

Hindutva-Nothing but Brahminic Sanathan Dharma

(Paper submitted by PALA to AILRC, Aug 1994 - published as a booklet in 'Conference Against Brahminic Terrorism', feb 2003)

The history of India is being explained to us through various perspectives. When the brahminical, gandhian and revisionist (blemished with brahminism) shades of those perspectives reveal themselves, or when they are unmasked, we confront the cruel and treacherous face of Brahminism hitherto unseen. To those who fail to see this and remain indifferent, the Hindu communalists have upon themselves the task of 'educating' them.

During the freedom movement, the CPI, which should have acted as a vanguard in the struggle against British imperialism and feudalism, compromised on both these fronts. It also glossed over the question of caste, a socio-economic oppressive system interwoven with the class oppression-the backbone of oriental despotism. It faithfully followed Gandhi and his moderate Hindu nationalism like a pet dog.

Dr.Ambedkar and Periyar EVR carried through the ideological struggle against Brahminism. Though they fought Brahminism in certain spheres of ideology, they went in for a class compromise and got institutionised in that process. That was the limitation destined by history to the bourgeois world outlook – an inescapable compromise with Brahminism, a close ally of imperialism.

Now, it is the second round of the game. After pauperising the country with their own policies, the ruling classes now accede to the pressure of re-colonisation by the imperialists, and shame lessly justify it as the only solution to the crisis. The Hindu fascists, representatives of the same comprador- feudal combine, put forth hindutva as their ideology and indulge in a deceptive patriotic sloganeering, projecting themselves as the only alternative.

Simultaneously, parties like BSP, which despise even the concept of class struggle and maintain a discreet silence over the issue of fighting imperialism and feudalism, are 'thundering' against Brahminism. They make no secret of their ultimate goal of sharing their crumb in the citadels of ruling class power. But that does not prevent them from gaining influence among the oppressed castes. We can also observe the emergence of a variety of forces, which demand more power to the state or separate statehood, alongside the existing armed national liberation struggles. Not to speak of the Sikh and Islamic nationalism.

The revolutionary and democratic forces who are steadfast in their struggle against Hindu communalism, do not clearly demarcate their ideology and organization – viz. Brahminism combined with, fascism with the result, the offensive loses its sharpness, gets scattered and misses the target.

Hence the ideology – Brahminism or the so called Hindu religion – on the basis of which the Hindu communal fascists justify their oppression in the spheres of caste, nationality,

language and gender, should be challenged. Likewise, when Brahminism attempts to revive and present itself as an alternative to the prevailing crisis, it does not remain to be an obsolete ideology justifying Varna dharma, but turns into a fascist ideology, wielded by a fascist clique. The significance of the struggle against Brahminism increases further, as it is a struggle against fascism in today's context.

HINDUISM - NOT A RELIGION

Hinduism is not a religion; it is an ideology that upholds the institution of socio – economic oppression. The reasons for the emergence of various religions of the world and the social purposes they attempted to serve have no relevance whatsoever with that of Hinduism.

To quote Marx,

“Religion distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and the protest against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of the heartless world, just as it is a spirit of spiritless situation. It is the opium of the people.”

Applying Marxism, we can look into the historical and social conditions which gave birth to the emergence of the three great religions of the world.

Christianity was born out of the distress of the slaves and their craving for liberation- it attempted to 'liberate' the slaves; it symbolised the freedom of the slaves.

The emergence of slave kingdoms leading to the violent crushing of primitive communes, the resultant yearning of its people for the 'commune democracy' and the compassion of Buddha for the oppressed castes and his concern to relieve them out of their distress gave birth to Buddhism. In other words, it rose against brahminical tyranny and deception.

Islam emerged as a unifying force amongst various warring tribes, and it promised equal treatment to all those who believed in monotheism (Allah) and recognized Mohammed as the last Prophet.

Thus, all the three major religions were born in the interest of the oppressed. Later, they got turned into instruments (of oppression) in the hands of the ruling classes.

