracy and has made the path of democracy safe. From this above writings it is very clear that Ambedkar was not the enemy of the proletariat dictatorship. Instead he recognized the necessity of proletariat dictatorship for all backward countries and to make democracy safe. But he opposed the permanent dictatorship (Ambedkar 1987).

Both Lenin and Ambedkar have almost similar stand on democracy. Both of them agreed on the point that democracy cannot be achieved without ending exploitation and inequalities on the basis of rights and dignity. The minor difference is that Lenin once defined democracy as a state which recognizes the subordination of minority to the majority that is an organization for the systematic use of force by one class against another, by one section of population against another. While Ambedkar defined it as mode of associated living where there will be mutual respect for each other free from any social barriers and segregation. Regarding the parliamentary democracy both of them have agreed on the point that it is not the best product as it appeared to be. Lenin completely rejected the parliamentary democracy as the dictatorship of the bourgeois declaring that violent revolution is required to establish the real democracy (dictatorship of the proletariat) of the people. While Ambedkar did not advocate those principles completely, he realized the need of a violent revolution if parliamentary democracy fails to establish social and economic equality and recognized the necessity of proletariat dictatorship for all backward countries to establish democracy, which is not permanent in its nature.

Lenin and Ambedkar on right to self-determination:

To Lenin, right of nations to self-determination means only the right to independence and political secession from the oppressing nation. But he said that this demand is identical with the demand for secession for the formation of small states. He said it as the logical expression of the struggle against national

oppression in every form. Lenin said that the aim of socialism is not only to abolish the present division of mankind into small states and all national isolation but also to merge them.

In order to achieve this objective, he demanded the liberation of the oppressed nations. He said that this demand must be raised not in general and in empty declamations, but in a clearly and precisely formulated political programme. He said, just as mankind cannot achieve the abolition of classes without going through the phase of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so also mankind cannot achieve the inevitable merging of nations without passing through the transition phase of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede. During Bolshevik revolution, Lenin demanded the right of self-determination of the various oppressed nationalities, as a result all the oppressed nationalities joined in the revolution under the leadership of Bolshevik party. After the revolution, a union of Russia and others nationalities was framed under the leadership of Bolshevik party which came to known as Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), recognizing the right to self-determination i.e. right to secede of the various nationalities. The cultural autonomy of the various nationalities were maintained and respected by the Bolshevik party under the leadership of Lenin. Lenin strongly supported the national liberation struggle of the various nations against the imperial forces. He was one of the early radical intellectual and leader to theorize and promote the ideas of right to self-determination of the oppressed nationalities.

Ambedkar does not differ with Lenin so far as the question of right to self-determination is concerned. Ambedkar said French revolution gave rise to two new principles, one is the principle of self-government and other is the principle of self-determination. According to Ambedkar, the principle of self-government expresses the desire of the people to rule it by their own whether the rulers are absolute monarchs, dictators, or privileged classes which is called democracy. And the principle of self-determination expresses the desire of a people united by common ideals and common purpose to decide its political status whether independence, interdependence or union with other people of the world without

external compulsion which is called nationalism (Ambedkar 1987). Ambedkar said that the idea underlying self-determination has developed along two different lines. First it meant the right to establish a form of government in accordance with the wishes of the people. Secondly it has meant the right to obtain national independence from an alien race irrespective of the form of government. Regarding the right to self-determination Ambedkar has said three important points. Firstly, nationality is not sacrosanct and absolute principle which can override every other consideration. Secondly, separation is not quite so essential for the preservation of a distinct nationality. The third point is self-determination for a nationality may take the form of cultural independence or may take the form of territorial independence. Again which form it can take depends upon the territorial lay out of the population. If any nationality lives in contiguous areas, it may take the form of territorial independence but where there is intermingling of nationalities all over the areas which not easily severable, then territorial independence is impossible. It may either take the form of cultural independence or the only alternative remains for people is the migration. Ambedkar was the most leading intellectual and political leader of his period to raise the demand of self-determination of the oppressed nationalities. He said that nationalism in India is imperialism because India is a umbrella of various nationalities. He strongly criticized the transfer of power to the aggressive Hindu majority by the British to decide the fate of minorities by warning that it will lead to imperialism. Taking side of the Muslims nationality, he said: “the Muslims cannot be deprived of the benefit of the principle of self-determination” (Ambedkar 1946, vol. 8: Pakistan or The Partition of India). But he was not in favour of the territorial independence of the Muslim population or the complete separation of Pakistan from India warning that the Muslims of the non-Pakistan provinces would become helpless after the separation, which is proved to be right within these sixty years of so called independence. He was well aware of the fact that the complete separation of the Pakistan from India will strengthen the position of Brahminical ruling class to exploit the other oppressed nationalities. Therefore he could not demand for the territorial separation of the untouchable considering every aspect of the Indian society. However, he raised the demand of separate electorate and separate

settlement for the untouchable as their right to self-determination. Ambedkar said, communal representation and self-determination are but two different phrases which express the same notion (Ambedkar 1987).

Therefore both Ambedkar and Lenin have taken similar stand on the issue of right to self-determination of the nations. The only difference is that Ambedkar had proposed that the communal representation is also another name of self-determination. He declared, separate electorate and separate settlement for untouchables are nothing but their right to self-determination.

Lenin and Ambedkar on social movement:

Social movement for Lenin was the movement to abolish social inequality created by the economic exploitation. Lenin never distinguished between social equality and economic equality because he believed that the economic exploitation is responsible for the social degradation and humiliation of the workers, peasants and women. To end exploitation of man by man in all form is the only objective of Lenin's social movement by the means of violent revolution and dictatorship of proletariat. Lenin criticized the functioning of the Social Democratic parties of his time in Russia, for not taking social movement in proper direction. He said that the "economist" trend in the working class movement created the danger of a weakening of connection between the Russian working-class and Russian Social-Democracy, the vanguard in the struggle for political liberty. To strengthen this connection was the most important part of the Lenin's social movement. He upheld that Social-Democracy is the combination of the working-class movement and socialism. One of the objective of the of Lenin's social movement was not to serve the working-class movement passively at each of its separate stages, but to represent the interests of the movement as a whole for its ultimate aim and to safeguard its political and ideological independence. He said that the working-class movement in isolation of the social democracy becomes petty bourgeois. He believed that in waging only the economic struggle the working class loses its political independence and it becomes the tail of other parties and betrays the great principle. Therefore he

said, he said the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves. So the social movement for him was to build up the working class movement in right direction towards the socialist revolution. He said the principal and fundamental of the social movement was to facilitate the political organization of the working class. Therefore he said, those who push this task into the back ground are following a false path and causing serious harm to the social movement. He believed that without such organization the proletariat will never rise to the class-conscious struggle to emancipate itself and the whole of the Russian people from political and economic slavery. He declared that if there will be a strongly organized party, a single strike may turn into a political demonstration, into a political victory over the government and a revolt in a single locality may grow into a victorious revolution (Lenin1964: 366-371).

