

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MAJOR RESEARCH PROJECT

(2015-2018)

A Study of Ambedkarite Literary Theory with Reference to Marathi Literature

Submitted to

University Grants Commission, New Delhi

by

Dr. Ashok Babar

P.V.P. Mahavidyalaya,

Kavathe Mahankal, Dist. Sangli. (Maharashtra)

CONTENT

Preface / 5

Introduction / 7

Chapter I Ambedkarite Theory / 17

Chapter II Indian or Western / 71

Chapter III Ambedkarite Literary Theory / 110

Chapter IV Ambedkarite Literary Criteria / 135

Chapter V Ambedkarite Literary values / 165

Chapter VI Ambedkarite Readings / 183

Chapter VII Conclusions / 273

References, Bibliography and Webliography / 293

Executive Summary
of
Major Research Project
by
Ashok Babar

The present project seeks to problematize the nature of Indian literature and the methods for analyzing literature. It explores: Indian literature, its definitions, the purpose, methods of value judgment, literary values (canons or standards), literature and society, literature and its interdisciplinary relevance, literary history (historiography), and literary theory as identified in the critical essays of Ambedkar.

In an introductory chapter, we have explained by making a summary statement of what we intend to study. The study aims to evaluate Ambedkarite literary theory with reference to Marathi literature. We have defined several terms that are used in the study and stated the theoretical premises of the hypothesis. We have also defined the critical terms, which we are going to use throughout the research explorations; and ended by comparative remarks, which we want to make, and summarized the arguments by establishing the relevance of more inclusive Ambedkarite literary theory and applied criticism of the representative texts such as

1. Rajan Gavas: *Ba Balicha* (B for Bali)
2. Rajan Gavas: *Tanakat* (Weed Out)
3. G. K. Ainapure: *Rebote* (Rebound)
4. F M Shahajinde: *Zombani* (The Offensive)
5. Premanand Gajvee: An Ambedkarite Playwright

We have stated the objectives of the study, skills, methods, and methodology by stating significance of the study and scope and limitations of the study. The introduction also deals with the brief sketch of Ambedkar's life and work: Dalit Movement, Protests, Political career, Drafting India's Constitution, Economic planning, Second marriage, Conversion to Buddhism, Writings and Speeches etc.

Ambedkarite theory

Ambedkarite theory is highly valued scientific theory of Indian society and the practice of transforming it in Indian context, and that sector of it known as Ambedkarite literary theory is no less so. It would therefore be not out of place to deal with a few basic issues and raise some fundamental questions in Ambedkarite theory. In this chapter, an attempt has been made to deal with, in some detail, Ambedkarite ideology- the ideas, values and feelings by which the Indian people experience their societies at various times.

Ambedkarite literary theory analyses literature in terms of the Indian history, revisiting the Purusharthas, the Castes, Castes in India, Annihilation of Caste, the women, the position of the woman before the days of Manu, the position of the woman during and after the days of Manu, the Castes as Endogamy, Paternity to Maternity, Manu's explanation of the origin of the mixed castes, the Riddle of Rama and Krishna, the Hindu Code Bill, the Shudras, the riddle of the Shudras, the Untouchables, Unapproachables and Unseeables, untouchability among non-Hindus, untouchability among Hindus, the untouchables live outside the village, racial difference and occupation as the origin of untouchability, contempt for Buddhists and Beef eating as the root of untouchability, the beef-eating makes broken men untouchables, the unapproachables and unseeables, slaves and untouchables, removing untouchability, the road to the cities, the Partition of India, two-nation theory, linguistic states, the State Socialism, the Republican Party, and the Conversion. In sum, Ambedkarite theory justifies the egalitarian principle for critiquing the practice of Indian literature. It provides social, political, economic i.e. interdisciplinary background for Indian literary theory. It also provides moral opportunity as well as strength to interrogate the exclusionary nature of the practice of Indian literary theory.

