NBU DARJEELING LIBRARY

THE ISSUE OF CASTE IN COLONIAL INDIA AND THE IDEAS AND ROLES OF GANDHIJI AND AMBEDKAR

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN HISTORY
UNDER THE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
2010

SUBMITTED BY

JAYDIP ROY

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, VIVEKANANDA COLLEGE
ALIPURDUAR, JALPAIGURI
WEST BENGAL

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

PROFESSOR ANANDA GOPAL GHOSH

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
RAJA RAMMOHUNPUR, DARJEELING
WEST BENGAL

&

DR. SAILEN DEBNATH

ASSOCIATE PROFFESSOR OF HISTORY
ALIPURDUAR COLLEGE, JALPAIGURI
WEST BENGAL

Th 954.03
R888i

252138

31 MAY 2013

Declaration

I hereby declare that the dissertation entitled **'THE ISSUE OF CASTE IN COLONIAL INDIA AND THE IDEAS AND ROLES OF GANDHIJI AND AMBEDKAR'** is now ready for submission for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History which is the product of my original research work under the guidance of Professor Ananda Ghopal Ghosh, Department of History, University of North Bengal and Dr. Sailen Debnath, Alipurduar College. This dissertation has not formed the basis for the award of any degree, diploma, associateship, fellowship or similar other titles. It has not been submitted to any other University or Institutions for the award of any degree or diploma.

Date: 01.12.2010

Place: N.B.U.

(Jaydip Roy)

Signature of Scholar

Acknowledgement

I acknowledge herein indebtedness to my Supervisors respected Professor Ananda Gopal Ghosh, Department of History, University of North Bengal, Darjeeling, West Bengal and Dr. Sailen Debnath, Associate Professor of History, Alipurduar College, for their counsel and guidance all through the course of my research work leading to the completion of this dissertation. Indeed, they have a significant role and involvement in the entire work. Without their keen supervision the present study would not have seen light of the day.

I must unreservedly acknowledge gratitude to respected teachers', Professor Ratna Ray Sanyal, Professor I. Sarkar, Dr. Bijoy Sarkar, Dr. Anita Bagchi of the Department of History, University of North Bengal for their constant encouragement and support.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my parents, brothers and sisters for their encouragement. I am deeply indebted to my wife Smt. Sikha Debnath for encroachment upon her time because the dissertation was mostly written during the moments which were exclusively hers. I am very thankful for her constant encouragement and appreciative understanding, without which it would not have been

possible for me to complete this research work. My thanks are due to my loving children Arka and Ayshee. Really, I deprived them from my care while completing this study.

My thanks are due to Mr. Sanjib Debnath, a young scholar, Department of English, University of North Bengal, for his constant inspiration and help to complete my research work. I also express my deep sense of gratitude to Dr. Biswajit Maitra, Department of Economics, Surya Sen College, Siliguri and well wishers and colleges who regularly supported me in various stages of the research work.

I am very much thankful to all the library officials of the University of North Bengal, Burdwan University, National Library Kolkata for furnishing the required relevant materials. Without their kind co-operation, it would have been difficult to pursue this work. I am also thankful to Mr. Prodip Mohanta, Librarian and Joya Saha, Library staff of Vivekananda College for their co-operation and help during period of my consulting different books relating to my research work.

Jaydip Roy

Jaydip Roy

VIVEKANANDA COLLEGE

ALIPURDUAR, JALPAIGURI

Date : 01.12.2010

Contents

Acknowledgement *i-ii*

List of Tables *viii*

Chapter 1 Introduction *1-18*

1.1.a. The Problem of Understanding the Evolution of the Hindu Caste System
1.1.b. The Issue of Caste and the Attitude of the Colonial Government
1.1.c.. The Issue of Caste and Intellectual Dichotomy in Colonial India
1.1.d. Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the Caste System
1.2. Research Gaps
1.3. Objectives of the Study
1.4. Hypotheses
1.5. Chapter Specifications
1.6. Research Methodology
1.7. Review of the Existing Literature

Chapter 2

Origin of Caste and its Evaluation in the Indian Society: A Historical Perspective *19-98*

2.1 a. Meaning of the term 'Caste'
2.1 b. Caste in Biology
2.1.c. Caste in Different Religion
2.2. Origin of Caste and its Growth into the Hindu Mind through the Rig Vedic 'Purusha Sukta'
2.2.1. Evidences from Rig Veda
2.2.2. Evidences from the Upanishads
2.2.3. Evidences from the Mahabharata
2.2.4. Evidences from the Manu Smriti
2.3. The "Theory of Three Varnas" of the Rig Vedic period transformed into the "Theory of Four Varnas (Chaturvarna)" in the later Vedic period
2.4. The Controversy regarding the "Aryan Race Theory"
2.5. Ambedkar's "Sudra-Aryan Theory"

2.6. The "Theory of the Creation of the Sudras"
2.7. Meaning of the term 'Varna'
2.8. Caste through the Ages
2.8.1. Caste and Professions
2.8.2. Occupation of the Brahmin Caste
2.8.3. Occupation of the Kshatriya Caste
2.8.4. Occupation of the Vaishya Caste
2.8.5. Occupation of the Sudra Caste
2.8.6. Caste and Marriage
1. Brahma Marriage
2. Arsha Marriage
3. Prajapatya Marriage
4. Daiva Marriage
5. Rakshasa Marriage
6. Gandharva Marriage
7. Asura Marriage
8. Paishacha Marriage
2.8.7. Status and Position of Women in the context of Caste
2.8.8. Caste and Property Rights
2.8.9. Caste System and the Law of the State
2.8.10. Caste and the question of Cleanliness (Especially Gupta Period)
2.9. Conclusion

Chapter 3
The Attitude of the 19th Century Reformers and the Role of the British Government towards the Issue of Caste ***99-173***

3.1 Introduction
3.2. Conceptualization of Italian and European Renaissance
3.3. Was the Indian Renaissance the outcome of Italian and European Renaissance?
3.4. Intellectual Dichotomy in Colonial India towards the Issue of Caste and Untouchability-Raja Rammohun Roy to Rabindranath Tagore
a. Raja Rammohun Roy
b. Pandit Iswarchandra Vidyasagar
c. Swami Dayananda Saraswati
d. Jyotiba Govindrao Phule

e. Sri Narayan Guru
f. Ramkrishna Paramhansa
g. Vivekananda
h. Bal Gangadhar Tilak
i. Rabindranath Tagore
3.5. The Role of the British Government towards the Issue of Caste
3.6. Conclusion

Chapter 4
The Socio-Political Environment of Gandhiji and Ambedkar *174-242*

4.1 Introduction
4.2. Deplorable Conditions of the Hindu Society before the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar:
4.3. Political conditions of India before the emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar
4.4. 1 Socio-Educational and Political Background of Gandhiji: Philosophical Influence upon Gandhiji
4.4.2. Family Background of Gandhiji
4.4.3. Educational Background of Gandhiji
4.4.4. Gandhi's Attitude towards the Issue of Caste and Untouchability during his Study Life
4.5. Eventful Professional life of Gandhiji in South Africa
4.6. Gandhi: A Native Indian identified as untouchable during his train Journey in South Africa
4.7. Gandhi's Civil Rights Movement in South Africa
4.8. Rise of Gandhi's Leadership in India
4.8.1. Gandhi's participation in the Champaran Satyagraha Movement
4.8.2. Gandhi's participation in the Kaira Satyagraha Movement
4.8.3. Gandhi's participation in the Amedabad Satyagraha Movement
4.8.4. "Jallianwalla Bag Massacre" (1919) and Gandhi's Response
4.8.5. Khilafat Movement (1918-1923) and Gandhiji
4.8.6. Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement
4.8.7. Gandhi's Salt Satyagraha and Civil Disobedience Movement
4.8.8. Quit India Movement
4.9. The Socio-Educational and Political Background of Ambedkar
4.9.1. Family Background

4.9.2. Academic Environment
4.9.3. Conditions of Study-Cum-Living Room of Ambedkar
4.9.4. Open-Sheded-Byculla Market Marriage Hall of Ambedkar
4.9.5. Contributions of the Maharaja of Baroda
4.9.6. The Curse of Untouchability and its impact in the Academic and Professional Life of Ambedkar
4.9.7. Role of a Cartman towards Untouchable
4.9.8. Attitude of Caste Hindus towards Thirsty Untouchables
4.9.9. Barbar and Washer man's Attitude towards Ambedkar
4.9.10. Teacher's attitude towards Ambedkar
4.9.11. Black Board incident
4.9.12. Ambedkar was prohibited to Study Sanskrit
4.9.13. Tiffin of Ambedkar left by Workman
4.9.14. College Hotel keeper and Professional Staff did not give water to Ambedkar
4.9.15. Experience in Baroda for Parsi incident
4.9.16. Rise of Ambedkar's Political Leadership in India
4.10. Conclusion

Chapter 5
Theories of Caste: Gandhiji and Ambedkar ***243-306***

5.1. Introduction
Different Theories of Caste
Traditional Theory of Caste
Manu's Theory of Caste
Brahmanical Theory of Caste
Racial Theory of Caste
Occupational Theory of Caste
Ketkar's Theory of Caste
Senart's Theory of Caste
Theory of Gandhian Caste Philosophy
5.2 The Ideas and Views of Gandhiji towards the Issue of Caste
5.3. The Ideas and Views of Ambedkar towards the Issue of Caste
5.4. Debate on the Question of Caste, Varna and the Hindu Shastras between Gandhi and Ambedkar

5.5. Conclusion

Chapter 6
Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the Question of Caste based Economic Life ***307-355***

6.1. Introduction
6.2. Conceptual frame work of Gandhian Economic Philosophy
6.3. Ambedkar on the question of Caste based Economic Life
6.4. Conclusion

Chapter 7
Caste, Politics and the Roles of Gandhiji and Ambedkar ***356-478***

7.1. Introduction
7.2. Caste Politics of the Congress Leaders and Politicians before the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the Political Arena
7.3. Caste Politics after the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the Political Arena
7.4. Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar in connection with the 'Communal Award' and the Historic 'Poona Pact' of 1932
7.5. Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar relating to the Question of Harijans and their Temple Entry Movement
A CAMPAIGN TO SECURE CIVIL RIGHTS
EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY
SOCIAL INTERCOURSE
AGENCY TO BE EMPLOYED
TEMPLE ENTRY MOVEMENT
Ambedkar's Statement on Temple Entry Bill on 14th February, 1933
7.6. Conclusion

Chapter 8
Concluding Observations ***479-488***

Selected Bibliography ***489-505***

List of Tables

1. Purusha Sukta
2. The Creation of the Theory of Chaturvarna
3. Rig Veda
4. Dasyus in the Rig Veda
5.. Mridhravata-Epithets of Dasyus
6. Variation of Sudra Paijavana
7. Evidences of Three Sudas
8. Evidences from Rig Veda regarding Sudas
9. Relation of the Rig Vedic Tribes
10. Different Meaning of the term Varna
11. Different form of Varna and its Meaning in the Zend Avasta
12. Share Distributions between Sons and Unmarried Sisters
13. Share Distribution for Different Mother's Caste
14. Caste based Share Distributions
15. Punishments Allotted to Four Castes
16. Discriminations of Punishments for Offences against Arya Minors
17. Discriminations of Punishments for Cheating an Arya
18. Caste based Punishments for Defamations to a Brahmin
19. Punishments for Defame a Non-Brahmin by Brahmin
20. Tilak Swaraj Fund
21. Amount Granted from Tilak Swaraj Fund to Different Provinces
22. Total Grant Allotted to Different Provinces
23. Misutilization of Tilak Swaraj Fund
24. Amount Sanctioned for Depressed Classes Welfare Scheme

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1.a. The Problem of Understanding the Evolution of the Hindu Caste System

The mystery and obscurity of the origin of Caste and its evolution through the ages created numerous never-ending problems in the Indian society, polity, economy, religion and culture. Whatever might have been the origin of the caste system, it developed all through the course of Indian history; and as a matter of fact, Caste mentality got embedded in 'the Indian psyche' since the very early times of Indian history. The term caste was used in most Indian languages as 'Jati'[1], which meant 'race', or any group sharing generic characteristics. It was the smallest endogamous social unit, more precisely, a regional population. But the term 'Varna' of the Rig Veda does not denote caste but colour. It should therefore be translated into 'Class' rather than 'Caste'. It is clear from different verses of the Rig Veda that the concept of Caste did not exist in the Rig Vedic age. Even the concept of 'Chaturvarna' did not (mature) appear at that time. The term Varna[2] was used to denote a particular class, colour of a particular person like white, black, tawny (reddish brown), copper, golden and their faith, believe religion and others in the Rig Veda. Even it identified different deities, like, Ushas, Agni, Soma, etc. and meant luster, features or colour. That is why; the 'Theory of Three Varnas' such as Brahmana (Priest), Kshatriya (Warrior) and Vaishya (Cultivator and trader) did appear in the Vedic age. In fact; there are chiefly two races, i.e. Aryans and Dasyus (Pre-Aryans) and many aboriginal tribes who perform worship of God Indra and undertake Arya religion by subduing and educating (Book 8.Hymn L1.IX). However, it is very interesting to note about the fact that from the early Rig Vedic period up to probable interpolation of the Purusa Sukta in the Rig Veda, there was not a single word in respect of Caste or Sudra. Many eminent scholars of India and abroad proved this assertion. The Rig Vedic society was categorized into different occupational groups, not in Castes. They could even change their professions at their own choice. It depended upon their requisite qualifications

and ability. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the 'Varna theory' of the Rig Veda was based on the doctrine of 'Karma' and the principles of liberty, equal opportunity and virtuous deeds. The term 'Varna' is derived from the word 'Vry'[3] meaning to choice and thus its proper meaning is a choice of profession or occupation. However, the womb of the Caste concept was the Purusa Sukta of the Rig Veda which most probably was an interpolation for the first time that formalized the Caste conception into the Hindu mind and it spread through the Vedic literatures. Manu, the ancient law maker, first institutionalized the concept of Caste to be based on heredity and brushed aside the doctrine of 'Karma' and inborn qualities as well as virtuous deeds. He divided the Indian society into four Castes, i.e., Brahmana, Kshtriya, Vaishya and Sudra. He also thereby laid the basis of inter-caste hatred and caste-based discrimination which, in course of time, divided the Indian society into multiple segments. Naturally, the liberal and democratic ideas of the Rig Vedic society lost its importance due to the hegemony of the caste system and Indian society, polity, economy, culture, religion etc. had gradually brought forcefully under the inhuman norms of the Caste Institution. The Brahmin, so-called intellectual class as well as privileged class became the head and backbone of the Indian society and the toiling masses were forced to remain in very distressed conditions only to serve the 'twice born' babies. The Brahmin enjoyed the autocratic power and position in the Brahmanical Hindu society in all spheres of their individual as well as national life. They were the real source of power behind the throne. The so-called intellectual class snatched away the rights of thinking, learning, teaching, earning, worshiping and the condition of peaceful living of the toiling masses in the Brahmanical Hindu society and they played a vital role to transform the Indian society into a land of caste based society. It created numerous problems in the Indian society As a result the concept of liberty, equality and fraternity in the Pre-Rig Vedic and early Rig Vedic period had completely disappeared through the inhuman mechanical devices of the Caste Institution by the propagation of the later Vedic and post Vedic multi-dimensional literatures in different ages. It compelled the unprivileged classes of the Brahmanical Hindu society to remain as a living fossil under the dictatorship of the Brahminical aggression and hegemony.

Therefore, it can be pointed out that the Hindu Caste System dividing the society into four divisions viz., the Brahmana, the Kshatriya, the Vaishya and the Sudra, though

originated and pervaded since the Vedic period, has been one of the main problems of Indian society and history owing to entailing inter-caste hatred and exclusiveness. Social reformers in different periods of history tried to address the issue of Caste, but the problem survived all positive treatments. In the colonial period, as the same problem endangered social unity in India in one hand and on the other kept the low-caste communities backward, the British Government did not fail to utilize it as a weapon against the Nationalist movement. Hence the social ideas of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in reference to the ideas of other thinkers of the 19th century proved to be very much relevant in the context of Caste during the Freedom Struggle. This research work, therefore, is an investigation into the distinct ideas of Gandhiji and Ambedkar relating to the Caste-based exclusiveness and disunity thereof in order to view into the separate discourses built by them separately in the domains of their socio-political roles.

But the very foundation of the Caste System received the first blow by the rise of Buddhism in India. The humanistic approach, universal appeal and scientific argument of Goutam Buddha hastened the way of peaceful living in society that denounced the religion of God for the religion of humanity. Mahavira also denounced the Caste System and advocated equality of man and woman. The 6th century Religious Protestant Movement greatly influenced the reign of Chandragupta Maurya, Asoke, Harsha and the Pala rulers. But the revivalist tendency of Hinduism received new enthusiasm under the Gupta, the Rajput and the Sena rulers of Bengal. During the medieval rule the low-born Hindus converted themselves into Muslims (Deshi Muslims) to get rid of the Brahmanical yoke. Yet their destiny did not change at all. The Caste System prevailed and the Upper Caste Hindus were benefited to some extent by their state policy.

1.1.b. The Issue of Caste and the Attitude of the Colonial Government

But the policy of the British Government and the impact of industrialization further greatly influenced the Caste Institution during the colonial period in India. In the first place the Colonial Government adopted the policy of neutrality towards the question of Caste and prevented from taking any particular side that might create social unrest.

In the second place, the British Government undertook to implement a few legal acts in order to suppress social evils and prevailing superstitions when such questions were aroused by the emerging Indian intellectuals during the 19th century. Such Legislation as the Caste Disabilities Removal Act of 1850, the Special Marriage Act of 1872, etc. may safely be cited as instances. In the third place, they now started to pay due and deserved attention to the question of Caste and the unsettled issues relating to it which had so long been treated casually. In this way they adopted uniform policies relating to education, employment etc. irrespective of caste, class, creed, and religion. The consequences of the Industrial Revolution, in various ways, minimized the differences between the Occidental and the Oriental beliefs to the question of Caste. The Colonial Government indeed saw to the welfare and upliftment of the Depressed.

1.1.c. The Issue of Caste and Intellectual Dichotomy in Colonial India

The 19th century Renaissance and Reformation Movement failed to eradicate the problems of the Caste System and Untouchability. Most of the 19th century intellectuals continued the tradition of the Indian National Congress in this respect although there were a few exceptions who demanded the abolition of caste system, untouchability etc. They expressed their views and opinions theoretically in a very limited way and did not come forward spontaneously to launch a direct movement for the abolition of the Caste System and Untouchability from the Hindu Society. Realizing the importance of its abolition, they did nothing but ideal talking. They knew it very well that India can not be developed as a 'Nation State' without its eradication. Even they differed in their respective approach in this issue. Naturally they were unable to introduce a crusade that would radically reform the Indian Society. The name of Raja Rammohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Swami Vivekananda and others may be mentioned in order to understand the real truth.

1.1.d. Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the Caste System

Gandhiji is called the 'Father of the Indian Nation' and Ambedkar is defined as the 'Modern Man' in India. But their attitude towards the issue of caste and its solution were completely opposite to each other. Gandhiji profoundly believed in the Caste

System. He treated it as the part and parcel of the Hindu religion. He advocated the Caste System as a divine arrangement in respect of punishment and reward for their previous deeds and activities. To him, caste is a kind of ethical stratification which is a projection of ethical status of human beings based on their deeds done in their previous life. He explained that the divisions of Varna were based on birth. Gandhiji believed in the Varnashrama Dharma and the Caste System[4]. He had a living faith in God and the facts and events that were described in the Vedic literatures in the context of caste. In fact, his emergence in the Indian political arena as an undisputed leader of the Indian National Congress makes an epoch making event in the history of the Indian National movement. Unfortunately he was very much convinced by the Indian so called cultural, social and religious traditional heritage in the context of caste. If Gandhiji was convinced scientifically regarding the burning issue of Caste, he might play a vital role for changing the Indian scenario at a large. His political movement in India was completely based on the principle of 'Ahimsa' and 'Satyagrahya'. But the philosophy of Gandhian economy was entirely based on the principles of trusteeship, idolization of Charka (the spinning wheel), manual work, opposition to machinery of the modern civilization. But during the freedom movement Gandhiji himself was responsible for the promotion of Casteism at different phase's viz. Communal Award and his active participation in the Second Round Table Conference, Poona Pact, Harijan Movement and the Temple Entry Movement etc. Gandhiji had vehemently opposed to the concessions and special privileges[5] given to the Depressed Classes for their upliftment by the Communal Award. He even started a hunger strike till death in order to oppose the separation of the Depressed Classes from the mainstream of the Hindu society. In such a critical situation Ambedkar came forward to save the life of Gandhiji and was literally compelled to sign the Poona Pact in 1932. In fact the Harijan movement and the Temple Entry Movement was a direct outcome of the Poona Pact. After this historic event, Gandhiji came forward for the first time to address the problems of the Harijans and became renowned world-wide as a champion of the Untouchables. But he launched a direct purification movement for the betterment of the Indian untouchables in the later part of his life. He was the first caste-Hindu leader of the Indian National Congress who ultimately took initiative in the later part of his life to launch a direct reformative movement against untouchability for bettering the condition of the ill-fated toiling masses of India. He made an arrangement to establish

tube wells, ponds, schools, roads etc. for the Harijans. His Harijan mission was propagated all over India through the journal of 'Harijan'. He took initiative to provide stipend to the Harijan students. All sorts of beneficial measures were adopted by him to uplift the socio-economic, educational and cultural conditions of the Harijans. His liberal and reformative zeal for 'Temple EntryMovement' could not be denied. Under the patronage of Gandhiji the All India Anti-Untouchability League was formed in September 1932 which was later on renamed as Harijan Sevak Sangh. Its main motto was to ensure the civil rights and privileges of the Harijans. That is why the role and activities of Gandhiji towards the emancipation of the untouchables was very much important. He played a vital role to establish the concept of social justice among the Harijans. In spite of numerous limitations the greatness of Gandhiji towards the uplift of the Harijans heralded a new dimension in the Indian history. He earned world-wide fame in this respect. Naturally, he became the champion of the Harijan movement in India.