But it was only the 'Hindu religion' that was created as an instrument of oppression in the hands of exploiting classes. Its principles as well as methods continue to be racism, tyranny, exploitation and deceit. Varna and casteism, which fortify endogamy, are its basis, and Brahminism is its ideology.

Hinduism not only denies the right to property and education etc. to the majority of the population, it denies them the basic religious right – the right to worship. Unlike other religions it exclude the majority of the population (belonging to lower varnas, castes and also women) from the basic aim of any religion – i.e., 'Salvation'.

The essence and soul of Hinduism is the caste system; what are the remaining basic religious aspects, if caste is done away with? Hundreds of mutually hostile gods, thousands forms of worship and dozens of philosophies. It does not possess a common principle on any of the basic issue that matters to any other religion – like theistic philosophy, forms of worship and moral principles – except of course, the chatur varna system. (But this ‘diversity’ is cunningly used today, by the Brahminic scholars as a proof to their democratic credentials.)

Religion is normally considered as part of superstructure. It is always claimed by the Hindu religious leaders that Hinduism is not a mere religion, but a ‘way of life’. Islam has also codified the ways of life. But Hinduism basically codifies the social system. It lays down well defined laws on the organization and functioning of the social, economic, political and cultural relations of the Varna – caste system. That is, it decides production as well as other relations. So, Hinduism is part of both superstructure and the base.

Ambedkar was right when he said that “...it (Hinduism) has not got the impulse to serve and that is because by its nature it is unhuman and unmoral. It is a misnomer to call it religion. Its philosophy is opposed to the very thing for which a religion stands.”

-Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar writings and speeches. Vol.3.p.92.

Periyar EVR emphasized the same, pointing out the malevolent and immoral character of the Brahminic gods, saints and their preachings including Manusmriti.

HINDUISM – A HISTORIC FRAUD

Historically there existed no religion called Hinduism and this fact does not require any new proof neither it represented the whole of society or a majority of it. It was only called as the ‘Sanatan dharma’ by its creators and defenders i.e., the Brahmins. Hinduism means nothing but Brahmanism and it was defined so only by Brahmins – not by us. They have never used the term ‘Hindu’ in any of their scriptures.

In fact, the twice born (Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaisya) did not have any dispute over the doctrines of Varna and karma, but, they were divided among themselves into six religions like saivism and vaishnavism; When the Brahminic authority floundered with the rise of Buddhism, Ajeevakam and Jainism, various Brahmin sanatanists tried to redefine the philosophical basis of varna and caste, in order to defend it. Sankara was one of them, who were instrumental in achieving some sort of unity amongst those six religions, defeating enemies through deceit and oppression.

The ‘Hinduism’ of the Vedic age was different from the one of the Upanishadic period; likewise, the ‘Hinduism’ of Bhagavat Gita varies much from that of the upanishadic period; Shankara’s ‘Hinduism’ is different from the present day ‘Hinduism’. Idol worship’ Temple worship and the doctrine against cow-slaughter were appropriated and developed by Brahminism in its struggle against Buddhism.

Brahminic Hinduism has always adapted itself to the political and economic realities and to defend itself from the onslaught of other religions.

It has adapted without much fuss, even conceded to upgrade the status of certain individuals and groups in the Varna hierarchy.

But it would not budge an inch in the matters of defending Varna dharma as a system and its own supremacy in the Pyramid. The attitude of Brahminism towards religious conversions is also worth mentioning here. While opposing conversions, in order to retain the oppressed castes in their fold, they argue that varna and caste division did not exist in Vedic or Upanishadic age. Thus they absolve themselves of the crime, but shamelessly continue to enforce caste in all religious matters.

The Shankaracharya of Kanchi was quite frank when he thanked the British for introducing the 'Legal Hindu Religion' and saving the Sanatanists from the danger of becoming minority 'in the own land'

"Had they [the British] not given us the name "Hindu" we could have divided ourselves into various religion - like Saivites, Vaishnavites, Sakthas, Muruga Bhakts and as devotees of Ellai Amma - in every town. Is there a common God for Saivites and Vaishnavites? No, Siva is not the God of Vaishnavites; the militant Saivites say that Vishnu is not a God at all, but only a devotee of Lord Shiva. Can anyone consider these two as belonging to a single religion? The British gave a common name – HINDU, and we are saved. The name that they christened saved us."