Ambedkarite Literary Theory

The contact with the west produced two distinct genre of literary theory. One is literary theory in India and the other is Indian Literary theory. What distinguishes the two is their respective intellectual framework. Literary theory in India does not have an Indian intellectual framework. It is primarily a body of western literary theory to be applicable to India. Some Indians adopted them together with their western intellectual framework. The Indian Marxists, Neo-Marxists, Feminists, Modernists, Post-Modernists, Existentialists, Subaltern theoreticians,

were (and still are) the skilled practitioners of this genre of literary theory. They used (and still use) the western intellectual framework depending on convenience, but not an Indian framework, in their attempt to modernize Indian literary theory. A recently published book in Marathi entitled *Aadhunik Samiksha Siddhant* (Modern Critical Theories) written by Milind Malashe and Ashok Joshi is a fine example of literary theory in India. The title of the book itself is misleading for Indian readers in general and Marathi readers in particular. In fact, the title of the book would have been *Aadhunik Pashchyatya Samiksha Siddhant* (Modern Western Critical Theories). In sum, the book is not about Indian literary theory, even then, this book has been taught in the Indian Universities as if an authentic Indian literary theory.

Indian literary theory, by contrast, is a body of ideas that includes Indian ideas as well as select nativised Western ideas, both set in a recognizably Indian intellectual framework. Jotirao Phule, Dr Ambedkar, Rajaramshastri Bhagavat, Maharshi Vitthal Ramaji Shinde, Bhaskarrao Jadhav, Rama Swami Periyar, Dineshchandra Sen, Bhadant Aanand Kausalyayan, Chandricaprasad Jidnyasu, D. D. Kosambi among others produced literary theory of this sort. The followers of Gandhian ideology : Sane Guruji, Acharya S.J. Bhagwat, Acharya Javadekar, G.B. Gramopadhye and some others, also produced Indian literary theory having an Indian intellectual framework but their works have been relegated to the category of para-literature and considered as non-literature because these critics had never made a compromise with the Brahmanical institutionalization of literature. Hence, Ambedkar once argued: But what annoys one is the intolerance of the Brahmin Scholar towards any attempt to expose the Brahminic literature. He himself would not play the part of an iconoclast even where it is necessary and he would not allow such non-Brahmins as have the capacity to do so to play it. If any non-Brahmin were to make such an attempt the Brahmin scholars would engage in a conspiracy of silence, take no notice of him, condemn him outright on some flimsy grounds or dub his work useless. As a writer engaged in the exposition of the Brahminic literature, I have been a victim of such mean tricks (1990:241).

Indian literary theory as a search for a coherent system or grammar of Indian literature which can account for the ever growing phenomenon of literary events across the time and space is bound to be social, political, economic, religious, i.e. interdisciplinary, as it seeks generalizations based on Indian history. Further, it must be complementary synthesis of horizontal general literature and vertical history of ideas. Hence, Indian literary theory needs

Indian literary history as well as criticism; just as Indian literary history needs Indian literary theory and criticism in order to arrive at Ambedkar's contribution to Indian literary theory. This paper is a beginning in the direction of formulating a well-considered and multi-dexterous response to the serious cultural challenges of our times. For example, globalization is an important issue in all aspects of cultural studies; hence the paper would explore the socio-economic ideologies which connect with the cultural war between global and the regional that proves literature as an institution with its power structure and power politics of center and periphery: Globalism and Nativism.

The purpose of literature

Ambedkar is one of the important literary theorists to introduce Indian literary theory inherited from the *Satyashodhak* (seekers of truth) movement started by Jotirao Phule. His literary theory is suffused with the spirit of rebellion, which was the essence of Satyashodhak movement. What concerns us here is not only the consistency of argument or its logical uniformity in the *Satyashodhak* theory but the main objective of the *Satyashodhak* organization is to liberate the *Shudras* and *Ati Shudras*, the underprivileged and to prevent their exploitation by the *shetaji* and *bhataji* (moneylenders and Brahmins). *Satyashodhak* expected to treat all human beings as children of the creator and worship of the creator without the help of any mediator. If we may assume that the *Satyashodhak* movement – Phule to Periyar – is the most significant creative upsurge of the Indian mind during the present millennium, no student of literary culture can ignore the literary canons of expression developed within the *Satyashodhak* movement which has ruled out the colonial Brahmin literary canons as being the only authentic Indian literature.

