Chapter II: Review of Literature

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Review of various researchers
2.1 Introduction

The review of literature is not mere reading for reading sake; it is also not a casual reading like reading of a story or novel. It focuses and directs towards specific purposes. It is also selective. A researcher has to select the kinds of literature to be reviewed and determine the purposes for which he was to study them. The literature review starts with the selection of a problem, for research, continuous through the various stages of the research process and ends with report writing (Rathod, 2010, 62-63).

Regarding the proposition of the definition of the review of literature, to take into account the reviews, concerning my topic had difficult for me. Because Phule’s economic researchers have not studied ideas. His ideas have been studied from the perspective of his Political, Historical and Sociological thoughts. He has been studied as reformer, revolutionary and literary person. G.P.Deshpande professor of History insisted that Phule’s ideas should be studied from the perspective of economic. In his study, he specified the similarities between the ideas of Karl Marx and Jotirao Phule. Gail Omvedt also found some remarkable observation in Phule’s thoughts and she specified his economic ideas in his research.

In the period of the British rule, every economist was blaming to the British ruler for poverty. However, Phule tried to find the causes of the poverty in Hindu religion. A very few researchers have been studied Phule’s ideas from the prospective of economic but not detail.

Phule’s ideas have been studied from the perspective of various aspects except economic. However, they have to take into account the economic ideas of Phule to fulfill their aim. Nevertheless, they have not agreed to accept to Phule as economist. His economic ideas have not been studied therefore; it is very hard to take review of his economic ideas.

Actually, his ideas and his revolutionary movement were dependent on the exploitation theory. He elaborated lack of money is cause of deterioration of the Shudras-atiShudras, and they had to accept slavery of elite persons, and had to keep away themselves from
education. Nevertheless, Phule’s basic ideas were not focused. He had wanted to expose the causes of poverty and to break the vicious circle of poverty. In various research, there has not been found conclusion of his ideas purely in economic approach, but they have thrown the light of his ideas which are related, poverty, exploitation interest, prices of food grains etc. These ideas of the researcher have been taken into account.

Ashwini Deshpande, professor of economics at Delhi school of economics has remarked about Phule, in the analytical frameworks employed in India and abroad to study and discuss caste, unfortunately, Phules writings and thought do not get the attention they deserve, given how powerful and pioneering they are (2011, 32).
2.2 Review of various researchers

Dhananjay Keer (1964, rpt. 2013, 286-287) in his study “Mahatma Jotirao Phooley, father of the Indian Social Revolution, has concluded that, Jotirao, the peasant philosopher, was the first Indian leader to use the axiom “Truth alone triumphs” which is the mainspring of Hindu culture and tradition. Filled with a heroic ethical purpose, Jotirao’s ethical-religious personality stands on a high spiritual plane. By his emphasis on Truth, Equality and Humanism, Mahatma Phooley occupies a place in the pantheon of great thinkers and sages of India.

Jotirao was pre-eminently a patriot of humanity. Like all great men, he was a universal man. He stood for human rights, Justice, peace and prosperity, and not for power. He wanted a religion, which recognized social equality. He was not one who could be called a religious personality in the sense that Jesus Christ and Gautam Buddha were. Neither was he God-intoxicated. He did not hanker after the salvation of the soul. Religion is something not to be professed but to be experienced. Jotirao’s personality was more ethical, social, and rational than religious. His virile and rational attack on the theory of incarnation was quite shocking in those days. He wanted to divest the Hindus of their false belief that God would come to their rescue in times of danger, and from the belief that their fate was pre-destined. He infused self-reliance into them and made them stand for and secure their human rights.

Laxmanshastri Joshi (1969, rpt.2006, 14-21) in the introduction of “Mahatma Phule Samgr Vangmay (consolidated Literature) (Marathi) has stated that the message of ‘Gulamgiri’ inspires us to struggle against the traditionalism, Brahmin dominated religious and social culture of India. Jotiba Phule has described the principles for starting the new social institutions and advised the demolition of the traditional social institutions. The principles of new social institutions are described in his ‘Sarvajanik Satyadharma’ (Universal religion of truth). These principles are modern human freedom, equality and universal fraternity. The consideration of these principles paves the way
of the full nature of truth visualized by Jotiba Phule. If ‘Gulamgiri’ and ‘Sarvajanik Satyadharma’ are need simultaneously as one unit, we really know their rich values. The thoughts in ‘Gulamgiri’ are rather destructive. The response to his destructive thoughts is to be found in his constructive thoughts of his ‘Sarvajanik Satyadharma’.