Ambedkar never considered that the economic exploitation is the only factor responsible for the social degradation or humiliation of the workers, peasants and women. Rather he believed that the social degradation of the lower caste people is much more responsible for their economic exploitation. Therefore unlike Lenin, social movement for Ambedkar is much more social than economical. He realized that the workers and peasants in India are not economic categories who are class conscious, but they are very much social categories and caste conscious divided with graded inequality of the caste system. They identify themselves with their caste and not with their class. Therefore Ambedkar said, caste system is not merely division of labour, it is also a division of labourers accompanied by the unnatural division of labourers into 'water tight compartments'. (Ambedkar1936). There are many self-enclosed social classes (castes) within an economic class category with descending order of hatred and ascending order of contempt. Therefore Ambedkar said that caste is enclosed class. The social hierarchy of the labouring class prevents them to make a common front against their common enemies. Ambedkar was very much critical about the so called social reformers, progressive individuals and the communist parties of his time for neglecting caste issue seriously. He said that there can never be any revolution so long as the proletariats are divided on the various castes. Therefore he led the anti-caste

movement in India and dedicated his entire life fighting against caste. He said that the root cause of caste is the religion (Hinduism or Brahmanism) which sanctified and glorified the caste system. Because of the religious flavor, caste has become the culture and religious matter for everyone. Therefore he declared that caste cannot be annihilated without uprooting the Hinduism or Brahmanism. So the annihilation of the caste and class, uniting all the oppressed people was the sole objective of the Ambedkar's social movement. He gave prime importance to the social movement than political movement. He said that without social union, political unity is difficult to be achieved. If achieved, it would be as precarious as a summer sapling, liable to be uprooted by the gust of a hostile wind (Ambedkar 1987). He demonstrated that however important political forces may be in the regeneration of a community, social, economic and moral forces are more vital and that political forces are only a means to the social, economic and moral regeneration of a people. Ambedkar from the very beginning laid greater stress on social movement than political movement (Ambedkar 1987).

Ambedkar's idea of social movement in its spirit is identical with the Lenin's idea of social movement but it differs little in its form in accordance with the prevailing social condition of their respective societies. For Lenin social movement was much more economical than social while for Ambedkar it was more social than economical. The reason behind this was Lenin considered that economic exploitation is responsible for the social humiliation or degradation of the people, while Ambedkar declared that social degradation of the people led to their economic exploitation.

Lenin and Ambedkar on Education:

While discussing about the importance of knowledge, Lenin said that the people are realizing knowledge as an important weapon in their struggle for emancipation and their failures are due to lack of education (Lenin 1965). He considered education as one of the component parts of the proletarian class struggle. He said that without education, the hypocrisy and lies of the bourgeois could not be countered with the complete and honest truth. He declared that the

soviet education and the Marxist outlook have discredited the belief that bourgeois democracy serves the interests of the majority. He countered the hypocrisy of the bourgeois educational system of claiming it above politics. Lenin told that the term apolitical or non-political education is a piece of bourgeois hypocrisy. He said that the education was thoroughly mixed with the bourgeois caste spirit. He declared that in all bourgeois states the connection between political apparatus and education is very strong, although bourgeois society cannot frankly acknowledge it. He has also told that the reactionary education is indoctrinated into the masses through the church and the institution of private property (Lenin 1968). He has taken education as part of the struggle for overthrowing the bourgeoisie. He demonstrated that education divorced from life and politics is lies and hypocrisy. He realized education as indispensable for the successful victory of proletariat over the bourgeois (Lenin 1965: 84-87).

The community which Ambedkar belonged to is deprived of education since thousand years by the Brahminical forces. He said, the complete denial of education to the Shudra and untouchable was one of the cardinal principles of Brahmanism which is responsible for their degradation and suffering Therefore Ambedkar gave the slogan of educate, agitate and organize. He emphasized the necessity of education to counter Brahmanism and caste because he said the foundations of Brahmanism are the superstition and illiteracy. He realized education as a double edged weapon can destroy the tyranny as well as maintain the tyranny. In that sense, whether education can destroy the caste or not he said, the answer is yes as well as no. He said that if education is given as it is today, it will have no effect on caste. In order to prove it he gave the example of Brahmin caste in India. He said that the cent percent of Brahmin caste are educated and majority of them are highly educated. But they never developed any interest to annihilate the caste. Instead they are very much eager to defend and preserve the caste system by interpreting it in many way utilizing their degree and intellect. Therefore he said, "in fact, an educated person belonging to the higher caste is more interested, after his education, to retain the caste system than he was not educated." So from this point of view the education is not helpful for the social

transformation. This is the negative side of education. But he said, education can lead the social transformation fighting caste system if it is given to the lower strata of the Indian society. It would raise their spirit of rebellion to fight against exploitation. Therefore he said that if education is given to those who have a vested interest to protect the caste system, then the caste system will be strengthened. On the other hand if it is given to the lower strata of society who is interested to blowing up the caste system, then the caste system will be blown down. He criticized the indiscriminate education given by the Indian government and America foundation by saying that it will strengthen the caste system. He said, to make rich richer and poor poorer is not the way to abolish poverty. The same is true of using education as a means to fight caste system. To give education to those who want protect the caste system is not to improve the prospect of democracy in India but to put our democracy in greater jeopardy (Lenin 1956: 519-523).

As far the education is concerned both Lenin and Ambedkar have taken similar stand. Both of them considered education as the component part of their struggle for equality.

Contemporary relevance of Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality:

The relevance of any social theory must be evaluated on the basis of two grounds. The first one is the doctrines of that theory whether it reflects the existing social reality or not. The second one is the revolutionary changes that theory has achieved for the radical transformation of society. As far as the second part is concerned, it involves the practice of that theory by the philosopher himself and her/her legacy carried out by others after her/his death. Applying these two factors to both Lenin and Ambedkar we must evaluate their contemporary relevance. Before discussing the important doctrines of both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality, I would like to discuss about the practice of their philosophy. Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality needs to be judged on the basis of its practice and impact in society for the real realization of equality.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar were the social revolutionary have brought many changes in society and have relevance. The major difference in the practice of their theories is that Lenin notion of equality has been carried out in Russia with the help of state machinery. Ambedkar's notion of equality is struggling against the hegemonic unequal social structure is yet to become a dominant ideology dethroning Brahmanism. The practice of Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality has a long history cannot be studied within the given time. Therefore I will be very brief in describing the practice of both Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality.

As we know Lenin since his student life was engaged in the revolutionary movement in the Russian society. He was working among the students, workers and peasants to unite them for a revolution to smash the feudal system of the Russia. At the early phase of the twentieth century Russia was going through many socio-political transitions because of the First World War and the pathetic socio-economic condition of people which created a mature ground for the development of revolution in Russia. It led to the overthrow of Czar Rulers in February 1917. Lenin has experienced the whole process of political transition in Russia. He had a determining role in the process of social transformation in Russia.

After the fall of Czar, two contending groups emerged in Russia to claim leadership over it. The first were the former Duma members and the second was the Petrograd Soviet. The Petrograd soviet represented the workers and peasant while the former Duma members represented the middle and upper classes. Lenin was the unchallenged leader of the soviets. At the beginning Duma members formed the provisional government. But soon after Lenin returned from the exile after the February revolution, he called for an insurrection against the provisional government. Lenin arrived in Petrograd at the Finland Station on 3rd April, 1917. Tens of thousands of workers and soldiers came to the station to greet Lenin. There were cheers all around and a sea of red waving flags. Lenin congratulated the Russian people first for their successful February revolution.

In his speech Lenin denounced the Provisional Government as the government of bourgeoisie and called for a new revolution. He reminded the people that the country was still at war and that the Provisional Government failed to give the people bread and land.