- Sri Chandrasekarendra Saraswathi, Kanchi Paramacharya, Voice of God
Volume 1, Page: 266. [Tamil Edn]

Hence, recognising Hinduism as a religion amounts to subscribing to a historic falsity and it also amounts to appeasing the Hindu Fascists.

IT IS NOT MERELY THE CHATUR VARNA

The essence of Brahminic Hindu religion is not only the Chatur Varna and caste system. It also includes Aryan Racism and oppression of various nationalities and languages.

Social estates based on simple occupational divisions have existed even in Europe, but they were not decided by birth, as in the case of Varna and caste system.

The Chatur Varna as an oppressive social system was formed after subjugating Dravidian and Kirata races placing them in the lower Varna, as slaves – otherwise called Dasas and Dasyues. The impelling ideology was racism found among the Rigvedic Aryans. Even after the Aryan-Dravidian-Kirata intermixture, this had not changed. It was a story of native tribes getting humiliated by the colonizers owing to their colour and birth.

The development of productive forces and emergence of slave and feudal societies led to the emergence of new castes. While the Aryans adapted the advanced culture and production techniques to other tribes, especially Dravidians, they tried to maintain their own identity and their own racial purity through Varna system. While the ideological basis for the emergence of Chatur Varna and the caste system was Aryan racism, the material basis was the absence of private ownership in land. In other words it was collective social slavery based on Asiatic form of ownership.

The 'Aryan pride' of the Brahmins does not end with the Vedic age. It transcends time and arouses sangh parivar to dream of an 'Akand Bharat'. Bharat has nothing to do with Sakunthala. It was the name of an Aryan tribe in the Saptha Sindhu. This particular tribe emerged victorious in its war against Dasyus and Kiratas (the native tribes), drove them out and the chieftain of the Bharatha tribe 'Sudhas' established his kingdom. The Rig Veda dwells at length about these wars and victories. Hence the official name of our country Bharath is discreetly chosen alternative word for "Aryavarta".

Of course it is true that wars and aggressions of one primitive ethnic tribe against the other and the eventual elimination or oppression of the defeated is not uncommon in the history of mankind. Likewise the intermixture of different ethnic tribes (in India, Aryan-Dravidian-Kirata) is also quite common throughout history.

But the uncommon and unique aspect of Indian history is that the Aryan racism and brutality against the native tribes and their subsequent enslavement were treated as a virtue and were accorded religious sanction. With Brahmins at the helm, the racial chauvinism continued over the centuries, the manifestations of which are to be seen in the puranas as Deva-Asura conflicts.

The intermixture of ethnic tribes and the inclusion of 'black' gods (only to uphold Brahminism) in the "Hindu" pantheon, will not absolve Brahminism of its racial chauvinism. The victories of the Devas over Asuras were celebrated. They were-and are still- depicted as the victory of good over evil.

Brahmins have never recognised or respected the mother tongue of various nationalities and tribes. Their 'own' language was Sanskrit, the language of gods (Deva Basha). They have even fought and won a legal battle with the erstwhile DMK government to guard the status of Sanskrit as Deva Basha. They maintain a separate cultural identity, the important ingredient of which is 'Aryan-Dvija-Sanskrit' pride, which cuts across all national 'barriers'. Sanskrit served as the 'national' language in their attempts to establish and safeguard the Brahminical order. All other nations, people and the languages were condemned as mlecha, untouchables and impure.

