Introduction

The Hindu social system is marked by a unique and unnatural division of labour which dehumanizes and degrades all those who come under this system. The Purusha Sukta in the Rigveda, the sacred text of caste Hindus, declares that the Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra have come from different parts of the Creator Brahma’s body. The Brahmins come from his mouth, the Kshatriyas from his arms, the Vaishyas from his thighs and the Sudras from his foot, to perform societal functions, as priests, warriors, entrepreneurs and the servile class. This arbitrary classification was named the Varna or caste system. The rigid and congenital assignment of labour inevitably involved the legitimization of various mechanisms and ideological superimposition of Hindu sanctified dogmas of purity, pollution and heredity, over and above the impersonal doctrine of Karma by the politico-religious power, and its incorporation as a rigid division of Hindu society.

Outside of this fourfold classification is a fifth class, which comes not from the body of Brahma but to serve the fourfold classes of Hindu society. Dehumanized, this fifth class has constantly been subjected to change of nomenclature from epoch to epoch, as Panchama, Nishad, Chandala, Pariah and, currently, Dalits. The Dalits, as the wretched of Hindu society, have always been ostracized by upper caste Hindus, cursed, starved, persecuted and forbidden to amass material goods. Their innate human development has been systematically blocked by this inhuman system. But, as B.R. Ambedkar says, the starving men of slavery and
oppression in human history will not always remain quiet. Ambedkar declared that the Chaturvarna with its old labels was utterly repellant and his whole being rebelled against it. The Dalits, as the most exploited class and the principal victims of the caste system, today are engaged in revolutionizing themselves. Their emergence as the special agents of the new democratic revolutionary force is itself evidence of an aggravation of the age-old caste-class contradictions in contemporary Indian social reality.

The present unfolding of Dalit consciousness, with its new democratic revolutionary content, fundamentally differs from all previous struggles, including the struggle for independence in which they militantly participated. The Dalits’ ideological understanding of the Indian independence struggle and its end outcome, however, has been that the transfer of power at midnight of 14-15 August 1947 brought gratuitous freedom exclusively to caste Hindus. That historically important event did not culminate their struggle against the systemic oppression by the caste Hindus. This impressionable understanding distinguished the Dalits in the formation of post-independence state structures and institutions. Their immediate concern, therefore, has necessarily been to evolve a political strategy through which they may modify post-independence politico-legal institutional arrangements to ensure for themselves certain legitimate safeguards as enunciated under the Charter of Human Rights and under the Constitution of India.

In response, the new rulers of independent India adopted certain welfare programmes or preferential policies. They declared that untouchability was an inhuman practice and made it unlawful. As part of
new policy measures, Hindu temples were unbarred to all professing Hindus. Assurance was given that the prosperity of all sections would be augmented by redistributing the wealth of the richer caste Hindus to the impoverished Dalits. The minimum social security of education, health, housing and employment opportunities was also promised. The Dalits’ representation in the decision-making bodies of the legislature, executive and all other public establishments was accepted through statutory reservations. The feudal remnants of the hereditary watan and jagir systems were abolished, land ceiling laws were enthusiastically passed and bonded labour and slavery were declared as unlawful. Even more important, the democratic universal principles of equality, liberty and justice have been adopted and universal adult franchise was extended to all citizens, on the principle of one-vote, one-value.

Post-independence India thus initiated a process of modernization, which has brought a perceptible, if not fundamental change in the traditional socio-economic structures and inevitably produced a new set of social relations between caste Hindus and Dalits. The most fundamental character of these relations, as Ambedkar anticipated, were that they significantly “entered into a life of contradictions”.\(^1\) The political assertion of Dalits through one-vote one-value, and their legitimate claim for the promised preferential policies was expected to compel the welfare state to redeem its promises of making policies aimed at banishing the deep-seated social and economic inequalities.

\(^1\) It was a historic warning. For full quotation see, DhananjayKeer, *Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission* (Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1994, reprint), p. 415.
There has, however, been a substantial shortfall in the will and ability of post-independence India to discharge its promises to the Dalits. While Hindu fundamentalism of an irrational character has been on the ascendant, the promised minimum economic benefits and educational benefits have been systematically blocked by the power wielders. The Dalits are almost non-existent in the categories of land ownership and industrial entrepreneurship, and are only marginally represented in public employment. While the rest of the world has made dynamic progress, they still continue with the traditional occupations of scavenging, leather work and low-paid menial jobs. The process of modernization and development has reinforced the upper caste dominance, enabling them to usurp and monopolize the advantages of the process of transformation. The growing indifference of the ruling class towards the problems of the Dalits, and the consequent slashing of welfare expenditure has resulted in a decline of the Dalits' confidence in the system, creating fertile ground for new forms of Dalit consciousness.