At the beginning Lenin was a lone voice to condemn the Provisional Government. But Lenin worked ceaselessly over the following few months and convinced the people, giving the slogan of Peace, Land, Bread. By September 1917, Lenin realized that the Russian people were ready for another revolution. On October 10, a secret meeting of the Bolshevik party leaders was organized to carry out the revolution. Lenin convinced the others that it was time for an armed insurrection. After having debated through the night, a vote was taken the following morning in favour of a revolution.

The people themselves were ready for revolution and in the very early hours of October 25, 1917, the revolution began. Bolsheviks captured the telegraph, power station, strategic bridges, post office, train stations, and state bank. Within a very short time everything was captured by the Bolshevik. By late that morning Bolsheviks captured the Petrograd except the Winter Palace where the leaders of the Provisional Government remained. But troops loyal to the Bolsheviks occupied the Winter Palace.

Lenin by applying the theory of violent revolution by Karl Marx could bring a new era of the workers and peasant for the first time in history. Lenin declared that the new regime would end the war and all private land ownership and would create a system for workers' control of factories.

However Lenin premises were hard to materialize because of the unfavourable condition created by the First World War. After Russia pulled out of World War, millions of Russian soldiers returned home who were hungry, tired, and wanted their jobs back. But their lives became much worse because of the increasing hunger and starvation with the counter revolutionary forces of the feudal upper and middle classes.

Lenin declared war communism in order to protect the revolution and to solve the problems of hunger and starvation which led to the civil war in Russia in 1918. The war broke out between Whites (those against the revolution which included monarchists, liberals, and other socialists) against the Reds (those in favour of revolution). The Civil War lasted for two years and the Reds succeeded to defeat the counter revolutionary forces. Millions of people were killed in the civil war.

War communism of Lenin had two objectives, first to defeat the counter revolutionary forces and second was to solve the problems of hunger, famine and starvation. In order to achieve this Lenin nationalized all land and industries. Bank and shipping were also nationalized and foreign trade was declared a state monopoly.

On June 28th, 1918, Lenin passed a decree that ended all forms of private capitalism. All large factories were taken over by the state and by November, 1920, any factory or industry that employed over 10 workers was nationalized. War Communism also took control over the food distribution. The Food Commissariat was set up to do this important task. Collective farming was introduced and all cooperatives were fused together under this Commissariat. In spite of all these policies of the Lenin, the poverty, hunger and starvation in Russia continued to remain. Therefore Lenin introduced New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921 at the tenth party congress. The NEP allowed peasants to dispose their food surpluses on the open market which was banned earlier under war communism. This led to the denationalization of small-scale industry and services. The establishment of trusts for supplying, financing, and marketing the products of large-scale industry were all designed to re-establish the link between town and country. Lenin said NEP as a small retreat for a bigger attack.

Though NEP revived the Soviet economy, it led to the re-emergence of a capitalist class in both countryside (the kulaks) and the towns (NEP men). Unemployment and frustration among workers increased. Inequality started growing among the people. Some referred NEP as the new exploitation of the

proletariat. Anxieties increased even within the party about bourgeois degeneracy and the loss of revolutionary dynamism.

Stalin became the General Secretary of the party after the death of Lenin in 1923 and carried forward the Lenin's mission of social transformation for equality. Stalin realized that the negative side of the new economic policy and abandoned it. Thereafter he followed a very strong policy of proletarian dictatorship centralizing everything for the socialism or equality. Stalin introduced the five year plan for the rapid development of soviet Russia. Stalin made strong punishment for the kulaks and NEP men. Private selling was abolished. Stalin declared zero tolerance towards the private ownership of production and selling. He evolved the policy of "socialism in one country" for the proper international communist movement. Stalin could able to make soviet Russia as one of the super power in the world defeating the fascist imperialist forces of Hitler in the Second World War.

After the death of Josef Stalin in 1953, Nikita Khrushchev became the general secretary of the party who reversed all policies of the earlier leaders. His period marked remarkable changes in the soviet foreign and domestic policies. His secret speech on Stalin's personality cult created conflict within the party and outside. Khrushchev denounced Stalin and blamed him for foreign policy errors and for the failings of Soviet agriculture. He has also blamed Stalin for mass terror and for mistakes that had led to the loss of life in the Second World War and the German occupation of huge areas of Soviet territory.

Khrushchev's leadership is considered as the turning point in the history of Soviet Union. Khrushchev's foreign policy of peaceful coexistence with the United States and its allies was in contrast to the policies of previous leaders. Khrushchev began the process of de-Stalinization in Russia for his new aspiration and changes motivated by the external forces. Khrushchev changed the internal economic policies of the state. He revived the culture of the private ownership within the society deviating from the party principle of proletariat dictatorship.

After Khrushchev, many leaders like Leonid Breznev, Yuri Andropov, Konstantin Chernenko and Mikhail Gorbachev came to the party who more or less followed the same policies in different forms.

In the 1980s, the Soviet Union was engulfed with many problems. The problems were social, political and economic. Soviet Union was going through the crisis of social inequality, political degeneration along with the pathetic agricultural and industrial economy. To reform the Soviet Union, Party Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev introduced the policies of “perestroika” and “glasnost.”

Perestroika refers to the reconstruction of the political and economic system of the Soviet Union. Under this policy, the general elections were introduced to bring the democratic practices of Western society. It allowed capitalism, a semi-free market system of capitalist practices of western countries. Unfortunately, such an economy further aggravated the socio-economic condition of people.

The term “Glasnost” means openness which represented the social and political reforms to allow more rights and freedoms upon the Soviet people. This led to a decreased censoring of the media in which writers and journalists were allowed to expose news of government corruption and the depressed condition of the people. Glasnost also permitted criticism of government officials and the state. This allowed the religious institution to function freely. These policies provided opportunities for the opposition to counter the system and created social unrest which further led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Finally socialism collapsed and capitalism restored after seven decade of the October revolution.

Now I will prefer to highlight the practice of Ambedkar notion of equality in India in order to evaluate its contemporary relevance. The practice of Ambedkar’s notion of equality can be studied in two phases in Indian society. First phase includes the struggle of Ambedkar himself for equality in his life time and second phase starts after his death that is his legacy carried out by others. Ambedkar’s struggle for equality starts with his ideological destruction of the hegemonic ideology of Brahmanism since his student life. He strongly attacked

the institution of caste which is the root cause of inequality in Indian society. But in ground he started his political works since 1920. He formed the *Bahishkrit Hitkarni Sabha* (Depressed Class Institute) in 1924 to mobilize the untouchables against caste system. Henceforth, he started his movement for a radical transformation of the Indian society. Ambedkar launched massive anti caste movement uniting untouchables by creating public opinion through his writings in several periodicals such as *Mook Nayak*, *Bahishkrit Bharat*, and *Janta*.

He launched a very significant movement of Mahad satyagraha to assert the rights of untouchable to take water from public watering places. He launched another temple entry movement at the Kalaram temple at Nasik in Maharashtra State.