The racist and puritans approach of Brahminism alone was responsible for propounding the system of untouchability (Avarna), which is the oldest, worst and the most horrible discrimination of man comparable only to apartheid. It denies all basic human rights to nearly one third of the entire society and it is a shame on the society. But for a few fanatics, even hardcore Hindu religious leaders could not defend it and try to acquit

'Hinduism' from the responsibility of its creation. But all Hindu fascists and communalists in their heart of hearts do not conceal their desire to safeguard it along with Varna and caste system. The religious rights of the Sanatanists to practice untouchability are also protected by the constitution. So whoever wants to fight caste and untouchability, should also direct his attack against Brahminic Hindu religion.

HINDU – HINDI – INDIA

While referring to the partition, the emergence of Muslim nationalism and the Non-Brahmin movement of South India, the congress easily finds a scapegoat in British Imperialism and escapes from its responsibility by simply branding them as 'agents'. Again the CPI and CPM faithfully follow this line. No body denies the fact that the imperialists played a 'Divide and Rule' tactics to frustrate the freedom movement. But the seeds of divisions were already present, and they were sown by the Brahminic Hindu nationalists.

The basic claim of Hindu nationalists had been 'Akand Bharat'. When it spoke about restoring 'our glorious ancient tradition' it was referring to the Vedic age with a Brahminic and Aryan pride. The ideological and emotional involvement towards 'Akand Bharat' existed only among the Brahmins. (None of the kings who rules even very large tracts of the present day India had such a 'vision'). In other words they infused an ideological and emotional content (patriotism based on Hindu nationalism) to the geographical area that was brought under the British sword. Brahminic culture did not and does not identify itself with any particular nationality. It always claims and upholds the Brahminical divine life of Rishis and Saints of Gangetic and Himalayan region which again reveals its 'Racial pride'.

When the European intellectuals started showing interest in the Sanskrit literature, it resulted in stirring up the Aryan pride amongst the Brahmins. Modern education, bureaucratic assignments and involvement in political movements gave rise to their dream of Akand Bharat.

The Gujarati, Marwari and Bania traders and usurers were a strong ally of Brahmins in advocating the concept of Akand Bharat, as their class interest perfectly synchronising with it. They have moved out of their own land and were settled in various parts of the country even before the entry of British East India Company. If Brahmins already possessed a unique cultural identity, the Banias and Marwaris did not hesitate to their ethnic identity and coalesce with the Brahminic Hindu culture, in their own class interest. They even renounced their own languages in favour of Hindi.

When the comprador bourgeoisie emerged from among this section of traders and usurers, they supported the congress and Hindu Maha Sabha. Atleast they were sure that the Hindu Rashtra of Hindu Maha Sabha, Ram Rajya of Gandhi and the term 'ancient Indian civilisation' used by Nehru meant the same i.e., Brahminic Hindu nationalism.

Brahminic nationalism satisfied craves of the comprador bourgeoisie for an all India market. In other words, the Brahminic nationalism received new class content. Thus the Indian (Brahminic) nationalism was against the rights of nationalities, right from its birth.

True to its tradition of recognising the vanquisher as Kshatriya, on the assurance for the perpetuation of caste system, Brahmin nationalists struck a deal with the imperialists. The historic characteristics of Brahminism and class interest of the comprador bourgeoisie and feudal lords perfectly mixed together in the new social context.

The coalition continues. While Brahmins dominate the political and cultural life of the country, Marwaris and Banias dominate the economic and commercial life of it. They have together formed a united front to exploit and oppress the rest of the people. The Gujarati, Marwari and Bania traders and compradors are the chief patrons of BJP throughout India. The NRIs among this section play a vital role in filling up the coffers of RSS today.

The concept of 'one nation-one people' stands for a strong centre i.e., total suppression of rights of the nationalities: Akand Bharat reflects the expansionist desire of the Indian ruling class.

The dream of 'Akand Bharat' is kept alive in the 'National Anthem' with its reference to Sindh province. The constitution on its part confers sanction also to the areas to be annexed in future by the Indian union.