Prabhakar Vaidya (1974, 21) in his book ‘Mahatma Phule Aani Tyanchi Parampara’, has analyzed that, Phule did not attack purposely on the four classes of Aryan which were society, religious, privileges and inequality in religion. It was absolute necessity and unavoidable part of his revolt. He was insistent about the entire equality, fraternity, humanity and universal family. There was no place, in his new society, to caste, race and discrimination based on religion, race and nation. The discrimination, for Phule, was benefited for a few people. It gave Brahmins chance to exploit and keep away ShudratiShudra from human equality. He emphasized for freedom, Humanity, equality and unity of the world.

Gail Omvedt (1976, rpt, 2011) in her study ‘Cultural Revolt In a Colonial Society’, The non-Brahman Movement in western India has attempted to analyze Phule’s ideas and his work that, The work of Phule has to be understood in his contemporary period. Phule’s own writings reflect the sporadic nature of non-Brahman organizational development; he is unsystematic, sporadic, pictorial rather than discursive, hard hitting but designed more to shock people into an awareness of the situation than to provide an extensive analysis. As he notes in the introduction to Sarvajanik Satya Dharma, he had wanted to write a more through book but felt it was more important for the book to be useful to the daily life of the people.

His writings include not only heart-rending descriptions of peasant poverty, besides poverty and propaganda, but also discussions of the causes and remedies of such poverty. These are not systematic, but they contain a basic logic and they reflect the dilemmas of the Indian masses of the time. Further, since the both the weaknesses as well as the strengths of Phule’s outlook become part of the general
heritage of the non-Brahman movement, it is important to understand his position.

Phule’s economic outlook, most clearly expressed in Shetkaryacha Asud, might be summarized by saying that while the Indian nationalist elite developed a theory of Indian backwardness because of colonial exploitation, Phule saw the peasant masses as toiling under a double exploitation that of the Brahman elite as well as that of the British rulers. In addition, while the elite viewed industrialization as the primary solution to Indian problems and took their stand with the emerging capitalist class, Phule focused on the problems of agriculture and spoke from the viewpoint of the peasant. He linked peasant poverty to the ruin of Indian crafts by competition with British goods, to the disastrous growth of population, to home charges and the expense of foreign military campaigns, to excessive spending on fat salaries for bureaucrats. He described with scorn the decadent lifestyle of British officials and their neglect of the peasants and noted that even the common British soldier lived like an aristocrat at the expense of the masses. Like the nationalists he viewed the ‘bureaucracy’ as the primary enemy of the peasants but where he differed from the nationalists was in seeing the bureaucracy as a whole, led at the top by the British but dominated at other levels by the native Brahman elite. In particular, the exploitation of the peasants by the incompetent, corrupt Judiciary was heavily attacked. While nationalists criticized the “drain” of income from India to England, Phule and such colleagues of his as Bhalekar directed their attention to the “drain” from the peasantry to the urbanized bureaucratic elite, and criticized such taxes as octroi, and the local fund, by means of which largely upper caste students were educated at the expense of the peasantry.

Archana Malik-Gaure (1977, 87) in her study’ Jyotiba Phule A Modern Indian Philosopher has concluded that, Phule was the first thinker who transformed traditional philosophy into practical and reconstructive philosophy. He rejected doubtful ideas like Svarga-Naraka, Papa-Punya and religious rituals performed by Brahmins. For him, education is a tool to achieve liberation from ignorance, which is
the reason for all sufferings; Phule’s philosophy is a synthesis of Indian and Western thoughts. He was impressed by Paine’s ideas of Right of Man. Humanism is the lead note in his philosophy and religion. His philosophy is not repetitive but critical, progressive, revolutionary and formative.

**Rosalind O’Hanlon** (1985, rpt, 2002) in her study of caste, conflict and Ideology, Mahatma Jotirao Phule and low caste protest in nineteenth-century Western India has carried out an extraordinary research and made a great effort to study the ideas of Jotirao Phule, according her Phule applied the contrast between productive and parasitic groups with equal rigour to British institutions. In economic terms, he felt that British rule had only exacerbated the problems of poverty and indebtedness amongst the cultivators. However he was less concerned with simply deprecating the effects of British rule as with presenting an account of the unequal distribution of resources between those who laboured on the land and those who did not, which would include his more general analysis of the nature of Brahman power, and leave room for a positive role for a reformed British administration.

