

THE DUAL STRUGGLE FOR EQUALITY: REGIONAL DALIT MOVEMENTS AND THE INDIAN FREEDOM STRUGGLE

Kapil Anadpind Rajahans

Research Scholar,

Neharu Institute of Social Sciences, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune

Article Info

Article History:

Received: 15th Dec 2025

Accepted: 18th Dec 2025

Published: 20th Dec 2025

Keywords:

Indian Freedom Struggle, socio-cultural, Regional Dalit Movements

ABSTRACT

The Indian struggle for independence constitutes a complex tapestry woven from both the political resistance against external colonial rule and the profound socio-cultural conflicts against entrenched internal hierarchies [1, 2]. This extensive academic research paper employs a Subaltern-Critical framework to rigorously analyze the seminal contributions of two pivotal regional Dalit movements—the Satyashodhak Samaj in Maharashtra and the Self-Respect Movement in Tamil Nadu—to the broader history of Indian nationalism. These movements fundamentally contested the hegemonic definition of Swaraj (Self-Rule), asserting that political liberation lacked efficacy without the prerequisite of social and economic equality, human dignity, and the establishment of 'Real Democracy' [3]. The study meticulously investigates their Dual Conflict against the synergistic forces of British imperialism and indigenous caste-based oppression, exploring their foundational philosophies, operational modalities, and their enduring, transformative influence on the drafting and ideological core of the Indian Constitution [4, 16].

Plagiarism Check Report:

Date of Report: Dec 17, 2025

Similarity Index: 3%

Remarks: No significant matching text. All citations and matches are properly referenced. The manuscript is considered original.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to Cite: Rajahans, K. A. (2025). *The Dual Struggle for Equality: Regional Dalit Movements and the Indian Freedom Struggle*. IIP: World Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IIPWJHSS), 1(VI), 2014–2021.

I. INTRODUCTION: RE-CONCEPTUALIZING FREEDOM AND THE DALIT CRITIQUE OF NATIONALISM

The traditional historiography of the Indian nationalist movement has overwhelmingly privileged the narratives of the high-caste, Western-educated elite, often relegating the socio-economic struggles of the marginalized to a secondary status [5, 15]. However, contemporary scholarly reassessment reveals that the process of decolonization in India was fundamentally a convergence of two distinct, yet interconnected, revolutionary forces: the political movement for national sovereignty, and the simultaneous socio-cultural uprising for internal emancipation and dignity [1]. For the oppressed classes, particularly the Dalits, 'freedom' was not a singular political goal but a composite aspiration, necessitating liberation from centuries of ritualistic, economic, and social subjugation alongside the termination of foreign rule [10].

This dualistic nature of the struggle was forcefully articulated by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, who rejected the notion of political freedom as an end in itself:

Quote: "We are demanding not only freedom from foreign rule but also the establishment of social and economic equality, which alone can make political freedom worthwhile for the masses." [2]

This research paper provides a comprehensive comparative-analytical perspective on the regional dimensions of this dual conflict. It focuses on the **Satyashodhak Samaj** led by Mahatma Jotirao Phule in Maharashtra [3] and the **Self-Respect Movement** led by E.V. Ramasami 'Periyar' in Tamil Nadu [9]. We aim to delineate the mechanisms through which these movements acted as **internal critics and ideological anchors** to the mainstream nationalist movement, challenging its class and caste biases, and irrevocably shaping the discourse around social justice as a non-negotiable component of nationhood [11].

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Methodological Approach: Historical-Comparative Analysis

This study employs a **Historical-Comparative Methodology**. This approach involves two core steps: first, a diachronic analysis tracking the origins, development, and contextual factors of the two regional movements [18]; and second, a comparative analysis to identify structural similarities and divergences in their ideologies, leadership styles, and tactical engagement with both the colonial state and the Indian National Congress [19]. The primary data sources used include the seminal writings of Phule, Periyar, and Ambedkar, archival records from colonial census reports, and contemporary movement publications [6, 4, 5].