The present work is confined to the situation of the Dalits in Andhra Pradesh. The Dalit movement in post-independence India in general, and particularly in Andhra Pradesh has continued to advance in anger and frustration. In this state on the eastern coast of India, the Dalit movement is in search of a redefinition of its political identity as a potential mass movement, encompassing all the oppressed masses, while challenging the different established traditional ideological discourses. There has been an unprecedented politicization of these marginalized masses during the last
two decades, making a significant impact on the political structures of the state.

The emergence of the Dalit movement, whether in the colonial times or in the post-independence period, has become a subject of social scientific investigation only recently. As a social movement it has been interpreted variously as collective action and understood from different theoretical paradigms. An attempt is made in the following paragraphs to review briefly the existing theoretical approaches, followed by an explication of the approach of the present work to the Dalit movement in Andhra Pradesh.

Sociological Understanding of the Dalit Movement:

Structural - Functionalism

The sociological understanding of the Dalit movement follows the various models of structural functionalism. Prominent among them are: (a) the theory of relative deprivation or reference group and (b) the structural strain/stress theory. The basic assumption of the former is that social movements emerge primarily when a people or group of people consider themselves deprived relatively to their expectations in comparison to their reference group. It is the discontent caused by this subjectively felt relative deprivation of social, economic and political spheres which would ultimately give rise to social movements.

Robert K. Merton of the United States was the first to propound this theory. The English sociologist Runciman\(^2\) brought further refinements in

---

\(^2\) M.S.A. Rao (ed.), *Social Movements in India* (Manohar Publishers, New Delhi, 1984), p. 4
it. In India, M.S.A. Rao was the foremost sociologist who applied this theory to study the emergence of the Dalit movement in India. According to him, "the relative deprivation theory offers a more satisfactory explanation of the genesis of social movements for it is pivoted around conflict and cognitive change, motivating people and mobilizing them around certain interests and issues." According to Gopal Guru, the other scholars who tried to link the emergence of Dalit movement with the issue of relative deprivation vis-a-vis the reference group were: Barbara Joshi, Harold Isaac, Owen Lynch, James Silverberg, Sachidanand, Anil Bhatt, Singer and Cohen, Nandu Ram, and Patwardhan.

Gopal Guru, while critically evaluating the entire gamut of these studies, questions the indiscriminate application of this theory to the Dalit movement. He asserts that "this view also has a strong tendency to assume that the Dalit movement is limited to achieving the partial advance that it has in the socio-economic, civic and political fields within the existing social order, thus, without any thought regarding its radical transformation.

3 Ibid. p. 6.

in other respects." He considers the reference group theory "quite inadequate to capture the reality at the theoretical level" and adds that "it tends to prevent the formation of critical consciousness which involves the critique of the Indian state and lopsided economic development. Instead it fetters itself to narrow contours representing envy, contempt and hatred about the persons from the same social situation." He speaks of the danger in espousing such a theory, on the ground that it diffuses the formation of the Dalits’ collective consciousness. Such a consciousness is essential for fulfilling the Dalits’ historical responsibility, placed on them by Ambedkar, of emancipating not only themselves but the whole suffering masses from dehumanizing conditions. Gopal Guru, it may be noted, sees the Indian welfare state itself as a subversive and independent actor, trying in all possible ways, particularly by politicizing the fact of relative deprivation, to defuse the Dalits’ desire for radical change.

The structural strain/stress theory sees the emergence of social movements as the result of disequilibrium in the social system, the dysfunctional nature of institutions, non-conformity between values and practice, modernization, uneven effects of industrialization, democratization, and cultural change, all of which unbalance the social system, leading to the aggravation of tensions and the consequent social
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4 Gopal Guru, op. cit.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid. (See also his article, "Dalit Movement in Mainstream Sociology" in Pendse Sandeep (ed.), At Crossroads: Dalit Movement Today (Vikas Adhyayan Kendra, Bombay, 1994).
movements. Following the path shown in this regard by Talcott Persons, Neil J. Smelser studied “the emergence of collective behaviour in spontaneous response to structural strains in society”, focusing attention on the political systems in which social movements in the form of collective behaviour would emerge.⁹