Phule was against of the British government in its setting up of a top-heavy administrative superstructure, composed both of European and of Brahman officials, the one incompetent and the other corrupt. Who enjoyed comfortable salaries and pensions, all of which had to be paid for by the labour of the cultivators? Phule insisted for a more active role a reduced British administration in changing the very structure of rural society. The children of the farmers should be given a proper education in agricultural techniques. The office of the Patil should no longer be hereditary, but should be conferred upon whichever candidate could show him most proficient in using the plough, the harrow, and the hoe, and in the personal virtues of honesty and reliability.

Phule had set up a standard of Justice in society by which all those who did not labour to earn their living appeared as parasites. This was to open the way for the growth of hostility to the moneylenders,
which was to become so important in non-Brahman polemic in the 1890 and after.

Here, we see a striking forerunner of the public style and the expert ability to exploit symbols that Mahatma Gandhi used in the political campaigns of the next century.

**J.R. Shinde** (1985, 157-160) in his study of ‘Dynamics of Cultural Revolution, 19th century Maharashtra has argued that, Equality was Phule’s passion. Caste distinctions create and nurse inequality and so such distinctions had no place in Phule’s new religion. For him, woman is equal to man, in almost all respects and hence entitled to equal rights and status in society. No man, nay, not even God has the right to hinder his freedom to enjoy legitimate and equal pleasure of social life. He rejected the sacred texts, the mystic traditions to uplift to the Shudra-atiShudra. Phule seems to have perceived, though in an obscure manner, the relationship between socio-cultural notions and economic reality. He has complained that the socio-cultural inequalities are used for economic exploitation of the masses. His thought reflected preindustrial situation and failed to perceive the essential link between the existing property relations and the exploitative socio-cultural set up, and hence failed to give a viable philosophy to combat the formidable collaboration of the bourgeoisie and the feudal classes on the one hand and the British imperialism on the other.

**Sharad Joshi** (1989) in his study of ‘Shetkaryancha Asud’- Ha Shatkacha Mujara (second edition) he has elaborated, Phule’s ideas that, ‘Capital accumulation is result of exploitation of farmer’. The farmers are illiterate; therefore, the Brahmans exploit them. It is the policy of the Brahman to keep them illiterate. Phule was the first economist who found out the causes of exploitation in Hindu religion. Therefore, he studied Hindu conventional religion from the perspective of economical aspects. He proved that, the caste system, education prohibition for ShudratiShudra and women’s slavery are not an accidental injustice, but it is purposely brought into force, and is supported by Hindu religion. The Brahmin was founder and supported
of Hindu conventional religion, traditions and disparity; therefore, his attack on them was reasonable and his economic ideas are practicable.

**Adi H. Doctor** (1997) in his book ‘Political Thinkers of Modern India has analyzed the view of Phule about Indian history and the Aryan invaders, in his book, he describes the Phule’s ideas that,

The Aryan portrayed as a ‘demon’ king Bali the original pre-Aryan natives of India, because it suited their purpose to do so. Phule makes king Bali, not only a rallying point for uniting low castes but also a symbol of oppressed humanity. He goes even further and speaks even Jesus Chris, Gautama Buddha and even George Washington and the Frenchman Lafayette as “other kings Balis”.

Quite clearly, Phule’s interpretation of History and Hindu mythology cannot take as a historian’s account based on research and facts. The principal purpose of his writings was to use history to mobilize, the downtrodden and low castes by arguing that the country’s real golden age was the pre-Aryan period when the Kshytriyas (the pre-Aryan tillers or the Kshetra or agricultural field) lived all equally and in dignity in the land of their birth under benign kings, like Bali. That to a great extent Phule’s writings have succeeded in instilling a new sense of identity among the downtrodden communities of Maharashtra (especially the communities called Other Backward Castes) cannot be denied. That Phule’s dream of uniting the Shudras (OBCs) and atiShudras realized is also perhaps equally true.