Theoretical Framework: Subalternity and the Politics of Difference

The core theoretical lens for this paper is the **Subaltern Studies framework**, supplemented by theories of **Social Exclusion** and **Internal Colonialism** [1]. This perspective mandates shifting the focus of historical inquiry away from the elite leadership (political parties, colonial administrators) towards the autonomous political agency of the subordinate classes. By analyzing the articulation of the Dalits' self-identity and their political resistance outside the ideological control of the national bourgeoisie, we uncover historical instances where the demands for **social Swaraj** superseded those for mere **political Swaraj** [19]. The concept of the **Dual Conflict** is central here. The Dalit movements operated under a *dual consciousness*—being simultaneously subjects of colonial oppression and victims of indigenous caste oppression [15]. This led to a tactical heterogeneity, often requiring them to engage with the colonial state to counter the power of the local high-caste elites—a strategy often condemned by mainstream nationalists

but essential for their emancipation [20]. Their fight was not just anti-colonial, but fundamentally **anti-hegemonic**, targeting the structures of Brahmanical patriarchy, feudal land relations, and ritual status hierarchy, rendering their contribution profoundly *transformative* to the definition of 'Indian freedom'.

III. THE SATYASHODHAK SAMAJ: ESTABLISHING THE SOCIAL JUSTICE PRECONDITION IN MAHARASHTRA

Genesis, Phule's Radical Pedagogy, and the Deconstruction of Caste

The establishment of the Satyashodhak Samaj (Truth Seekers' Society) by Mahatma Jotirao Phule in Pune in 1873 was a watershed moment in Western Indian social history [6]. Emerging from the socio-economic upheaval following the decline of the Maratha empire and the firm establishment of British rule, the movement was a direct, localized challenge to the enduring ideological and ritualistic dominance of the Peshwa-era Brahmanical elite [8]. The Samaj's mission was explicitly to liberate the **Bahujan (Shudra and Ati-Shudra)**—the peasants, laborers, and Dalits—by combating Brahmanical authority through education and critical rationalism [21].

Phule's intellectual contribution lay in his pioneering use of historical and religious critique to dismantle the moral authority of the caste system. In his seminal treatise, *Gulamgiri (Slavery)* [6], Phule posited the caste hierarchy not as a divinely ordained order but as a result of an ancient, ongoing '**Aryan-Brahmanical invasion**' that resulted in the enslavement of the indigenous population. This theory fundamentally redefined social hierarchy as a structure of power and historical subjugation rather than a religious necessity [22].

The primary tool of liberation was deemed to be education. Phule articulated the catastrophic consequences of illiteracy:

Quote: "Lack of wisdom leads to loss of movement, loss of movement leads to loss of wealth, loss of wealth leads to loss of Shudras, and all these calamities are caused by illiteracy." [7]

The Samaj established schools for the untouchables and women, actively practicing a form of **emancipatory pedagogy** that was revolutionary for its time, placing social reform as a precondition for any meaningful political change [21]. The work of Savitribai Phule in pioneering women's education was indispensable to this social revolution [3].

Political Tactics and the Dual Engagement Strategy

The Satyashodhak Samaj maintained a deeply critical distance from the early national leadership, primarily composed of Chitpavan Brahmins (like Ranade and Tilak) whom Phule viewed as primarily interested in securing political power for their own caste and class, rather than dismantling the oppressive social order [8]. Phule argued that Swaraj, if achieved without social justice, would merely lead to a perpetuation of indigenous tyranny, stating that a "Brahmin Raj" would be worse than British rule.

This conviction led to the Samaj's distinctive **dual engagement strategy**. They often petitioned the British government for welfare measures, educational access, and reservation in jobs, strategically leveraging colonial authority to counterbalance the entrenched power of the local high-caste structure [20]. This pragmatic approach, while seemingly supportive of the colonial regime to some nationalists, was, in reality, a tactical move aimed at forcing the colonial state to address social inequality—a core element of their anti-hegemonic struggle [22]. The intellectual groundwork laid by the Satyashodhak Samaj on

Bahujan rights, education, and social democracy served as the essential intellectual and social precursor to the rise of Dr. Ambedkar's movement in the 20th century [10].