Among the Indian proponents of the theory, Rajni Kothari ascribes the contemporary Indian social disorder and violence to the distorted political institutions and the Congress system, which led to the emergence of grass-roots movements.¹⁰ Kothari’s basic argument is that there has been a serious disjunction between the State and society in India. This has manifested itself in the upsurge of a wide spectrum of struggles. Some of the notable ones among these are: the class-based struggles against the hegemonies of the upper castes and classes; the struggles for women’s rights; the new assertion of peripheral and forcibly displaced communities against the rampart destruction of their environment and natural resources; the tribal uprisings for safeguarding their life-style; and the struggle for the preservation of cultures, regional identities and nationalities. In Kothari’s view, all these struggles constitute a broad range of popular awakening and protest, and are genuine grass-root progressive movements striving for human order. He argues that the political system that was designed to be
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¹⁰ Rajni Kothari, Politics and The People: In Search of a Humane India (2 vols.), (Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1989); idem, Rethinking Development: In Search of Humane Alternatives (Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1989); idem, Transformation and Survival: In Search of Humane World Order, (Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1989); idem, State Against Democracy: In Search of Humane Governance (Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1989).
multi-centred, multi-ethnic and multi-caste has been thrown into turmoil and out of gear. The State institutions, having lost authority and legitimacy to deal with these new forces, indulge in genocidal terrorism against them. Thus, the structural strain/stress manifests itself in the clash between politically asserting marginalized social groups and power withholding homogeneous ruling elite who try to consolidate their power and perpetuate their dominance.

A slight modification in Kothari's view may be seen in a recent study. Three elements in this modification may be noted. One is that today, the newly exploding caste identity and consciousness of Dalits needs a thorough renewal of the entire spectrum of secular striving forces. The liberal democratic state, which in his view forms a prominent segment of these forces, is expected to ensure the people's rights, principles of equality and non-discrimination through the parliamentary democracy and legal framework of the constitution, but has failed to realize these principles.

Secondly, social movements, often called new social movements, which he earlier described as genuine grass-root movements, have failed to fulfil the people's aspirations and have lacked the real transformative quality. Thirdly, the left parties, both traditional and radical (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) have lacked a clear social agenda and have failed to give due representation to the Dalits, the backward and oppressed social strata in their own organizational structure. Faced with this growing irrelevance of various grass-roots movements, with their fuzzy ideological framework, a

---

new Dalit movement has emerged. According to Kothari, the consciousness of the Dalit movement is not limited to the scheduled castes. Rather, it symbolizes a much broader spectrum of the oppressed and hitherto alienated strata of Indian society. The Dalit movement also distinguishes itself from the new social movements or alternative movements in its espousal of major issues, especially the nature of the struggle against the dominant forces. Kothari’s prescription for responding creatively to this stirring Dalit consciousness and its challenge is renewal of all existing perspectives, particularly Gandhism, apart from the liberal-bourgeoisie and the Marxist models.  

Marxism and New Left

The Marxists and neo-Marxists (also called the New Left) are agreed that a revolution or social movement breaks out primarily on account of the central structural contradictions between capital and labour. It is a material phenomenon rooted in the labour process. Thus, historical materialism is the key to understanding social change or movement. The agents of the revolution are defined and identified as the proletariat, a class whose conditions of life necessarily drive it to social revolution. The proletariat is thus a historical agency, conscious of their historical role and destiny. However, the orthodoxy within Marxism maintained that “Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: bourgeoisie and proletariat.”

12 Ibid.

Deriving from this simple two-class model, the Marxists in India sought to explain the Indian social reality in terms of broad universal category of classes, invalidating in the process the historical specificities of caste, gender and other factors.\(^\text{14}\) According to Marxists of the orthodox school, the political revolution led by the proletariat or working class to capture State power would ultimately emancipate all other forms of oppression. Going by this doctrine, it followed that the emergence of Dalit consciousness and identity as a separate social movement was non-progressive and sectarian.