**Ashok Chopde** (1998, rpt.2006, 237-246) in his article, ‘Aadhunik Marathi Kaviteche Janak’ included in ‘Shodhachya Navya Wata’ edited by Hari Narke has concluded the Phule’s ideas that, ‘He wrote his poems to describe and expose painful life of the Shudra-atiShudras. He insisted them to break down the vicious circle of religion and accept materialistic view. He clarified an idolatry is used by the Brahman for exploitation should be stopped; and idol of god should be smashed to prevent exploitation of the farmers. He connected himself to Non-Vaidik culture and he accepted Bali raja, Buddha, Kabir and Shivaji as idol of Maharashtrian culture to emancipate from Hindu religion.
Bharat Patankar (1998, rpt.2007) in his study ‘Mahatma Phule Aani Sanskratic Sangharsh has expounded Phule’s ideas that. There are lot of rays of light in Phule’s thought, which can guide for future with these ideas, which are about, culture, environment, agriculture, farmer, emancipation of woman and religion. Without severing the relation with the origin of Indian culture, he put forward the new ideas. When he studied about the group of exploited, he examined their internal discrimination, which was among proletarians, farmers, Balutedaras and untouchables. In addition, he delineated ideas to emancipate of these classes from the exploitation of the Brahmanism. Especially he stressed women’s slavery and he pursued the ideas of emancipation of women belonged to all castes and advocated emancipation of whole humankind.

Arvind Deshpande (1998, rpt. 2006, 6, 7) has written his article ‘Paryayi Sanskrutiche Janak’, in a book ‘Shodhachya Navyya Wata’, has concluded the Phule’s ideas that, in his view exploitation is not an accidental outcome, but is result of tradition, caste and culture. For him, economic inequality is in consequence of the social inequality. From the perspective of him, both inequalities are related to each other, but each one has its own existence. He noted that, the economic progress would not bring equality about among the people. There is needed to come change about in the view of need of aristocratic people. The economic progress can help to increase in income of ShudratiShudra, but not to protect them from the exploitation. He argued that exploitation may be increased in excessive proportion; because, for Phule, the Brahman is not cast only but also an economic class; and for their privileges, ShudratiShudra have been kept in poverty by using various devices. He emphasized that religious privileges and caste should be disregarded for emancipation from the chain of poverty.

G.P. Deshpande (2002, 6, 45) in his study “selected writings of Jotirao Phule” and ‘The World of Ideas in Modern Marathi’, Phule, Vinoba, Savarkar’ has analyzed that, Jotirao Phule (1827-90), the nineteenth-century social reformer from Maharashtra, was India’s first systematic theoretician of caste and one of its most radical opponents.
Religion and caste are at the centre of Phule’s thought. He was opposed not only to the Varna system, but also to almost everything within the Hindu belief system, as he believed that the Hindu texts (Shrutis, Vedas and the Smritis) rationalized and perpetuated Brahmanical dominance. He believed that ‘Brahmanism was historical constructed over time and since it was the ideology of oppression and dominance, it had to be opposed and ultimately smashed. There was nothing sacred or divine about it.

The Brahmans divided the Shudras into various castes, punished or rewarded them according to their loyalty and established their control over them. In addition, are now enjoying themselves at the cost of the Shudras. He puts forward a theory about the origins of the Varna system and caste conflict. There is a very strong economic element to Phule’s writings. As would be expected from someone who was so committed to the cause of the Shudra-atishudras, Phule was extremely concerned about agrarian issues and about the conditions of cultivators. He wrote extensively on the subject, including some very concrete suggestions related to irrigation, animal breeding, education of children of peasants, and the role of the state towards the small peasantry, which he felt were imperative to ameliorate the condition of the cultivators. What makes Phule’s analysis of this oft-discussed topic (that is, conditions of the peasantry) unique is that he intertwines this assessment with his critique of Brahmanism by outlining, in meticulous detail, the various ways in which the Brahmans deprive the peasantry of its already meager income.

Dilip Walse Patil (2002, 7) in his article in forword written for ‘Cultivator’s Whipcord’ has evaluated ideas of Phule that, In Mahatma Phule, we have not only a crusader against the caste system, Valiant fighter for the cause of the down-trodden in India but also an agricultural economist whose contribution in the form of the cultivator’s whipcord will be cherished forever by posterity. In fact his fight for human rights and an emancipation of all those enslaved in the world gave him recognition as a liberator of humanity from injustice, social and economic.
Govind Pansare (25, 26 Dec. 2004) in his ‘Dusre Satyashodhak Sahitya Samelan’ at Jalna, he concluded the Phule’s ideas, According to him, Phule reinterpreted Indian History and concluded that; the Aryan Brahmins are alien as British and therefore, the History of India is history of conflict between the Aryan and the Dravid. Phule wages struggle against the Brahmin Ideas, which are included in Purankatha, Incarnation stories and festivals. The Aryan was established their colony in India from two thousand year and they have been tyrannizing over the Shudra-atiShudra since their establishment of the colony. Their overseasness, Phule took into account and developed his theory alien verse indigenous. He supported to the British rule, only for their education policy, the principle of democracy and equality. He took the support of the British rule to overthrow the Brahmin’s preponderance to emancipate to the Shudra-atiShudra from various slaveries.