Ambedkar fought for the rights of workers and peasants founding Independent Labour Party in 1926. He took up the cause of tenants in the Konkan region of Maharashtra. The Independent Labour Party organized a huge march of 20,000 peasants to Mumbai in 1938. In the same year Ambedkar along with the communists organized a strike of Mumbai textile workers to protest the anti-workers bill of the British. (Gail Omvedt 1994) Ambedkar was in the front in condemning the bill inside the assembly and argued that the right to strike was simply another name for the right to freedom of assembly.

Ambedkar attended all three Round Table Conferences that held in London during 1930- 32 where he emphasized the separate identity of untouchables' and demanded separate electorate for them. Regarding this he had to confront with Gandhi in the Second Round Table Conference. The British Government granted "Communal Award" in 1932 and provided separate electorate for the Depressed Classes. Gandhi strongly protested it and resorted to fasting unto death. Ambedkar was forced to withdraw his demand of separate electorate due to the increasing atrocities on untouchables by the Hindus followed by the Gandhi's fast onto death.

Ambedkar had formed Independent Labour Party in 1936 and later in response to the increasing communal stands in politics; he formed the Scheduled Caste Federation (SCF) in 1942. He had planned to form a different political party at the end of his life, to bring together all the progressive forces under a single banner named as the Republican Party of India (RPI). But he could not live longer to see it formed. At the time of the foundation RPI, it was decided to have collective leadership within the party because there was no leader like Ambedkar to win the confidence of all. But this experiment failed and the RPI got divided on the issue of what Ambedkarism was. BC Kamble, one of the members of party and an advocate by profession, realized that Ambedkarism was only constitutionalism. He rejected the then senior leader Dadasaheb Gaikwad accusing him of becoming communists. Thereafter RPI started splitting on this point. Some young leaders of the RPI joined the Congress. The RPI under the leadership of Gaikwad launched a nationwide land satyagraha. It threatened the ruling classes of India, as a result they consciously launched their age old cooptation strategy to finish it. Dadasaheb Gaikwad was the first victim of their strategy despite he was conscious about this fact. Gaikwad was made as the Rajya Sabha member by the congress government.

However, by the late 1960s, when the entire world was witnessing various peoples' movements, the Dalit youth in Mumbai formed the Dalit Panthers in reaction to the increasing caste atrocities, inspired by the Black Panthers in the US. They tried to unite the whole socially oppressed and economically exploited people into 'Dalits' speaking a militant language of revolution. But before it could grow and do anything significant in the society, it split. Raja Dhale, one of the founding member of Dalit panther raised an issue of Ambedkarism and accused others of moving towards Marxism. He believed that Ambedkarism was Buddhism and opposed to Marxism. Dalit Panthers got divided and disappeared within three years but it reflected soon in the form of the Bharatiya Dalit Panthers with the leadership of late Arun Kamble and Ramdas Athwale. In early 1980s when the debate on Ambedkarism was at the peak, Prakash Ambedkar, the grandson of Ambedkar appeared on the scene. He launched some struggles on

economic issues of Dalits and other poor. But very soon he was very strategically defused by the Sharad Pawar who picked up Ramdas Athwale to neutralize him.

The political movement of Dalits in Maharashtra today is reduced to numerous factions RPI, Dalit Panthers and others which become active on the eve of elections to get sell their votes. The division of Dalit parties is not necessarily ideological; it is very much personnel based on their self-interest. The factions go with Congress, BJP and other and claim themselves Ambedkarites. This is the common feature of present day Dalit politics all over India. The Dalit Panthers movement had its impact in many states. Gujarat saw a vibrant Panthers movement but it also failed to grow. In Karnataka, Dalit Sangharsh Samiti lived longer but could not survive. But there is one exception, the Bahujan Samaj Party created by the late Kanshiram.

Kanshiram started it with Bamcef organising government employees belonging to Dalits, Adivasis, BC/OBCs and other religious minorities. Bamcef was very apolitical, non-agitational, socio-cultural organization. It conducted meetings, seminar and conferences at various levels and charged fees. It was 'paying back to the society. Kanshiram did social movement by creating DS4, the Dalit Shoshit Samaj Sangharsh Samiti and soon formed Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) for parliamentary politics. Taking experience from the RPI he made BSP unitary and centralized. BSP with a unique advantage of Dalit demography in Uttar Pradesh emerged as a major political force. But it has also degenerated gradually after the death of Kanshiram. It has failed to win even a single seat in the Legislative Assembly election of 2014. BSP was the only party having Dalit base, raised radical slogan against Brahminism and came to power in UP. But it could not do much more for the Dalit people. Dalits in UP and in other states are the worst sufferers of the social inequality. They are living in acute poverty without having land and livelihood. Each and every day Dalits are killed, houses are born down; women are raped all over the country.

Having discussed the practice of Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality, I would like to highlight some of the important revolutionary changes brought out by these ideas.

Revolutionary changes brought by Lenin:

- For the first time in the history it established workers government by overthrowing the landlords and capitalists through violent revolution.
- First time in the human history it practiced real socialism i.e. complete social ownership over means of production and banned private ownership or capitalism.
- First time in the history it provided free education and health services to the common people.
- First time in the history it abolished the “sex slavery- prostitution” and crime (domestic and social) on women to a large extent. It raised the social status of women by providing space them in strategic positions within the Communist Party (the supreme authority) and in government.
- First time in the history international working class solidarity was established. Communist parties were established throughout the world under the leadership of Lenin for the world revolution. The idea of proletariat internationalism was developed and propagated.
- It has inspired many people’s movement for equality and dignity throughout the world. The Chinese revolution under the leadership of Mao, Cuban revolution under Che Guevara, Korean revolution and many others are directly influenced by the Lenin’s notion of equality.

Revolutionary changes brought by Ambedkar’s notion of equality:

- For the first time in India it created a strong anti- caste movement. The untouchables (most oppressed) people started organizing themselves under the ideas of Ambedkar's notion of equality.
- For the first time the Brahminical scriptures and knowledge system was attacked by this revolutionary ideas.
- For the first time the untouchables and other socially oppressed communities could know their history and became conscious about their rights and struggle.
- It has disclosed the mystery of caste and Brahmanism in India.
- It is the guiding ideology for the entire Dalit movement all over the India.
- The untouchable people who are divided in many castes and sub-castes are getting united in the name of Ambedkar.
- For the first time a party (BSP), having Dalit base and Dalit leader could achieve political power in UP.
- For the first time a huge gathering of 25000 untouchable women was organized at Nagpur in July 1942. It was the biggest women gathering for their own emancipation in India.
- It has emancipated million of untouchable from the yoke of Hinduism by giving the path of Buddhism.
- It has created a radical organization like "Dalit panther" which aimed to destroy the Brahminical social structure which tied to unite the whole oppressed people against exploitation and inequality.
- It is uniting the all historically oppressed classes like Adivasis, Dalits, backward classes and religious minorities to fight against Brahmanism and capitalism.

- It is creating a pre- requisite ground for the structural annihilation of caste and class.

Now I would like to discuss about some of the core doctrines of both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality and its relevance. Both Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality has a great relevance in the present day Russian and Indian society. We can understand the relevance of their ideas by observing the following core doctrines of their notion of equality. Some of the basic doctrines of Lenin's notion on equality are,

- There is always inequality in a class divided society based on property.
- There is always class struggle in a class divided society.
- Private property is the root cause of exploitation.
- Private property determines the social status.
- Economy is the base of society which determines the superstructure, those are religion, culture, morality, literatures, education, art, plays etc.
- Bourgeois parliamentary system cannot establish equality in society. It is the system of wage slavery or capitalism which always produces inequality and exploitation.
- Without violent revolution the exploiters cannot be overthrown.
- Without dictatorship of proletariat, there will be no abolition of private property, no abolition of exploitation or inequality and no real socialism.
- Women, workers, peasants and others oppressed classes cannot get equality in capitalism.
- Parliamentary democracy is nothing but the dictatorship of bourgeoisie over proletariat.