Neo-Marxism or New left, which challenged this orthodox historical materialism, brought about a general renaissance of Marxist thought, led by Georg Lukacs and Antonio Gramsci. The other luminaries of the new structuralist Marxism were Louis Althusser, the Frankfurt school of critical theory led by Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, all of whom sought to give relevant answers many acute problems of society and politics. They widened the political role of the working class in relation to the new social movements which are based not only on class but on other categories of caste, gender, culture and ecology.\(^\text{15}\) Influenced by this broadened New Left thought, there emerged the phenomenon of subaltern


historiography, popularly known as the Cambridge School of Indian scholars, with Ranjit Guha in the forefront. Their mode of historiography is distinctly different from the mainstream history. They write “history from below”. According to the subaltern historiographers, all forms of social consciousness are an outcome of spontaneous impulse to resist imperial dominance. These historiographers focused on popular social movements in colonial India, keeping in view the dyadic relationship between imperialism or colonial dominance and people’s resistance. However, the problem with this New Left or Subaltern studies, as Kancha Ilaiyah points out, is that they have not given due importance to caste subordination and exploitation. Moreover, they did not differentiate between Gandhi and Ambedkar or Nehru and Periyar. It is Ilaiyah’s view that Gandhi and Nehru represented the interests of the upper caste, feudal and bourgeois forces, whereas Ambedkar and Periyar represented the poor, the oppressed and the suppressed. In order to understand the specific caste-class position of subordinated Dalit bahujans, Ilaiyah characterized them as sub-subalterns.

16 Ranjit Guha, (ed.), Subaltern Studies, Writings on South Asian History and Society, vols. 1 to 8. (Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1982-). For feminist versions of history from below, see, P.G. Jogdand, (ed.), Dalit Women: Issues and Perspectives (Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 1995); Zoya Hasan, (ed.), Forging Identities: Gender, Communities and the State (Kali for Women, New Delhi, 1994).


18 Kancha Ilaiyah, “Caste or Class or Caste-Class: A Study in Dalitbahujan Consciousness and Struggles in Andh Pradesh in 1980s”. (Research paper submitted to the Centre for Contemporary Studies, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Teen Murti House, New Delhi, 1995.)
A radical impetus to social theorizing was given by the emergence of the Dalit movement itself in the early 1970s. The phenomenon of the Dalit Panthers raised many fundamental ideological and methodological questions, including the far-reaching question: Who is your father—Ambedkar or Marx? This seemingly irreverent question became a prelude for a reinvestigation of Indian social reality. Ever since, attempts have been made to synthesize Ambedkar and Marx to explain the caste-class phenomenon. As part of this trend, in 1970 an organization was formed, called Phule-Ambedkar-Marx or FUAMMA. This organization proposed an Indian version of Marxism by fusing the struggle for caste annihilation with class annihilation.

Based on this perspective, Sharad Patil, the leader of the Satya Shodhak Communist Party initiated a rigorous theoretical debate. According to his party formulation, “the class system (in India) was manifested only through the Varna and Jati system”. Taking Jati as the basic unit, Patil tried to explain the caste system within the frame of historical materialism. He argued that in the pre-class tribal society, the institution of Jati performed the ultimate function of administration and exploitation and in fact hindered class formation. In Patil’s view, only in colonial times Jati disintegrated and gave rise to the class system.

---


21 Ibid. For a deeper understanding of his argument see Sharad Patil, “Dialectics of Caste and Class Conflicts”, EPW, Annual Number, 1979; his thoroughly researched work, Das-Shudra
Among those who disagree with Patil on this interpretation of Jati as caste and feudalism is Gail Omvedt, who holds that it was not Jatis but sub-castes which were the real units of endogamy and interaction, the broader Jati in itself often being a category or identity rather than an actually existing group. Omvedt argues that a definition of caste that focuses on Jatis alone tends to imply that caste struggles or caste movements are movements of a Jati or set of Jatis for rising in the system. Since these may not necessarily be against the system they may leave it intact, and are hence not seen as progressive movements. Among the other scholars who adopted the caste-and-class approach are Haragopal and Manoranjan Mohanty.

While studying the Dalit movement in colonial India, Omvedt adopted the discourse-analytical approach of the neo-Gramscian theorists Laclau and Mouffe. According to this perspective, the spread of capitalism is also connected with the spread of global democratic revolution as a major emancipatory ideology with the values of freedom, equality and autonomy. Influenced by this perspective, Omvedt asserts that the Dalit

---


23 Ibid., p. 30.


25 Omvedt, Dalits and the Democratic Revolution, p. 16.
movement and overall radical anti-caste movements in India have a crucial expression of the democratic revolution. They are also more consistently nationalistic and anti-imperialist. Further, like Laclau and Moffe, she stresses the importance of ideological struggles.