Uttam Kamble (2005, rpt, 2010) in his ‘Mahatma Phulyanchi Jalneeti’ has attempted to analyze thoughts of Phule that,

Jotirao Phule fought in his whole life, for two causes, water and agriculture. He studied of these two factors very deeply, and put forward his ideas about these two concepts in his books Gulamgiri and Shetkaryach Asood. His ideas about water may be recognized as ‘Jalniti’ and ideas of land as ‘Bhuniti’. He was modern agricultural scientist. He studied the causes of the less productivity of the land and found the causes of it. For Phule, water is main input, which can increase the productivity of land. Water is wealth, and it should be used scientifically, therefore, there is need to create literacy of water (Jalsakharta) among the farmers. Man has been lost all his rights to live as a man due to lack of Dharmsakhsharta as if the poverty of farmer is due to the lack of Jalsakhsharta.

Behind poverty, there is not God’s disfavor or the concept of Surgav or Nark, however lack of knowledge about Jalniti, Bhuniti and Dharmniti. Therefore, Phule insisted to the government little portion of the collected revenue from the farmers should be spent on canals facilities instead of luxurious of the employees. Therefore, output of the farmers will be increased and the government’s revenue increased.
The farmer’s economics was very poor they had not known why the water is very costly. However Phule studied the causes of the higher ‘Panipatti’ and he concluded that, the loan for canal was taken from the Sawakar and he employed high rate, and simultaneously the salaries of the employees, who were working in water department, was very high, therefore the farmers had to pay very big amount as Panipatti. Therefore, he suggested curtailing their payment and implementing for them the principle of responsibility. Phule had known the scarcity of water therefore; he recommended ‘Tap system’. Water should be used in optimum and be supplied in essential proportion. The wastage of water to carry to crops should be saved by the ‘Tap system’. He requested to the government to institute ‘Agricultural Schools’ and impart their modern, practical and technical education to the farmer’s sons, therefore new technical education will help to increase output of the farmers and poverty will be reduced.

**Braj Ranjan Mani** (2005, rpt, 2011): in his study” Debrahmanising History Dominance And Resistance in Indian society, has concluded that, In Shetkaryacha Asud, Phule not only details the material life of cultivators but also raise important social and economic concerns, against the historical background of exploitive brahmanical system and indifferent British regime. Comparing the cultivators of India with the farmers of other countries, he notes with concern that the lot of Indian peasantry is far worse, ‘even worse than that of beasts’. For this, he pins the blame on cultural and economic exploitation by Brahmans, and on the callous British rulers who go by the dictates of their subordinate Brahman officials. The British government is an utterly incompetent and highly expensive government, which does not do anything to improve the situation, he claims. He points the finger as the vicious nexus that exists between the local exploiters- Brahmans and moneylenders and the distant one, the indolent British officials who make merry by drawing exorbitant salaries.

**Salunkhe, A.H.** (Nov. 2006 rpt. Jan 2009: 4, 5) in his study ‘Mahatma Phule Aani Dharma’, has concluded Phule’s ideas,
Phule was savior of Mang and Mahar. His enthusiasm was not limited only to them, however, he had ardour of the farmers. He studied the problems of the farmers and made them known to the British government. He himself suggested revolutionary measures to bring about progress among the Shudra-atiShudras. According to Salunke, he was the first revolutionary savior of the farmers, likewise the first advocator for women’s education. Phule developed his ideas on the principle of ‘Live and let live’, he did not think about the revenge of the former exploiters. His concept of the nation expresses integration, equality and equal opportunities.

Sham, Kadam (2008, 146-147) has carried out a study, ‘Mahatma Phule Aani Maharashratil Rajkarn’, and he has concluded Phule’s ideas that, There was need to attack on Hindu religion, their Karmakand and supporting scriptures, texts, Puranas to bring about social, economical and political change in society; therefore Firstly, Phule attacked on religion for their Karmakand, disparity and privileges and simultaneously he established ‘Satya Shodhak Samaj’ to substitute for Hindu religion for the Shudra-atiShudras. Phule’s preposition was human being is occupied entirely by Hindu religion and therefore, without any antagonism the Brahmin priest can exploit on the name of religion. He came to know that illiteracy is a main cause of their backwardness, therefore he advocated for compulsory education and simultaneously, he started the schools for Shudra-atiShudra and girls. He did not think only emancipation of Shudras, but he thought for women’s emancipation without class, caste or race. His idea was that, the women belong to any caste or class is exploited in same way. Therefore, his philosophy was different for women’s emancipation. He fought and developed his ideas for emancipation of women from man’s slave. He crushed superstition, Karmakand and Scriptures and gave new ideas of religion to human beings, these are, Equality, Fraternity, Morality, Compassion and Freedom. For Phule, ‘Humanity’ should be principle of new religion.