- State is the means of exploitation at the hands of ruling class.

Ambedkar's notion of equality has its following core doctrines,

- Society is always consists of classes and they may be economical, social and intellectual.
- There is inequality in a class divided society based on private property and social status.
- Private property not necessarily determines the social status.
- Social status is also determined by caste, religion and culture.
- Economy is not the only source of power; social status and religion are also the source of power. Religion determined the economy and politics for thousand years in India. It has also determined the ruler and ruled hereditarily for generation after generation.
- Hinduism is nothing but Brahmanism.
- Indian history is the history of conflict between Brahmanism and Buddhism.
- Caste cannot be annihilated without uprooting Hinduism.
- Caste is not the division of labour, it is also the division of labourer
- Caste is the root cause of all kind of exploitation in India.
- Political unity does not last long unless there is social unity.
- So long as there is caste in India, there will be no democracy.
- Political democracy cannot survive long without social democracy.

- Parliamentary democracy without state socialism will produce inequality and exploitation.
- Parliamentary democracy is not the best product as it appeared to be.
- If the system of parliamentary democracy fails to establish social and economic equality, it will be blow down by the people who are suffering because of inequality.

When we examine and verify the above doctrines of the Lenin and Ambedkar, we find that it reflects the existing social realities. The form of inequality or exploitation may differ according to the different social condition, but each and every class-caste divided society perpetuates inequality and exploitation. The major difference between Lenin and Ambedkar is nothing but the difference of social reality that is the difference of class and caste. But the existing social inequality and exploitation throughout the world on the basis of economy and social status proved the relevance of Lenin and Ambedkar' s notion of equality.

Exploitation or inequality in human society exists in two different forms. Those are economic and social. However the economic exploitation is not separated from the social exploitation and vice versa. But the difference is that either one of these two determines the other. That is the economic exploitation is bound to lead the social exploitation and social exploitation inevitably gives birth to economic exploitation. Both are like father and have the capacity to reproduce. The racial and caste based exploitation is the social exploitation. One of the major differences between social and economic exploitation is that the former becomes worse in its degree than the later because of the social stigma or status attached to the social groups. It is important to know that the social form of exploitation is not merely social; it is always economic and political. Social status is not free from economy and politics. In fact social status is three dimensional, economic, political and cultural. Social status is artificially constructed for the oppression of one community by the other. Therefore caste in India is an “economically and politically charged social status”. So also is the racial and gender inequality and

exploitation. The social based inequality and exploitation of the human beings itself proved the relevance and significance of the Ambedkar's notion of equality. Beside these the economic exploitation has a old history since the development of private property in society. It is the "central factor or objective" of each and every kind of exploitation. It is the most potent weapon to suppress others. The economic exploitation in human society starting from slave system to capitalism proved the relevance Lenin's notion of equality. So long as there is inequality or exploitation in any form in society, both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality will be relevance.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality is similar in its objectives but it differs so far the problems of equality and means of equality are concerned which is imposed by the respective social conditions. It rejected the absolute notion of equality. Both Lenin and Ambedkar understood equality in terms of rights and privileges. Both of them opposed inequality theoretically and practically. Their notion of equality stands for the abolition of exploitation of man by man based on social status, private property, gender and nationality. Both of them realized that so long as there is inequality on the basis of social status, property, gender and nationalities, there can be neither equality nor democracy in society.

Both of them emphasized the necessity of morality to establish equality in society. However their notion of equality strongly rejected the morality based on god or supernatural power. Both of them struggled to replace the old anti- social morality based on inequality by the new social morality charged with the idea of equality. They realized that the old anti social morality is responsible for the degradation of the whole working people and the root cause of their exploitation at the hands of landlords and capitalists.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality stands for the unity of the whole oppressed section for a radical egalitarian social transformation. Their notion of equality considered religion as the means of exploitation of the common people at the hands of oppressors. However Ambedkar notion of equality considered Buddhism as the scientific religion and a social philosophy. Ambedkar notion of equality will remain incomplete without the programme of Scientific Buddhism. Ambedkar adopted it as a means of caste and class struggle, as a unifying force to unite the socially graded people to uproot Hinduism. Lenin considered all religion as the opium of the people and made religion as private matter in USSR though not applicable to the party member. Ambedkar notion of equality considered Buddhism as political philosophy and the source of morality to fight

against injustice and exploitation in order to establish a society of equality, liberty and fraternity.

Both Lenin's and Ambedkar's notion of equality stands for the emancipation of women. Gender equality constitutes an organic part of their notion of equality. Both of them realized that women are the most vulnerable and oppressed by the exploitative feudal and capitalist system. They fought for the rights and dignity of women. Their notion of equality holds the view that so long as there is inequality based on private property and social status in society, the emancipation of women cannot be realised. Therefore Lenin's and Ambedkar's notion of equality stands for the abolition of private property and social status. Lenin notion of equality traced the beginning of structural exploitation of women to the emergence of private property in society while Ambedkar notion of equality having recognized this fact emphasised the patriarchy and caste. Ambedkar notion of equality exposed the worst form of exploitation of the women in the caste ridden Hindu society. It says that the super imposition of endogamy over exogamy is the creation of caste. Ambedkar notion of equality traced the origin of Indian kind of brutal subjugation of women to the origin of caste and Hinduism. Therefore Ambedkar's notion of equality demonstrates that the emancipation of women is directly conditioned with the annihilation of caste (endogamy) and class.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality recognized that there is always class struggle in society because of the inequality and exploitation. Lenin's notion of equality emphasized the economic aspect of the class struggle while Ambedkar's notion of equality emphasized the social aspect of the class struggle. Lenin's notion of equality considered economy as the base of society which determined the power and social status while Ambedkar's notion of equality proved another fact that there are socio-cultural factors capable of determining the economy and social status or power. Ambedkar has shown that the religion in India has determined not only the social status, rather the oppressors and oppressed generation after generation. Therefore Ambedkar's notion of equality emphasized over the "politically and economically charged social status" than the mere economy.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality recognized the right to self-determination of the oppressed nationalities or minorities. Lenin's notion of equality declares that the right to self-determination of the oppressed nationalities as an important aspect of socialism. It speaks that the oppressed nationalities must have their political rights to agitate for the demand of their secession. It means the complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede. Lenin's notion of equality also stands for the abolition of national boundaries for the merging of whole humanity. Ambedkar's notion of equality recognized the right to establish a form of government in accordance with the wishes of the people by obtaining national independence from an alien race irrespective of the form of government. Ambedkar notion of equality also recognize the right to self-determination of nation even where the territorial separation is not possible. Ambedkar considered separate electorate and separate settlement of the untouchable as another name of right to self-determination.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality stands for the democracy. It says that democracy is a state where there is no social hierarchy, classes and exploitation. Lenin notion of equality defined democracy means equality that is the complete abolition of classes. Ambedkar notion of equality also recognize the complete abolition of economic and social inequality as the prerequisite condition for the existence of democracy in society. It says that democracy is incompatible and inconsistent with isolation and exclusiveness which has a root in the distinction between the privileged and the unprivileged. It declared that democracy is not a form of government; it is essentially a form of society. Therefore it says that the existence of democracy in society denies the existence of inequality in all forms. It says that for the successful working of democracy there must not be an oppressed and suppressed class. Lenin's notion of equality differs little with the Ambedkar's notion of equality on democracy and says that democracy is a state which recognizes the subordination of minority to the majority that is an organization for the systematic use of force by one class against another, by one section of population against another. But it does not differ with the Ambedkar's notion of equality when it speaks that democracy is

state of society where subordination of minority to the majority, one man to another or one section of population to another will be abolished.