Omvedt has also studied the development of ideologies of Dalit liberation (particularly that of Ambedkar) and their relationship to Indian Marxism and Gandhism.\(^{26}\) She maintains that notwithstanding the many inadequacies of existing Marxist theories, the Marxist methodology is fully adequate to throw light on the structure and role of caste in South Asian society.\(^{27}\) While disagreeing with mechanical materialism and its vulgarized interpretation, Omvedt argues that the orthodox Marxists have invalidated the pre-capitalist sociological categories like caste, gender, family, kinship, the state, which categories, in her view, are as much exploitative as class. In these categories, the fight against exploitation takes place through communities, tribes, castes and kinship groups. Omvedt also disagrees with the traditional Marxists' assumption that these categories constitute an ideology which works at the superstructure level. In order to understand the linkage between ideological superstructure and economic base, she has constructed "a revised historical materialism". She argues that, class defined solely in terms of the ownership of private property and the ownership or control of the means of production does not explain major aspects of exploitation and capital accumulation. Hence, she begins her revised historical materialism with defining the caste system and its exploitative

\(^{26}\) Ibid., p. 17.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., p. 28.
features of endogamous principles and practices, purity and pollution and hierarchy, which shaped Indian society and the Indian economic system.\textsuperscript{28}

Kancha Ilaiah, in his study of the Dalit bahujan consciousness in Andhra Pradesh, has adopted the caste-class approach.\textsuperscript{29} He finds limitations, both subjective and objective, in the writing of both Western and Indian upper caste scholars in their approach to Dalit bahujan history. Ilaiah's argument is that the history written by such scholars fails to express the inner voice of the Dalit movement. Also, it does not become living history that can inspire the subjective forces that are fighting to change the objective reality of subordination and exploitation.\textsuperscript{30} Adopting the actors' view, Ilaiah says that the makers of history themselves should become the writers of history. This is the only way of making the interaction between the history and the makers of history a living interaction. Ilaiah argues that "The organicness is more fundamental for perceiving the reality in its true spirit."\textsuperscript{31} He also disagrees with the typical Gramscian mode of class-organic intellectual writing of history of caste struggles. This is because, in his view, caste constructed consciousness in ways that were fundamentally different from the consciousness created by class in European societies.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p. 30.

\textsuperscript{29} Ilaiah, "Caste or Class or Caste-Class".

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
An Ambedkarite Perspective

The foregoing attempts, especially those of the neo-Marxists who adopted the synthetic caste-class approach within the broad new historical materialism, provide a rich insight into the Indian social reality, notwithstanding their limitations. The emergence of the Dalit movement itself is a manifestation of the new synthesized political process. However, the view that the radicalization of Dalit theory and praxis through the synthesization of Ambedkarism and Marxism for the guidance of true revolutionary transformation of caste-class society is at present in its embryonic form and needs much greater and comprehensive understanding. Understanding the Dalit movement as a cognitive praxis would aid in enhancing such useful knowledge.

Ambedkar says that consciousness is the pre-eminent thing in man’s life and only after it arises man becomes a sentient being. And “consciousness is cognitive when it gives knowledge, information, as appreciating or apprehending, whether it be appreciation of internal facts or external things and events”. In consonance with this view would be the pre-eminence we place on the creative role of Dalit consciousness and its cognitive praxis, which itself is a historical construction. Dalit consciousness is not merely a challenge to the hegemony of Hinduism and capitalism. Equally important, it is a historical force. The emergence of the Dalit movement has become the fundamental source of new knowledge

33 Sec. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.11, The Buddha and His Dharma (Educational Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 1992), p. 263.
34 Ibid.
production—of new propositions, ideas, advanced strategies and, in sum, for a newly synthesized scientific theory. The Dalit movement has raised many fundamental new questions and redefinitions by reflecting on their cognitive identity.

There is a link between Ambedkar’s concept of consciousness and the neo-Marxists’ conception of knowledge and interest, which the present study seeks to establish. Of late, Eyerman and Jamison have developed a new synthetic cognitive approach to social movements. In their book, *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach* (1991), they have developed this synthetic social contextual theory of knowledge, drawing basic ideas from the neo-Marxist theorists or the Frankfurt School theorists such as Lukacs, Gramsci, Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Habermas, Martin Jay, Eric Fromm and Anthony Giddens. Eyerman and Jamison conceptualize social movements as cognitive praxis and look at “social movements through the complex lens of a social theory of knowledge that is both historically and politically informed”.