HINDI –A PROXY TO SANSKRIT

The questions of nationalities as well as the languages were never solved democratically in India. The ruling classes repeatedly try to impose Hindi and oppose the struggle for national self-determination. The relationship of Brahminic Hindu nationalism with the Hindi is organic and integral, hence irrefutable. Hindi nationalism or 'Nationalist Hindi' encroaches in to the rights of other nationalities and suppresses them; at the same time it denigrates the people of the oppressed castes and classes belonging to the 'Hindi belt'.

It was not without reason that the 'Brahminic nationalists' chose Hindi as the official language instead of Sanskrit, their darling. Sanskrit was a dead language and the chance of its immediate resurrection was also very remote. The inevitable choice was Hindustani- much closer to Sanskrit than any other Indian language.

But it had to be cleansed of the Persian and Arabic words for obvious reasons. The Brahminical contempt for the people's languages was not reserved only to the non-Hindi speaking people. Words belonging to Mahati, Maithili, Rajasthani, Brijbasha, Chattisghari and Bhojpuri (people's languages which were very much alive and which also belonged to the Hindustani family) were also systematically removed in the cleansing process, to be substituted with the Sanskrit words. Thus Hindi was duly sanitised (Sanskritised) before it was allowed to enter in to the portals of higher education.

Article-151 of the constitution while envisaging the future development of Hindi lay down in clear terms that, attempts to improve Hindi should primarily depend upon Sanskrit. Golwalkar was candid when he said that, only Sanskrit was competent to be the national language of India, while Hindi was only an interim arrangement. On its part congress went to the extent of even opposing the formation of linguistic states.

Both political and religious leaders repeatedly emphasis that Hindi particularly Sanskrit alone can serve as the uniting force of the country and urge the people to study Sanskrit. Large amount of government money is spent to promote Hindi education and Sanskrit research. They insist that our country's best traditions and values should be drawn from the Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas - hence the study of Sanskrit should be encouraged. Thus the Hindu communal (Brahminic) bias in favour of Hindi is borne out by historical facts. Hence it would be absurd, if we are to be accused of giving communal colour to a people's language i.e., Hindi.

Of course, the above facts do not attribute any communal motive to Hindi speaking people. Still we cannot gloss over the following questions:

- What induced the Punjabi Hindus to register their mother tongue as Hindi in the census records?
- Can we say that the anti-Urdu sentiments in UP does not have communal undertone?
- Should the people of the non-Hindi nationalities unconditionally believe in the democratic credentials of the 'Hindi' proletariat, in spite of the fact that no voice of protest worth mentioning has ever been raised from the 'Hindi belt' against the imposition of Hindi on others?

The answers to these questions are understandable. The ruling class has considerably succeeded in influencing the people of the 'Hindi belt' with its 'Hindu-Hindi nationalism'. Further the fact that the Brahminical – Hindu nationalists could go ahead with their plan of 'Sanskritisation of Hindi' without any protest is also much distressing. Of course there was a lone voice of protest. Rahul Sankruthyayan proposed the formation of three different linguistic states for the people speaking Panchali, Kauthali and Kauravi; but the CPI termed his proposal as backward and feudal. It went ahead and supported the ruling class attempt to create a 'Hindi heartland'.

The source of the concept of Hindi- Hindu – Hindustan is Brahminic Hinduism. Its genesis explains the truth. Its roots can never be amputated unless the contempt inherent in the 'Brahminic Hindu religion' towards any national identity is exposed.

A VOICE OF PROTEST BEFORE 1947 The concept that “the tradition of Indian nationalism, cherished by the people of our country through the ages and enriched by their struggle against imperialism” is basically wrong. There was only a multiplicity of Indian culture and traditions of various nationalities. Questions are raised as to how one could determine the essence of the 'nationalistic spirit' of Bhagat Singh and other such revolutionaries. Their understanding of India as a 'nation' was limited to the geographical

boundary enslaved by the British – i.e., British India. In other words, the content of their ‘Indian nationalism’ was only an anti-thesis of British colonialism.