But Gandhiji was against modernization, industrialization and urbanization[6]. He stressed on traditionalism, naturalism, manual work, handicraft, small-scale industry, trusteeship of wealth to achieve the ideal of Ramrajya. He said, "Here Ram means a Panchayat (the Council of five) – A state built upon public opinion is the Ramraj for that area"[7]. He then coined the word 'Ramrajya' to describe the kingdom of God on the earth, i.e., 'the sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority'. He used the word 'Swaraj' to mean 'self-rule and self-restraint'. According to him, Swaraj was synonymous with the concept of 'Ramraj'. He wanted that the perfect democracy in which inequalities based on possession and non-possession, colour, race or creed or sex would vanish from his Ramrajya. In it the state had the obligation of realizing the greatest good of all rather than the greatest good of the greatest number. The real administrative structure of the concept of Ramraj was Panchayat Raj. The vision of him was decentralization of power to the local Panchayat of the villages. He did not approve of the proletarian dictatorship of the Communists and the parliamentary democracy. Parliaments were the real emblems of slavery. He emphasised handicraft and Charkha (spinning wheel) for the growth of cottage industry in the villages. He thought that through handicraft the industrial demand of simple village life could be met with. Through the practice of Swadeshi and Khaddar, Gandhiji evolved as a practical remedy for the crushing poverty of millions of village residents who lived on

the border line of starvation. In advocating the production and use of Khadi, Gandhi had a humanitarian motive. But he identified machinery as anti-social for it was meant to replace human labour and thus increased unemployment. His supreme consideration was man. His utmost aim was to establish a classless society by changing the hearts of the people. Some scholars pointed out that humanism was the basic principle of his economic theory. But it was very difficult to accomplish in the real sense of the term. He was completely against modernization, urbanization and industrialization and by the development and progress of which the 'Depressed Classes' could improve their lot at a large. Instead, Gandhiji advocated the call of nature which ultimately compelled the toiling masses of India to remain in the same distressed condition. He urged for 'Sarvodaya'. But the state of 'Sarvodaya' was a state of moral anarchism. He said that the poor should not be jealous of the rich because this discrimination was mainly due to their own destiny. He said that the poor, workers and peasants would not to proceed for revolution against the ruling trustees but only compromise for reforms. He considered the divine right of the trustees and rulers as permanent and it was the duty of the ruled not to hate the rulers. The Indian National Congress was more interested in 'political revolution' rather than 'social revolution'. Therefore, Gandhiji sought to render a balance between the two by the introduction of the Harijan movement. His economic philosophy was based on the principles of 'Trusteeship' and the ideology of 'Ramraj'. Gandhiji said that economics and ethics were not two separate entities. Economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation were immoral and therefore sinful. Trusteeship was the principle to maintain status-quo in the society between the landlords and peasants, capitalists and poor. If reforms would come from the above for the benefit of the toiling masses that would prevent unrest in the society, otherwise not. So the struggle would be avoided if a compromise between the two interest groups was possible. Gandhiji said that his theory of trusteeship was no makeshift, certainly no camouflage. It had the sanction of philosophy and religion behind it. In fact, the idea of trusteeship of him was integrally related to the concept of non-possession. Non-possession and equality for him pre-supposed a change of heart, a change of attitude. These type of socio-political and economic thoughts of Gandhiji practically complicated the emancipation process of the 'Depressed Classes' and the 'Harijans'. It was Ambedkar alone who solely fought against the evils of the Caste System. He strongly opposed the 'Aryan Race theory' in the context of the Rig Vedic Society and

founded the 'Sudra-Aryan' theory. He tried to establish how the Sudras became Untouchables in the Indo-Aryan society. He claimed that Caste Institution and Untouchability be abolished from the so-called Brahmanical Hindu society. His attitude towards Caste and its annihilation was based on the principle of humanity, equality, liberty, fraternity in the context of socio-political and economic democracy. Even Ambedkar had very rightly fought for the equalization of the Depressed Classes in all spheres.

He himself took leading role and arranged various protest movements to achieve his goal i.e. social justice for the Depressed Classes. He launched Chower Tank Satyagraha movement, Nasik and Kalaram Temple Entry movement to establish the civil rights and privileges of the low-born people[8]. His fighting zeal greatly inspired the common masses of India. His struggle was further strengthened by the declaration of the 'Communal Award' by Ramsay Macdonald, the then Prime Minister of England. He attended the Round Table Conferences as a sole representative of the Depresses Classes in India. His scientific and logical explanation for the benefit of the Depressed Classes created an amicable settlement among the 'Minority Communities'[9] to implement the provisions of the 'Communal Award' in spite of the opposition from Gandhiji who demanded himself as the sole representative of the Indian Untouchables. Ambedkar was in favour of modernization, industrialization and urbanization which, he found, were indispensable for the overall growth of the nation. The fighting zeal of Ambedkar for human rights gave him international recognition as a liberator of humanity from social and economic injustice. His economic thoughts were based on the concept of mixed economy, socialism, industrialization, state ownership of industries, worker's right to strike etc. He fought against the caste based economic life to establish the idea of liberty and equality in the society. His chief aim was to create a liberal atmosphere in the field of economic life and activities with a vision to open up the flood gate of different occupations to every citizen, irrespective of their caste, class, creed, sex and religion. He struggled for mixed economy or State Socialism to prevent endless social and economic exploitation[10]. He had understood that economic equality was very much essential along with political equality to empower the toiling masses in India. That is why he stressed on the nationalization of economy for the benefit of the toiling masses in India. Besides, as the first law minister in independent India he always tried to alleviate the lot of those

sociologically and economically exploited masses. He proposed for the implementation and enactment of the Hindu Code Bill[11] the importance of which was only felt at a pretty later stage.

The foregoing discussions made it clear that both Gandhiji and Ambedkar were for equality, justice and freedom to all, regardless of caste, creed and sex; yet in their perceptions we come across series of differences on how such a social order could be established. Both of them played vital roles towards the emancipation of the Harijans in India. They came forward to establish the concept of 'Social Justice' among the Harijans in India. But it was an irony of fact that in spite of the never-ending and endangering affects of the Caste System on society, polity, economy, religion, administration and human psychology no appropriate measures have yet been taken on the part of the Government and different political parties to abolish the Caste System completely. Therefore its glowing effects can be seen in the face behind the mask of the Orthodox Hindus in the Indian society. That is why; Ambedkar indeed played a vital role in establishing the concept of Social Justice and Human Rights among the Depressed Classes.

1.2. Research Gaps

The review of the existing literature is reflective of the fact that most of the works have dealt partly on the issue of Caste in colonial India and rarely on the ideas and activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the context of Caste. The rarity of contextual analysis has left behind a big hiatus in historical research for which the present research proposal seems to be cogently appropriate. In order to fulfil the gap in historical research specific analysis have to be made in what conditions and social ambience Gandhiji and Ambedkar, though from different outlook and socio-philosophical standpoints, evinced their ideas and played what roles. Moreover the lack of characterization of their ideas and activities in terms of the Castes and Classes represented by them separately has to be taken up in the present research work to the effect of suitable and judicious identifications.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The present study is to examine the socio-economic and political philosophy of Gandhiji and Ambẻdkar as regards the question of Caste. In fact, particularly the motto is to make an enquiry into the following aspects:

1) To know the origin and tradition of the Caste System in the Indian society.
2) To assess the policy adopted by the Colonial Government towards the problems of Caste and Untouchability in India.
3) To find out the roles of the Social Reformers towards the issue of Caste.
4) To assess the ideas of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in relevance to the issue of Caste and Untouchability.
5) To sort out the roles of Gandhiji and Ambedkar to deal with the problems of the Depressed Classes and the Untouchables in Indian society, polity and economic life.
6) To assess the contributions of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the fields of Social Justice.

1.4. Hypotheses

In the backdrop of inter-caste exclusiveness, hatred, discrimination and disunity as maintained traditionally in Colonial India, Gandhiji and Ambedkar brought about a new lease of life in the terms of reforms, liberalism, humanism and progress in the Indian Society though each of them differed from the other owing to their mutually distinct socio-cultural and political originations. Gandhiji stood for retaining caste conditioned by moral, humanitarian and social responsibility; whereas Ambedkar on the basis of greater humanism and social equality with a pledge to annihilate the age-old Caste System to the effect of unstinted national unity.

1.5. Chapter Specifications

The study consists of **eight** chapters as stated below.

Chapter 2 presents Origin of Caste and its Evaluation in the Indian Society: A Historical Perspective

Chapter 3 deals with the Attitude of the 19th Century Reformers and the Role of the British Government towards the Issue of Caste.

Chapter 4 contains the Socio-Political Environment of Gandhiji and Ambedkar.

Chapter 5 enquires into the theories of Caste: Gandhiji and Ambedkar.

Chapter 6 presents Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the Question of Caste based Economic Life.

Chapter 7 is devoted to the study the Caste-Politics and the Roles of Gandhiji and Ambedkar.

Chapter 8 presents the Concluding Observations.

1.6. Research Methodology

To continue any research work, a standard and appropriate research method or design should be utilized. In the present work, the research method is substantially influenced by the heuristic model of structure and functionality symbiosis assumption along with the requirements of social sciences. All the data collected for the work will be put to comparative study and meticulous analysis in order to avoid unreasonable generalization as well as myopic outlook. Most of the data will be put to test of reality-oriented possibilities and any error thereof too will cautiously be avoided. The objective of the work will be achieved in terms of veracity.

1.7. Review of the Existing Literature

A good number of studies have been conducted on the Caste System of India and the thoughts of Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the issues of Caste and Untouchability very

shortly and in a scattered manner. They do not fulfil the expectations of a systematic and chronological history on the Caste System of India and the ideas of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the problems of it. Most of the works are either a general description from earliest times up to modern period or are a scattered description in the history of Indian caste problem and the ideas of Gandhiji and Ambedkar. Hence, a few of the noted studies of different sources regarding the Indian Caste System and socio-political and economic ideologies of Gandhiji and Ambedkar made by the renowned scholars of India and abroad are here reviewed as follows:

Ahir D.C: Buddhism and Ambedkar, B. R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 1990. He has pointed out that Ambedkar was one of the greatest national leaders of modern India who was essentially a religious man. Being a symbol of self-elevation, self-help and self-respect, Ambedkar adopted the religion of Goutam Buddha. But this book does not deal with the issue of caste and untouchability.

Bharathi, K.S: Encyclopaedia of Eminent Thinkers, Vol. I, The Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1998. He has presented very nicely the eventful life and works of Gandhiji and his ideas on leadership, religion, Stateless Society and Satyagraha in South Africa. But it does not highlight the views and ideas of Gandhiji towards the issue of caste and untouchability.

Ibid; Vol. IX, The Political Thought of Ambedkar. He has highlighted in brief the life-struggle and activities of Ambedkar and his thoughts on Nation, Nationalism, Philosophy, Society, Democracy, State, Justice and Peace. But it only marginally highlights the views of Ambedkar on the issue of caste and Social Justice very scatteredly within a few lines.

Bhattacharyya, Buddhadeva: Evolution of the Political Philosophy of Gandhi, Foreworded by Nirmal Kumar Bose, Calcutta Book House, Calcutta, 1969. He has lucidly interpreted the ideas of Gandhiji and his thoughts on Ethics, Economics and Politics in brief. But he does not focus the views and ideas of Gandhiji towards the issue of caste and untouchability.

Biswas, S.C. ed.: Gandhi Theory and Practice Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance, Indian Institute of Advance Study Shimla, K.P. Bagchi and Company, Calcutta, 1969. It deals mainly with Gandhiji's ideas in relation to economy, polity and society. But it does not discuss the issue of caste and untouchability.

Biswas, Nanigopal and Biswas Renuka: Gandhi O Ambedkar- Tulanamulak Samiksha, Published by Sri Kasishar Sarkar, Kalikata-30, 1987. They have noted in brief the ideas and activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the context of Caste and Untouchability but very inexclusively.

Chentharassery T. H. P: Ambedkar on Indian History, Rawat Publications, New Delhi, 2000. He has noted shortly the ideas and insight of Ambedkar about the history of India in the sphere of Social condition, Counter-Revolution and the later development of Chathurvarnya. But it does not emphasize the problems of untouchability.

Chitkara, M.G: Dr. Ambedkar and Social Justice Published by S.B.Nangia, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi, 2002. He has highlighted the fact that the concept of Social Justice of Ambedkar was founded on the basic ideal of socio-economic equality and its aim was to assist the removal of socio-economic disparities and inequalities. But it highlights the views of Ambedkar on the issue of Caste, inequalities and Social Justice very shortly and scatteredly.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut: Social and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, First Published by Routledge Taylor & Francis Group London and New York, 2006. He has interpreted the theory of Ahimha (non-violence) of Gandhiji which galvanized the masses into action. Besides, he has highlighted a unique contextualized study of Gandhi's social and political thought on the basis of his writings in Harijan, the Servants of the Untouchable Society. But his book lacks interpretation of the issue of Caste inequalities and Social Injustice.

Dasgupta, Pannalal, Gandhi-Gabeshana, Nabapatra Prakashan, Kolikata, 1999. He has interpreted very nicely the different aspects of Ahimsa, Satyagraha, Trusteeship and

Gandhism. But he hardly wrote anything about the views and ideas of Gandhiji towards the issue of Caste and Untouchability.

Debnath, Dr. Sailen: A Compendium of Gandhism & Netaji's Critique of Gandhism, Published by ROPI, Alipurduar, Jalpaiguri, 1998. He has given in brief a critical interpretation of Gandhism covering the aspects of Caste System, Varnashrama Dharama, Ahimsha, Satyagraha, Trusteeship, Ramrajya, National and Social Education, Ruralisation, Western Civilization, etc.

Gautama Q. L. - Dr Baba Saheb Ambedkar Brahmanism, B. R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 2002. He has tried to find out very precisely where the Brahmins have failed and why they were hated. He has pointed out that the Brahmins should come out of hibernation and they should also delete verses of doubtful authenticity so far the Vedic scriptures are concern. But his description is also inadequate in itself relating to the issues of Caste inequalities and Social Justice.

Ghurye, G.S; Caste and Race in India, Popular Prakashan Private Limited, Bombay, 1994 (Reprinted). He has given a scattered description about the Caste System of ancient and colonized India and also focused on Race and Caste. But it does not deal with the problem of untouchability.

Hutton, J.H; Caste in India, Its Nature, Function and Origins, Oxford University Press, 4th ed. 1963. He has noted the racial elements of Southern, Western, Central and Northern part of India. He has also explained the Caste structures with its strictures, sanctions and functions in the context of socio-political, economic and religious aspects. He has identified Caste as a communal unit. His explanation on the issue of Caste has general descriptions only.

Jatava D. R; Ambedkar Code of Conduct, Published by ABD Publishers, Jaipur, India, 2005. He has mainly mentioned certain parameters to know how far one may be an Ambedkarite, both in Spirit and action. He has expressed his personal views highlighting the movement of Ambedkarism and described the Social Philosophy of Ambedkar to eradicate the social poverty of India irrespective of caste, class, creed,

sex and religion. But he highlights the views of Ambedkar on the issue of Caste inequalities very shortly.

Keer, Dhananjoy; Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission, 3rd ed., Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1971. He gave an idea of Ambedkar's role, activities and contribution to India in the context of socio-political and economic ideas in different phases. His conversion to Buddhism and last years of his life was categorically described. But he highlights the issue of Caste inequalities and the problems of Untouchability only occasionally.

Khare, Vijay S.: Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and India's National Security, Kilaso Books, New Delhi, 2005. He has noted the relevance and contribution of Ambedkar to India's National Security and how India has been able to utilize the policies or ideas of Ambedkar in solving the problems related to India's National Security. But his interpretation lacks discussion on caste, untouchability etc.

Ketkar, S.V; History of Caste in India (evidence of the laws of Manu on the social conditions in India during the 3rd century A.D.), Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 1979. He has defined Caste, explained the theory of Caste, psychology of Caste, types of Caste, constitution of four Varnas, discrimination on account of Varnas and others. But it does not deal with the problems of Untouchability.

Mehra, Shashi, ed. : Ambedkar's Perspective on State Caste and Social Justice, Sanjay Prakashan, New Delhi, 2002. This study has stressed on Ambedkar as a legal luminary, social reformer, prolific-writer, original thinker and has interpreted Indian heritage according to Ambedkar's outlook. Ambedkar's fighting's against injustice and made the downtrodden aware of their rights and duties. But it does not concern with the inhuman nature of Untouchability.

Namboodiripad, E.M.S: The Mahatma And The Ism, Published by Sunil Basu, National Book Agency (p) Ltd., Calcutta, 1981. He noted very shortly the meaning of Gandhijism and its impacts after Gandhi. He said that Marxist-Leninists should carry on a principled, ideological struggle against the philosophy and practice of Gandhism,

though on specific issues where it is possible to develop joint actions. But he does not probe into the issue of Caste inequalities and the problems of Untouchability.

Nanda, B. R: Mahatma Gandhi, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1958. He noted very briefly about a biography of Gandhiji which contained the eventful life-story of Gandhiji. But he does not highlight the attitude of Gandhiji towards the issue of Caste inequalities, the inhuman nature of Untouchability and Social Justice.

Parekh Bhikhu, Colonialism, Tradition and Reform, An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1989. He very nicely and shortly highlighted the discourse on Untouchability and the theory of Non-violence of Gandhiji. It does not cover the issue of Caste.

Senart, Emile ; Caste in India: The Facts and the System, translated by E.Denison Ross, C.I.E., ESS ESS Publications, New Delhi, 1975. He has explained the Hindu Castes and Hindu mind along with the concept of Castes and Classes shortly. But it does not concentrate on the problems of Caste inequalities and Untouchability.

Shastri, Shibnath; Jativeda ed. by Sri Dilip Kumar Biswas, published by Sri Pullin Behari Sen, Sadharan Brahmasamaj, Calcutta, 1370 (Bengali). He has noted the evaluation of the Caste System and the Anti-Caste Movement led by the Brahmasamaj. But it does not note the issue of Untouchability.

Shabbir Mohammed, ed. Ambedkar on Law, Constitution and Social Justice, Rawat Publication, New Delhi, 2005. He has highlighted the role and contributions of Ambedkar in law and framing the constitution, development of the weaker sections of the society, especially the Scheduled castes and Scheduled tribes, marginalized groups and their development, problems of minorities, law and social justice, human rights, gender justice etc. All these issues have been noted very shortly and scatteredly.

Shukla, Ramakant: Gandhian Philosophy of Education, Sublime Publications, Jaipur, India, 2002. He has noted Gandhiji as a meticulous thinker and planner who tried to devise a plan and strategy to tackle the socio-educational problems of India. He has highlighted the Educational Philosophy, Moral and Spiritual Education, concept of

Basic Education and Social Philosophy of Gandhiji in a very lucid manner. But Gandhiji's education policy depends on the principle of communalism rather than secularism which is not noted in this book.

Vidyadagar, I.S: Concept of Humanism of Dr. Ambedkar, ABD Publishers, Jaipur, India, 2005. He has explained Ambedkar's ideas on Humanism, Rationalism, Emancipation of Women, Socialism, Democracy and Human Rights. But he does not properly express the views of Ambedkar on Caste inequalities and Untouchability.

Wilson, John; Indian Caste, Vol. I, Deep publications, New Delhi, 1976. He has explained in brief the origin and development of the Hindu Caste System. It does not discuss with the problems of Untouchability.

So the above noted studies do not deal with the issue of Caste inequalities, Untouchability and the ideas of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards these inhuman problems methodically, chronologically, systematically and historically.

Referencs

1. Encyclopaedia Britannica Ready Reference, Encyclopaedia Britannica (India) Pvt., Ltd., New Delhi, Vol. 2, 2005, p. 173.
2. Moon Vasant ed. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharastra, 1990, Vol. 7, pp. 81-85.
3. Sharma, S.P; History of Ancient India, Mohit Publications, New Delhi, 1996, p.98.
4. Gandhi, M. K.; Nava-Jivan (a Gujarathi Journal), 1921-22. It was reprinted in Vol. II of the series called Gandhi Sikshan as No. 18.
5. Chentharassery, TPH; Ambedkar on Indian History, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2000, pp. 153—162.
6. Gandhi, M.K.; Modern V. Ancient Civilization, Hingorani T, Anand ed. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1970, p. 2.
7. Gandhi, M. K.; 'The Prince and Peasant' Published in Navajivan in Gujrati, dated 22/3/31 in Gandhi M. K. Industrial and Agrarian life and Relations, Kher, V. D. ed. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1984, p. 259.

31 MAY 2013

252138

8. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar-Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 2002, pp. 89-102.

9. Moon Vasant ed. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, op.cit. Vol. 9, pp. 307-311.

10. Vidyasagar, I. S.; Concept of Humanism of Dr. Ambedkar, ABD Publishers, Jaipur, India, 2005, p. 117-139.

11. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar-Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 405.