Ambedkar wanted Indian literature that can speak to the masses, hence; the subtitle of *Riddles in Hinduism* is *An Exposition to Enlighten the Masses*. In his introduction to *Riddles in Hinduism* he has clearly mentioned his purpose of writing: 'This book is an exposition of the beliefs propounded by what might be called Brahminic theology. It is intended for the common mass of Hindus who need to be awakened to know in what quagmire the Brahmins have placed them and to lead them on to the road of rational thinking'(1996:5). The purpose of analyzing literature of Brahminism and literature of Buddhism has been clearly stated by Ambedkar in his books *Riddles in Hinduism* and *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, respectively. Ambedkar does not agree with Brahmin as well as European scholars with the view that the Hindu civilization is

sanatan, that is, unchanging; and attempts to show, in his book *Riddles in Hinduism*, that this view is not in accord with facts and that Hindu Society has changed from time to time and that often times the change is the most radical kind. His purpose is neither hedonistic nor didactic but to make the mass of people to realize that Hindu religion is not *sanatan*, and to draw attention of the Hindu masses to the devices of the Brahmins and to make them think for themselves how they have been deceived and misguided by the Brahmins (Ambedkar:1996:5).

Ambedkar's interest in writing *The Buddha and His Dhamma* is to cater to the growing demand for a clear and consistent statement of the life and teachings of the Buddha because he was of the opinion that 'of all the founders of religions in the world the presentation of the life and teachings of the founder of Buddhism presents a problem which is quite puzzling if not baffling' (Ambedkar: 1992: Introduction). He had in his mind the future of Buddhism and not simply the interest of doctrinal consistency. According to him literature must not be dull reading so that it may fall upon passive set of readers. After reading literature, the reader must give out his reaction; otherwise, the silence on the part of the reader is great discouragement to the writer. In sum, Ambedkar thinks that Indian literature, in particular, or, any literature, in general, must excite the readers so that the readers should contribute to the literature with which the reader is concerned.

Indian or Western

The different Western and Brahmnical schools of thought dominated the Indian critical thinking; hence it has indeed been excessively in-group and obscurantist. Edward Said has pointed out that 'seven years before Jones (Orientalist) arrived in India, Warren Hastings had decided that Indians were to be ruled by their own laws' (1978:78). In fact Ambedkar would have preferred Warren Hastings to rule India by English law, an egalitarian view in Indian context, however, Hastings and Jones decided to govern Hindus and Muslims in accordance with their traditional legal customs and practices, preserving caste distinctions and other pernicious practices, thus perpetuating the fragmented structure of Indian society. In the tradition of western scholarship, 'there is no work that has had such great fame and has for centuries been considered to be so authoritative as the *Manusmriti*' (Winternitz: 1967:546). *Manusmriti* was among the first Sanskrit works to be translated into many European languages. The earliest translation of the *Manusmriti* was that of Sir William Jones, one of the founding fathers of modern Indology (whom Edward Said calls Orientalist). 'The statue of William Jones in St. Paul cathedral in

London holds a volume of *Manusmriti* in its hand' (Doniger : 1991:XIX). But, the statues of Ambedkar everywhere in India and abroad hold a volume of Indian Constitution.

Nietzsche declared that 'God is dead'; Indian existentialist, including some radicals, were moved and fascinated by Nietzsche's western slogan and consciously or unconsciously, adopted existentialism which has been seen as the cultural correlate of modernism that carried forward the formalist tradition. Dr. Shriram Lagu's oft quoted slogan that 'God must be retired' has its roots in Nietzsche's AntiChrist interpretation of the Bible. But these existentialists and even modernists have never made any kind of inquiry into Nietzsche's intention and his interpretation of the Bible. It is Ambedkar who argued that 'the Hindu social order is nothing but Nietzsche's Gospel put in action. Nietzsche himself never claimed any originality for his theory of the superman. He (Nietzsche) admitted and avowed that he borrowed it from the Manu Smriti (1987:116).

Nietzsche's theory of superman is nothing but the theory of Brahmanism. He continues to use Manu as a stick with which to beat Christianity. Nietzsche said, 'My feelings are quite the reverse when I read the law book of Manu (*Manu Smriti*), an incomparably intellectual and superior work, which it would be a sin against the spirit even to mention in the same breath with the Bible (Ambedkar, 1987:116). The bone of contention is that Friedrich Nietzsche sang Manu's praise while Ambedkar asserts that 'ninety percent of Christianity is copied from Buddhism both in substance and in form' (Ambedkar, 1997:248). According to Ambedkar parallel to the philosophy of Hinduism is to be found in Nietzsche. Nietzsche himself declared that in his philosophy he is only following the scheme of Manu. What is more disturbing is the fact that Nazis trace their ancestry from Nietzsche and regard him as their spiritual parent. Hitler has himself photographed beside a bust of Nietzsche. Moreover, Nietzsche's own cousin Richard Ochler approvingly says that Nietzsche's thought is Hitler in action. Thus, the philosophy of Nietzsche is capable of Nazism.