N.L. Gupta (2008, 87-101) in his study” Mahatma Jotiba Phule, An Educational Philosopher has analyzed that, Jotirao Phule through
his drama “Tritiya Ratna” criticized the superstition that Brahmins are the ‘Gurus’ of eighteen Varna. In addition, he has thrown light on the fallacy of astrology. The ignorance of knowledge was the origin of unvirtuous behavior is the advice given by the drama. The intention of writing ‘Gulamgiri’ was not only to disclose the injustice of Brahmins but also to convince the British rulers how their officers neglect the needs and interests of the common masses. Brahmin priest does not spare not only the poor Shudra farmers and tortured by the whip of priests, but even the rulers of the sansthans. Unless the lamp of knowledge is enlightened, the standard of living of farmers cannot be improved was proposition of Phule.

Thom Wolf (25 feb.2010, www.word.press.com) in his ‘Mahatma Phule’s Bali raja Proposal’ has thrown the light on the Phule’s thoughts that, Jotirao Phule, was to only person other than and before Ambedkar who so fully thought the needed changes for Indian transformation And Phule thus becomes one person both Ambedkar and Gandhi acknowledge as their own guru. For, it was Phule alone, who, in the 19th century, worked from a comprehensive scheme for India’s social, political, economical and spiritual transformation. Phule experientially was also-by education and spiritual transformation- in that rare but distinct category of a world-class Indian precisely because he was lifted from (non left-to) his original, backward caste.

The starting point for Phule, however, was beyond the Manu worldview horizons, outside the brahmanical system. Thus, Phule called for Manu-revolution, seeking an alternative to the traditional Hindu system, by calling for nothing less than a foundational change of Indian society. Phule looked around his India and saw the necessity for an alternative. That alone would be sufficient, Phule side a Manu-alternative so Phule, almost 100 years before Ambedkar, saw the need for total transformation-political-economical social and spiritual-and sought a comprehensive alternative to the 3,000 years old system. In his 1873 Slavery, Phule clarified Bali rajas position: “Their great sage is called Yeshwant and his great teaching is: ‘you must love your enemy and do him a good turn’. With that insight, Phule located an alternative
cultural mentor to Manu. In addition, with that, Phule anticipated Weber’s thesis that cultural presuppositions deeply carve out the tracks on which cultures route their people.

**Srividya Natarajan** (2011, 127-128) in his study of ‘a Gardner in the Wasteland’, ‘Jotiba Phule’s fight for Liberty’ has analyzed Phule’s ideas that, Phule treats the membrane between history and myth. Fantasy and reality, as permeable, to make a point, that was crucial to his campaign. The Indo-Aryan origin theories allowed a king of symbiosis between Brahmans and the British colonial overlords with whom they claimed kinship: but logically speaking. Phule argues, if Brahman nationalists were protesting against British rule because the British were interlopers, then, as descendants of the Aryans, they were no less interlopers and invaders who seized power from the indigenous people. Phule was all for a transfer of power from colonial governments to articulate the fear that if the indigenous hands were those of the comprador Brahman middle-class, the transfer would merely consolidate and perhaps extend the forms of caste-based exploitation that already flourished under the British. His emphasis on the education of Shudra and atiShudra children, both girls and boys, was partly a corollary to this perception; if there were young non-Brahmans educated enough to occupy public office or to contest elections, it would prevent the concentration of power, at all levels, in Brahman hands. In a larger sense, Phule was interested in building a better system that would be viable foundation for a liberal, democratic, equitable society. The stranglehold of brahmanical Hinduism had to be loosened through the exposure of its fraudulent, self-serving logic, if such project was ever to be launched, and if the ‘kingdom of Bali’ Phule’s trope for a just society, referencing a chain of ‘Bali rajas’ from the mythic Bali himself to Gautama Buddha to Jesus-were to be manifested on earth.