Chapter 2

Origin of Caste and its Evaluation in the Indian Society: A Historical Perspective

2.1 a. Meaning of the term 'Caste'

The mystery and obscurity of the origin of Caste and its evolution in the Indian society heralded an epoch making event in the history of India. It is a critical movement, a question of life and death, we ought to consider it, and there is no scope to escape. Practically speaking, Caste mentality is embedded in 'the Indian psyche' since the interpolation of the Purusha Sukta in the Rig Veda. But the term 'Caste'[1] comes from the Spanish and Portuguese word 'Casta'. 'Casta' means lineage or race. It is derived from the Latin word Castus, which means pure. The Spanish word "Casta" was applied to the mixed breed between Europeans, Indians (American) and Negroes. However, 'Caste' was not used in its Indian sense until the 17th century. It meant a group of people having a specific social rank, defined generally by descent, marriage and occupation. Each caste even now has its own customs that restrict the occupations and dietary habits of its members and their social contacts with members of other castes. The term caste was used in most Indian languages as 'Jati', which meant 'race', or any group sharing generic characteristics. It was the smallest endogamous social unit, more precisely, a regional population. At present, there are more than 3000 castes and 25000 sub-castes in India, some with several hundred members and others with millions[2].

2.1 b. Caste in Biology

But there is no caste-based division in the world of beings, and whatever divisions do appear is simply determined by the categories of genus and species. If we assume a caste like division in biology, it is then a subset of individuals within a colony of social animals has a specialized function and is distinguished from other subset by morphological and anatomical difference[3]. The differentiation of larvae into various castes is often determined by diet, though hormonal and environmental factors can play a decisive role.

2.1 c. Caste in Different Religion

In fact, there are several divisions like the caste system in different religions among the followers of the same religion, as for example; Theravadi and Mahayana among the Buddhists; Shia, Sunni, Kadiyani, Ahamadia, Wahabi, Bahai and Momin among the Musalmans; Roman Catholic and Protestant among the Christian. But their rivalry between or among the followers of the same religion are mainly due to the way of worship[4] and differences hardly based on the principle of graded inequality in connection with the descending scale or ascending scale as is found in the Hindu caste system.

2.2. Origin of Caste and its Growth into the Hindu Mind through the Rig Vedic 'Purusha Sukta'

It is an established fact that the Rig Vedic society was categorized into different professional or occupational groups or classes, not in castes. Even the people of the Rig Vedic society could change their professions. It was depended upon their requisite qualifications and ability. This content can be proved by the following verse of the Rig Veda:

"I am a poet, my father is a physician and my mother grinds corn on stone. Being engaged in different occupations, we seek wealth and happiness as cows seek food in different pastures."[5]

Not only that but also the 'Theory of Varna ' of the Rig Vedic society was based on the doctrine of 'Karma' and the principles of liberty, equal opportunity and virtuous deeds. The term 'Varna' is derived from the word 'Vry'[6] meaning thereby to choice and thus its proper meaning is a choice of profession or occupation. But the word 'Varna' of the Rig Veda does not denote caste but colour. It should therefore be translated into 'Class' rather than 'Caste'. Therefore, it is clear that the concept of Caste did not exist in the Rig Vedic age. Even the concept of Chaturvarna did not (mature) appear at that time. The term of Varna was used to denote a particular class, colour of a particular person like white, black, tawny (reddish brown), copper, golden and their faith, believe religion and others in the Rig Veda. Not only that but also it identified different deities, like, Ushas, Agni, Soma, etc. and meant luster, features or colour. That is why; the

'Theory of Three Varnas' such as Brahmana (Priest), Kshatriya (Warrior) and Vaishya (Cultivator and trader) did appear in the Vedic age. In fact; there are two races, i.e. Aryans and Dasyus (Pre-Aryans) and many aboriginal tribes perform worship of God Indra and undertake Arya religion by subduing and educating (Book 8.Hymn L1.IX). Therefore, there is a lot of controversy among the scholars in different fields regarding the content and the possibility of the interpolation of the sloka of the Rig Veda, i.e., the 'Purusha Sukta' (10.90.1-16) on the issue of the creation of the concept of caste. Some scholars pointed out that the so-called intellectual classes of the-then society perhaves intentionally interpolated the sloka of 'Purusha Sukta' into the Rig Veda for establishing their authority, supremacy, privilege and lordship in perpetuity through the ages. However, the Orthodox Hindus believe in its supernatural creation in the context of 'Chaturvarna'. It is very much interesting to note that even today its glowing effects can clearly be seen into the psychological minds and the abnormal social-religious behaviour of the so-called Hindus. But some renowned Western scholars and reputed experts in Vedic Sanskrit literature have already proved their intrusion regarding the interpolation of the sloka of 'Purusha Sukta' in different phases. Therefore, it is better to note that the Rig Veda contains 1017 hymns (Sukta) and is divided into Ten Mandalas. The Tenth Mandalas, said to have been added later as its language differs from the other nine mandalas, contains the famous Purushasukta' which explains that the four Varnas (Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra) were born from the mouth, arms, thighs and feet of the Creator. However, it is very interesting to note about the fact that from the early Vedic period up to probable interpolation of the Purusha Sukta in the Rig Veda, there was not a single word in respect of Caste or Sudra. Almost all the scholars generally agree that the so-called caste system did not exist in olden times. This contention was already proved on the basis of various evidences. Besides, it can be noted that the opinion of some scholars regarding the creation of Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra from the mouth, arms, thighs and feet respectively of the Creator can be described as follows:

"Brahmanas are the head of mankind, Kshatriyas are made of his arms, Vaishyas are his thighs and Sudras are made his feet"[7]

Naturally it can be said that the whole social organization is here conceived symbolically as one human being – the 'Body Social', we may say with its limbs

representing the social classes based on the principle of division of labour. This alone is the appropriate meaning of this hymn as is evident from the context. This is not caste system based on the principle of birth but on merits. Mr. R.C. Dutt also says that we do not find one single passage in the entire range of Vedas to show that the community was cut up into hereditary castes[8]. In view of this fact, the opinions and observations of Colebrooke, Prof. Maxmullar, Prof. Weber and others may be mentioned.

Colebrooke said that the language, metre, style of the Purusha Sukta is quite different from the rest of the prayers of the Rig Veda. It must have been written after the Sanskrit tongue had advanced from the rustic and irregular dialect in which the multitude of hymns and prayers of the Veda was composed. Purusha Sukta has a decidedly more modern tone. It has not been written by following the same rustic and irregular dialect in which the multitude of hymns and prayers of the Veda was composed. However, it has been created by modern Sanskrit language in which the mythological poems, sacred and profane (Puranas and Kavyas), have been written[9]. Prof. Maxmuller pointed out that the style of writing of the Purusha Sukta (10.90.1-16) of the Rig Veda is completely modern in tune both in its character and in its diction. It uses technically philosophical terms and the concept of four Castes is enumerated for the first time in it. But it does not appear in the Rig Veda before the composition of the prayers of the hymns of the Purusha Sukta. Prof. Weber said that Purusha Sukta is the latest addition of the Rig Veda, which is clearly perceptible from its contents. Even the Sama Samhita has not adopted any verse from it. The Naigeya School has probably extracted the first five verses in the seventh prapathaka of the first Archika, which is really peculiar to it[10].

The absence of caste system during the Rig Vedic period can also be noted in the following words, which find mention in the Rig Veda:

2.2.1. Evidences from Rig Veda

"A bard am I, my dad's a leech, mammy lays corn upon the stones.
Striving for wealth, with varied plans, we follow our desires like kine. Flow, Indu, flow for Indra's sake."[11] (R.V.: Book IX. Hymn CXII. III)

"We all have various thoughts and plans and diverse are the ways of men.

The Brahman seeks the worshipper; wright seeks the cracked, and leeches the maimed. Flow, Indu, flow for Indra's sake."[12] (R.V.: Book IX. Hymn CXII. I)

2.2.2. Evidences from the Upanishads

On the basis of the Upanishads, it can be proved that caste system did not exist during this period. Any person could rise on the basis of his merits. His low birth was never an obstacle in the path of progress. The example of Satyakama Jabala from the Chhandogya Upanishad can be mentioned in this connection. Satyakama Jabala, the son of a slave woman went to Hari Drumat Gautama to seek knowledge in theology or Brahmavidya. Gautama enquired about his family. He replied frankly, "I do not know Sir, of what Gotra I belong to. In my youth when I had to move about much as servant, I conceived thee. I do not know to what family thou art, I am Jabala by name, and thou art Satyakama. I am therefore Satyakama Jabala Sir."[13] The Rishi was impressed by his frankness and accepted him as his disciple and the same person subsequently became a Rishi.

2.2.3. Evidences from the Mahabharata (Shanti Parva)

Various passages occur in Mahabharata, which clearly show that the ancient classification of people into four Varnas was not based on birth but on merits. The following conversations[14] between Bhrigu and Maharishi Bhardwaj regarding the creation of Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Sudra were held in the Shanti Parva of the Mahabharata may be mentioned to prove the notion that the so-called four Varnas were completely based on merit not on birth. Bhrigu asked Maharishi Bhardwaj as follows:

"What is that by which a man becomes Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Sudra? Tell me this, O Brahmarishi and foremost of speakers." Bhrigu replied in this manner, "That person is called a Brahman who has been consecrated by the 'Sanskara', beginning with Jata-Karma, who has fully studied the Vedas, who performs the six ceremonies, who observes all pious acts and who is devoted to truth. He is called a Brahman in whom are seen the truth, liberty, charity, abstention from injury to others, harmlessness, modesty, compassion, benevolence and austerity." "He is Kshatriya who does the duty of a protector and he studies Vedas, makes gifts and receives taxes from his people." "He, who keeps cattle, is devoted to agriculture and other means of

acquiring wealth, who is pure and has studied the Vedas, is called Vaishya." "That person is a Sudra who takes all kinds of food, does all kinds of work, does not study the Vedas and does not perform religious observances." These are the characteristics of a Sudra. A person who possesses them is a Sudra, while a Brahman who possesses them is no Brahman.

Therefore, another example from other sources of Mahabharata may be mentioned in this connection.

In Mahabharata, a reference occurs as follows

"Neither the family nor the birth, but actions alone make a man Brahman. Even if a Chandala possesses a good character, he is Brahman, O, Yudhisthira."[15]

In Shankaraniti, again a reference occurs as follows

"No person is a Brahman, Kshatriya or Sudra by birth, this division is based on the merits and actions."[16]

2.2.4. Evidences from the Manu Smriti

"The Shudra attains the position of the Brahmana and the Brahmana sinks to the position of the Shudra; the same should be understood to be the case with the offspring of the Ksattriya or of the Vaishya."[17]

The superiority of Brahmana rests on knowledge, of Kshatriya on strength, of Vaishya on wealth and of Sudra alone on birth. If a twice born does not perform the duties of that class to which he belongs, he is degraded to the class of Sudras as is evident from the following verse:

"That twice born who neglecting the study of the Vedas devotes his energies otherwise, soon falls together with his family in his own life time into the state of Sudra"[18].

Therefore, it can be said that there are references to prove that a person belonging to low caste could be promoted to higher class as the following verse:

"A Sudra could be elevated to the status of a Brahman and a Brahman may be degraded to the status of a Sudra. Similarly, a man born of Kshatriya parents or Vaishya parents may be elevated or degraded according to his actions"[19].

Therefore, it can be conclusively proved on the basis of the above-mentioned evidences that the Caste System did not exist in ancient times. It was essentially the product of the later age.

However, Ambedkar critically examined the above noted evidences of different scholars and literatures to prove the notion that the Vedic society was completely based on class distinction, not on hereditary birth circle based on caste division. Therefore, the 'theory of three Varnas' was based on the concrete evidences from the Rig Veda and the two Brahmanas, viz., the Satapatha Brahmana and the Taittiriya Brahmana which in point of authority were co-equal with the Vedas. Both the Shruti and the Brahmanas mention it in a very precise and definite terms that there were only three Varnas and the Sudras did not form a separate as well as a distinct Varna. In fact, the Sudras were the only part of the Second Varna, i.e., the Kshatriya Varna. Therefore, Ambedkar's standpoint on the Varna system was an epoch making event. Most of the scholars do not accept the 'theory of four Varnas' of the Purusha Sukta because it was a later composition added to the original Rig Veda. In fact, the Purusha Sukta was probably an interpolation in the Rig Veda. Ambedkar pointed out after critical examinations of the 16th verses of the Purusha Sukta along with the different Vedas and Samhitas that the Atharva Veda is the only Veda, which includes more or less the exact verses of the Purusha Sukta of the Rig Veda. Purusha Sukta was not mentioned in the Atharva Veda, the Sama Veda and the Yajur Veda. Even in the 16th verse of the Atharva Veda and the Yajur Veda do not remain the same as the Purusha Sukta of the Rig Veda. But the content of the text of the 15th Verse of the different three Vedas are not same and identical which are common to the three Vedas. Therefore, it can be said that the subject matter of the texts of the Purusha Sukta are not same with the other three Vedas. The Sama Veda has taken only 5 Verses from the Purusha Sukta. The Vajasaneyi Samhita of the White Yajur Veda also includes it. But the most important fact is that the Purusha Sukta in the Vajasaneyi Samhita has 22 Verses. Three Samhitas in the Black Yajur Veda (theTaittiriya, the Katha and the Maitrayani) do not give any place to the Purusha Sukta. However, the most important fact is that the position of the

Purusha Sukta in the Rig Veda occurs in the miscellaneous part whereas it occurs in the supplementary part in the Atharva Veda. Ambedkar pointed out that the Purusha Sukta was added to the Rig Veda after the Taittiriya Samhita, the Katha Samhita and the Maitrayani Samhita of the Black Yajur Veda and its position in the miscellaneous and supplementary part made it clear that the Purusha Sukta was composed at a later stage. The chronological position of the Purusha Sukta did not maintain properly in the different Vedas and Samhitas, which highlighted that the Purusha Sukta was not an ancient hymn, as the Verses of it did not reproduce in its original form. Prof. Weber and others made it clear that the Purusha Sukta was a later interpolation. Therefore, the standpoint of Ambedkar regarding this matter was all right. He also noted that the two Verses, viz. , 11 and 12 which explain the origin of the four Varnas are in the form of question and answer whereas the other Verses describe it are in the narrative form. He said that the main motto of the author was perhaves to introduce a new matter. In fact, these two Verses are much later than even the Purusha Sukta is. According to some critics, the Purusha Sukta was a forgery by the Brahmins to establish their superiority in perpetuity. Ambedkar noted the instance of Donations of Constantine and Pseudo-Isidore Decretals in this context, which was well known forgeries in the history of the Papacy. Even the Brahmins of India were not free from forgeries. Max Muller noted that the Brahmins had changed the original word 'Agre' to make Rig Veda give support to the burning of widows. Not only that but also a whole Smriti was fabricated to support the case of a plaintiff in the time of the East India Company. Therefore, nothing surprising if the Brahmins forge either the 16^{th} Verses of the Purusha Sukta or at least the 11^{th} and 12^{th} Verses long after the fourth Varna had come into being, with a view to support the system of 'Chaturvarnya' the sanction of the Veda.

Table 1: Purusha Sukta[20]

Rig Veda	Sama Veda	Yajur Veda		Atharva Veda	Remark (if any)
16th Verses of the Purusha Sukta (included) in the Rig Veda	Only 5 Verses are taken from the Purusha Sukta in the Sama Veda	White Yajur Veda includes only 5 Verses in the Vajasaneyi Samhita but the Purusha Sukta in the Vajasaneyi Samhita has 22 Verses	Black Yajur Veda has three Samhitas (the Taittiriya, the Katha and the Maitrayani) but none gives any place to the Purusha Sukta.	Only the Atharva Veda contains a more or less exact reproduction of the Purusha Sukta of the Rig Veda.	1. The Purusha Sukta in the Rig Veda occurs in the miscellaneous part whereas it occurs in the supplementary part in the Atharva Veda. 2. The Verses nos. 11 and 12 of the Rig Vedic Purusha Sukta which explain the origin of the four Varnas are in the form of question and answer whereas the other Verses describe it are in the narrative form. 3. The Purusha Sukta was added to the Rig Veda after the Taittiriya Samhita, the Katha Samhita and the Maitrayani Samhita of the Black Yajur Veda. 4.The Rig Vedic Purusha Sukta was interpolated in the later Vedic period. 5.The Verses of the Purusha Sukta did not reproduce in its original form in another three Vedas. 6. But the content of the 15th Verse of the Rig Vedic Purusha Sukta are quite different from the another three Vedas. 7. The sequential order of the Verses of the Purusha Sukta did not maintain properly in the different three Vedas. 8. The Verses nos. 11 and 12 are much later than even the Purusha Sukta. 9. + sign mean that they are not identical.
1	3	1	-	1	
2	5	2	-	4	
3	6	3	-	3	
4	4	4		2	
5	7	5		9	
6	*	14		8	
7	*	9		14	
8	*	6		10	
9	*	7		11	
10	*	8		14	
11	*	10		12	
12	*	11		5	
13	*	12		6	
14	*	13		7	
15	*	15		15	
16	*	16 +		16+	
*	*	17		*	
*	*	18		*	
*	*	19		*	
*	*	20		*	
*	*	21		*	
*	*	22		*	

* Means that these Verses are not to be found. + Means that they are not identical.

2.3. The "Theory of Three Varnas" of the Rig Vedic period transformed into the "Theory of Four Varnas (Chaturvarna)" in the later Vedic period

In support of this view, the testimonial evidences from the Satapatha Brahmana and the Taittiriya Brahmana may be mentioned. Both these Brahmanas highlight the creation of three Varnas only and they do not discuss a little bit about the creation of the Sudras as a separate Varna. The Satapatha Brahmana very clearly describes the creation of the three Varnas as follows:

II. 4.11. "(Uttering), 'bhuh', prajapati generated this earth. (Uttering) 'bhuvah' he generated the air, and (Uttering) 'svah' he generated the sky. This universe is co-extensive with these worlds. (The fire) is placed with the whole. Saying 'bhuh', Prajapati generated the Brahman; saying 'bhuvah', he generated the Kshattra; (and saying) 'svah', he generated the Vis. The fire is placed with the whole. (Saying) 'bhuh', Prajapati generated himself; (saying) 'bhuvah', he generated offspring: saying 'svah', he generated animals. This world is so much as self, offspring, and animals. (The fire) is placed with the whole" [21]

In view of this fact, the references from the Taittiriya Brahmana may be mentioned as follows:

III.12. 9. 2. "This entire (universe) has been created by Brahma. Men say that the Vaishya class was produced from ric verses. They say that the Yajur Veda is the womb from which the Kshattriya was born. The Sama Veda is the source from which the Brahmins sprang. This word the ancients declared to the ancients."[22]

Ambedkar noted in this perspective that the 'theory of three Varnas' (Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya) of the Rig Vedic period transformed into the 'theory of four Varnas' (Chaturvarna) due to the constant conflict between the Sudra kings and the Brahmans in which the Brahmins were subjected to many tyrannies. As a result of it, they refused to invest the Sudras with the sacred thread due to their hatred towards them. The Sudras became socially degraded, fell below the rank of the Vaishya and came to form the forth Varna after losing the rights of the sacred thread. However, the

Sudras were a part of a Kshatriya Varna and they ranked as a Kshatriya Varna in the Indo-Aryan society. Inspite of it, the concept of Chaturvarna did not radically change as such the mode of the caste system of Manu. Inborn qualities and doctrine of karma (action) were the main pillars to the theory of Chaturvarna. Therefore, it can be pointed out that all these above noted verses of the Rig Veda vividly indicate the distinction between the Aryans on the one side and the Dasas and Dasyus on the other. But this distinction was not a racial distinction of colour or physiognomy. Naturally, a Dasa or Dasyu could become an Arya. But the Aryans did not tolerate it as because the Dasas and Dasyus could establish themselves as an Arya. So they urged God Indra to destroy them and Indra ultimately played a vital role to separate them from the Arya.