In sum, the Brahmins have propagated their views on many issues : of castes, varna, linguistic states, Hinduism etc., and their views have been reinforced by a good many of the European scholars, however, Ambedkar has attempted to show that their views are not in accord with facts, and proved himself an indigenous thinker. Regarding India Arnold Toynbee wrote in 1915 that 'British statesmanship in the nineteenth century regarded India as a 'sleeping beauty', whom Britain had a perspective right to woo when she awoke'; Ambedkar agrees with Toynbee

and reinforces his indigenous thinking while saying that the 'sleeping beauty is awake.... She is a mad maiden having a dual personality, half human, half animal always in convulsions because of her two natures in perpetual conflict: Hindu and Muslim' (1990:9). Edward Said's *Orientalism* is one of the seminal works of our generation which has been noticed in prestigious books in India, but Ambedkar's work remained unnoticed, in this regard, as a critique of Orientalism.

Antonio Gramsci, an Italian Marxist thinker, rejected economism and crude materialism, offering a humanist version of Marxism which focused on human subjectivity. Gramsci used the term 'hegemony' to denote the predominance of one social class over others (e.g. bourgeois hegemony). This represents not only political and economic control, but also the ability of the dominant class to project its own way of seeing the world so that those who are subordinated by it accept it as 'common sense' and 'natural' that involves, in fact, 'willing' and 'active consent'. Gramsci, further, elaborated the term 'hegemony' as 'cultural hegemony'.

Surprisingly, Ambedkar advanced the term 'supremacy' instead of hegemony and interpreted Indian History in terms of 'cultural supremacy' theory. Ambedkar, further, elaborated and developed the theory of 'the infection of imitation' in order to prove his thesis that some castes were formed by imitation. The conditions for imitation, according to this theory are : 1) that the sources of imitation must enjoy prestige in the group and 2) that there must be numerous and daily relations among members of a group. The Brahmin is a semi god and very nearly a demi god. He sets up a mode and moulds the rest (Ambedkar, 1979:19).

Gramsci has become an important figure in current academic discussions within literary studies in India, but Ambedkar's theories have been relegated to the category of para-literature as stated earlier. Similarly, Marxist literary theory enjoys the prestige in India but Ambedkarite literary theory has not been even accepted as literary theory itself. Moreover, Marxism has a place of honour among Indian elite intellectuals but these intellectuals are allergic to Ambedkarism. This is what is disastrous ingroupism and obscurantism of Western and Brahmin schools of thought.

Buddha or Karl Marx

Karl Marx argues that 'the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggle (haves and have-nots)'. Unlike Karl Marx, Ambedkar recounts the salient facts of Indian History and argues that 'Indian history is nothing but the history of the struggle for supremacy

between Brahmanism and Buddhism' (1987:267). In one of the 'forewords', Marx said that he took England as the 'chief illustration' since his aim in writing *Capital* has been to examine the capitalist Mode of Production and England is the 'classic ground' for such an economic system. In a similar vein, Ambedkar's aim has been to examine caste system which is exclusively Indian socio-political and economic system. In his essay *Buddha or Karl Marx*, Ambedkar discards Marx's theory – class struggle based on economic interpretation of history – to be applicable to India because it does not have an Indian intellectual framework. In other words, Karl Marx deals with class consciousness; on the contrary, Ambedkar with caste consciousness.

As a vanguard of the proletariat, Ambedkar rejects communist Dictatorship in Russia and prefers Buddha to Marx in his essay *Buddha or Karl Marx*. According to him Russian Dictatorship would be good for all backward countries but this is no argument for permanent Dictatorship. Humanity does not only want economic values, it also wants spiritual values to be retained. Permanent Dictatorship has paid no attention to spiritual values and does not seem to intend to. Man must grow materially as well as spiritually. The French revolution was welcomed because of the slogan: liberty, equality and fraternity. It failed to produce equality but it cannot be too much emphasized that in producing equality society cannot afford to sacrifice fraternity or liberty because equality will be of no value without fraternity or liberty. It seems that the three can co-exist only if one follows the way of the Buddha. Communism can give one but not all (Ambedkar, 1987:462).