**Rajni Bala & Navjoti Marwha** ([www.sikhinstitute.org](http://www.sikhinstitute.org) Oct. 2011, 13) in their paper, ‘Mahatma Jyotiba Phule, ‘A Educational Philosopher’ they have analyzed that, Experiments of great thinker and educationists can act as beacon light to guide our thoughts. One such
thinker, teacher, educationist and social revolutionist we had in India was Mahatma Jyotiba Phule. He lived and worked in Maharashtra. His single aim was universalization of primary education. Mahatma Jyotiba Phule concentrated on need of primary education, the essential quality of primary teacher and the curriculum of primary education. He gave importance to upliftment of lower castes and women. He was a very Nobel thinker, reformer educationist and social revolutionary.

Aparna Devare (2011, 22-23) in her study of History & the Making of Modern Hindu self has argued that, However, what makes Phule’s intervention unique is that he was a non-elite intellectual, a rarity in those times. He was one of the earliest voices from the ‘margins’ that challenged the emerging compact between the colonizers and the ‘native’ western educated elite (the Brahmins particular) in the constitution of a colonial Indian public sphere. However, it would be erroneous to suggest that Phule was entirely articulating a discourse of ‘subalternity’ or voicing an indigenous world-view, because his response was very modern. While historicizing Hindu myths, exposing their social origins and power relations, Phule also simultaneously rewrote these myths as imaginative tales imbued with a moral purpose, from a non-Brahmin standpoint-something that had been done within folk Hinduism for centuries. Dismissing the ‘mythological’ Purans as Brahminical fabrications, he drew from them in his retelling of one of the mythological characters, Bali, the demon king. Phule made Bali a symbol of empowerment for imagining a collective lower caste or Shudra identity in the present: Bali’s historical ‘facticity’ was therefore of less importance. While on the one hand, he rejected the basic terms of the Hindu religion itself as flawed, on the other, he also refashioned many key Hindu practices and traditions in innovative ways. This is particularly evident with respect to the Satyashodhak Samaj, the organization he started for creating awareness among and educating and improving the status of the Shudras.

Sharanabasappa B. Ragi & Jyoti S. Bamman (June, 2011, 112 to 115) in their research paper ‘Mahatma Phule and women’s emancipation’ has analyzed Phule’s ideas as, Phule subjected religious
texts and religious behavior to the tests of rationalism. He wanted to abolish this blind faith in the first instance. All established religious and priestly classes find this blind faith useful for their purposes and they try their best to defend it. He concludes that it is untenable to say that religious texts are manmade and they represent the selfish interest of the classes, which are trying to pursue and protect their selfish ends by constructing such books. In his views, every religious book is a product of its time and the truth is contains have permanent and universal validity. Again, these texts can never be free from the prejudices and the selfishness of the authors of such books.

He believed in overthrowing the social system in which man has been deliberately made dependent on the other, illiterate, ignorant and poor with a view of exploiting him. To him blind faith eradication formed part of a broad socioeconomic transformation. This was his strategy for ending exploitation of human beings. Mere advice, education and alternative ways of living are not enough, unless the economic framework of exploitation ends.

Phule had a favorable opinion about the British Rule in India at least from the point of view of introducing modern notions of Justice and equality in Indian society and taking India into future.

**Ashwini Deshpande** (2011, 32-33) in her study of “The Grammar of caste”, Economic Discrimination in Contemporary India has elaborated that, Denial of access to education, especially to good quality education, as a fundamental cause of caste disparity and discrimination is a theme that emerges forcefully first in Phule’s writing. It is important to make a final point about Phule. In the analytical frameworks employed in India and abroad to study and discuss caste, unfortunately, Phule’s writings and thought do not get the attention they deserve, given how powerful and pioneering they are. Phule is better known in Maharashtra, but attacked by the Hindu right wing and not very often discussed outside the region, which could be because the Indian academic community overwhelmingly thinks and writes in English and its access to vernacular writings is rather limited.
Desh Raj Sirswal (Oct., 2013 www.msesaim.wordpress.com) in his research paper ‘Mahatma Jyotiba Phule: A Modern Philosopher’ has thrown light on the ideas of Phule, according to him that, Phule was the first defender of human equality and rights, he was the first revolutionary and leader of downtrodden, peasants and supporter of woman education. He established many institutions and tried to remove manmade inequality. He was propagator of Human unity and national progress. Phule’s view on philosophy was based on facts reality, experiences, and observation. In that sense, his philosophy was not utopian but realistic. About religion, his intention was to show the dilemma created by religions authorities who bound man in religious rituals and made people enemy to each other. His thinking was Hindu religion not only gives spiritual knowledge to human being but also bound his social and personal life in religious bigotries. He wants that religion, which gives a man true freedom to grow socially and spiritually.