Ambedkar also noted the fact that being a European race; the Aryans must have had colour prejudice. So they refer the colour prejudice among the Indo-Aryans in the context of 'Chaturvarnya'. According to them, the term Varna means colour and on the basis of which racial classification is based on 'Chaturvarnya'. In fact, they do not take into consideration the possibility that the Aryan race in the physiological sense is quite different rather than an Aryan race in the philological sense. According to them, 'Chaturvarnya' is the out come of the innate colour prejudice of the Aryans. It is really illogical. If it is all right, a question may be raised that if colour is the origin of class distinction, there must be four different colours to account for the different classes which create 'Chaturvarnya'. Simultaneously none has categorized the four colours of 'Chaturvarnya' and who were the four coloured races who were welded together in 'Chaturvarnya'. But the Aryan race theory starts with only two opposing people, Aryas (white) and Dasas (dark). Yet the Brahmin scholars in India sponsored this theory. As they claim to be the representative of the Aryan race, and believed in the two-nation theory. They also tried to establish kingship with the European race and share their arrogance, colour prejudice and superiority. On the basis of which they liked it which made the Aryan, an invader and conqueror of the pre-Aryan native races. After comparing different ideologies regarding the 'theory of creation of Chaturvarna', Ambedkar noted that there are mainly two Vedas, such as, the Rig Veda and the Atharva Veda. The Sama Veda and the Yujar Veda are basically different forms of the Rig Veda. But the Atharva Veda was not recognized by the Brahmins as sacred as the Rig Veda for a long time. It was treated as vulgar. It seems to us that the Rig Veda and the Atharva Veda are the religious text of the two different races of Aryans. The

Atharva Veda was recognized after a long time on a par with the Rig Veda when the two different racial groups of Aryans had merged into one. Not only that but also there are a lot of evidences, scattered in the whole of the Brahmanic literatures regarding the existence of the two different ideologies specially relating to the 'theory of creation'. The first is sacerdotal in colour and character whereas the other is secular. One refers to a human being Manu as the progenitor whereas the other refers to God Brahma or Prajapati as the originator. One is historical in its drifts whereas the other is supernatural. One mentions about the deluge whereas the other is completely silent about it. The main motto of one is to explain the four Varnas whereas the other explains the origin of society only. Therefore, it can be highlighted that there were many fundamental differences between the two ideologies. The prime factor behind it is 'Chaturvarna'. 'Chaturvarna' is recognized by the sacerdotal ideology whereas the secular ideology does not. Inspite of it, an initiative is taken to mould the two ideologies into one by explaining as it is done in the Ramayana and the Puranas, how Manu's progeny developed into four Varnas. This attempt is very much calculated and deliberated and fails to merge these two ideologies into one. It seems to us that there are two explanations in the context of Chaturvarnas, viz., 1. Supernatural Chaturvarna created by Purusha. 2. Natural Chaturvarna as developed among Manu's sons. Therefore, it can be pointed out beyond doubt that these two ideologies are fundamentally different and irreconcilable. So it is a very much surprising and astonishing fact that the existence of these two fundamentally different ideologies which are recorded in the Brahmanic literature has not been noticed by scholars who have dealt with this subject. Yet their importance can not be ignored. After thorough examination of these Brahmanical literatures about the creation of Chaturvarna, it seems to us that these are the ideologies of two different Aryan races. One of these racial groups of Aryans profoundly believed in Chaturvarna but the other did not. Although these two racial groups of Aryans were, ultimately moulded into one. The most important evidence in support of this view comes from the anthropometrical survey of the Indian people. Sir Herbert Risley did this survey in 1901 based on cephalic index. Risley concluded that the people of India were of four different races, viz., Aryan, Dravidian, Mongolian and Scythian. Risley even defined the areas where they had settled. Dr. Guha tested his survey in 1936. Dr. Guha's report was an important document in the sphere of Indian anthropology on this subject. He prepared a map on which he identified the settled areas of the Indian people according to their

head measurements, which highlighted the racial composition of the Indian people. He asserted in the concluding note that the people of India are composed of two racial groups, viz., long-headed race (Mediterranean) who settled in the interior parts of India and short-headed race (Alpine) who settled in the out skirts/ adjacent areas of India. The evidences of skulls found in different parts of India supported the conclusive decision of Dr. Guha. He concisely pointed out that the evidences found in different areas regarding the human remains from pre-historic sites were extremely meager except the case of the Indus Valley Civilization. Yet it helped us nevertheless to visualize the broad outlines of the racial history of India in these times. Probably a long-headed race with a narrow prominent nose lived in the Northwestern India from the beginning of the fourth Millennium B.C. At the same time we find the existence of another very powerfully build race. The composition of their head was long with lower cranial vault, and equally long-faced and narrow nose. However, the latter was not so high pitched as that of the former. He also said that a third type of people lived in India. Their head form was broad and apparently, Armenoid affinities existed. But their advent occurred probably somewhat later judged by the age of the site as Harappa from which most of this latter type of skulls came.[23]

Table 2: Creation of the theory of Chaturvarnya[24]

SL. No.	Name of the Brahmanical Texts	Points of relevant Verses for evidence from Rig Veda and others	Content	Different Content
1	Rig Veda	Purusha Sukta : 10.90.1-16	Creation of Chaturvarnya: Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra	-
2	,,	10.72.1-9	-	Being was born of non-being
3	,,	i.96.2	-	Creation of men only and not their class
4	Apastamba Dharma Sutra	Prasna-1,Patala-1, Khanda-1, Sutra 4-6	Supported Chaturvarnya	-
5	Vasishtha Dharma Sutra	Chapter-II, verses.1-4	,,	-
6	Vajasaneyi Samhita of the Sukla Yajur Veda	Same verses as Purusha Sukta, extra -6	First explanation of the Verses:1-16 more or less same as Purusha Sukta	But the second explanation is quite different from the Purusha Sukta regarding creation
7	Atharva Veda	IV.6.1; XV. 8.1, 9.1	,,	Creation of Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaisha only
8	Taittiriya Samhita of the Krishna Yajur Veda	IV.3.10	Same as the Vajasaneyi Samhita(XIV.28)	-
9	Satapatha Brahmana	Xiv.4.2.1; I. 2.6.7; II. 2.3.9; I.8.1.1; vi.1.2.11, vii. 5.2.6; x.1.3.1,	-	Completely different content regarding the theory of creation
10	T .S.	Vi. 5.6.1	-	Different Content
11	T .B.	ii. 2.9.1; 3.8.1	-	Completely different content regarding the theory of creation
12	T .B.	iii.2.3.9	-	Sudra sprung from non-existence
13	T .A.	i.12.3.1		Different Content
14	Manu Smriti	Chapter–I, Verse-31, Chapter-II,Verse-6, Chapter-X, Verse-4	Manu invested first the social ideal of Chaturvarnya with a degree of divinity and infallibility which it did not have before	-
15	Mahabharata	Banaparva, Adi parva	-	Different Content but Manu shall create all living beings
16	Ramayana	Second Kanda	-	Manu, son of Vivasvat was the Lord of creatures (Prajapati)
17	Ramayana	Third Kanda	Manu (wife) of Kasyapa produced men, Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaisha and Sudra	-
18	Puranas	Bishnu Purana	Saunaka originated the system of four caste	-

2.4. The Controversy regarding the "Aryan Race Theory"

There is a lot of controversy among the scholars regarding the terms Aryan, Race and Aryan Race in the context of the Vedic literatures. Some Western scholars and Brahmanical writers said that the term 'Aryan' has been used in to denote a race. They mentioned that the ancient Iranians also used this term in the similar way. However, the term 'Aryan' actually did not denote a race in India at all. Although in an inscription of the Persian Emperor Darius, 486 B. C. he claimed himself to be 'an Aryan of Aryan descent'. But the modern scholars like Sir William Jones and Maxmuller pointed out that the term 'Aryan' or 'Arya' is a purely linguistic conception applied to an Indo-European language from which springs Sanskrit, Persian, and Celtic, German, Greek, Latin and Gothic languages. (Iran in the ancient East, 1941, p. 190) In 1786, Sir William Jones pointed out in his famous address to the 'Asiatic Society of Bengal' that 'the similarities among the languages like Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Roman etc. can be accounted by the fact that they originated from some parent language called the Indo-European'. In fact, the languages belonging to Indo-European family are found in an area extending from the Gangetic valley of India to the Atlantic basin in Europe. However, Maxmuller strongly supported the above noted theory and pointed out that Aryan was a linguistic term and the word did not denote a particular race at all. However, the principal motto of the 'Aryan race theory' is to establish the proposition that there lived a people in India who were Aryans by race. Therefore, we must have to know the real meaning of the term 'race'. Otherwise, there is a great possibility to mistake a people for a race. The best instance of this fact is the Jews. Most of the people believe that the Jews are a race. Apparently, it seems to be correct. But after identifying some aspects of the Jews, some scholars have strongly pointed out that the Jews are not a race at all except that they are merely a people. Prof. W.E. Ripley noted in the same version regarding the origin of the Jews. According to him, the Jews are only a people and not a race at all. This is reflected in the structural formation of their faces. From other traits, we confirm that they possess certain characteristics, which pass from one generation to another that is called the inheritance of a race. Therefore, it is a very important task to define a race. Some scholars have pointed out that a race may be defined as a body of people possessing certain typical traits, which are hereditary. However, the unanimously accepted decision of the anthropologists in determining

the race of an individual is based upon the head-forms and they developed it into an exact science, which is called anthropometry. It has two devices for measuring the head-forms, viz. Cephalic index and Facial index. Prof. W.E. Ripley, an authority on the question of race has concluded on the basis of the above noted two devices of measuring head-form and noted that the European people belong to three different races such as, Teutonic, Alpine (Celtic) and Mediterranean. He noted also in details in the book 'The Races of Europe', (p.121) regarding the head, face, hair, eyes, stature and nose of these three different races of Europe. That is why, it can not be denied that without the scientific knowledge of anthropometry, no body can define the term 'race' as it always crop up in literature dealing with the question of race.

Therefore, we have to justify the notion in the physical sense of the term about the Rig Vedic Aryans in the perspective of race. Therefore, a question may be raised; 'Was there an Aryan race in the physical sense of the term in the Rig Vedic age?' There are two views on this issue. Some scholars pointed out that such characteristics viz. a long head, a leptorrhine nose, a long symmetrically narrow face and a high facial angle, identified the Aryan type. The physical stature of the Aryan was fairly high and their figure was generally well proportioned. Max Muller relied on Panini (iii.1.103) for this perspective and pointed out that the term Aryan was used in the following three different senses[25]. He clearly expressed his views in the lectures of the 'Science of Language' on this issue as follows:

'In ar or ara, I recognise one of the oldest names of the earth, as the ploughed land, lost in Sanskrit but preserved in Greek as (era) so that Arya would have conveyed originally the meaning of landholder, cultivator of the land, while Vaishya from Vis meant householder, Ida, the daughter of Manu, is another name of the cultivated earth and Ida was probably a modification of Ara'.

The second sense of the term was ploughing or tilling the land. Not only that but also the etymological signification of the term 'Arya' seemed to be one who plough or till the land. The Aryans choose this name for themselves due to oppose the nomadic races; the Turanians whose original name Tura implied the swiftness of the equestrians.

The third sense of the term was used as a general name for the Vaishya who formed the whole mass of the people.

Apart from these, there was a fourth sense of the term, i.e. noble origin. It got importance in the later period. He strongly asserted that there is no Aryan race in blood. The term Aryan is inapplicable to any race under any circumstances in the context of scientific language.

According to him, Aryan means only language and nothing else. Max Muller repeatedly said that the term Aryan means neither blood, nor bones, nor hair, nor skull. It simply means those who speak an Aryan language. The same applies to Hindus, Greek, Romans, Germans, Celts and Slaves. When he speaks of them, there is no sense of anatomical characteristics at all. If the languages come of a common ancestral speech, there must have been existed a race whose mother tongue it was and since the mother tongue was known as the Aryan tongue, the race who spoke it was the Aryan race. But the existence of a separate and a distinct Aryan race is thus an inference only. It highlights the fact that the Indo-Germanic people are the purest of the modern representatives of the original Aryan race. To establish this assumption, the theory of Aryan invasion is an inevitable invention. Otherwise, it cannot be proved that the Aryans must have come to India from somewhere in Europe or outside India. Besides, it is noted that the Aryans are a European race and the European race is superior to the Asiatic races.

These two views are opposite to each other. Prof. Ripley vividly stated that the Aryan race existed in a physiological sense with typical hereditary traits and features with a fixed Cephalic and Facial index whereas Max Muller noted that the Aryan race existed in a philological sense as a people speaking a common language.

However, Ambedkar made an extensive research and thorough investigation of the Vedic literatures to draw a definite conclusion on this issue and pointed out that there are two terms in the Rig Veda. One was 'Arya' with a short 'a' and the other was 'Arya' with a long 'a'. The word 'Arya' with a short 'a' was mentioned in the Rig Veda in 88 places. He noted that this term was used in four different senses such as enemy, respectable person, name for India and owner, Vaishya or citizen. Not only

that but also the term 'Arya' with a long 'a' was used in the Rig Veda in 31 places. Therefore, it cannot be denied that the words 'Arya' with a short 'a' and a long 'a' which occurred in the Vedas had not been used in the racial sense[26] at all.

According to Prof. Ripley, there are two races, which are long headed among the European racial types. However, none could draw an indisputable conclusion on the fact that who are the Aryans between these two racial types. Some scholars have described the Aryan race as long-headed. However, there is not a single particle of evidence of anthropometry. Therefore, all the conclusions drawn by the scholars of different groups without any definite evidences in the context of Aryan race are subject to doubt.

Apart from these, there is a lot of controversy on the issue of the original homeland of the Aryans whether it is situated in India or outside India. There are two opposite views on this issue. The Western scholars and the Orthodox writers of India believe that the original homeland of the Aryans is situated outside India whereas some reputed scholars pointed out that India is the original homeland of the Aryans. However, this controversy is still now going on. None can draw a definite conclusion on this issue until today due to the lack of solid evidences. Inspite of this lacuna, we should consider the theories of different out looks on this issue. Some scholars pointed out that India was the original homeland of the Aryans. According to them, there are seven languages belonging to Indo-Aryan group. Out of these seven sister languages, only Sanskrit and Persian exist outside Europe. The remaining five languages like Greek, Latin, German, Gothic and Celtic are European. Since the majority of the Indo-European languages are European, the original homeland of the Aryans was in Europe. M. M. Ganganath Jha, D. S. Triveda, L. D. Kalla, A. C. Das, Pargiter, Ambedkar etc. are the outstanding scholars who strongly advocate the theory of the Aryan homeland in India. M. M. Ganganath Jha has noted that Aryans originally lived in Brahmarshi Desa situated in the confluence of the Ganges and the Yamuna. D. S. Triveda claims that Multan was the original homeland of the Aryans. L. D. Kalla has advocated the theory that Kashmir and the Himalayan region was the original place of living of the Aryans. A. C. Das has put the claim of Punjab. They have put forward the following arguments in support of their theory.

are definite literary evidences in the Vedas that the Aryans regarded the Sapta-
.u (Punjab) as their original home. There is not a single definite evidence to
e the notion that the Vedic Aryans came to India from outside. It is already
ved that Sanskrit contains the largest number of original Indo-European vocables
nore than any other European language. Naturally, it proves that India was the original homeland of the Aryans. The strange absence of the Aryan literatures in other countries proves the notion that India was the original homeland of the Vedic Aryans. The sacrificial rituals of the Vedic Aryans highlight to their Indian origin. The geographical data found in the Rig Veda exactly fit in with the geographical phenomenon of Punjab and the neighboring regions. The River hymns in the Rig Veda mention the names of the rivers of the region. The flora and fauna mentioned, the willow, the birch trees abound in the Himalayan region. But the objection against this proposition regarding the animals like tiger and elephant has been turned down by the competent Vedic scholars. They have noted the Sloka of the Rig Veda (6.54.7) where tiger has been mentioned. Not only that but also the Slokas (4.4.1, 8.45.5) of the Rig Veda where elephant has been mentioned. Some scholars have pointed out that India is the original home of the people who are called Aryans. It is further noted that the Vedic Aryans were distinct from the Indo-Europeans and Aryans of Asia. Not only that but also the similarity of language is superficial one and should not be taken too far. It may be noted in this context that the Lithuanian language is most archaic and nearest to the parent Indo-European language but the Lithuanians lived in an isolated way without much external contact.

But there is a lot of controversy regarding the original homeland of the Vedic Aryan Race. But it is noted in the Rig Veda that there are two races, i.e. Aryans and Dasyus (Pre-Aryans) and many aboriginal tribes perform worship of God Indra and undertake Arya religion by subduing and educating (Book 8.Hymn L1.IX). In fact, it was generally said that with the invasion of the Aryans in India, different aspects of socio-economic, political, cultural and religious faiths and beliefs of the pre-Aryans had been drastically changed. They had possibly arrived in India around 2000 B.C. to 1500 B.C. After defeating and subjugating the aboriginal Indian peoples in different phases, they occupied India and consolidated their power and position in perpetuity. The Western scholars and the Brahmanic writers have mainly expressed such views. The Orthodox scholars always supported the Aryan race theory of the Western writers

as it has upheld their dignity, status and superiority. That is why; we have to examine the following propositions on which the pillars of the Aryan race theory were built up. The Western scholars and the Orthodox Brahmanas highlighted the Aryan race theory in their own way. According to them, the Aryan race once invaded India and conquered the pre-Aryans (natives) i.e., the Dasas and Dasyus. They came from outside India. They were a white race. But the Dasas and Dasyus were a dark race who was racially different from the Aryans. They were ultimately enslaved by the Aryans and termed as Sudras. Even the people of Aryan race created the Vedic literatures. In fact, the Aryans cherished colour prejudice and created the institution of Chaturvarnya whereby they separated the white race from the black race such as the Dasas and Dasyus. It was noted that the Mediterranean race spoke to the Aryan language and its home land was Europe around the Mediterranean basin from where they migrated to India before the entry of the Alpine race. But Prof. Ripley, in the book, 'The Races of Europe' (pp. 473-74) clearly mentioned that the home land of the Alpine race was Asia, somewhere in the Himalayas. He said that the roots of the Alpine race ran Eastward and those of the Mediterranean type towards the South. However, there raised a great deal of controversy regarding the introduction of the Aryan language in Europe, whether it was introduced by the Nordics (the purest of the Indo-Germans) or the Alpines. In view of this fact, it can be said that the language of the Alpine race was Aryan. So it would be better to call the Aryan race in the philological sense. Naturally, there arises a direct conflict between the Western theory and the testimonial evidences of the Rig Veda. In view of this fact, the following Verses[27] from the Rig Veda may be considered:

"Rig Veda, vi.22.10, "Oh, Vajri, thou hast made Aryas of Dasas, good men out of bad by your power. Give us the same power so that with it we may overcome our enemies."

Rig Veda, X.49.3, (says Indra). – "I have deprived the Dasyus of the title of Aryas."
Rig Veda, i.151.8 – "Oh, Indra, find out who is an Arya and who is a Dasyu and separate them."

Therefore, it can be noted from the foregoing discussions that there were two Aryan races in India and not one at all. There is a solid foundation in anthropometry and

history in support of the Rig Veda relating to this conclusion. Therefore, some scholars pointed out that the Western Aryan race theory must be discarded as it contradicts with the testimony of the Rig Veda. Besides, the Rig Veda itself is the best testimonial evidence in this context. But none is able to ensure us which of the two Aryan races first came to India. If they belonged to the Alpine race at all then they belonged somewhere near the Himalayas. Therefore, there is not a single particle of evidence for the theory of invasion from outside India. But the Western writers asserted that the Aryans conquered the native tribes if it is propagated that the Dasas and Dasyus were racially different from the Aryans. Yet it can not be denied that the theory of conquest must take into consideration not only of a possible conquest of Dasas and Dasyus by Aryans but also of a possible conquest of Aryans by Aryans. Naturally a question may be raised which of the two Aryans conquered the Dasas and Dasyus if they did at all. Therefore, it can be said that the Western theory is the outcome of a hurried conclusion drawn from insufficient examination of facts whatsoever they tallied with certain pre-conceived notions about the mentality of the ancient Aryans.

Ambedkar vehemently opposed the 'Aryan Race Theory' of the Western scholars and Brahmanic writers. His arguments based on the evidences of the Rig Veda and the logical points expressed by the noted scholars in different fields. He noted very clearly that there is not a single particle of evidence in the Rig Veda (X.75.5) in connection with the Aryan invasion in India from out side. He strongly supported the line of thinking of Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar, Prof. D.S. Triveda etc. According to Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar, the terms Arya, Dasa and Dsayu as mentioned in the Mantras did not refer to race but to cult. These terms are mentioned mostly in the Rig Vedic Samhita in the sense of cult. However, the term Arya occurred about 33 times in the Mantras of the Rig Vedic Samhita, which contained 153972 words on the whole. The rare occurrence of the term 'Arya' itself a concrete evidence that the tribes that called themselves Aryas were not invaders that conquered the country and exterminated the native people. For an invading tribe would naturally boast of its achievements constantly (life in ancient India in the age of the Mantras, pp. 11-12). Apart from this, it can be pointed out on the basis of the testimony of the Vedic literature that the Western and Brahmanical theory regarding the Aryan original homeland out side India was completely discouraging and disappointing. The

reference of the 'Seven Rivers' in the Rig Veda (X.75.5) is very important in this regard. Prof. D.S. Triveda categorically insisted upon the fact that the rivers were addressed as "my Ganges, my Yamuna, my Saraswati"[28] and so on. That is why, it can be said on the basis of the use of these familiar and endearing terms that no foreigner would ever address a river in such a manner unless by long association he had developed an emotion about it.

It would be noted that there are many hymns in the Rig Veda, which narrate about the Vedic Rishis' who have urged their Gods to kill and annihilate the Dasas and Dasyus. However, the Dasas and Dasyus are referred as enemies of the Aryans in the Rig Veda. That is why; Ambedkar pointed out that the upholder of the Aryan invasion theory in India must have to take the above mentioned points of the Rig Veda into consideration before drawing any indisputable conclusion regarding their conquest and subjugation of the Indian natives. Therefore, it can be pointed out that these Verses of the Rig Veda vividly indicate the distinction between the Aryans on the one side and the Dasas and Dasyus on the other. But this distinction was not a racial distinction of colour or physiognomy as a Dasa or Dasyu could become an Arya. But the Aryans did not tolerate it as because the Dasas and Dasyus could establish themselves as an Arya. So they urged God Indra to destroy them and Indra ultimately played a vital role to separate them from the Arya. So they have tried to establish the theory of the Aryan invasion to India and the conquest by them of the Dasas and Dasyus. It is also told that the European races were white and had a colour prejudice against the dark races. Being a European race, the Aryans must have had colour prejudice. So they refer the colour prejudice among the Indo-Aryans in the context of Chaturvarnya. According to them, the term Varna means colour and on the basis of which racial classification is based on Chaturvarnya. In fact, they do not take into consideration the possibility that the Aryan race in the physiological sense is quite different rather than an Aryan race in the philological sense. According to them, Chaturvarnya is the out come of the innate colour prejudice of the Aryans. It is really illogical. If it is all right, a question may be raised that if colour is the origin of class distinction, there must be four different colours to account for the different classes which create Chaturvarnya. Simultaneously none has categorized the four colours of 'Chaturvarnya' and who were the four coloured races who were welded together in 'Chaturvarnya'. But the Aryan race theory of them starts with only two opposing

people, Aryas (white) and Dasas (dark). Yet the Brahmin scholars in India sponsor this theory. As they claim to be the representative of the Aryan race, and believe in the two-nation theory. They also try to establish kingship with the European race and share their arrogance, colour prejudice and superiority. On the basis of which they like it which makes the Aryan, an invader and conqueror of the pre-Aryan native races. That is why; the following points may be considered before drawing any decision.