However, Marxist literary theory has been acclaimed in India but Ambedkarite literary theory has not been canonized in India. In fact, the books can be exportable-importable commodities, but not the literary values because each nation has unique culture and civilization governed by its own constitution with its own political economy which provides literary values and value-judgment. There are creative uses of Indian tools, such as spirituality or the revival of Buddhism by Ambedkar, which are beneficial to Indian literary theory than any other so-called aesthetic ideas, because no pure literary theory exists in any of the literatures in the world. One can easily deduce from Ambedkar's observations that western approaches to Indian literary theory cannot be mechanically applied to Indian situation.

Indian literary values

Indian literary theory has been shaped during its historical phases: Naga- Brahmin- Buddhist-Hindu-Indian constitutions, respectively. Ambedkarite literary theory is nothing but

Indian literary theory as a product of Indian Constitution. This does not mean that literary values should be shaped according to the constitution but the constitution remains the source of literary values. For George Orwell Socialist Constitution of Russia was the source of writing and for Pastor Niemoller, Nazi constitution. It can also be said that literary values should be shaped for and against the constitution whichever is essential for the people.

Indian literary theory demands Indian intellectual framework, as pointed out earlier, to evolve Indian literary values. It has a most particular relevance to the political systems, throughout history of India in different phases, governed by: Naga Constitution, Brahminic Constitution, Buddhist Constitution, Hindu Constitution, and Indian Constitution; hence, it would be not only beneficial but also necessary to draw Indian literary values from these constitutions for evaluating Indian literature, consequently, Ambedkar's literature is the prime source for this purpose. It was Buddhist tradition that pleaded for equal and common human rights for women and men from Buddha's *Dhamma* to the Indian constitution. Ambedkar belongs to this tradition; hence, he locates Indian values that are suitable for Indian polity and literature.

According to Ambedkar, Hinduism is positive religion. It is not grown up like primitive religions, under the action of unconscious forces operating silently from age to age but it is the result of conscious formulations of the philosophy of religion. Ambedkar writes, 'Hinduism is not like an unwritten constitution. It is enshrined in a written constitution and anyone who cares to know it will find it laid bare in that Sacred Book called *Manu Smriti*, a divine code which lays down the rules which govern the religious, ritualistic and social life of the Hindus in minute detail and which must be regarded as the Bible of the Hindus and containing the philosophy of Hinduism' (1987:8).

Ambedkar puts literature of Hinduism on its trial to assess its worth as a way of life like Judaism, Christianity and Islam. According to him, the norm or the criterion for judging right and wrong in the Antique society was utility while the norm or criterion for judging right and wrong in the modern society is justice. He proposes to adopt these norms or criteria in examining the philosophy of Hinduism in order to identify Indian values because the life of the Hindu is regulated by religion at every moment of his life. Therefore, he proposes to apply both the tests, the test of justice and the test of utility to judge the philosophy of Hinduism. For him, justice is simply another name for liberty, equality and fraternity.

First, Ambedkar asks whether Hinduism recognizes equality. After a detailed and scathing analysis of *Manu Smriti*, he concludes that Manu can be charged with being the progenitor if not the author of the caste system. Consequently, Hinduism is a denial of equality both social as well as religious and it is also a degradation of human personality. Secondly, Hinduism denies liberty because it is opposed to the existence of two conditions: social equality and economic security, which are crucial to promotion of liberty. It denies the individual the right to choose his own means of livelihood, his avocation and knowledge. Finally, by showing that Hinduism is opposed to equality and liberty, Ambedkar also shows implicitly that Hinduism discourages individualism. Fraternity could arise only if there is a sentiment of fellow feeling. He also shows that Hinduism fails even by the test of fraternity. The fragmentation of Hindus into anywhere between 2000 to 3000 castes prevents even the remotest possibility of any sentiment of fellow feeling. Caste hierarchy and inequality work in the same direction.

Turning to the question of utility, Ambedkar claims that there is no necessary antagonism between justice and utility. Therefore, if Hinduism denied justice, it also denied *ipso facto* utility. Naming caste once again as the villain of the piece, he argues that its structure and ideology tend to destroy social utility. It is in this sense Ambedkar uses justice as a criterion to judge Hindu literature and concludes that the philosophy of Hinduism neither satisfies the test of social utility nor does it satisfy the test of individual justice.