Both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality recognize the fact that without socialism there cannot be equality in society. It upholds the principle of nationalization of industries and agriculture. It stands for the abolition of private ownership over means of production. The difference is that Lenin's notion of equality accepts the necessity of proletariat dictatorship for real socialism while Ambedkar's notion of equality does not advocate the need of proletariat dictatorship. Ambedkar's notion of equality recognizes the need of proletariat dictatorship for a short period. Both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality advocated the idea of collective farming in agriculture industries.

Lenin's notion of equality completely rejects parliamentary democracy as fake democracy. It attacked the parliamentary democracy by stating that it is deceiving the people and concealing bourgeois character. It rejected the elections system held in all capitalist countries and said it as the means to confuse the poor working class. It strongly opposed the terminologies like "free", "equal", "democratic" or "universal" of the capitalist countries saying that these are designed to hide the truth that the means of production and political power remain at the hands of the exploiters and that the real freedom and real equality for the exploited will remain out of the question. It says that it is sheer mockery of the working and exploited people to speak of pure democracy, equality, freedom and universal rights when all working people are ill-fed and ruined because of the capitalist wage slavery. It exposes the historical limitation of the bourgeois democracy. Ambedkar's notion of equality does not reject the parliamentary democracy completely like Lenin's notion of equality. Ambedkar's notion of parliamentary democracy is not identical with the existing system of parliamentary democracy. State socialism occupies the central point of Ambedkar's notion of parliamentary democracy. Ambedkar's notion of equality stands for the idea that parliamentary democracy gives birth to communal fascism without state socialism. It does not allow capitalism or the private ownership of means of production. It gives priority to social and economic equality. Taking experience from the Europe and other democratic

republics, it declared that parliamentary democracy is not the best product as it appeared to be.

Ambedkar's notion of equality opposes permanent dictatorship of proletariat, but it recognized proletariat dictatorship till the social exploitation gets abolished and society achieved equality. It openly emphasized the need of proletariat dictatorship for all backward countries. Lenin's notion of equality advocates proletarian dictatorship theoretically and practically as an organic part of the theory of equality. It says that without proletarian dictatorship there cannot be any socialism. It advocates that the abolition of classes, private property, exploitation and state is objectively conditioned with the proletarian dictatorship. It declares that the dictatorship of the proletariat alone can emancipate humanity from the oppression of capital and to establish democracy for the poor.

As far as the question of violent revolution is concerned, Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality recognised it as means of social transformation. The difference is that Lenin's notion of equality advocates theoretically as its organic part while Ambedkar notion of equality does not. Lenin's notion of equality says that violent revolution is inseparably bound up with the question of equality. It upholds that without violent revolution, there can be no overthrow of ruling classes, no proletarian dictatorship and no abolition of classes. It says that the withering of state is directly linked with the violent revolution. It recognised the necessity of violent revolution for the overthrow of an economy based on exploitation. It says that that the replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution. It also declares that violent revolution in a bourgeois state is inevitable. It advocates the idea that proletarian revolution is impossible without the violent destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the replacement for it of a new one.

Ambedkar's notion of equality recognizes the use of force as an important means for any kind of social revolution. It says that ethics cannot defeat economics unless there is sufficient force behind it. It defines ahimsa or non violence as to love towards all creatures and destruction of all evil doers. It says that peace obtained by surrender to force of violence is no peace and justified the war for

justice and peace. It says that war cannot be abolished by refusing to fight when attacked and to abolish war, one must win the war and establish just peace.

It says that a man who fights for justice and safety cannot be accused of violence. Only the oppressors can be accused of violence. It advocates violence when all means of maintaining peace fail and the responsibility for violence falls on him who starts the war. It allows war for justice and peace. But it says war must not be for selfish ends.

Ambedkar's notion of equality highlighted three important prerequisites of an armed revolution. First is the existence of a sense of a wrong in society, second is the people's capacity to know that they are suffering because of the wrong and the third is the availability of the arms. It says that so long as the first two factors are absent in society there can be no revolution.

Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality has a similar history of both success and defeat consistently struggling to abolish all kind of social inequality and exploitation to establish a society based on equality, liberty and fraternity. The existing reactionary socio-cultural values of both these society which prevents the common masses to be united and fight against the oppressors, have been the major obstacle for Lenin and Ambedkar notion of equality to be realised. However the role of Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality has a wider significance in society and have been the guiding principles for the oppressed people in their struggle for equality. It has much more relevance today at the era of globalization and imperialism. It stands for the abolition of feudalism, capitalism and imperialism. It stands for the abolition of all kinds of inequality and exploitation. So long as there is inequality in society, so long as there is exploitation on the basis of private property, social status and religion, both Lenin and Ambedkar's notion of equality will continue to be the emancipatory ideas and have relevance.

References

(* indicates a primary source)

Ahir, DC (May 1992), *Buddhism in Modern India*, South Asia Books

- * Alexandra, K. (1984), *Selected Articles and Speeches*, Moscow: Progress Publishers
- * Althusser, Louis (2006), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Kolkatta: Aakar books
- Aloysius, G. (April 15, 1999) *Nationalism without a Nation in India*, Oxford University Press.
- Aloysius, G. (January 1, 2002), *Religion of the Modern Buddhist*, Wordsmiths.
- Aloysius, G. (January1, 1998), *Religion as emancipatory identity: A Buddhist movement among the Tamils under colonialism*, New Age International.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1916), *Castes in India; Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development*, Writings and Speeches of Dr B. R. Ambedkar, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1923), *The Problem of Rupee: It's Origin and its Solution*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1936), *Annihilation of Caste*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1940), *Pakistan or the Partition of India*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1943), *Mr. Gandhi and the Emancipation of the Untouchables*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1945), *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1947), *Who were the Shudras: How they came to be the Fourth Varna in the Indo-Aryan Society*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1947), *States and Minorities: What are their Rights and How to secure them in the Constitution of Free India*, Writings and Speeches of Dr B. R. Ambedkar, Government of Maharashtra.

- * Ambedkar, B.R (1948), *The Untouchables: Who Were They and Why They Became Untouchables*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1957), *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1955), *Thoughts on Linguistic States*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.1, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1943), *Ranade, Gandhi and Jinah*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.1, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1919), *Evidence before the Southborough Committee*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Vol.1, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1939), *Federation Versus Freedom*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B.R.Ambedkar, Vol.1, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1945), *Communal Deadlock and a Way to solve it* Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.1, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1918), *Small Holdings in India, Mr.Russell and the Reconstruction of Society*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.1, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R(1987), *Philosophy of Hinduism*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.3, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1987), *India and Pre- Requisites of Communism*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.3, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1987), *Revolution and Counter Revolution in Ancient India*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.3, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1987), *Buddha or Karl Marx*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.3, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1987), *Riddles in Hinduism*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol.4, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1957), *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 11, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.