P.K. Satapathy (N.D.) in her research paper ‘Caste Laws: Jotirao Phule’ has concluded Phule’s though that, book Gulamgiri was written by Phule to make people aware of the debilitating effect of the caste system on society. The book was meant to raise awareness amongst the masses and galvanize them to work against the continued existence of caste laws. Consequently, the tone and tenor of the essay is charged and impassioned. A rational style was not appropriate for his purpose. A high-pitched style, as we find in this essay, often works well to galvanize people to action.

The second thing that Phule needed was a powerful image to bring out the suffering of the people under the caste system. Hence, he compares the caste system to slavery. Slavery, as we all know is an extremely in human system. A slave is stripped off all dignity and humanity. By equating slavery with the suffering of the Shudras, Phule sends out a very powerful massage. At the same time, Phule was aware that it was much more difficult to free people of mental slavery than physical slavery. The Shudras were kept ignorant by denying them education. They had come to believe what was told to them by the Brahmins. Moreover, the Brahmins, predictably told them of a divine
system which had ordained that the Brahmins were God’s favorites and that the Shudras duty was to serve the Brahmins.

Therefore, Phule writes an alternate account of the past and tries to overturn the Daivyal Daitya hierarchy. He tries to show that neither the Brahmin was Devas nor the Shudras were Daityas. He tries to prove that these Brahmin’s stories are not only farfetched but also proof of their cunning. The Brahmin managed to convince the Shudra that he was inferior because the Shudra was uneducated.

Hence, it is only that the Shudra can see through education the cunning of the Brahmins. Therefore Phule was insistence that the Government must spend time and resources on the education of the masses, if the masses are educated then society will be free of the repugnant caste laws there will be more harmony and peace in society. It is only then that the country can hope to progress and prosper.

Suman Siwach (Dec.2013, Vol..1 / issue 9) in her research paper ‘Mahatma Jotirao Phule and Peasants in India’, has concluded Phule’s thoughts,

Man’s primary need is directed at the production of food and clothing. Hence, it is important for the farmer community to be healthy and strong. Modern society has been built on the industrial revolution but it still requires the support to its foundation from the farmer community from this sociological standpoint Jotirao wrote and published the book Shetkarayacha Asood.

The subject matter of Shetkaryacha Asood is not restricted to farmer’s problems alone. Jotirao also examines the restraints imposed on various castes, which hampered progress. The Brahmins were responsible for the taboo imposed on overseas travel. As a result, Hindus last touch with the outside world. The Brahmins, however, enjoyed the isolation. They had the Shudras to slave. For them, work on their farms and weave their clothes.

Jotirao Phule was one of the first people to rebel against the traditional social system in India. From where he find the inspirations for this revolt considering that the prevailing social laws had taken a firm hold on the Indian mind for thousands years? The answer is that
Jotirao was a Satyashodak seeker of truth the moral truth of Human life. The manifestation of that perennial truth was his belief in man’s freedom in the universe, as upheld by modern civilization.

Summary:

Various researchers have studied Phule’s ideas from the perspective of various aspects. Their conclusion decides Phule as peasant Philosopher, because he studied peasant’s conditions, their causes, and remedies he suggested. Adoption of new technology was his proposition to free from poverty and non-affordability of farming. His concept of development was related to the ‘Humanitarian’; therefore, he was against of religion and its discrimination. To emancipate from the religious shackle he evoked to overthrow the religious traditions and its scriptures, texts etc. To fulfill the space of religion, he established ‘Satya Shodhak Samaj’ and rejected concepts of Papa-Punya, Svarga-Narka etc., and considered one god, for all, as like one father.

He was thoroughly against of exploitation, which was being become through the administration, moneylender and religion. He insisted for equality and for economic incentives, he advocated materialistic view. For all these changes, he insisted education for all and compulsory. Education should be practical oriented; and it should be available for everyone without any discrimination on caste or race base. For education, expenditure of the government should be curtailed and saved money should be shifted for education was his opinion.

He was advocate of Bali raja’s rule, means kingdom of peasants, without exploitation, disparity or injustice. For this new rule, Phule reinterpreted concepts of history and put forward in a new form, and tried to prove ‘Kshatiyatav’ of indigenous. For Phule, Bali raja means equality, sovereignty, fraternity and nationality. According to the researchers, Phule’s philosophy was based on facts and reality. He was only one philosopher, who insisted, India’s social, political, economical and spiritual transformation.
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