There is not a single particle of evidence straightway in the Rig Veda on wars between the Aryans and the Dasas or Dasyus. But we get a lot of description about the Aryan opposition in different 33 places in the Rig Veda in relation to the Dasas and Dasyus. The opposition occurred between the Aryans and the Dasas only in 8 places in the Rig Veda whereas the same type of opposition between the Aryans and the Dasyus is mentioned in different 7 places in the Rig Veda. Therefore, it can be pointed out that this may show the sporadic riots between the two at that time. Even there are many references of conflict in the Rig Veda between the Dasas and Aryans. In fact, they have ultimately arrived at a mutual understanding and settlement in relation to the principle of peaceful negotiation with honour. Both the Aryans and the Dasas unitedly play a vital role against their common enemy, which is clearly mentioned in the Rig Veda. The following verses from the Rig Veda may be mentioned for drawing a better conclusion.

Table 3: Rig Veda.

Mandal	Hymn	Rick	Content
VI	33	3	Dasas and Aryans stood as one united people against their common enemy
VI	83	1	"
VIII	51	9	"
X	102	3	"

Apart from these, the conflict between the two is not the conflict of race. It happened due to difference in their religion and it is not racial at all. There are a lot of references in the Rig Veda regarding the term Dasyus in this context. The following Verses from the Rig Veda may be mentioned in this connection. The term Dasyu is referred in the Rig Veda in different aspects and indicates the following different meanings that already mentioned.

Table 4: Dasyus in the Rig Veda

SL No.	Various terms to indicate Dasyus in the Rig Veda	Different meanings of the terms	Mandal	Hymn	Rick
1	Avrata	Without the Aryanrites	I	51	8, 9
2	,,	,,	I	132	4
3	,,	,,	IV	41	2
4	,,	,,	VI	14	3
5	Apavrata	Different rites	V	42	2
6	Anyavrata	Different rites	VIII	59	11
7	,,	,,	X	22	8
8	Anagnitra	Fireless	V	189	3
9	Ayajyu	Non-sacrifices	I	131	44
10	Ayajvan	,,	I	33	4
11	,,	,,	VIII	59	11
12	Abrambha	Without prayers or also not having Brahmana Priest	IV	15	9
13	,,	,,	X	105	8
14	Anrichah	Without Ricks	X	105	8
15	Brahmadvisha	Haters of prayer or Brahmans	V	42	9
16	Anindra	Without Indra,despisers of Indra	I	133	1
17	,,	,,	V	2	3
18	,,	,,	VII	18	6
19	,,	,,	X	27	6
20	,,	,,	X	48	7

From the foregoing discussions it can be pointed out that, the Dasyus enjoyed different rites without a Brahmin priest. They hated the Brahmans and disliked the worship of God Indra. Besides, their manners were not sober. Even they did not provide gifts to the Brahmanas (R.V., V.7.10). Apart from this, the Rig Veda (X.22.8) provides us a lot of information regarding the status and position of the Aryans in relation to their attitude towards the Dasyus and Dasas. They prayed to God Indra and always urged for their own benefit. They called God Indra and said that they lived in the midst of the Dasyu tribes who did not perform sacrifices and nor believe in anything. They had their own rites, manners and customs. Not only that but also they were not entitled to be called men. Thus, they prayed to God Indra, destroyer of enemies, to annihilate them and injure the Dasas. That is why, it can be obviously pointed out after considering the above-mentioned references from the Rig Veda that the theory of a military conquest by the Aryan race against the pre-Aryan races of Dasas and Dasyus cannot be accepted. Apart from these, there is a great deal of controversy among the scholars about the fact that in what sense the terms Dasa and Dasyus are used in the Rig Veda. We have to trace out the real meaning of these terms in the context of the Rig Veda. Some scholars believe that these words are used

in the Rig Veda in the sphere of racial perspective. Their argument rely upon two things; firstly, the words 'Mridhravak' and 'Anasa' which are used as epithets of Dasyus in the Rig Veda and secondly, the clear cut description about the Dasas as being of Krishna Varna is vividly mentioned in the Rig Veda. However, it would be noted that the word 'Mridhravak' is mentioned only in four different places in the Rig Veda as follow:

Table 5: Mridhravak- Epithets of Dasyus in the Rig Veda.

Rig Veda			
Epithetsof Dasyus	**Verses**		
Mridhravak	**Mandal**	**Hymn**	**Rick**
„	I	174	2
„	V	32	8
„	VI	6	3
„	VII	18	3

Therefore, it can be said that the term 'Mridhravak' is used as an adjective in the Rig Veda. It means one who speaks crude and unpolished language. So it would be baseless to rely upon this as a basis of consciousness of race difference. That is why; it cannot be treated as an undisputed evidence of race difference. However, the term 'Anasa' is mentioned in the Rig Veda (V.29.10). According to Max Muller, 'Anasa' means 'one without nose, or 'one with a flat nose'. In view of this fact, it seems to him that the Aryans were a separate race from the Dasyus. Max Muller utters this term 'Anasa' as 'a-nasa'. In view of this fact, Sanyanacharya said that the term 'Anasa' means 'mouthless', i.e., devoid of good speech. He reads the term 'Anasa' as 'an-asa'. Therefore, it can be said that the word 'Anasa' has a definite meaning itself. But it is difficult to support straightway the views and meanings of the word 'Anasa' given by both the scholars as because there is no other place where the Dasyus are described as noseless. It is better to read this term 'Anasa' as a synonym of 'Mridhravak'. Apart from this, there is not a single particle of evidence to prove the assertion that the Dasyus belonged to a different race. Besides, the term Dasas are described as 'Krishna Yoni' only in one place in the Rig Veda (VI.47.21). So there is no possibility to accept the views that the Dasas are narrated as 'Krishna Yoni' in the sense of a dark race until the clarification of this phrase is possible whether it is used in the liberal sense or in a figurative sense or a settlement of fact or a word of abuse.

2.5. Ambedkar's "Sudra-Aryan Theory"

According to Ambedkar, the Sudra was one of the Aryan communities of the solar race. They ranked as the Kshatriya Varna in the Indo-Aryan society. They were not a separate Varna but a part of the Kshatriya Varna. The Aryan society recognized only three Varnas, Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya. There was a continuous conflict between the Sudra kings and the Brahmanas, in which the Brahmins were subjected to many tyrannies and indignities. The Brahmins refused to invest the Sudras with the sacred thread due to their hatred towards them. The Sudras became socially degraded, fell below the rank of the Vaishya and came to form the forth Varna after losing the rights of the sacred thread. Ambedkar formulated the theory regarding the origin of the Sudras that they were Aryans and they belonged to the Kshtriya class. They were a very much powerful class. Even the most powerful and renowned kings of the ancient Aryan communities were Sudras. His hypothesis was primarily based on the Verses 38-40 of Chapter 60 of the Shanti Parvan of the Mahabharata as follows:

"It has been heard by us that in the days of old a Shudra of the name of Paijavana gave a Dakshina (in his own sacrifice) consisting of a hundred thousand Purnapatras according to the ordinance called Aindragni."[29]

In fact, the above mentioned Verses of the Mahabharata (The Verses quoted above was taken from Mr. Roy's edition of the Mahabharata who emphasized the accuracy and authenticity of his text as it was substantially based on the publication of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.) highlighted three important factors such as, Paijavana was a Sudra, this Sudra Paijavana performed sacrifices and the Brahmins performed sacrifices for this Sudra Paijavana and received dakshina from him. Apart from these, he also noted 18 manuscripts, which procured from different parts of India that were carefully collated by the Burdwan Pandits before they admitted a single sloke as genuine (It was quoted from Sukthankar Memorial Edition, Vol. I, pp.43, 44, 131, 14) and mentioned in it. Ambedkar gave a vivid description regarding the collation of the text of Sloke 38 of the 60th Chapter of the Shanti Parvan of the Mahabharata from different manuscripts. He got an opportunity to use the collation sheet for cross verification of that authenticity from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute and noted the facts of this 'Sudra Paijavana' in the following manner:

Table 6: Variation of 'Sudra Paijavana'[30] in Different Manuscripts

Sl. No	Variation in the Name of Paijavana	Index No
1	Shudrah Paijavana nama	(K) S
2	Shudrah Pailavano nama	(M/1:M/2) S
3	Shudrah Yailanano nama	(M/3:M/4) S
4	Shudrah Yaijanano nama	F
5	Shudrah Yajane nama	L
6	Shudrah Paunjalka nama	(TC) S
7	Shuddho Vaibhavano nama	(G) N
8	Pura Vaijavano nama	(A,D/2)
9	Pura Vaijanano nama	(M) N

[N.B.: N or S indicates that the manuscripts collected from the North or South India. K is Kumabhakonam.]

After expertise scrutiny of these manuscripts, Ambedkar highlighted different variations regarding the description of Paijavana. Even he noted different variations in the name of Paijavana. Among these nine manuscripts, six had described Paijavana as a Sudra. One noted Paijavana as Shuddho and another two mentioned the time when he lived and use the term Pura. There was no similarity between any two among these manuscripts regarding names. Each highlighted a different reading. Ambedkar clearly mentioned the fact that the real text was Paijavana and this assumption was supported by both the recessions of Northern and Southern India. He also pointed out that the term Vaijavana in no. 8 was the same as Paijavana. But the scholars perhaps failed to understand the true content of it and failed to read the original copy correctly due to the variations of the term. In fact, the instance of Paijavana story was nothing but a mere illustration in connection with the issue of Sudra. The repetition of the term Sudra before Paijavana was unnecessary because the term Paijavana had occurred in ancient times. Therefore, the scholars were probably aware of this fact. They naturally felt no necessity for describing Paijavana as Sudra since it was made clear from this context. However, the change from Sudra to Pura was not accidental except deliberatation. Yet it is very much difficult to say it categorically. Inspite of this, the decision and its conclusion regarding the Sudra Paijavana would not be changed at all. The authentic information can be obtained from the Yaska's Nirukta ii.24 in connection with the identification of Paijavana. According to its version, Paijavana[31] was the son of Pijavana and Sudas, a Sudra, was the son of Paijavana (Lakshman Sarup, The Nighantu and Nirukta, pp.35-36). It can be noted on the basis of this Yaska that the Paijavana mentioned in the Verses of the Shanti Parvan of the Mahabharata was simply the other Sudas. There are three persons in the name of

Sudas in the Brahmanic literature. But the Rig Veda refers the name of one Sudas among them. His family details are noted clearly in different Verses of the Rig Veda such as R.V., vii.21-25 (Wilson's Rig Veda, vol.iv, Poona reprint, p.146). But the Bishnu Purana refers the name of the other two Sudas in chapter IV and xix as the descendant of Sagara and as a descendant of Puru respectively (Wilson's Vishnu Purana, pp.377, 380, 447-456).

Table 7: Evidence of Three Sudas[32] One in the Rig Veda & Two in the Vishnu Puranas

Status of Sudas in the Rig Veda			Sudas in the Vishnu Purana	
VII,18: 22	VII,18: 23	VII,18:25	In the Sagar Family	In the Puru Family
Devavata Pijavana Sudas	Pijavana Sudas	Divodasa = Pijavana Sudas	Rituparna Sarvakama Sudas Saudasa= Mitrasaha	Bahvashva Divodasa Mitrayu Chyavana Sudas Saudasa Somaka

The above ancestry list of the three Sudas makes it clear that the Rig Vedic Sudas was a quite different person from the other two Sudas of the Vishnu Puranas. The Paijavana of the Mahabharata can be identified with anyone that lived in ancient times. The Rig Vedic Sudas can only be identified with the Paijavana of the Mahabharata because he was the son of the Pijavana, which was another name of Divodasa. Wilson's text in 25 is probably more accurate and correct in the context of Pijavana, Divodasa, Paijavana and Sudas. According to its version, Pijavana was really another name of Divodasa whereas Paijavana would be another name of Sudas. Prof. Weber's opinion based on the Verses 38-40 of Chapter 60 of the Shanti Parvan of the Mahabharata as follows:

"Here the remarkable tradition is recorded that Paijavana, i.e., Sudas who was so famous for his sacrifices and who is celebrated in the Rig Veda as the patron of Vishvamitra and enemy of Vasishtha, was a Sudra."[33] He drew a conclusion on this fact that Paijavana of the Mahabharata was none other than Sudas of the Rig Veda. According to Muir, Sudas was neither a Dasa nor an Arya; both of them were really the enemies of Sudas. In fact, Sudas was a Vedic Aryan. Divodasa was the father of Sudas. He was probably the adopted son of Vadhryashva. Divodasa was a king. He fought several battles against Turvasas, Yudus (R.V., vi.61.1; vii.19.8), Shambara

(R.V., i.130.7), Karanja (R.V., i.53.10) and Gangu (R.V., x.48). But the name of the mother of Sudas was unknown. Sudevi was the name of his wife (R.V., i.112.19). It is generally said that the Ashvins procured her for Sudas. Sudas, the son of Pijavana, became a king and the coronation ceremony of him was performed by the Brahma-rishi, Vasistha. After this auspicious ceremony, he went out to conquer the whole earth and sacrificed the sacrificial horse. He ultimately became a renowned hero and played a vital role in the battle of the ten kings which was vividly described in the various Suktas of the Seven Mandala of the Rig Veda (Sukta 83 -4,6,7,9; 33(2-3),19(3-6), 18(5-20). Therefore, it can be said that the term Sudas occurred in different 27 places in the Rig Veda and highlighted that the Vedic people respected Sudas. So the battle of the ten kings was a great event in the history of the Indo-Aryans. But the exact causes of the war were unknown. Although the Rig Veda, vii.83.7 clearly noted that the kings arrayed and united against Sudas. As per tradition, Sayanacharya identified some hymns of the Rig Veda, which were composed by the kings for the Rishis. He mentioned the name of Sudas as a composer of Vedic hymns in the following manner:

"Vitahavya (or Bharadvaja) x.9, Sindhudvipa, son of Ambarisha (or Trisiras, son of Tvashtri) x.75, Sindhukshit, son of Priyamedha; x.133, Sudas, son of Pijavana; x.134, Mandhatri, son of Yuvanasa; x.179, Sibi, son of Usinara, Pratardana, son of Divodasa and king of Kasi, and Vasumanas, son of Rohidasva; and x.148 is declared to have had Prithi Vainya."[34] Even the Rig Veda, iii.53 noted the fact that Sudas performed Ashvamedha Yajna and became very famous for charity to the Brahmins. They entitled him as a great philanthropist and praised him. The following evidences from the Rig Veda may be mentioned in this connection:

Table 8: Evidences from the Rig Veda regarding Sudas

Sl. No.	Mandal	Hymn	Rick
1.	i	47	6
2.	i	63	7
3.	i	112	19
4.	vii	19	3
5.	vii	20	2
6.	vii	25	3
7.	vii	32	10
8.	vii	53	3
9.	vii	60	8

Therefore, Ambedkar had already mentioned the biographical bits regarding Paijavana in the Shanti Parvan of the Mahabharata after obtaining the solid evidences from the Rig Veda. According to the texts of the Rig Veda, his real name was Sudas. He was a very powerful Kshatriya king. Even the Mahabharata highlights a new dimension regarding this hero that he was a Sudra. Naturally; all that a Sudra might be an Aryan, a Kshatriya or a king, generally know it. That is why; this peculiar reality is very much astonishing and surprising. This was possible at that time. Ambedkar critically examined the Rig Veda and mentioned the name of several tribes such as, Tritsus, Bharatas, Turvasas, Durhyus, Yadus, Purus and Anus. He also pointed out that Sudas connected only with three tribes' viz., Purus, Tritsus and the Bharatas as per the versions of the Rig Veda.

Table 9: Relation of the Rig Vedic Tribes of Purus, Tritsus, Bharatas and Sudas.

Sl. No	Rig Veda	Mandal	Hymn	Rick	Description of relation among the Sudas, Tritsus and Bharatas	Sudas	Purus	Tritsus	Bharatas
1.	„	i	63	7	Divodasa as the king of Purus	„	„	-	-
2.	„	i	130	7	Divodasa as Paurve	„	„	-	-
3.	„	vii	18	15	Sudas raided the camp of Tritsus and took possession of their wealth.	„	-	„	-
4.	„	vii	83	6	Sudas and Tritsus were on one side against the battle of ten kings and they are shown as seperate	„	-	„	-
5.	„	vii	35	5	Sudas is identified with Tritsus and the former Sudas becomes a king of the Tritsus	„	-	„	-
6.	„	vii	83	4	„	„	-	„	-
7.	„	V	16	4,6, 19	Divodasa, the father of Sudas belongs to the Bharatas	„			„
8.	„	vii	33	6	Tritsus are the same as the Bharatas	-	-	„	„

Therefore, it can be said from the foregoing discussion that the Purus, Tritsus and Bharatas were either different branches of the same folk or they were different tribes, who in course of time became one. If it is assumed that they were different, to whom did Sudas originally belong? In fact, it can be noted in relation to his father, Divodasa

with the Purus and Bharatas that Sudas was either Purus or Bharatas. But it is really too difficult to say definitely which group specifically did Sudas really belong to. He actually belonged to the Bharatas as his father Divodasa belonged to that group. Naturally, a question may be raised that who were these Bharatas as there were two Bharatas quite different from each other. But Sudas really belonged to the one tribe of the Rig Vedic Bharatas who descended from Manu and the other tribe of Bharatas was Daushyanti Bharatas who descended from Dushyanta and Shakuntala and who fought the war. India has been named 'Bharata Bhumi' in connection with the Bharatas of the Rig Veda and not with the Daushyanti Bharatas of the Mahabharata. Even the Bhagavata Purana has made a clear-cut conclusion in relation to the name of India as 'Bharata Bhumi' (Quoted by Vaidya in Mahabharatacha Upasamhara, vol. - VII-7, p. 200) in the following manner:

"Manu, the son of Syavambhu, had a son named Priyamvada; his son was Agnidhra; his son was Nabhi; he had a son Rishabha. He had a hundred sons born to him, all learned in the Veda; of them, Bharata was the eldest, devoted to Narayana, by those name this excellent land is known as Bharata."[35]

Therefore, the above examples and its relevant evidences make it clear that Sudas who was a Sudra belonged to the renowned illustratious line of kings in ancient India. Sudas was of course an Aryan as the Bharatas were Aryans. The Rig Veda, VII.18.7 creates some doubt regarding Sudas as to whether he belonged to the Aryan origin or not. So it can conveniently be pointed out that the case of Sudas is an unsettled one whether taken as a Bharata or as a Tritsus but there is no denial to the fact of his being an Aryan. But what then does the word Sudra signify? Sudas was a Sudra in the light of this new discovery. So the term Sudra now stands quite different. According to the old scholars, the term Sudra was just the name of a servile and aboriginal class and this new discovery must come as a surprise for which their past researches cannot possibly offer a definite answer. But Ambedkar pointed out that the primitive societies of the Aryans were organized in groups and they worked as groups. These groups were divided into the clans, phratries, moieties and tribes. In some cases the tribe, the clan, the phratry were the primary units. Even the tribes were sub-divided into clans in some cases whereas there were no clans in other cases and it was a single clanless tribe. The Vedic Aryans had no doubt some such type of social organization.

This fact is very clear from the nomenclature. Prof. Emile Senart has pointed out in relation to these facts as follows:

"The Vedic hymns also conform to this proposition that the Aryan population lived under the rule of an organization dominated by the traditions of the tribe and the lower or similar groupings. The very variety of names indicated in the same source support that this organization was somewhat unsettled."[36]

But it is too difficult to identify whether the term Sudra was the name of a clan, a phratry or a tribe. Prof. Weber noted this fact on the basis of the Satapatha Brahmana (i.1.4.12) that different modes of address should be adopted inviting the sacrificer to proceed with the sacrifice, addressing him as 'come' if he is a Brahmin, 'hasten hither' if he is a Kshatriya, 'hasten hither' if he is a Vaishya and 'run hither' if he is a Sudra. Prof. Weber once again highlighted the fact that the Sudras had the rights to take part in the holy sacrifices of the Aryans and they were entitled as an Aryan tribe, which came to India before others. This statement can be justified by the following comments of Prof. Weber:

"The entire passage is of great importance, as it shows (in opposition to what Roth says in the first Volume of this Journal, p.83) that the Shudras were then admitted to the holy sacrifices of the Aryans, and understood their speech, even if they did not speak it. The latter point can not certainly be assumed as a necessary consequence, but it is highly probable and I consequently incline to the view of those who regard the Shudras as an Aryan tribe which immigrated into India before the others."[37]

In fact, the Sudras were Aryans as well as Kshatriyas beyond simultaneously. Therefore, there was no 'Sudra Varna' from the very beginning in the Indo-Aryan society at all. The theory of four Varnas (Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras) propagated by the Brahmanic and Western scholars can not be accepted. As the Brahmins are noted as a separate Varna 15 times and Kshatriyas 9 times in the Rig Veda. The most important fact was that the term Sudra was not used as a separate Varna in the Rig Veda. Therefore, it can be asserted that the Varna system very much existed in the Rig Vedic period. There were only three Varnas (Brahmins, Kshatriyas

and Vaishyas) in the Indo-Aryan society and the Sudras were not identified as a fourth as well as a separate Varna from the very beginning.