For them, “Social movements are bearers of new ideas, and have often been the sources of scientific theories and of whole scientific fields, as well as new political and social identities”. They seek “to place social movements in political historical context”. Their approach “is thus comparative, defining success or failure of social movements in comparative terms. both between political cultures.” They conceive social movements “as forms of cognitive praxis which are shaped by both external

---

35 Eyerman and Jamison, op. cit., p. 2.
36 Ibid., p. 3.
37 Ibid.
and internal political processes". For them social movements "express shifts in the consciousness of actors as they are articulated in the interactions between activists and their oppositions in historically situated political and cultural contexts." Their approach focuses "upon the process of articulating a movement identity (cognitive praxis), on the actors taking part in this process (movement intellectuals), and on the contexts of articulation (political cultures and institutions)."

It will be seen, therefore, that there is a greater interaction and close relationship between Ambedkar’s conception of consciousness and cognition, and Eyerman and Jamison’s cognitive approach, which itself is based on the Frankfurt School. Proponents of this school of thought sought to analyse the relations between social change and social consciousness. Also, "Rather than starting from the ideas themselves as did the sociologists of knowledge, the critical Marxists started from society and attempted to elucidate, as well as produce, the kind of knowledge that was necessary for revolutionary change." In parallel with the Frankfurt School Ambedkar developed a relatively coherent social theory of knowledge which was imbued with unity of theory and practice. In this view of things, science is not only central to the development of material forces but also provides the practical social knowledge.

38 Ibid., p. 4.
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid., p.50.
Objective and Scope of the Present Study

Underlying the present study, entitled “The Dalit Movements in Andhra Pradesh: A Study of Political Consciousness and Identity”, has been the cognitive approach. It analyses the post-independence Dalit consciousness and identity as the cognitive praxis, within the caste-class social relations.

The broad scope of the study is to cover the post-independence emergence of Dalit consciousness in Andhra Pradesh. The geographical unevenness of the region studied has accounted for the vastly different character of political economy and social change in the coastal, Rayalaseema and Telengana regions of the state. Taking account of these differentiating factors the study analyses the Dalit assertion and consciousness in all the three regions. In order to present a better perspective, it does not strictly confine itself to Andhra Pradesh, but compares the Dalit movement in the state with those of other states, particularly Maharashtra.

The study comprises six chapters, including the present one and the Conclusion. Chapter One begins with a brief overview of the historical roots or the motivating factors of the Dalit movement in Andhra Pradesh. Its main thrust is to study systematically the objective socio-economic conditions of Andhra society in which the subjective consciousness of the Dalit has been formed. The role of the post-independence State, as an external actor in shaping the Dalits’ cognitive consciousness through its preferential measures, has also been analysed. Chapter Two deals with Dalit
cognitive praxis, which was shaped by both external and internal political processes. It analyses how the Dalit consciousness has been articulated by the Congress and Communist parties, and its implications for the development of Dalit consciousness. The chapter also traces separately the sporadic Dalit axiomatic activity up to the mid eighties, i.e., before the Karamchedu incident. Chapter Three focuses on the emergence of new Dalit leadership and autonomous organizations. It explains how the formation of the Dalit Mahasabha created a new wave of articulation, how it has been responsible for the fundamental questioning of the entire Andhra society and its traditions, how it has been responsible for: (a) the new knowledge about the synthetic approach of Marxism and Ambedkarism and (b) the formation of new alliances and new production of knowledge. This it has done by publishing different propaganda journals and starting cultural organizations. Chapter Four presents a comprehensive study of Dalit literature produced in the course of the Dalit movement. It examines how the Dalit movement created a new space for the emergence of new types of intellectuals. It also discusses the cognitive concept of movement intellectuals, studied as organic historical actors. In Conclusion, the success or failure of post-independence Dalit movement is evaluated in comparative terms to the movement before independence. The shifts in the consciousness of the Dalit movement are also discussed. In the second part of the conclusion there is a brief overview of the guiding aims of the Dalits' new democratic revolution.
Sources of Research

The material for the present study has been gathered from primary as well as secondary sources. The primary sources comprise government reports, mainly the Report of Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the Andhra Pradesh State Assembly debates and the Parliamentary debates. Books and published articles as also publicity material issued by the Dalit organizations and other working-class movements in the state were used extensively as the secondary sources. For collecting the resource material extensive face-to-face personal interviews were conducted and taped with Dalit leaders and activists. The interviews were held in Telugu.