- * Ambedkar, B. R (1993), *Ancient Indian Commerce*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 12, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1993), *The Untouchables and the Pax Britannica*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 12, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1993), *Lectures on the English Constitution*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 12, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1995), *Dr. Ambedkar and The Hindu Code Bill; General Discussion on the Draft*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 14, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B.R (1945), *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 9, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1915), *Administration and Finance of the East India Company*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 6, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R(1925), *The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India* , Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 6, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1947), *Who were the Shudras? How they came to be the Fourth Varna in the Indo- Aryan Society*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 6, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra.
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1989), *Untouchables or the Children of India's Ghetto and other Essays*, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Vol. 5, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1943), *Labour and Parliamentary Democracy*, *Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 10, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B.R (2003), *The Independent Labour Party: A Source for Betterment of the Depressed Classes*, *Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part I, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B.R (2003), *Civil Liberties of Indians*, *Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part I, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra

- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *We are separate Element in the National Life, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part I, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R(2003), *Thoughts on the form of Legal Education in the Bombay Presidency, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Buddha and Future of his religion, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (1950), *The rise and fall of the Hindu women: Who was responsible for it?, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *The Mahars: Who were they and how they became the Untouchables? Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Separate Settlements for Untouchables, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Demand for Political Independence, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Joint V/S Separate Electorates: Dr. Ambedkar's via Media, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Constitution and Constitutionalism, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *The Position of Women in Hinduism and Buddhism, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Under- Privileged in India sold to Oppressors, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part II, Bombay
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Untouchables Must Have Political Power, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Political Reform must precede Social Reform, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra

- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *What way Emancipation?, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Communists Exploited Labourers, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Peasant and workers should think over the Causes of their Poverty, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Prospect of Democracy in India, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part-III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra
- * Ambedkar, B. R (2003), *Constitution of the Samata Sainik Dal, Writings and Speeches of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar*, Vol. 17-Part III, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra

Bonney, Richard (2004), *Three Giants of South Asia: Gandhi, Ambedkar and Jinnah on Self-Determination*, Delhi: Media House.

Busher, Greta (2008), *Daily Life in Imperial Russia*, Westport: Greenwood Press.

Clements, B.E. (1979), *Bolshevik Feminist: The Life of Aleksandra Kollontai*, Bloomington

Novosti Press (1990), *Documents and Materials: 28th Congress of the CPSU, July 2-13, 1990*, Moscow: Novosti.

D'souza, Joseph, and Kancha Ilaiah (2000), *Dalit Freedom Now and Forever: The Epic Struggle for Dalit Emancipation*, Dalit Freedom Network, Reprint Edition.

Engels, Frederick (1977), *The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State*, Moscow: Progress Publishers

Farnsworth, Beatrice (1980), *Aleksandra Kollontai: Socialism, Feminism and the Bolshevik Revolution*, Stanford, Cliff: Stanford University Press

Gorbachev, Mikhail (1987), *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*, London: Forlana/Collins

Government of India (1975), *Report of the Committee of the Status of Women in India*, New Delhi: Ministry of Education and Social Welfare.

Guru, Gopal, and Sundar Sarukkai (June 15, 2012), *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory*, Oxford University Press.

Guru, Gopal (September 15, 2011), *Humiliation: Claims and Context*, Oxford university Press.

Ilaiah, Kancha (April 23, 2001), *God as Political Philosopher: Buddha's Challenge to Brahminism*, Bhatkal & Sen.

Ilaiah, Kancha (April 23, 1996), *Why I am Not a Hindu: A Sudra Critique of Hindutva Philosophy, Culture, and Political Economy*, Samya; February 2003 edition.

Ilaiah, Kancha (December 17, 2012), *The Weapon of the Other: Dalitbahujan Writings and the Remaking of Indian Nationalist Thought*, Pearson Education India.

Ilaiah, Kancha (January 1, 2004), *Buffalo Nationalism – A Critique of Spiritual Fascism*, Samya Publications.

Ilaiah, Kancha (January 1, 2013), *Untouchable God*, Samya/Bhatkal and Sen.

Ilaiah, Kancha (2009), *Post- Hindu India: a discourse in Dalit- Bahujan, socio- Spiritual and Scientific Revolution*, New Delhi: Sage Publications

Jaffrelot, Christophe (October 15, 2002), *India's Silent Revolution*, Columbia University Press.

Jaffrelot, Christophe (August 6, 2005), *Dr. Ambedkar and Untouchability; Fighting the Indian Caste System* (The CERI Series in Comparative Politics and International Studies), Columbia University Press.

Jaffrelot, Christophe (June 28, 2011), *Religion, Caste, and Politics in India*, Columbia University Press.

Khrushchev, Nikita (1956), *Summary of the Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow: Politizdat.

- * Lenin, V. I (1965), *Economics and Politics in the Era of The Dictatorship of The Proletariat*, collected works, Vol.30, Moscow: Progress Publisher.
- * Lenin, V. I. (1934), On International Working Women's Day, *On the Emancipation of Women*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I (1963), *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, collected works, Vol.1, Moscow: Progress Publisher.
- * Lenin, V.I (1965), *Third Congress Of the Communist International*, Vol.32, Moscow: Progress Publisher.