But even before 1947, voices of protest against Brahmin nationalism were raised from Tamilnadu, which has a centuries old tradition of fighting against Brahminism and Sanskrit. Though not placed in an integrated form, it was forcefully put forth by Periyar EVR. After a long drawn struggle inside the congress, he resigned from it to continue his struggle against Brahminism and Brahmin nationalism from outside. Though he was stubborn in fighting against Brahminism, his struggles were not targeted against feudalism and its political power or imperialism. He chose to compromise with them.

The Non-Brahmin movement of south India, especially Tamilnadu was a reaction to the Brahminic domination in British bureaucracy and various other factors. Its anti-Brahminism ended at the point of sharing the power and it was also pro-imperialist and reformist. But all these facts will not justify Brahmin nationalism and its undemocratic and comprador characteristics.

THE ALTERNATIVE TRADITION

We recognise the right to self-determination of every nationality including the right to secede; that does not mean that we stand for the secession of every nationality; on our part we only strive to unite the proletariat of all the nationalities against the common enemy.

But while rejecting Brahminic nationalism as fake and undemocratic, we are left with the question of finding our own tradition.

Since Brahminic nationalism and Brahminic Hinduism is an amalgam of Chatur Varna. We should inherit the best traditions of the struggles against all these oppressions- Casteism, Aryan racism and linguistic and national oppression.

- Various schools of philosophies- materialist, anti-Brahmin and atheist, from charvaka to Buddha and siddhas of Tamilnadu- who valiantly fought against the Brahminic and Vedic authority.
- The struggles of the native tribes against Aryan racism and Brahminic deceit; in other words the struggle of Asuras against Suras (Devas).
- Victims of Brahminic tyranny like Ekalavya, Sambuka and Nandha and the reformers who challenged the Brahminic Hindu religion.
- Struggles for democratic right of various nationalities, including the struggle against imposition of Hindi and Sanskrit.
- All anti-feudal, anti-imperialist struggles and

The struggles of the international proletariat, oppressed nations and the struggles against racism and apartheid.

We should inherit the best of all these traditions and wield them as a weapon in our struggle for a new democratic India.

As mentioned earlier, Asuras are not mere mythological entities, but the native tribes of our country who relentlessly fought against the Brahminic authority. In other words, they were the ‘terrorists’ and ‘extremists’ of those times, hated and feared by the Brahminic authority. They can appropriately be treated as a symbol in our struggle against Brahminism.

It will be apt to recall the attempts of Periyar EVR (of course with its own shortcomings) in this regard. His movement turned the permanent villains of the puranas, in to heroes and staged plays like “Hiranya Kasipu- the incomparable hero” and “Ravanakavya” against Ramayana. The “Ravana Leela” against Ram Leela was also held on these lines.

We should unearth and bring to light all our traditions hitherto unknown or misinterpreted by the ruling classes, propagate them and create an alternative historic consciousness which will naturally inspire the people in their struggle against Brahminism.

ATTACK HINDUISM THAT SANCTIFIES CASTE OPPRESSION

Caste should not be seen as a mere obstacle blocking class unity. It is a separate socio-economic oppressive system existing in the base. Class struggle and caste struggle are not to be fought side by side or alongside. Caste struggle is part of class struggle. Sometimes the caste aspect takes the primary form, while the class aspect becomes primary in certain other situations. Hence both the prepositions of ‘class struggle a pre-condition to class struggle’ and ‘giving up of caste struggle in the interest of class struggle’ are wrong. Both the class and caste struggles should be carried out simultaneously, so that one compliments the other and helps the development of the revolutionary movement.

Struggle against caste oppression or untouchability are not to be treated as mere local issues to be settled with a particular land lord or a community. Its scope should be extended to fight Brahminic Hindu religion that sanctifies caste system. Only the “class unity” achieved on these lines will help removing the ‘caste consciousness’ among the people and effect the fall of Brahminic Hindu religion.

HINDUISM IN ITSELF IS COMMUNAL

In the struggle against Hindu communalism the focus is mainly made opposing the anti-muslim propaganda. Historic distortions and communalization – of secular issues by the sangh parivar and the class interest behind its politics should definitely be exposed.