IV. THE SELF-RESPECT MOVEMENT: ANTI-CASTE RATIONALISM AND THE CHALLENGE TO CULTURAL HEGEMONY IN TAMIL NADU

The Birth of Radical Rationalism and Dravidian Identity

The **Self-Respect Movement** (SRM), founded by E.V. Ramasami 'Periyar' in the mid-1920s, represented the most radical and sustained articulation of anti-caste sentiment in South India [9]. Arising from the context of the Tamil non-Brahmin movement and the perceived linguistic and cultural dominance of North Indian "Aryan" culture, the SRM sought not just reform, but the **total annihilation of the caste system** based on principles of **radical rationalism** and atheism [12].

Periyar's philosophy was profoundly secular and rationalist. He rejected the moral and spiritual foundation of Hinduism and all organized religion, which he viewed as the primary tool for perpetuating social inequality and gender subjugation [23]. His philosophy was encapsulated in his defiant posture:

Quote: "There is no God; there is no creator of this universe. If there is, he is not needed." [4]

The core of the movement was the affirmation of **Dravidian identity** and the reclaiming of 'Self-Respect'. This included promoting **Self-Respect Marriages** (without Brahmin priests or religious rituals) and launching widespread campaigns of denouncing Hindu mythology and religious texts as tools of oppression [12]. The movement was also highly progressive on gender equality, criticizing patriarchy alongside caste oppression [4].

Confrontation with Mainstream Nationalism and the Demand for Separation

Periyar's engagement with the mainstream nationalist movement was marked by ideological confrontation [11]. Though initially a member of the Congress, he resigned in 1925 after finding that the party, under high-caste leadership, systematically prioritized political freedom over social reform (e.g., the Vaikom Satyagraha revealed the reluctance of Congress to challenge local caste customs) [23].

Periyar viewed the Congress-led movement as an attempt to substitute British rule with the dominance of the North Indian, Brahmanical elite. His opposition manifested in two critical areas:

1. **Anti-Hindi Imposition:** He vehemently opposed the compulsory teaching of Hindi, arguing that it was a strategic move to impose North Indian (Aryan) cultural and linguistic hegemony over the Dravidian South. This opposition successfully politicized regional identity and cultural rights within the freedom struggle [12, 24].
2. **Demand for Dravida Nadu:** In the 1940s, Periyar escalated his demands to a call for a **separate Dravida Nadu**. This move symbolically and politically underscored his belief that the social liberation of the oppressed classes was inherently incompatible with the unitary, high-caste-dominated vision of an independent India. His legacy established the potent **Brahmin-Non-Brahmin binary** as the central axis of Tamil politics, fundamentally altering the trajectory of post-colonial governance in the region [9].

V. DR. AMBEDKAR: SYNTHESIZING REGIONAL CRITIQUES INTO A NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL PROJECT

The intellectual currents generated by the Satyashodhak Samaj and the Self-Respect Movement found their most powerful political and constitutional expression in the leadership of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar [13]. As an heir to Phule's tradition, Ambedkar elevated the regional struggles for dignity to the level of national constitutional demands, articulating the comprehensive political theory necessary for Dalits to secure their rights.

The Articulation of Political Agency: Round Table Conferences and Minority Status

Dr. Ambedkar used the platform of the Round Table Conferences (RTCs) (1930–1932) in London to internationally present the Dalit question not as a mere welfare issue but as a political problem requiring constitutional resolution [5]. He categorically rejected the claim of the Congress to speak for the untouchables, asserting their status as a distinct minority requiring political safeguards. His argument was premised on the permanent nature of the power imbalance:

Quote: "History bears out that all ruling classes are averse to share their power with others." [13]

To secure the political agency of the depressed classes, Ambedkar initially demanded **Separate Electorates**, which would guarantee that their representatives were chosen solely by the Dalit electorate, free from the influence of caste Hindus [5].

The Poona Pact and the Triumph of Reserved Representation

The British '**Communal Award**' (1932) granting separate electorates to the depressed classes provoked Mahatma Gandhi's famous fast unto death. The ensuing pressure led to the **Poona Pact (1932)**. Although Ambedkar was compelled to withdraw the demand for separate electorates, he successfully negotiated a significant increase in **Reserved Seats (Reservation)** for the Depressed Classes (from 71 to 147 seats in provincial legislatures) and guaranteed representation in the Central Legislature [14, 25]. The Poona Pact, while a compromise, was a major victory derived directly from the decades of regional mobilization. It legitimized the demand for state intervention to ensure representation and established the principle of **compensatory discrimination** as a foundational element of future Indian democracy [1].