Ambedkar believes that the only parallel to Hindu philosophy is the philosophy propounded by Nietzsche. He declares, 'this leaves no doubt that Zarathustra is a new name for Manu and that *Thus spake Zarathustra* is a new edition of *Manu Smriti*' (1987:76). In short, according to Ambedkar, Hinduism is such that cannot be called the religion of humanity. 'It is superman's heaven and the common man's damnation' (1987:78).

Ambedkar, further, analyses *Vedas* and *Bhagwat Geeta* with the help of the same norms and criteria (justice and utility) and concludes that 'Geeta is Manu in a nutshell' (1987:81). He says that the *Smritis*, the *Vedas* and *Bhagwat Geeta* are woven on the same pattern, the same thread runs through them and are really parts of the same fabric because 'the Brahmins who were the authors of the whole body of Hindu religious literature except the Upanishad Literature – took good care to inject the doctrines formulated by them in the *Smritis*, into the *Vedas* and the *Bhagwat Geeta* as the gospel of Hinduism' (1987:81). Thus, Indian romantic and formalist literary values have been planned and worked out in concert. For instance, Ambedkar argues, 'the

survey of literature of Brahmanism brings out one other point. Vyas writes Mahabharata. Vyas tells Bhagvat Gita, and Vyas also writes the Puranas. Mahabharata contains 18 Parvas, the Gita has 18 Adhyayas and the Puranas number 18. Is all this an Accident? Or is it the result of a design planned and worked out in concert?(1987:257).

In sum, as the question: What is Indian literature is important, the question, how and by what standards – is it to be judged? is also very significant. It was common in the world before 1960s that the literary products were submitted to the critical standards of the west, without considering the relevance of the native standards. It is Ambedkar who propounded the justice: liberty, equality and fraternity, as native standard to judge Indian literature in particular and the World Literature in general. Hence, Ambedkarite literary values are local and global, simultaneously. Therefore, K. Raghvendra Rao argues that ‘any definition of literature which is not broad enough to include within its purview the work of Ambedkar as a writer would be unduly narrow and historically too restrictive’ (1998:85).

Conclusion

In all the essays, Ambedkar deals with criticism, but to him criticism is the whole work of scholarship and taste concerned with literature, which is a part of what is variously called liberal culture, or the study of the humanities. He propounds the principle that criticism is not simply a part of this larger activity, but an essential part of it. He defends the right of criticism to assume that criticism is a structure of thought and knowledge existing in its own right, with some measure of independence from the works he deals with. He makes us to concede that criticism deals with literature in terms of a specific humanistic framework with a special interest in interdisciplinary study in order to train Indian citizens to think critically in response to the challenges of globalism.

Ambedkar has attempted genuine criticism. His criticism is, of course, concerned with developing Indian literary theory and methods appropriate to his aims: he considers the questions of the relation between writing and humanity, or of text and ideology, as other theories, with the exceptions of Marxist and feminist, in general do not. For him, Indian literary theory is, primarily, the Buddhist literary theory, which in his opinion is more valuable than any of the literary theories in India. Thus, Ambedkar advanced an Indian literary theory which is the very reverse of elitist.

The Bible is a work of literature as long as it is being examined by a literary critic. No wonder, Ambedkar has made a critical enquiry into Brahmin and Buddhist literature and culture and has used justice and utility as norms or criteria to judge literature. Ambedkarite literary values: liberty, equality and fraternity are essential and fundamental requisite of human existence. Ambedkar's Indian literary theory is part of the ideological history of India and it has been bound up with ideological values. Moreover, his criticism is not merely from or for India or about India but it is always a criticism of India.

Literature should not be Dalit, Gramin or Adivasi but it must be ideology. Ambedkarite literature is opposed to the dalit, modernist, Brahman and Hindu literature because they are only in their own small circle. They are not wrong for the reason that they are only moving in the narrow circle. They know nothing outside it. Even a brilliant *dalit* writer will not be able to spread his wings to the limits of Marathi or Indian society. Ambedkarite literature is neither Dalit literature nor Marathi literature, the former refers to the communal ideology and the later regional Marathi only ignoring even many more small groups of minorities having their own languages like Kaikadi, Vadar, Nandivale, etc. It could be even short sighted to call it Indian literature because it offers, like Marxist literature, human values: the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. Literature produced in India is either Ambedkarite or anti-Ambedkarite.