

legal reforms that were brought about while he was in the Executive Council of the Viceroy, can be the examples of his concern for workers' exploitation. The formation of ILP was not welcomed or supported by the communist leaders arguing that this will lead to a split in the working-class votes. Ambedkar replied that communist leaders were working for the rights for the worker but not for the human rights of Dalit workers.

Imperialism

Ambedkar's attitude towards imperialism has been projected in a distorted manner right from the beginning, mainly because he refused to take part in the freedom struggle or opposed Gandhi who for many was the anti-imperialism personified. He strategically sought to maintain neutrality vis-à-vis the colonial State. As per him, it would not be possible for the resource less Dalits to fight its mighty foes all together. He did not want to dissipate and squander his extremely limited resources on several fronts.

He however knew the basic exploitative character of the colonial regime. At several occasions, he burst out saying that British imperialism and Indian feudalism were the two leaches that clung to Indian people. However, there was a fundamental difference between his and others' viewpoint. For instance, he did not approve equating opposition to imperialism with opposing the British.

He noted that the opposition to imperialism couldn't be effective until its supporters within the country are left untouched. He always believed that without struggling against the landlords, mill owners, and moneylenders - the friends of imperialism within the country, it was not possible to wage an effective fight against imperialism.

It was in fact this reason only which led him to question the so-called freedom struggle launched under the leadership of Congress as an anti-imperialist struggle. He contended that the Congress basically represented the class of feudal lords and the urban capitalists - the twosome exploiters of Indian masses. Although, it succeeded through the charismatic leadership of Gandhi in galvanizing masses in its support, it essentially relied on bargaining with the colonial rulers for securing itself more share of power.

He thus not only saw no point in siding with this more real exploiter of people than perhaps the colonial rulers, but also did not hesitate to openly oppose it when it came in the way of dalit liberation. He smelt rot in all such struggles that refused to notice existence of inhuman exploitation of some of their own people within their precincts and tended to over-externalize their woes. Here lay his second point when he raised a question of Hindu imperialism perpetrated through its caste system that was certainly seen as more vicious by its victims than the British rule.

Oppression of Women

Besides these mainstream forms of exploitation, even the subaltern forms like women's exploitation, could not escape his agenda. He viewed them as the most oppressed of all. He raised his voice against women's discriminatory situation in the society. His basic law of social engineering was that the social revolutions must always begin from the standpoint of the most oppressed or the ones on the lowest rung of the society.

He always involved women in his struggles and tended to give them important positions. For example, about 500 women had marched at the head of the historical procession at Mahad (Drinking Water Satyagraha, Maharashtra, 1927) to assert the untouchables' right to drink water from the public tank. He also oversaw the drafting of a new law in 1951 which allow women to choose their partners and give them divorce if necessary.

Religion

Religion was the institution envisaged to control the organization at the level of an individual and society to curb their latent exploitative instincts. It was a philosophical device that would regulate their lives, including the interface between them at the most primary level. Ambedkar viewed it as a code of behaviour, a way of life that is upheld by the multitude. He insisted that this code should be