2.6. The "Theory of the Creation of the Sudras"

Mr. A. C. Das highlighted the fact in 'The Rig Vedic Culture', (p.133) that the Dasas and Dasyus were either savages or non-Vedic Aryan tribes. Among them those who were subjugated in war, were most probably made slaves and ultimately constituted the Sudra caste. Mr. Kane, a Vedic scholar and upholder of the Western theory, noted in 'The Dharma Shastra' II (I), (p.133) that the term Dasa used in the later Vedic literatures in the perspective of 'serf or slave'. The Dasa tribes who were opposite to the Aryas in the Rig Veda gradually abolished and they were ultimately made to serve the Aryas. According to the Manusmriti (viii, 413) that the Sudra was created by God for service (dasyu) of the Brahmana. Even we get the same content regarding the Sudras in the Tai Samhita, the Tai Brahmana and other Brahmana works. Therefore, it was generally accepted that the Dasas or Dasyus conquered by the Aryans were gradually transformed into the Sudras. The Western scholars and some Indian writers tried to establish a theory of the creation of Sudras. They said that the Sudras are the same as Dasas and Dasyus. They were non-Aryan aboriginal tribes of India and their civilization was very much primitive and savage. However, these views of the Western writers and its upholders should be justified in the context of the Vedas as they treated the Dasas, Dasyus and Sudras as the same people and they are one. In fact, it was Ambedkar who vehemently opposed the above-mentioned 'Sudra creation theory' of the Western writers and some Indian scholars and their approach towards the Dasas, Dasyus and Sudras who were treated by them as the same people and they are one. He said that the Dasas and Dasyus were as civilized as the Aryans. They were more powerful than the Aryans. So he launched a daring challenge and tried to establish the historical truth on these issues. He strongly emphasized the notion based on the Rig Vedic proposition and references made by different scholars to establish the fact that the Dasas, Dasyus and Sudras were quite different to each other. He pointed out that the words like Shambara, Shushna, Vritra and Pipru, which are mentioned both as Dasas and as Dasyus and they were called the enemies of Indra and Deva, mainly the Ashvins. The terms like Dasa and Dasyu are referred to some Verses of the Rig Veda in a sense, which do not differentiate the meaning between the

two. But these terms are also referred to some Verses of the Rig Veda, which are completely different in meaning. The word Dasas are mentioned in different 54 Verses of the Rig Veda whereas the word Dasyus are referred to separate 78 Verses of the Rig Veda where it is noted that the Dasas and Dasyus were completely two different communities. Apart from these, the term Sudra beyond doubt is actually a proper name of a tribe or a clan, not a derivative word Shuc (sorrow) and Dru (overcome) – it means one overcome by sorrow at all. In support of this view, the term 'Sodari', name of a tribal group known as ancient Sudras and different republic of the Sudras may be critically examined. There were a number of republics in India as free, independent and autonomous in the time of the invasion of Alexander the Great that were ruled by different tribal groups and were known by the name borne by those tribes. Alexander the Great ultimately conquered these republics. There was an important tribal group at that time known as 'Sodari' which raised its voice against Alexander's invasion in India. This tribal group was defeated ultimately. Historian Lassen entitled them with the ancient Sudras. Patanjali at 1.2.3 of his Mahabhasya refers to Sudras and associates them with the Abhiras. Even the Mahabharata (Sabha Parvan, Chapter-xxxii) gives a vivid description about the republic of the Sudras. Different Puranas such as Vishnu Purana, Markandeya Purana and Brahma Purana mention the Sudras as a separate and distinct tribe among various tribes. Besides, B.C. Law noted in 'The Tribes in Ancient India' (p.350) about the identification of their location in the Western part of the country above the Vindhyas.

Ambedkar noted that the term Dasyu does not use at all in a racial sense indicative of a non-Aryan people rather than to denote persons who did not follow the rules and customs of Aryan religion. The reference of the Mahabharata (Shanti Parvan, Adhyaya-65, and Verse-23) may be mentioned in this connection. It highlights the fact that 'in all the Varnas and in all the Ashrams, one finds the existence of Dasyus'. Still it is very much difficult to come to a reasonable conclusion about the origin of the word Dasyu. It is asserted that the term Dasyu was used to 'to rebuke' them. The Indo-Aryans used it to rebuke the Indo-Iranians. The Rig Veda refers to a lot of evidences regarding the conflict between the Aryans and the Dasyus. Naturally, it is quite possible for the Indo-Aryans to use such a contemptuous terminology for their enemies. Besides, it can be said that if Dahaka of the Zenda Avesta were same as Dasa of the Rig Veda then it may be the names of one and the same person. If

similarity in name can be relied upon as an evidence then Dasa in Sanskrit can easily be Daha in the Zenda Avesta as 'Sa' of Dasa may naturally be converted to 'Ha' of Dahar. But there is concrete evidence which leaves no doubt regarding their identity. In Yasna Ha 9, Azhi-Dahaka is denoted as 'three-mouthed, three-headed and six-eyed'. In fact, this physical description of Dahaka in the Zenda Avesta is exactly similar to the description of Dasa in the Rig Veda (x.99.6) where he is also denoted as having three heads and six eyes (The Maharashtra Dnyana Kosha, Vol-III, p.53). Thus if it is accepted that the Dasa in the Rig Veda is the same as 'Dahaka' in the Zenda Avesta then the Dasas were not definitely native aboriginal tribes to India.

Mr. Iyenger said that the Dasas and Dasyus were as civilized as the Aryans. They were more powerful than the Aryans. The Dasyus settled in cities (R.V., i.53.8, i.103.3) under the kings the names of many of which have been mentioned. They had accumulated wealth (R.V., viii.40.6) in the form of cows, horses and chariots (R.V., ii.15.4) and kept these in the hundred-gated cities (R.V., x.99.3). But Indra seized the wealth of Dasyus and distributed it to his worshippers, the Aryas (R.V., i.176.4). Besides, the Dasyus were not only very much wealthy (R.V., i.33.4) but they had a large number of properties also in the plains and on the hills (R.V., x.69.6). They were even decorated with their array of gold and jewels (R.V., i.33.8). They had a large number of castles (R.V., i.33.13; viii.17.14). It would be noted here that the Dasyu demons and the Arya gods alike lived in gold, silver and iron forts (S.S.S.; A.V., V.28.9; R.V., ii.20.8). Indra defeated them for the interest of his worshipper, Divodasa. It is repeatedly noted in the Rig Veda that Indra destructed a hundred stone castle (R.V., iv.30.20) for the Dasyus but Agni, for the sake of his worshippers the Aryas, burnt the cities of the fireless Dasyus (R.V., vii.5.3), (R.V., vii.5.3). Brihaspati destroyed the stone prisons of the Dasyus. However, the Dasyus kept the cattle there captured from the Aryas (R.V.; iv.67.3). Even they possesed the same weapons (R.V.; viii.24.27; iii.30.5; ii.15.4) and used chariots in war like the Aryans.

Apart from this, Ambedkar noted that the Dasas and Dasyus were not the same as the Sudras although these terms, Dasas and Dasyus are sometimes mentioned together. The word 'Sudra' is referred only once. Therefore, it has no connection with the previously mentioned terms, which completely disappear from the later Vedic literature. They probably absorbed with the Vedic Aryans. In fact, the early Vedic

literature is completely silent regarding the Sudras whereas the later Vedic literature is full of them. It highlights the fact that the Sudras were quite different from the Dasas and Dasyus. It is an already established fact that there were two categories of Aryans in the Vedic Age. But they were different and opposite of each other. In fact, the Sudras were Aryans of a different sect or class. The following references[38] of the verses of the Atharva Veda, Vajasaneyi Samhiti and others may be mentioned in this connection to reach a reasonable conclusion that the Sudras were not a primitive aboriginal non-Aryan tribe:

1. A.V., xix. 32.8. – "Make me, Oh, Darbha (grass), dear to the Brahmin, and the Rajanya (i.e., Kshatriya), to the Shudra and to the Arya and to him whom we love and to everyone who is able to see".

2. A.V., xix.62.1- "Make me beloved among the gods, make me beloved among the princes; make me dear to everyone who sees, to the Shudra and to the Arya."

3. Vajasaneyi Samhita, xviii.48. - "(Oh, Agni), give to us lustre among Brahmins, give us lustre among kings; lustre among Vaishyas and among Shudras; give to me lustre added to lustre."

4. Vajasaneyi Samhita, xx. 17.- "Whatever sin we have committed in the village, in the forest, in the assembly, with our senses, against the Shudra or against the Arya, whatever sin one of us (two, the sacrificer and his wife) has committed in the matter of his duty (towards the other), - of that sin, you are the destroyer."

5. Vajasaneyi Samhita, xviii.48 – "As I speak these auspicious words to the people, to the Brahmin and the Rajanya, to the Shudra and to the Arya and to my own enemy, may Ibe dear to the gods and to the giver of dakshinas here in this world. May this desire of mine be granted? May that (enemy of mine) be subjected to me?"

In fact, the first point makes a distinction between the Brahmins and the Aryas. Therefore, would it be reasonable to say that the Brahmins were non-Aryans? The second point highlights the prayer for love and goodwill of the Sudras. Naturally a

question may rise. How would such a prayer be comprehensible to the Sudras if they were primitive aboriginal non-Aryans?

The Sudras even could perform the Vedic sacrifices and enjoyed the rights and privileges of Upanayana. There is a lot of evidence regarding the eligibility for Upanayana of the Sudras in the 'Samskara Ganapati'. Max Muller noted the same views (Ancient Sanskrit Literature, 1860, p.207). He also noted this aspect of the Chhandogya Upanishad (IV: 1-2) through the story of one Janasruti that the preceptor Raikva thought Veda Vidya. Janasruti was a Sudra. The important fact is that Kavasha Ailusha, a reputed Rishi and the author of several hymns of the Tenth Book of the Rig Veda, was also a Sudra. Jaimini, the author of the Purva Mimamsa (Adhyaya 6, Pada 1, Sutra 27) vividly mentioned the name of Badari, an ancient teacher who highlighted the fact that the Sudras even could perform Vedic sacrifices. It is also admitted in 'The Bharadvaja Srauta Sutra' (V.28) that a Sudra could also consecrate the three sacred fires necessary for the performance of a Vedic sacrifice. Besides, the Katyayana Srauta Sutra (1.4.16) highlights that there were certain Vedic texts, which led to the inference that the Sudras were eligible to perform Vedic rites. Apart from these, there is definite evidence in the story of the Ashvins that the Sudras had the right to 'the divine drink of Soma'. V. Fausboll also noted this very clearly in his book, 'The Indian Mythology' (pp.128-134) and pointed out that when Indra objected by saying that the Ashvins were Sudras and should not be entitled to Soma, Rishi Chyavana who was made perpetual Youth by the Ashvins instead of his wife Sukanya's sacrifice to them for their work. But Rishi Chyavana compelled Indra to provide them Soma. Therefore, the 'Sudra non-Aryan theory' preached by the Dharma Sutras did not similar as it contradicted the views taken by Manu. That is why; the following Verses from Manu[39] require to be considered carefully as regards the decision on the question whether the Sudras were Aryan or non-Aryan:

"If a female of the caste sprung from a Brahmana and a Shudra female, bear (children) to one of the highest castes, the inferior (tribe) attains the highest caste within the seventh generation."

"(Thus) a Shudra attains the rank of a Brahmana and (in a similar manner) a Brahmana sinks to the level of a Shudra; but know that it is the same with the offspring of a Kshatriya or of a Vaishya."

"If (a doubt) should arise, with whom the pre-eminence (is, whether) with him whom an Aryan by chance begot on a non-Aryan female, or (with the son) of a Brahmana woman by a non-Aryan;" (Chapter X, Verses 64-67)

The decision is as follows: 'He who was begotten by an Aryan on a non-Aryan female, may become (like to) an Aryan by his virtues; he whom an Aryan (mother) bore to a non-Aryan father (is and remains) unlike to an Aryan.'

But there is a great deal of controversy regarding the interpretation on the 64th Verse of Manu. In fact, we find the same Verse in the Gautama Dharma Sutra (uv.22) as Verse no. 64 of Manu. After a close analysis of the Verse, Buhler sums it up as follows:

"According to Medh., Gov., Kull., and Ragh, the meaning is that, if the daughter of a Brahmana and a Shudra female and her descendants all marry Brahmana, the offspring of the sixth female descendant of the original couple will be a Brahmana. While this explanation agrees with Haradatta's comment on the parallel passage of Gautama, Nar. And Nan. take the verse very differently. They say that if a Parasava, the son of a Brahmana and of a Shudra female, marries a most excellent Parasava female, who possesses a good moral character and other virtues, and if his descendants do the same, the child born in the sixth generation will be a Brahmana. Nandana quotes in support of his view, Baudhayana i.16.13-14 (left out in my translation of the Sacred Books of the East, ii, p.197)....'(offspring) begotten by a Nishada on a Nishadi, removes within five generations the Shudrahood; one may initiate him (the fifth descendant); one may sacrifice for the sixth.' This passage of Baudhayana the reading of which is supported by a new MS from Madras clearly shows that Baudhayana allowed the male offspring of Brahmanas and Shudra females to be raysed to the level of Aryans. It is also not impossible that the meaning of Manu's verse may be the same, and that the translation should be, if the offspring of a Brahmana and of a Shudra female begets children with a most excellent (male of the Brahmana caste or female of the Parasava tribe), the inferior (tribe) attains the highest caste in the seventh generation"[40]

Now it can obviously be pointed out that a Sudra, under certain circumstances, could become a Brahmin in the 7th generation. But this type of conception would be impossible if the Sudra was not an Aryan. W. E. Hearn has also noted the same view in his book 'The Aryan Household' (Chapter viii). The school of Arthashastra did not consider the Sudra as a non-Aryan too. Even Kautilya as a representative of that school, noted his valuable opinion on this question that the Sudra was definitely an Aryan. He made it very clear in laying down the law of slavery (Book III, Chapter 13) as follows:

"The selling or mortgaging by kinsmen of the life of a Shudra who is not a born slave, and has not attained majority, but is Arya in birth shall be punished with a fine of 12 panas. Deceiving a slave of his money or depriving him of the privileges he can exercise as an Arya (Aryabhava) shall be punished with half the fine (levied for enslaving the life of an Arya). Failure to set a slave at liberty on the receipt of a required amount of ransom shall be punished with a fine of 12 panas; putting a slave under confinement for no reason (samrodhaschakaranat) shall likewise be punished. The offspring of a man who has sold what he has earned himself without prejudice to his master's work but also to the inheritance he has received from his father."[41]

Further, there is a great deal of controversy regarding the question of slaves. The Western and Brahmanic scholars asserted that the Dasas were made slaves. Their argument based purely on the references of the Rig Veda. But the term Dasa was used only in five places in the context of slaves or servants in the Rig Veda. That is why, this notion cannot be approved unless and until it is identified that the Dasas and Sudras were the same people. If the Sudras were treated as Dasas as well as slaves then how would it be possible for them to enjoy the rights and privileges of Upanayana ceremony and to take part in the coronation of kings? It is noted earlier in this chapter that the Sudras could take part in the coronation ceremony of kings in the post Vedic or the period of the Brahmans. The main significance behind this ceremony was nothing but an offer of sovereignty to the king by the representative of the people. They were called Ratnis because they held Ratna (Jewel) which was a symbol of sovereignty. So they got an opportunity to play a vital role in the investiture of the king. The king only became the source of sovereignty when the Ratnis handed over to him the jewel of sovereignty. After receiving his sovereignty, the king had to

go to the home of each of the Ratnis and made an offering to him. One of the Ratnis was always a Sudra. Therefore, it was very important to the Sudras as regards their status, dignity, power, position, rights and privileges in all sphere of their life. Jayasswal made it very clear in 'The Hindu Polity', 1943 (pp.200-201) that a Sudra Ratni's presence and participation was mandatory in the coronation ceremony of kings as a token of sovereignty. Besides, Nilakantha, the author of 'Nitimayukha', has given a clear-cut description of the coronation ceremony of kings at a later stage. He noted the fact that the four chief ministers, such as, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra, consecrated the new king. After that the leaders of each Varna and comparatively lower castes still had to consecrate the new king with holy water and ultimately the new king was welcomed by the 'twice-born'. The Sabha Parvan (Chapter xxxiii, Verses 41-42) of the Mahabharata highlights the fact that the Sudras were invited to be present at the coronation ceremony of the king along with Brahmins. The testimonial evidence behind it may be mentioned by the description of the coronation of Yudhishthira, the eldest brother of the Pandavas. Besides, the Sudras were the members of the Janapada and Paura, the two political assemblies of ancient times. They were entitled to special respect even from a Brahmin, as a member of these political assemblies. The evidences from the Manusmriti (vi.61) and the Vishnu Smriti (xxi.64) may be mentioned in this connection. It is noted in the Manusmriti that a Brahmin should not live in a country where the king is a Sudra. It means that the Sudras were kings also. Bhishma deliberates his lessons on Politics to Yudhishthira in the Shanti Parvan of the Mahabharata as follows:

"I shall, however, tell thee what kinds of ministers should be appointed by thee. Four Brahmins learned in the Vedas, possessed of a sense of dignity, belonging to the Snataka order, and of pure behaviour, and eight Kshatriyas, all of whom should be possessed of physical strength and capable of weilding weapons, and one and twenty Vaishyas, all of whom should be possessed of wealth, and three Shudras, everyone of whom should be humble and of pure conduct and devoted to his daily duties, and one man of the Suta caste, possessed of a knowledge of the Puranas and the eight cardinal virtues should be thy ministers"[42]. In fact, the Sudras could become ministers and they were almost equal to the Brahmins in number. The Maitrayani Samhita (iv.2.7.10) and the Panchavimsa Brahmana (vi.1.11) noted the fact that the Sudras were not poor and lowly. They were rich. This fact is clearly referred to in the Vedic Index, Vol. - II, (p.

390). Therefore, it can be noted that the Aryans knew slavery and allowed the Aryans to be made slaves (R.V. - vii.86.7; viii.19.36; viii.56.3). However, the Western theory fails to satisfy the following queries:

Why should particularly the Aryans want to make slaves of the Sudras? Why should they make different laws for the Sudra slaves? Who were the Sudras originally? How did the Sudras become the fourth Varna?

2.7. Meaning of the term 'Varna'

It is generally said that the Vedic Aryans and the European races were fair complexioned. But the evidences of the Rig Veda and the contemporary Iranian literature Zend Avesta do not approve of this notion. But the term Varna is used in both these literatures to denote different types of meanings; such as class, colour of a particular person like white, black, tawny (reddish brown), copper, golden and their faith, believe, religion and others in the Rig Veda. Not only that but also it identified different deities, like, Ushas, Agni, Soma, etc. and meant luster, features or colour. Prof. Ripley is quite definite on the question of the colour of the earliest Europeans that they were of dark complexion. He says in the book, 'The Races of Europe' (p.466) as follows:

"We are strengthened in this assumption that the earliest Europeans were not only long-headed but also dark complexioned, by various points in our enquiry thus far. We have proved the prehistoric antiquity of the living Cro-Magnon type in Southern France; and we saw that among these peasants, the prevalence of black hair and eyes is very striking. And comparing types in the British Isles we saw that everthing tended to show that the brunet populations of Wales, Ireland and Scotland constituted the most primitive stratum of population in Britain. Furthermore, in that curious spot in Garfagnana, where a survival of the ancient Ligurian population of Northern Italy is indicated, there also are the people characteristically dark. Judged, therefore, either in the light of general principles or of local details, it would seem as if this earliest race in Europe must have been very dark...It was Mediterranean in its pig mental affinities, and not Scandinavian"[43]

So we have to go through the Vedas whether the Aryans had any colour prejudice or not. There are many instances in the Rig Veda to prove the notion that the Aryans had no colour prejudice at all. There are different types of complexions referred to the Rig Veda about the Aryans. Some Aryan's were of copper complexion, some white and some black. As for example, there is a reference to Ashvins having brought about the marriage between Shyavya and Rushati. Shyavya is black and Rushati is fair (Rig Veda, i.117.8). There is a prayer in the Rig Veda (i.117.5) for addressing to Ashvins owing to save Vandana who has been referred to as golden colour. An Aryan prays to invoke the Devas to bless him with a son with certain virtues but of (pishanga) tawny (reddish brown) complexion (Rig Veda, ii.3.9). Not only these identical Varnas are mentioned in the Rig Vedas but also some historical name occurred in different dimensions with their complexions, such as, Rama (Dasharatha's son) has been mentioned as 'Shyama'. It means dark in complexion. The Rishi Dirghatamas, who was the author of many mantras of the Rig Veda must had been of dark colour if his name was given to him after his complexion. Kanva, an Aryan Rishi, was of dark colour (Rig Veda, x.31.11). Let us discuss first, in what sense the-then Rishis' used the term Varna in the Rig Veda. As per the versions and references of the Rig Veda, the term Varna was used in 22 verses of it. Out of which, the term Varna was mentioned in different 17 places by the Rishis' in the Rig Veda to identify different deities, like, Ushas, Agni, Soma, etc., and meant luster, features or colour. Apart from this, they used the term Varna in five different verses of the Rig Veda in the context of human beings (Rig Veda, i.104.2; i.179.6; ii.12.4; iii.34.5; ix.71.2). The meaning of the term Varna in different verses of the Rig Veda is given below:

Table 10: Different meanings of Term Varna in the context of Human beings in the Rig Veda

Verses of the Rig Veda					
Sl. No	**Mandal**	**Hymn**	**Rick**	**Varna**	**Meaning**
1	i	104	2	"	Dasa as a class
2	ii	12	4	"	Dasa as a class
3	ix	71	2	'abandons Asura Varna'	Not colour but class or indicative of roopa or darkness
4	i	179	6	Two Varns proposered	Class and not colour
5	iii	34	5	Caused Shukla Varna to Increased'	White colour increased or Hymn maker being of white complextion

However, the meaning of the word Varna in the above noted Verses of the Rig Veda do not approve of the notion that it is used only in the sense of colour and complexion. This term is also used to indicate a particular class. Therefore, it can be

pointed out that the references from the Rig Veda regarding the term Varna is quite inconclusive and undeceive. Therefore, it will be of great help to us if we are able to trace out the meaning of the term Varna and in what sense this word was used in the Indo-Iranian literatures at that time. The language of the Rig Veda is said to be contemporary to that of the Zend Avesta of the Iranians. But the term Varna occurred in the Zend Avesta in the form of Varana or Varena in the sense of faith, religious doctrine and choice of creed or belief. This term was derived from the root 'Var' which meant to put faith in, to believe in. This term was used in the Gathas about six times in the sense of faith, doctrine, and creed or believes. The following table will help us a lot in this perspective:

Table 11: Different forms of Varna[44] and its Meaning in the Zend Avesta

Name of the Gatha	Yasna Ha No	Stanza No	Term occurred	Meaning of the term	Zarathushtra's comments
Ahunavaiti	30	2	'Avarenao vichithahya'	Avarenao-faih, belief Vichi-thahya-'of discriminating, of selecting of determining'	He exhorts each one individually to use reasoning faculty and freedom of choice in the selection of his or her faith
Ahunavati	31	11	Vareneng , plural form of Varena	Belief, faith	He propounds the theory of man's creation and says that voluntary beliefs are given to man
Ushtavaiti	45	1	Varena	Evil faith	He says that 'owing to sinful belief the wicked is of evil tongue'.
,,	45	2	,,	Faith, religion, belief	He says about the good and evil aspect of human mind. Thus 'neither in thought, word, intelligence, faith (or religion or creed) utterance, deed, conscience nor soul do we agree.'
Spenta Mainyu	48	4	Vareneng	Religion, faith (root Vere Persian gervidan = to have faith in)	He says that a man who will make his mind pure and holy and keep his conscience pure by deed and word, such man's desire is in accordance with his faith (religion, belief).
,,	49	3	Varenai	Religion	In Vendidad (a book of Zarathustrian sanitary law written in Avesta language) we get a word Anyo - Varena which means other religion.
,,	,,	,,	Thaeshai	Religion, creed, religious law	In Vendidad, we get a word Anyo-Tkaesha which means a man of different religion.