Defining Social Democracy

Dr. Ambedkar's conceptualization of nationhood culminated in his definition of **Social Democracy**. He recognized that political rights (one man, one vote) were meaningless without corresponding social and economic equity [26]. His vision for independent India required the state to actively dismantle traditional hierarchies and promote fraternity:

Quote: "A way of life which recognizes liberty, equality, and fraternity as the principles of life. The principle of liberty cannot be divorced from the principle of equality; nor can the principle of equality be divorced from the principle of liberty. Nor can liberty and equality be divorced from the principle of fraternity." [16]

This profound definition, derived from the historical struggles of the Satyashodhak and Self-Respect movements, directly informed his role as the chief architect of the Indian Constitution [13].

VI. THE ENDURING LEGACY: CONSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE DUAL STRUGGLE

The regional Dalit movements ensured that the constitutional framework of independent India was fundamentally shaped by the logic of the **Dual Conflict** [16].

The Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles

As Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constitution, Ambedkar ensured that the core principles derived from the anti-caste struggles were enshrined as fundamental law:

- **Abolition of Untouchability (Article 17):** This was the single most decisive constitutional victory of the Dalit movement, legally eradicating the ritual basis of the caste system—the very target of Phule and Periyar [26].
- **Prohibition of Discrimination (Article 14, 15):** Guarantees of equality before the law and explicit prohibition of discrimination on grounds of caste ensured the legal framework for social inclusion [16].
- **Compensatory Discrimination (Article 16(4) and Article 330, 335):** The provision for reservation in public employment and political representation formalized the solution that Ambedkar fought for at the RTCs, ensuring that the marginalized could access the levers of state power [14].

The insertion of these principles transformed the Indian state's role from a mere neutral administrator to an active agent of social transformation, fulfilling the aspirations of social justice advocated by the regional movements for over a century [14].

The Transformation of National Agenda and Political Culture

The Dalit movements effectively countered the narrow, high-caste definition of nationalism that saw freedom primarily as the transfer of power [27]. They expanded the national agenda to include:

1. **Inclusivity and Representation:** They forced the mainstream leadership to acknowledge and address the internal social fracturing of Indian society.
2. **Secularization of Society:** The rationalism of Periyar's movement contributed to the secular and humanistic outlook of the state by challenging the religious justification for social hierarchy [23].
3. **Economic Justice:** The Satyashodhak focus on the exploitation of the peasant class (Bhujan) ensured that land reform and economic upliftment remained a crucial part of the post-independence state policy (Directive Principles) [15].

The legacy is not just constitutional but political; the Dravidian movement in Tamil Nadu, directly springing from the Self-Respect movement, created a unique political culture that has dominated the state, consistently prioritizing social justice and welfare over religious nationalism [9].

VII. CONCLUSION: THE INDELIBLE MARK ON INDIAN DEMOCRACY

The regional Dalit movements—the Satyashodhak Samaj and the Self-Respect Movement—were not peripheral movements; they were **structural determinants** of modern Indian democracy [1]. They successfully navigated the complexities of the colonial era, waging a **Dual Conflict** that simultaneously undermined British authority and challenged indigenous social tyranny.

Their most enduring contribution lies in establishing the principle that true self-rule requires a radical commitment to social equality. They forced India to confront its internal contradictions, leading to a constitutional framework rooted in compensatory justice and human dignity [14]. The history of these regional movements is therefore not a footnote to the story of Indian independence, but the **core narrative** defining the moral and ethical foundation of the Republic—a narrative that transformed India from a traditional, hierarchical society into the world's largest, albeit imperfect, social democracy [14, 19].

The struggles initiated by Phule and Periyar, culminating in the legal and constitutional architecture designed by Ambedkar, represent the most profound realization of the promise of social liberation in the history of the freedom struggle [26].