- * Lenin, V.I (1972), *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, collected works, Vol.20, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *What Is To Be Done? Burning Questions of our Movement*, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism; Critical Comments on a Reactionary Philosophy*, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 14, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1896), *To the Tsarist Government*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1897), *A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism (SISMONDI and OUR NATIVE SISMONDISTS)*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1897), *The Heritage We Renounce*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1897), *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *The New Factory Law* *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1899), *On Strikes*, *Lenin Collected Works Vol.4*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Capitalism and Agriculture*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.4*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1902), *The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social –Democracy* *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1904), *May Day*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.12*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1904), *What We Are Working For (To the Party)*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.7*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *The Democratic Tasks of the Revolutionary Proletariat*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1918), *Left-Wing Childishness and petty bourgeois mentality*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 27*, Moscow : Progress Publisher.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1918), *State and Revolution*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol 25, Moscow: Progress Publisher.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1919), *First Congress of the communist International*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.28, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *A Talk With Defenders of Economism*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *Another Massacre*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *On a Letter from Southern Workers*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *Political Agitation and The Class Point of View*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *The Agrarian Question and the Critics of Marx*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *The Protest of Finish People*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *Where to Begin?*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1961), *Anarchism and Socialism*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.5, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *A Revolution of the 1789 or the 1848 Type?*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.8, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *From Narodism to Marxism*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.8, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *Good Demonstration of Proletarians and Poor Arguments of Certain Intellectuals*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.8, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *On the History of Party programme*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.8, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *On the Question of a Nation-Wide Revolution*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.12, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *Petty- Bourgeois Tactics*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.12, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *Revolution in Russia*, *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol.8, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *Social-Democracy and the Provisional Revolutionary Government, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *The Autocracy and the Proletariat, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *The Beginning of the Revolution in Russia, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *The Revolutionary – Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *The revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *The Strength and Weakness of the Russian Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.12*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *Victorious Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.8*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1962), *Working-Class and Bourgeois Democracy, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 3*, Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1963), *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.1*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1963), *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.1*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *A Letter to a Comrade on Our Organisational Tasks, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *A Shameless Lie of the Capitalists, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.24*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Concerning Demonstration, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Extract from an Article Against the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *From the Destruction of the Old Social System; To the Creation of the New, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Lecture on the Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.23*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Lessons of the Crisis, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.24*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *On the Subjects of Reports by Committees and Groups of the R.S.D.L.P. to the General Party Congress, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *On the Tasks of the Social- Democratic Movement, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Once More on the Theory of Realisation, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.4*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back (The Crisis In Our Party), Lenin Collected Works, Vol.12*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Political struggle and political Chicanery, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *The Basic Thesis Against the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *The Development of Capitalism in Russia; The Process of the Formation of a Home Market for the Large- Scale industry, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.3*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.23*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *The Task of proletariat in Our revolution (Draft Platform of the Party), Lenin Collected Works, Vol.24*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *To the Rural Poor: An Explanation for the Peasants of What the Social- Democrats Want, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Vulgar Socialism and Narodism as Resurrected by the Socialist- Revolutionaries, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Where is State Power and Where is Counter-Revolution?, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.25*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *Why the Social-Democrats Must Declare a Determined and Relentless War on the Socialist- Revolutionaries?*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.6*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions for the Second Congress of the Communist International*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.31*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.30*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Fourth Congress of the Communist International*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.33*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Freedom to Criticise and unity of Action*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.10*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Guerrilla Warfare*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.11*, Moscow, Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *On Proletarian Culture*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.31*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Our Revolution*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.33*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Role and Function of the Trade Unions; under the New Economic Policy*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.33*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *The Fight for Freedom and the Fight for Power*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.10*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *The Land Question and the Fight for Freedom*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.10*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *The Second Congress of the Communist International*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.31*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *The Second Congress of the Communist International*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.31*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *The Tasks of the Working Women's Movement in the Soviet Republic*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.30*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1965), *Third congress of the communist International*, *Lenin Collected Works, Vol.32*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *An Estimate of Marx by International Liberalism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.13*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Critical Remarks on the National Question, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.20*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited people, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.26*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Explanation of the Law on Fines Imposed on Factory Workers, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *National Equality, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.20*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *No Falsehood! Our Strength Lies in Stating the Truth, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.9*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *On the Significance of Militant Materialism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.33*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Playing at Parliamentarianism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.9*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Revolution and Counter- Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.13*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *The Agrarian of Social- Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.12*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of it in Mr. Struve's Book (The Reflection of Marxism in Bourgeois Literature)", Lenin Collected Works, Vol.1*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *The Liberal Unions and Social- Democracy, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.9*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *The Right of Nations to self Determination, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.20*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *The Struggle of Proletariat, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.9*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *To the Working men and Women of the Thornton Factory, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.2*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Two Tactics of Social- Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.9*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1972), *Workers' Unity and Intellectualist Trend, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.20*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1973), *Marxism and Revisionism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.15*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1973), *The Aim of the Proletarian Struggle in Our Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.15*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1974), Marx, Karl, *A Brief Biographical Sketch With an Exposition of Marxism, Volume 21*, Moscow: Progress Publisher.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1974), *Liberalism and Democracy, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.17*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1974), *On the Two Lines in the Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.21*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1974), *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.28*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1974), *The War and Russian social- Democracy, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.21*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1975), *The Priesthood and politics, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.18*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1975), *The Working –Class Masses and its 'Parliamentary' Representatives, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.18*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, volume 19*, Moscow: Progress Publisher.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *Civilised Barbarism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.19*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *Lessons of the Revolution, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.25*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *On Slogans, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.25*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *One Fundamental Questions of the Revolutions, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.25*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *The Cadets and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.19*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *The Separation of Liberalism from Democracy, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.19*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.19*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1977), *The Working- Class Masses and the Working- Class Intelligentsia, Lenin Collected Works, Vol.19*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- * Lenin, V.I. (1964), *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution, collected works, volume 24*, Moscow: Progress Publisher.
- * Lukacs, George (1997), *Lenin: A study in the unity of his thought*, Calcutta: Seagull Books Private Limited.
- * Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick (1967), *The German Ideology*, Garden City: Doubleday.
- * Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, (1978), *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Omvedt Gail (2006), *Dalit Visions: The Anti- Caste Movement and the Construction of an Indian Identity*, New Delhi, Orient Longman.

Omvedt Gail (2012), *Understanding Caste: From Buddha to Ambedkar and Beyond*, Orient Blackswan.

Omvedt, Gail (2008), *Ambedkar: Towards an Enlightened India*, Penguin Books.

Pandian, MSS (2008), *Brahmin and Non-Brahmin: Genealogies of the Tamil Political*, Permanent Black.

Rege, Sharmila (2013), *Against the Madness of Manu: B.R Ambedkar's Writings on Brahmanical Patriarchy*, New Delhi: Navayana Publications.

Rege, Sharmila (2013), *Writing Caste/Writing Gender; Narrating Dalit Women's Testimonies*, Zubaan.

Rodrigues, V (2004), *The Essential writings of B.R. Ambedkar*, Oxford University Press.

Rothore, AS, and Ajay Verma (July 15, 2011), *The Buddha and his Dhamma: A Critical Edition*, Oxford University Press.

Roy, Arundhati (2014), *Ambedkar, B. R, November; The Annihilation of Caste*, Verso Publications.

Sangharakshita, Vante (August 1, 2004), *Ambedkar and Buddhism*, Windhorse Publications.

Sontakke, Y.D. (2004), *Thought of Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar*, Delhi: Samyak Prakashan.

Stalin, J.V. (2006), *Foundation of Leninism*, Lucknow: Rahul Foundation.

Teltumbde, Anand (January 1, 1997), “*Ambedkar*” in *and for the Post-Ambedkar dalit movement*, Sugawa Prakashn.

Thorat, Sukhadeo, and Narendra Kumar (March 15, 2008), *Ambedkar on Social Exclusion and Inclusion*, Oxford University Press.

Trotsky, Leon (1970), *Women and the Family*, New York.

Trotsky, Leon (1972), *The Revolution Betrayed: What is the Soviet Union and where it is Going?* New York: Pathfinder Publishers.

Usha, K.B., “Political Empowerment of Women in Soviet Union and Russia: Ideology and Implementation,” in Stephen White and Cerwyn Moore, eds., *Post-Soviet Politics, vol. III, Polity, Economy and Society* (London: Sage Publication Ltd., 2012), pp. 211-236.

Usha, K.B., *Dr. B.R. Ambedkar: A Champion of Women's Rights, SAMYUKTA: A Journal of Women's Studies* (Thiruvananthapuram: Women's Initiatives), vol. 2. No. 1, January 2002, pp. 365-80.

Zelliot, Eleanor (2004), *Ambedkar's world: the making of Babasaheb and the Dalit movement*, Delhi: Navayana Publication.

Zelliot, Eleanor (2013), *Ambedkar's World*, Navayana Publications.

Zetkin, Clara “From My Memorandum Book,” *My Recollections of Lenin*, given as Appendix in V. I. Lenin, n. 75, pp. 93-119.