Therefore, it can be pointed out in the context of the above-mentioned evidences from the Zend Avesta that the term Varna originally meant a class holding to a particular faith and it had nothing to do with colour or complexion. The Vedas do not know any such race as the Aryan race. There is no evidence in the Vedas of any invasion of India by the Aryan race and its having conquered the Dasas and Dasyus supposed to be natives of India. There is no evidence to show that the distinction between Aryans, Dasas and Dasyus was a racial distinction. The Vedas do not support the contention that the Aryas were different in colour from the Dasas and Dasyus. Apart from all the above, it can be strongly asserted on the basis of the following verses of the Rig Veda[45] that the authors who propounded the theory of an Aryan race invading India and conquering the Dasas and Dasyus fail to take note of certain verses in the Rig Veda:

Rig Veda, vi.33.3, "Oh, Indra, Thou hast killed both of our opponents, the Dasas and the Aryas."
Rig Veda, vi.60.3, "Indra and Agni-these protectors of the good and righteous suppress the Dasas and Aryas who hurt us."
Rig Veda, vii. 81.1. – "Indra and Varuna killed the Dasas and Aryas who were the enemies of Sudas and thus protected Sudas from them."
Rig Veda, viii. 24.27, "Oh you, Indra, who saved us from the hands of the cruel Rakshasas and from the Aryas living on the banks of the Indus, do thou, deprive the Dasas of their weapons."
Rig Veda, x.38.3, "Oh you much revered Indra, those Dasas and Aryas who are irreligious and who are our enemies, make it easy for us with your blessings to subdue them. With your help we shall kill them."
Rig Veda, x.86.19, "Oh, You Mameyu, you give him all powers who prays you. With your help we will destroy our Arya and our Dasyu enemies."

Ambedkar pointed out from the above mentioned Verses of the Rig Vedas that there were two different communities of Aryas who were not only different but opposite and inimical to each other. The Atharva Veda was not recognized by the Brahmins as sacred as the Rig Veda for a long time. It was considered as vulgar. That is why; it seems to us that the Rig Veda and the Atharva Veda are the religious text of the two different races of Aryans. The Atharva Veda was recognized after a long time on a par

with the Rig Veda when the two different racial groups of Aryans had merged into one.

2.8. Caste through the Ages

There is a great deal of controversy among the scholars, historians, philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, linguistic experts and others regarding the origin and evolution of the Hindu Caste System. In fact, the womb of the Caste concept was the Purusha Sukta of the Rig Veda. It was most probably an interpolation which for the first time formalized the Caste conception into the Hindu mind and it was spread and evoluted through the Vedic literatures (Vedas, Brahmanas, Aranyakas and Upanishads), Sastras (Vedangas), Sutras, Darshanas, Puranas, Smriti literatures, Ramayana and Mahabharata and so on. The so-called Manu, the ancient lawmaker, fixed up the caste conception by transforming it into 'Caste Institution' on to be hereditary basis brushing aside the doctrine of 'Karma' (action) and inborn qualities as well as virtuous deeds. He divided the Indian society into four Castes, i.e., Brahmana, Kshtriya, Vaishya and Sudra and thereby laid the basis of inter-caste hatred and caste-based discrimination which in course of time divided the Indian society into multiple segments. He made the Caste System hereditary and issued a lease of permanent privilege in case of power, position and status in society, polity, economy, education, culture, religion etc. for the benefit of the 'Twice Born' and especially for the Brahmins by degrading the condition of the Sudras into the level of animals. The Sudras were denied a little comfort. They were compelled to become an unprivileged caste. It was an irony of fate that the 'myth of caste' transformed into a hard reality in the method of Goebels. The concept of caste was extensively executed in all sphere of national live. Naturally, the rigidity of caste system did not affect society at that very juncture. The human values did not altogether disappear at a large. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the Hindu Caste System in India which in spite of various vicissitudes retained its supremacy not only in the religious affairs, but also in the socio-cultural, politico-economic and administrative arena of Hindu life. In ancient times, this institution had became so deep-rooted in our social organization that even today after the elapse of thousands of years, its glowing effects can clearly be seen. The Indian use is the leading one now, and it has influenced all other uses. This phrase has no meaning. As long as we use the abstract noun "Caste" in a variety

of senses and the words "Caste System" as one expression to denote a group of phenomena, the expression "Origin of Caste" can have no meaning. The 'theory of four Varnas' (classes) in society has its origin; sharp lines between various layers of society have their origin; ascendancy of the priests and their exclusiveness has their origin; association of purity and impurity to various objects also has its origin. We can even conceive of the origin of endogamy. If historical psychology should ever be worked out, it may give us the origin of pride and of feelings of superiority and inferiority. So the Hindus believe that all men in the world are divided into four castes; i.e., Brahmanas (Priests), Kshtriyas (warriors), Vaishyas (common people), and Sudras (servants). The precedence of these castes is in the order of enumeration. All other castes are produced by inter-marriage either with pure or the mixed. These differences in the castes are innate and cannot be obliterated or concealed. If there are any tribes, communities, or nations like the old Greek and English people where caste is not found because those people neglected the rules of marriage and conduct and have consequently merged into barbarism, and caste among them is destroyed by indiscreet intermixture (fusion of Varnas). Indeed, there are two important psychological factors in the Hindu caste system; endogamy and hierarchy, which always restrict man's choice. Classes are converted into castes by becoming endogamous. As a result, people of India were unprogressive for many centuries and trying to live up to the ideal past. The great sages who introduced the law in the past ages were liable as a man to err, and that, if they have erred, it is neither a sin nor an impossibility to correct them. The people of India do not depend on their own intelligence for the guidance but on the intelligence of the people who are dead and gone. They will not break a custom because they see no sense in it as an Englishman or an American of strong individually will do, but will blame their own frail intelligence that they do not see the sense in it. They have almost the same respect for what is old as Christian might have for the words of Jesus. Scholars have traced out three principal stages of evolution in the caste system, viz., the Rig Vedic age, the later Vedic age and the age of the Sutras or Upanishads. Many experts in the field of the Vedic literatures opined that the concept of caste did not exist in the Rig Vedic period. Even it did not originate as much in its mature form in the later Vedic period. Its development was gradual. An extensive study of the Rig Veda highlights the distinctive as well as fundamental features on these issues. The pre-eminence of the

Brahmin was so great that the Mahabharata declared that there was only one 'Varna', viz., the Brahmin and the other Varnas were merely its modifications.

Practically speaking, the terms Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra mean different classes such as priest or scholar, soldier or warrior and ruler, trader and farmer and servant respectively not castes in the Rig Veda. Even a Sudra could change their profession and become a Brahmana by his talent and virtuous deeds at that time. But Manu's Caste philosophy was based on hereditary birth circle not by choice or virtuous deeds. The very foundation of the Caste System was stirred by the rise and growth of Buddhism in India. The humanistic approach, universal appeal and scientific argument of reasoning of Goutam Buddha hastened the way of peaceful living in society. He instructed to maintain and follow the prime factors such as; all men are equal, everything is changeable, everything is to be examined to search the real truth, man and morality must be the centre of religion, not God; the real existence of Dharma (Religion) lays in the heart of man, not in the Sastras. Both Lord Buddha and Mahavira denounced the Caste System and advocated equality of man and woman. The 6th century religious protestant movement greatly influenced the reign of Chandragupta Maurya, Asoke, Harsha and the Pala rulers. However, the revivalist tendency of Hinduism got new enthusiasm under the Gupta, the Rajput and the Sena rulers of Bengal. During the medieval rule, the lowborn Hindus converted themselves into Muslims (Deshi Muslims) to get rid of the Brahmanical yoke. But their fate never changed at all. Even the Caste System was prevailed in course of time and the upper caste Hindus to some extent, were benefited by their state policy. Therefore, the issue of caste in the Indian society has existed from the very beginning. In the course time, they have all the more multiplied and complicated gradually. Through the Ages, the so-called Privileged Caste has emerged as the main source of power behind the throne in the name of the 'Divine Right Theory' and the 'Dwija (Twice born) Theory'.

Therefore, it can be said that the caste system has grown and developed all the way through the Vedic period, Brahmanical period (1000-600 B.C.), Maurya period (322-184 B.C.), Gupta period, Harsh Vardhan period, Rajput period (700-1200A.D.) and Muslim period (1200-1757 A.D.), Medieval period (700-1757 A.D.) and so on. Some scholars hold that it had prevailed even in the earliest portion of the Rig Veda. Three caste divisions were there in the Rig Veda. But Sudra caste did not exist at that time.

The Aryans created it in the closing phase of the Rig Veda. Haug, Kern, Apte supported this view. According to another view, there was no caste but Varnas that were not hereditary but flexible. Muir, Zimmer, Weber, Ghurye and others strongly advocated this view. But the theory of four castes came to be repeatedly mentioned in the literatures of the Brahmanical period (1000-600 B.C.) and the 4 castes became clearly established and rigid. The concept of priesthood in the later part of the Epic period became hereditary and inevitably, the Brahmins began to pay attention to the purity of the blood and attaining a position of superiority over others. The Grihsutras (700-300 B.C.) and the Dharmasutras (600-300 B.C.) had a great impact on the social life of the people. Even the religious concept of purity and pollution accelerated the process to the formation of the caste system. Chandragupta Maurya, a Sudra ruler (322-298 B.C.) tried to remove all sorts of barriers imposed upon the Sudras by the Brahmins in the course of time by declaring that the royal law would supersede the dharma law. Kautilya, a Brahmin minister extended his helping hand to him in this context. Ashoka's (273-233 B.C.) religious policy had broken the very foundation of the caste institution as his religious outlook was based on the principles of toleration and universal brotherhood. That is why; it could not develop as a rigid institution during this period. Pushyamitra's (184 B.C.) rule marked militant Brahmanic reactions to revitalize this system in a new regicidal dimension and its dynasty called Sunga dynasty that ruled for 112 years (184-72 B.C.). Even the Sunga, Kanva, Kushan kings revived the caste system rigorously. Manu in Manusmriti (185 B.C.) rediscovered a new mechanism to implement his hereditary birth circle policy to protect the class interest of the 'Twice born' especially the Brahmins by creating the death warrant of the low-born Sudras. Even different severe punishments were allotted for them such as, if a Sudra insults a twice-born man, he shall have his tongue cut out; if he utters the names and jatis of the twice-born with contempt, an iron-nail, ten fingers long, shall be thrust in his mouth; if he arrogantly teaches Brahmins their duty, the king shall cause hot oil to be poured into his mouth and into his ears. Even the king could not collect tax from a Brahmins in time emergency. Naturally, the concept of equality in law was destroyed by such caste rules and it evolved on rigid lines. The revival of Brahmanism was laid down during the Sunga, Kanva and Kushan dynasties. Brahmanism became the ethnic religion of India in the Gupta period and the real development of the caste system reached its utmost position with severe rigidity in this time (300-500 A.D.). Besides, untouchability emerged as a

dangerous element during this time in the society. Even the domination of Brahmanism remained same during the time of Harsh Vardhan and others (606-700 A.D.). Hieun Tsang said that caste system ruled the social structure and persons who adopted unclean professions as like butchers, anglers, scavengers etc. had to settle down outside the four walls of the city. The ancient Hindu period came to an end with the death of Harsh in the middle of the 7th century A.D. and the history of the Rajput period (700-1200 A.D.) and Muslim period (1200-1757 A.D.) began. The social system of India became static and caste system became rigid. Sankaracharya established mathas and it became a centre of luxurious life. Devdasi system fostered the growth of temple prostitution. A large number of new castes and sub-castes sprang up at time of the invasion of the foreign armies. Naturally, the Brahmins tightened the norms and rigidity of castes associations. Even the process of disintegration most probably started with the Brahmin caste. Their sub-castes multiplied and their territorial units as like, Kokan Brahmins, Telegu Brahmins etc, identified them. Same procedure was followed regarding the sub-divisions of the Kshatrias and Vaishyas. A large number of occupational castes like, weavers, smiths etc. were emerged that came to be known as different caste or sub-castes. Therefore, a change came in the society in the form of multiplicity of castes and rigid observance of the caste norms. The caste system became even more rigid during different dynasties of the Muslim period as the Muslims led a religious crusade upon India and tried to convert people to Islam. The Brahmins adopted severe measures to protect the Hindus from the impending danger of Islamic impact. In spite of the best efforts of the Bhakti saints like Ramanuj, Kabir, Nanak, Chaitanya, Tukaram, Tulsidas etc. to establish the concept of equality by denouncing the caste system, priesthood etc., they could not fully abolish the caste system. The Brahmins made caste distinction more rigid by declaring that Muslims and the people of the Hindu society who worked for the Muslims were called as mlecchas. As result of it, Sunar (goldsmith), Luhar (blacksmith) etc. were identified as low castes. Puranas were rewritten to abide the caste rules with rigidity in this time. In the course of time (pre-industrial British period – 1757 to 1918 A.D.), the British government transferred the judicial powers of the caste councils to the civil and the criminal courts. The British government adopted severe measures like the Caste Disabilities Removal Act of 1850, the Widow Re-marriage Act of 1856, the Special Marriage Act of 1872 etc. to disintegrate the solidarity of the caste system with purely administrative purpose and to abolish the

caste institution. Even some social movements organized by different social thinkers (Rammohun Roy to Vivekananda) in this period to attack the caste system. They also ultimately failed in abolishing the caste institution in this period except mild structural patterns. Therefore, the structural pattern of the caste institution remained the same as like earlier. Only the impact of the industrialization greatly affected the very foundation of this institution. That is why; the core principles of the caste system can be explained in the following manner to understand the truth.

2.8.1. Caste and Professions

Manu, the ancient lawmaker institutionalized the so-called caste system in the Brahmanical Hindu society. He divided the Hindu society into four divisions in the context of castes, viz., Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra. Each caste division has its own socio-religious custom and based on hereditary birth circle. Therefore, he prescribed different types of norms and principles for each caste division. Each caste division has formed numerous divisions of sub-castes in course of time. He fixed up the rights and duties of each caste divisions. Manusmriti highlighted rules and regulations of the caste system. He categorically distributed the works and professions of the four caste divisions that were mandatory for each caste groups to follow up strictly. Naturally, Indian society was cut into multiple segments. The norms and principles of the 'Chaturvarna' were quite different from the caste system of Manu that was already mentioned. But it is the irony of fate that the glowing effects of the hereditary caste system of the so-called Manu did not disappear in course of time from the caste-mind of the so-called Hindus that has been creating numerous difficulties such as social, political, economic, religious etc. and after all national. The people of India did not overcome this life and death issue until today. The impact of the industrialization in England and the establishment of its rule in India heralded an epoch-making event in reducing the caste mentality of the so-called Hindus.

The profession of a person depended upon his status and position into the hereditary caste division of the society. It does not bother the merit of a person or inborn qualities of him rather than hereditary caste division to which he belonged. According to the theories of caste, each caste division has its own professions prescribed by the numerous Hindu Sastras. The occupations of the different castes were fixed and in

ordinary circumstances, there could not be any alteration. The lawful occupations of different castes in all the law-books were as follows:

2.8.2. Occupation of the Brahmin Caste

The lawful professions of a Brahman caste in all the law-books were studying, teaching, sacrificing for him, officiating as priest for others, giving alms and receiving alms. The status and position of the Brahmana caste was higher than the other caste groups in the Hindu society. They enjoyed the monopoly rights and privileges since the inception of the caste system. They propagated themselves as the mediator between God and man and entitled themselves as the sole representative of God. They established their power and position by the introduction of the 'divine right theory' in this way. They played a vital role as a priest and worshiper to satisfy God and Goddess for the welfare of themselves. They demanded themselves as the Vedic Aryans. They were the creator of different Vedic Hymns and literatures. Their main professions were to worship, to teach Vedavidya, to compose Vedic hymns, Sastras and different mantras in different periods, to advice the king, to form socio-religious norms due to compel the other caste groups to maintain it with harshly etc. They treated themselves as the superior caste. They followed the 'Dwija theory' of Manu that was based on birth by discarding the theory of Karma based on virtuous deeds and inborn qualities. According to the Dharma Sastras, the main duties of the Brahmanas were to read and teach the Vedic literature and to perform various sacrifices for themselves and for others. They were to live on the charity of the people or on the fees obtained by the performance of various rites. They were not to covet wealth, power or any worldly gain. Their only job was to make an effort to realize the truth by leading the best of life, an ideal for others. Sometimes they turned out to be the best of soldiers as well. Dronacharya, a teacher by profession, was one of the best soldiers of his time. Apart from these, Manu stated that a Brahmin should adopt the professions of Rito (unschabriti), Ajachito, vaikha, agricultural trading, kushid, yajyana, teaching and pratigriha. The Brahmin may adopt the prescribed professions of the Vedas and Smritis. It was noted in the Aitareya Brahmana that the offerings of the kings were not acceptable to the God unless they were offered with the help of a Purohita (chaplain). The Shatapatha Brahmana identified a Brahmin as impure if he took the occupation of a physician. There were many opinions regarding the

occupations of the different caste groups in time of distress or emergency among the Sutra-writers. According to Vishnu, "in times of distress, each caste may follow the occupation of that next (below) to it in rank"[46] (II. 15). It was noted that a Brahmin in distress might adopt a profession of fighting and ruling of the Kshatriyas, agriculture, trade, and others of the Vaishyas. Baudhyana pointed out that a Brahman would take the profession of a warrior (II. 2.4.). But Apastamba noted that a Brahman should not take a weapon into his hand, though he be only desirous of examining it (I. 10.6). Kautilya referred to regiments of Brahmans as well as of other castes. Apastamba (II. 10.26.4) mentioned the name of the Brahman officers whereas Vishnu (III.73) noted the name of the Brahmin Judges whose main duty was to protect the people in villages and towns. Gautama said that a Brahman could take the profession of agriculture and trade but he did not work himself (X.5-6). Apastamba said that trade was not lawful for a Brahman (I.7.20.10).

2.8.3. Occupation of the Kshatriya Caste

The lawful professions of a Kshatriya caste in all the law-books were studying but not teaching, sacrificing for him, but not officiating as priest for others, giving but not receiving alms, governing and fighting. The status and position of the Kshtriya in the Hindu caste division was next to the rank of the Brahmins. Their main duty was to protect the country and take part in war against the enemy. They had to maintain physical condition through different types of exercises. They had to adopt different strategies to protect their king and its citizen. They used horse in fighting. Actually, they were warrior caste. In fact, they were primarily concerned with the administration of the country, especially defence. As political power was the most important power, the Kshatriya often asserted their superiority over the Brahmins. To the Kshatriya, the door of learning was always open. Probably, they produced the Upanishads. King Janaka was one of the profoundest scholars of Vedas in his time. Some scholars pointed out that Kshtriya even got opportunity to act as priest. It was mentioned in the Upanishadic literatures that the kings of this age were well versed in philosophical speculations. Janaka of the Videhas, Pravahana Jaivali, Ajatashatru, Ashvapati Kaikeya were the great philosophical-kings. Kshatriya could follow the occupations of a Vaishya in time of emergency (Gautama VIII.26). Besides, it was noted vividly in the Arthasastra of Kautilya that the Kshatriyas of Kamboja, Saurastra

and other countries lived by agriculture, trade and occupation of arms[47] (Bk.XI.Ch.I). The Sutra-writers pointed out that "in successive births men of the lower castes are born in the next higher one, if they have fulfilled their duties, and men of the higher castes are born in the next lower one, if they neglect their duties"[48] (Apastamba II. 5.11. 10-11).