But due importance should be given to wipe out the social base it has created among the oppressed castes in the name of ‘Hindu unity’. A mere reference to the upper caste nature of its leadership is not enough. The fact ‘communal’ towards to its ‘own’ members should be highlighted.

HURTING RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OR UPHOLDING SELF-RESPECT

Fears are repeatedly expressed that attack against Hinduism would result in the religious sentiments of the common people. We should clarify ourselves. There has never been a common religious consciousness among Hindus. It is divided on caste lines. In other words even the gods are divided on caste lines and this is the only religion where the gods have repeatedly punished or killed their own devotees for the crime of violating Varna dharma. But now Sangh Parivar is attempting to create a 'common hindu identity' and a 'common religious consciousness' by focusing the same gods who stood to defend Varna dharma.

As stated earlier, the gods of the scheduled castes and oppressed castes are quite different from that of the Brahminic Hindu gods; the forms of worship and rituals also vary. Likewise, the nature of the religious consciousness amongst the oppressed castes is by and large proto-materialist and tribal.

This does not mean that we are closing our eyes to the fact that over a period of time – owing to various historical reasons -some of the oppressed castes have been deceived in to accepting the Brahminic gods like Ram, Krishna, Shiva etc., this only increases our responsibility to expose the misdeeds of such 'gods' amongst the oppressed castes or else they may fall prey to the ploy of Sangh Parivar, which uses these 'gods' as common symbols of Hindu resurgence.

As for the people born in upper castes – but not castiest – who may have a general religious sentiment towards such Brahminic gods then we have no other way but to convince them of the Varna caste chauvinism of their gods and religion.

Further our propaganda against Brahminic Hinduism is not atheistic in nature. We are only putting bare before the people, the history of Brahminic Hinduism which has hurt the self-respect of the oppressed castes. So the question of hurting the religious sentiments and the fear of getting isolated from the people, are totally unfounded; especially when such campaigns go hand in hand with the class struggle. The experiences of Dr.Ambedkar and Periyar EVR in this respect are only positive not to mention of our own experiences in 'burning Ram', 'entry in to the sanctum sanctorum of Srirangam temple' and the 'Tamil people music festival'.

HINDU COMMUNALISM OR BRAHMINIC HINDU COMMUNALISM

By referring to Hinduism as Brahminic Hinduism and Hindu communalism does it infer that we are excluding the non-Brahmin upper castes belonging to the upper varnas? No, the terms are only meant to expose the essence of Hinduism i.e., Brahminical caste hierarchy. As explained earlier it is not a new terminology, but the one used by the Brahmins themselves earlier in history. While all upper castes perpetuate caste oppression it was the Brahmins who formulated, upheld and sanctified the ideology that justifies this oppression. In other words, Brahminism plays the role of giving the

ideological leadership to the Varna-caste system. It is analogous to our usage of proletarian leadership or proletarian ideology.

Further, can we justify the usage of the term 'hindu', which practically results in the inclusion of the Dalits and the oppressed castes who are in no way responsible for whipping up the communal frenzy and who are always at the receiving end of the caste oppression?

HINDU LAW AND UNTOUCHABILITY AS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

While insisting upon a uniform civil code, the sangh parivar poses itself to be secular and democratic. It does not open its mouth about the discrimination prevalent in the Hindu law and the constitution.

The Hindu law accepts Manu Smriti and certain other Brahminic Dharma Sastras as its basis. Laws relating to marriage, renunciation (sanyas) and adoption are based on these Dharma Sastras.

While untouchability in social life is legally treated as a crime, it is justified as a religious right of the Brahmins in matters of Hindu religion. When this matter came before the Supreme Court it has upheld this 'religious right'. In a judgement relating to Ayodhya, the Supreme Court has endorsed Ram as a constitutional entity. On our part we must expose and struggle against the Hindu law and the constitutional provision which recognises untouchability as a Hindu religious right.

CONCLUSION

Hence all the struggles against Hindu communalism should be sharpened as struggles against Brahminism and Fascism.