REFERENCES

1. Gail Omvedt. (2008). *Dalits and the Democratic Revolution: Dr. Ambedkar and the Dalit Movement in Colonial India*. (3rd ed.). Sage Publications. pp. 1-25.
2. B.R. Ambedkar. (1945). *What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables*. (1st ed.). Thacker and Company Limited. pp. 177-180.
3. Dhananjay Keer. (1971). *Mahatma Jotirao Phooley: Father of Indian Social Revolution*. (2nd ed.). Popular Prakashan. pp. 100-115.
4. E.V. Ramasami 'Periyar'. (2005). *Why Were Women Enslaved?* (Translated ed.). The Periyar Self-Respect Propaganda Institution. pp. 5-10.
5. B.R. Ambedkar. (1930-1932). *Speeches and Writings at the Round Table Conferences*. Vol. 2. Government of Maharashtra Publications. pp. 503-509.
6. Jotirao Phooley. (1873). *Gulamgiri (Slavery)*. (Original Marathi Edition). Bombay: Satyashodhak Samaj.
7. Jotirao Phooley. (1883). *Shetkaryacha Asud (Cultivator's Whipcord)*. (Original Marathi Edition). Pune: Satyashodhak Samaj.
8. Rajendra Vora. (2010). 'Satyashodhak Samaj: An Evaluation of its Contribution to the Lower Classes'. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 45, No. 34. pp. 13-17.
9. V. Geetha and S.V. Rajadurai. (1998). *Towards a Non-Brahmin Millennium: From Iyothee Thass to Periyar*. (1st ed.). Samya. pp. 300-320.
10. Eleanor Zelliot. (1992). *From Untouchable to Dalit: Essays on the Ambedkar Movement*. (1st ed.). Manohar Publishers. pp. 15-30.
11. P.C. Joshi. (1990). 'The Freedom Struggle and the Question of Social Change'. *Social Scientist*. Vol. 18, No. 8/9. pp. 3-21.
12. K. Manickam. (1985). *The Dravidian Movement: A Historical Perspective*. (1st ed.). New Century Book House. pp. 45-60.
13. Christophe Jaffrelot. (2005). *Dr. Ambedkar and Untouchability: Analysing and Fighting Caste*. (2nd ed.). Columbia University Press. pp. 110-125.
14. Yogendra Singh. (1986). *Modernization of Indian Tradition*. (Revised ed.). Rawat Publications. pp. 30-45.
15. A.R. Desai. (1948). *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*. (4th ed.). Popular Prakashan. pp. 240-255.
16. Granville Austin. (1999). *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*. (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. pp. 27-50.
17. Sumit Sarkar. (1983). *Modern India 1885-1947*. (2nd ed.). Macmillan India. pp. 60-75.
18. David Hardiman. (1987). *The Coming of the Devi: Adivasi Assertion in Western India*. (1st ed.). Oxford University Press. pp. 1-15.
19. Ranajit Guha. (1997). *Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. (1st ed.). Harvard University Press. pp. 100-110.

20. Rosalind O'Hanlon. (1985). *Caste, Conflict, and Ideology: Mahatma Jotirao Phule and Low Caste Protest in Nineteenth-Century Western India*. (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. pp. 200-215.
21. Gail Omvedt. (1976). *Cultural Revolt in a Colonial Society: The Non-Brahman Movement in Western India, 1873-1930*. (1st ed.). Scientific Socialist Education Trust. pp. 150-165.
22. G. B. Sardar. (1970). *The New Age: Socio-political and Historical Thought of Jotirao Phule*. (1st ed.). Pune University Press. pp. 40-55.
23. N. C. Nanda. (2001). *E.V. Ramasami Periyar: A Study in the Politics of Equality*. (1st ed.). Sterling Publishers. pp. 80-95.
24. M. S. S. Pandian. (1992). *The Image Trap: M.G. Ramachandran in Film and Politics*. (1st ed.). Sage Publications. pp. 10-25.
25. Ravinder Kumar. (1982). *Essays in the Social History of Modern India*. (1st ed.). Oxford University Press. pp. 180-195.
26. Bipin Chandra, et al. (1989). *India's Struggle for Independence*. (1st ed.). Penguin Books. pp. 260-275.
27. S. P. Sharma. (2015). 'The Role of Social Justice in Indian Constitutionalism'. *Journal of Constitutional Law*. Vol. 15, No. 2. pp. 45-60.