2.8.4. Occupation of the Vaishya Caste

The lawful professions of a Vaishya caste in all the law-books were studying, sacrificing for himself, giving alms, cultivating, cattle breeding, trading and lending money at interest. However, the position of the Vaishya caste was next to rank of the Kshtriya caste in the circle of the hereditary caste division. They were cultivators, traders, and merchants. Their main duty was to produce or cultivate to fulfill the necessity of the citizens of the country. They were very wealthy caste. But they did not satisfy for their socio-religious position due to the prescription of the caste institution. They were connected with the economic life of the country. They were responsible for the production of wealth. As India was and has been an agricultural country, the Vaishya tilled the land and reared cattle. They also carried on trade and commerce. Sometimes, they even became kings and warriors. The Vaishyas were agriculturists, merchants, cattle- rearers, smith, carpenters, oilmongers, weavers, garland makers etc. Sudras also adopted the occupations of traders, artisan and agriculture. Therefore, it can be said that the occupations of different castes remained the same. In the Gupta age, some Brahmanas and Kshatriyas adopted the occupations of caste below them while some of the Vaishyas and Sudras followed the occupations of the upper castes. Mayurasarman exchanged Brahmana's role for that of a Kshatriya and became the founder of the Kadamba dynasty. The same was the case with Vindhyasakti who was the founder of the Vakataka dynasty. Matri-Vishnu was a Brahman but he was a Gupta feudatory in Central India. Brahmanas took to arms, trade and agriculture. There were several Brahmana families of rulers and commanders of armies. There were Brahman officers in the civil service. Hiuen Tsang met a Brahman who was ploughing the land with his own hands. The chief officer of a guild of oilmen was described as Kshatriya in a record of the fifth century.

2.8.5. Occupation of the Sudra Caste

The Sudra was to obtain his livelihood by serving the higher-castes and if necessary by practicing mechanical arts. They had no rights to study the Vedas, nor would make sacrifices and their gifts not ordinarily be accepted by the Brahmanas. But they were the strangest creation of the Indo-Aryans. They were denied the study of the Vedic literature and the wearing of sacred thread. Mixing with them was not permitted to the upper castes. They remained in lower position of the caste division in the Hindu society. They were advised to serve their superior three caste groups. Otherwise, they were severely given punishment by the so-called norms of the caste institution. They were forced to become the menial labours of the upper three castes, i. e., Brahmanas, Kshtriyas and Vaishyas. According to the Panchavimsha Brahmana, some of the king's ministers were Sudras. But the distinction of the occupations of the Vaishyas and the Sudras were very little in the time of Kautilya (4^{th} cent. B. C.). Among the lawful occupations of a Sudra were agriculture and cattle breeding not only in times of distress but also in normal circumstances[49] (Arthasastras, Bk. I. Ch. III). According to Manu, Among the several occupations the most commendable are teaching the Veda for a Brahman, protecting the people for a Kshatriya and trade for a Vaishya - (X.80). But agriculture and cattle breeding came to be regarded as degrading for a Vaishya in the course of time. Manu declared in X.84: "That means of subsistence (agriculture) is blamed by the virtuous; for the wooden implement with iron point injures the earth and the creatures living in the earth"[50]. Apart from all these, the so-called mixed caste peoples the Paulkasas and Nishdas must lived by hunting, while the Chandalas by executing criminals sentenced to death and clothing themselves in the rags picked from dead bodies at the cremation ground.

2.8.6. Caste and Marriage

The Hindu marriage system was created following the basic principles of the Caste Institution. The ancient lawmakers, especially Manu, framed the norms and regulations of the Hindu marriage institution to fulfill the needs and requirements for the protection of the divine rights of the privileged caste groups. But marriage was nothing but a union between a man and a woman. Some scholars emphasized on social sanction of this union. According to them, different rituals and ceremonies were made to accomplish it. Sociologists noted it as a system of rules for making primary

relationships. Primary relation in marriage performs two important functions: one of need gratification and other of social control. It gratifies biological (sex satisfaction), psychological (affection and sympathy) and economic (food, clothing and shelter) needs of the individuals and acts as a primary source of morality and ethics. According to Indologists, Hindu marriage evolved as a sanskar or a dharma. Thus, marriage is a miniature of the Hindu social system, which must be kept in equilibrium if it is not to fall apart. Every caste group has to maintain the norms of the caste rules in the context of marriage. There were eight types of marriage in ancient India. Marriage between the two caste groups determined by many factors, which gave birth to numerous social problems.

Ancient law-makers pointed out in different religious texts that dharma (fulfillment of religious duties) was the highest aim of marriage. Certain rites were performed before Agni (the most sacred God) by reciting mantras (verses) from Vedas by a Brahmin (the most sacred person on earth). A man could perform several sacraments during the course of his life. But a woman performed only one sacrament of marriage in her life, it's very important for her. Stress was given on chastity of a woman and the faithfulness of a man. Husband and wife were bound to each other not only until death but also even after death. Although, the Hindu marriage has undergone changes in the last few decades, yet mutual fidelity and devotion to partner are still considered the essence of marriage.

Following the older authorities Manu and Yajnavalkya permit the marriage of a Brahmin, a Kshatriya and Vaishya with four, three and two wives respectively in the proper (anuloma) order; but marriage of the three castes and especially of the Brahmins, with Sudra girls is condemned in the strongest terms. The marriages of Brahmins, not to speak of Kshatriya and Vaishyas with Sudra girls, though denounced by the Smritis, continued to be performed. The rules relating to prohibited degrees of marriage follow the older lines. According to tradition, Chyavana and Shyavasha, two Vedic sages, married Kshatriya girls. But there were many examples among the personages of this age where a Brahmin girl had married a Kshatriya. Even the Kshatriya girl had an opportunity to marry a Brahmin. It was noted in the Shatapatha Brahmana about the marriage relations of an Arya male and a Sudra female and a Sudra male with the Arya female. Manu excludes those who are blood relations

(sapinda) on the mother's side and of the same gotra on the father's. Manu denounced marriage with the daughter of a paternal or maternal aunt or with the daughter of a maternal uncle. Manu and Yajnavalkya repeated the following eight forms of marriage known to the older Smritis:

1. Brahma Marriage

In Brahma Marriage, the parents settle the marriage. A Brahmin is called to preside over the marriage rites and her father gives the daughter to the groom along with some dowry of ornaments and clothes, etc. It is good for the Brahmins in the context of religion.

2. Arsha Marriage

In Arsha Marriage, the bride's father gets something from the groom – say a pair of cattle or two – in exchange for his daughter. This is just for the sake of the ceremony. This marriage favoured for the Brahmins.

3. Prajapatya Marriage

In Prajapatya Marriage, though consent of parents is essential but no ceremony is performed. This marriage is very good for the Brahmins as per religious text.

4. Daiva Marriage

In Daiva Marriage, the Brahmin who officiates over the ceremony is not paid any dakshina (gift) but is given daughter, properly bejeweled and decorated. This marriage extended the prestige and dignity of the Brahmins.

5. Rakshasa Marriage

In Rakshasa Marriage, marriage is by capture or abduction without obtaining the consent of the girl or her parents. This was practiced in times when group conflicts and tribal wars were very common. The victorious groups used to carry away the girls of the conquered groups and keep them as 'keeps'. This marriage is good for the Kshatriyas as per the religious text.

6. Gandharva Marriage

In Gandharva Marriage, neither is the consent of parents necessary nor are the rites or dowry essential. Only the will of the marrying parties is given importance. This marriage is believed to spring from desire and has sex satisfaction as its chief purpose.

This marriage is good for the Vaishyas and Sudras according to the marriage regulations formulated in different Dharma Shastras.

7. Asura Marriage

In Asura Marriage, the groom gives bride price to the bride's father. This is sort of an economic contract. There is no limit of the amount given. It is better only for the Vaishyas and Sudras

8. Paishacha Marriage

In Paishacha Marriage, a woman who is seduced when asleep or unconscious or when incapable of protecting herself is given the social status of a wife. This marriage is prescribed only for the Vaishyas and Sudras.

But Manu recommended only three types of marriages such as Prajapatya, Gandharva and Rakshasa that is good for religious of all Varnas (castes) and marriage of Asura and Paishacha is completely irreligious for all castes. Therefore, he said that the last two types of marriages should not be done. The Gandharva and Rakshasa marriage, both are good and religious for the Kshatriyas. The marriage of Dusmanta and Sakuntala was treated as Gandharva marriage. But the marriage of Bichitravirya and Ambhika was identified as Rakshasa marriage. Even the marriage of Arjuna and Suvadra was noted as the mixture of Gandharva-Rakshasa marriage. But the marriage of Rakshasa and Paishacha was prohibited during the rule of the British Government by the Section – 366, I.P.C. (Abduction) and Section-376, I.P.C – Reap. Among these, eight forms of marriage, Brahma is considered the best marriage where a girl is given to a boy of merit in the same caste or in a caste of equal status. Both bride and groom in this marriage are supposed to be grown-up persons competent to give consent. Apart from this, the Polygynous marriage was practiced in the early and medieval times. The only instance of Polyandrous marriage is found in the Mahabharata – the marriage of Drupadi with five Pandavas. But Polygyny is marriage of one male with more than one female, or what may be called the 'plurality of wives'. In the early Hindu society, it was the second type of polygynous marriage that was practiced. According to Apastamba Dharmsutra, a man could marry again after ten years of his first marriage if his wife was barren or could marry after thirteen or fourteen years if he had only daughters from his wife and wanted a son. Manu has said that a man can supersede his first wife after eight years of his first marriage, if his wife is barren;

after ten years if children produced by his wife do not remain alive; after eleven years if his wife produces only daughters and immediately after the first marriage if his wife is quarrelsome, rebellious or harsh. In the Mahabharata, it is said that man who marries twice without any rational cause commits sin for which there is no penance. Today polygyny has been legally prohibited. Manu and Yajnavalka agree in praising the first four forms and condemning the last four. But Manu also noted other views in the same context declaring Prajapatya, Gandharva and Rakshasa to be lawful and Paisacha and Asura alone to be unlawful. He clearly recommended different forms for different castes. A young man of the first three castes could marry under the Smriti law, only after the completion of his studies, i.e. at least after twelve years from his investiture with the sacred thread. The general rule of mate selection in the Hindu society depends upon the concept of endogamy, exogamy and hypergamy. Endogamy is a social rule that requires a person to select a spouse from within certain groups. These endogamous groups specifically refer to Varna, caste and sub-caste. That is why, a Brahmin boy has not only to marry a Brahmin girl but a Kayastha boy has to marry a Kayastha girl. Kayastha is a caste, which is divided into numerous sub-castes like, Mathur, Saxena, Srivastava, Bhatnagar, Nigam, etc. So the marriage of a Kayastha boy, according to the rules of endogamy, has to be fixed not only in the same caste but in the same sub-caste too. Exogamy is a social rule, which forbids selection of a spouse from certain groups. In fact, two types of exogamy practiced by the Hindus like, Gotra exogamy and Sapinda exogamy. Apart from these, a village is also identified as an exogamous group. There is a lot of controversy regarding the cause of the origin of exogamy. Westermarck pointed out in his book, 'History of Human Marriage, 1931 that origin of exogamy was due to the absence of sexual attraction between persons who are brought up together. Kane noted in the 'History of Dharmasastras' in 1930 that exogamous prohibition was due to two reasons; firstly, if near relatives marry, their defects will be transmitted with aggravation to their offspring's and secondly, the fear that there may be clandestine love affairs and consequent loss of morals. Therefore, it is very difficult to identify the specific cause of the origin of the rule of exogamy. It is a group whose members are believed to have descended from a common mythical ancestor of a rishi. Initially there were only eight gotras but gradually their number increased to thousands. The gotra exogamy prohibits marriage between members of the same gotra. Altekar said that there were no restrictions on gotra marriage upto 600 B.C. However, Manu formulated

restrictions on marriage in one's own gotra. But the British government removed the restrictions on gotra marriage in 1946 by the Hindu Marriage Disabilities Removal Act. It means one who carries the particles of the same body. Sapinda relationship arises from being connected by having particles of the same ancestor. Marriage with such persons has been prohibited. But there is a lot of differences on this issue among the ancient lawmakers, like Manu, Gautama, Vasistha, Yajnavalkya, etc. Manu did not mention any exact number of generations on each side to avoid in mate selection in this context. Gautama proposed to avoid seven generation from father's side and five generations from mother's side on the same issue. Vasistha said that it would be better to avoid only five generations from father's side. Yajnavalkya recommended the same view of Vasistha. It (anuloma) is a social practice according to which a boy from upper caste can marry a girl from lower caste and vice-versa. For example, Kannauj Brahmins are sub-divided into three sub-groups or hypergamous groups like Khatkul, Panchdhari and Dhakra. According to hyper-gamous rules, a Khatkul boy can marry a Panchdhari or a Dhakra girl but a Dhakra boy can marry only a Dhakra girl. Hypergamy was sanctioned. But marriage of a girl with a higher Varna (caste) boy was strictly condemned. Manu has also maintained that twice-born men who in their folly wed wives of a low Varna (caste) soon degrade their families and their children to the state of a Sudra. The Gods will not eat the offerings of the men who perform rites in their honour chiefly with a Sudra wife's assistance. The rule of anuloma and pratiloma marriages has greater significance for the caste structure of Hindu society than for the marriage pattern of the Hindus. However, inter-caste mixture also did not raise any insurmountable barrier in the way of marriage for a long time. Even in the days of Manu, the system was much more flexible than it is today, as regards both inter-marriages and inter-dining. It was noted that marriages of males of higher castes with females of lower castes were not uncommon in the society down to the 8th century A.D. The orthodox Smriti and Nibandha writers regarded them as legal. Even the authors of the Dharmasastras lay down the rules governing the shares of inheritance of sons born from wives of different castes. Inter-caste marriages of the anuloma type were not infrequent at least among the Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. Numerous epigraphically and literary evidences highlighted the same context. The Brahmana king Agnimitra of the Sunga family had married a Kshatriya princess named Malavika in c. 150 B.C. A Kadamba ruler, though a Brahmana by caste, gave his daughter in marriage to the Guptas, who were Vaishyas. The founder

of the Pratihara family, king Harichandra (c. 550 A.D.) had both a Brahmana and a Kshatriya wife. Even the father of poet Bana had a Sudra wife as well as her children were living in the same household. Such inter-caste marriages became out of fashion from 10th century A.D. Several 16th and 17th century travellers had noted the fact that how inter-caste marriages were quite unknown to the contemporary Hindu society. It prevailed before the beginning of the Christian era under certain unavoidable circumstances. Even Manu highlighted this issue in his book, 'Manusmriti' that a woman would not be blamed if she abandoned her husband who was impotent, insane or suffering from a particular incurable disease[51] (IX, 79). He identified such abandonment as divorce. Manu noted in his book that such a woman would to re-marry if her previous marriage was not consummated[52] (IX, 175-6). We find an example in the Atharvaveda that a woman marrying again[53] (IX, S. 27-8). Her second marriage of course presupposed a divorce. According to the writers of Dharma Sutras (400 B.C. to 100 A.D.), a Brahman woman might have to wait for her husband until five years who had gone for a long journey. If he did not return within the stipulated time, his wife had the right to go out to join him or could unite herself with another member of the same family or gotra [54] (V.D.S, XVII, 67). Kautilya mentioned the duration for waiting of a woman for her husband only ten months. He vividly noted the requirement of judicial permission before contracting second marriage in the context of death or long absence of her husband (Atthasastra III, 4). Parasara's permission to re-marriage given to the wife of a person who was impotent, had become a religious recluse, or was boycotted, clearly presupposed the possibility of divorce from the earlier marriage [55] (IV, 24). Kautilya noted that divorce had prevailed among the higher castes also to some extent. If the husband and the wife hated each other, divorce was to be granted. The later Dharma Sutras and the Smrti-writers also recognized even re-marriage of widows. Sayana gave an important commentary in the context of remarriage of woman on the same line.

2.8.7. Status and Position of Women in the context of Caste

The status and position of women in the Rig Vedic period was very high in comparison with the later Vedic period. They did not enjoy full equality and wisdom of certain practices. Even the birth of a female child was not as welcomed. We find in the Atharvaveda that charms and rituals were followed to ensure the birth of a son in

preference to that of daughter[56] (III, 23; VI, II). But the Brahdaranyaka Upanishad clearly highlights the fact that some rituals were performed to ensure the birth of an intelligent daughter[57]. However, the Upanayana or the ceremonial initiation into Vedic studies was as common in the case of girls of the three upper castes like the boys[58]. If upanayana was not performed for a girl, then the girl would be reduced to the status of Sudra and she could not marry. However, they could study as the boys. Even they desired to quit studies at the age of 16 or 17 to marry and they were called a 'Brahmavadini'. If they quit their studies to become married, they would be called 'Sadyovahas'. But the Sudra woman was ineligible for Vedic studies. Twenty-seven female Rishis composed several Vedic hymns. The first type of hymns mainly attributed to female Rishis, which included the poems of Vishwavara, and Apale that was composed for Agni and Indra respectively. The second type of hymns particularly attributed to female Rishis, like Lopamundra, and Shashiyasi. These hymns explained how wife and husband should observe celibacy between them. But the authorship was not confirmed of the third type of hymns that were attributed to female Rishis, like Gasha, Kakhivati, Suryasavitri, Indrani, Shrudha Kamayani, Urvashi etc. These hymns had dedicated to mythological beings and personification of abstract qualities. Therefore, it can be said that women were on an equal footing with men in this field as they could learn the Vedas, recite the Vedas and teach the Vedas. The Chhandogya Upanishad noted that women could study the Vedas and become Brahmavadini[59]. Even the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad further supported this assertion. The Satapatha and Vajasenya Brahmana made the association of wife as an indispensable condition precedent for the performance of sacrifice. Women could initiate sacrificial ceremonies and rites of their own accord as noted in the Satapatha Brahmana. But they occupied equal status with men in religious sacrifices in the Upanishads. They were free to take part in samanas, climb hills, dancing and choosing their own husband. But Manu made several arrangements to take away many rights of women like, the right of education, intellectual pursuit, widow remarriage and participation in politics and administrative affairs that were enjoyed by them since the Vedic era. According to him, women were basically fickle, unreliable in mind, promiscuous and not independent as an individual. He noted that women did not need education. Even they were not eligible for the study of the Vedas, or for the use of mantras in performing sacraments except marriage. The nuptial ceremony was to be the only Vedic sacrament for women. He said, "... if a woman obeys her husband, by that she

is exalted in heaven... By violating her duty towards her husband a wife is disgraced in this world; after death she enters the womb of a jackal and is tormented by foul diseases as punishment for her sins"[60]. However, in the course of time woman was brought down under control at all times. They could not act according to their own will in stage of their life. But women were declared by the Smriti-writers to be unfit for independence and they were to be kept under tutelage during their whole life. Manu clearly highlighted this fact that "In childhood she is under the control of her father, in youth she is subject to her husband and in her old age, where her husband has died, under the control of her sons"[61]. Manu noted very clearly that generally women had no property right of their own except few exceptions. "A wife, a son, and a slave – these three have no property; the wealth which they ear is acquired from him to whom they belong"[62].

Manu noted woman as more emotional and less rational by nature than man. They are incompetent for administration. The king should not consult women for secret missions because they betray secret acts. Even he did use the term king, not queen. Not only that but also he said that men are more reliable than women are. Women of upper castes normally did not work. But the women of lower castes might engage in musical instrument, sing, dance etc. even they were given as gifts. According to Dasarath, "Women are cunning and selfish." Agastya noted, "Women stick to a man while he has prosperity but give him up in adversity. ...they are capricious and sharp like weapons." Even some woman in ruling families used to receive military and administrative training also. Kshatriya heroines defending their hearths and homes in times of danger. However, the emergence of the caste concept and its establishment as a socio-religious institution in the course of time brought down the status and position of women. Naturally, the hereditary divisions of caste doomed their position in the society and termed them as Sudrani. Although a Sudra woman according to her socio-religious, position was termed as Sudrani, Sudra-Acharani etc. in the Vedic period. But their position was deteriorated in the course of time and they had to remain in a very ill-fated position by the introduction of the caste institution. Therefore, every caste group had to follow the rigidity of the norms and rules of the hereditary caste system. Even Sumitra, one of the four wives of king Dasharatha, was a Sudra. A girl could find herself a husband even from another Varna (4.12.10) if her father was indifferent about her marriage at the time of puberty.[63]

2.8.8. Caste and Property Rights

According to the caste rules, property rights of different caste divisions were fixed up by their caste position in the Hindu society. It was severely implemented. The Brahmanas had enjoyed all sorts of property rights and privileges for their benefit. They had especially enjoyed the property rights than the other castes. Besides; they had also played a vital role in spiritual development. Even their property could not be appropriated by the state in times of emergency (5.2.37)[64]. Not only that but also the king could not do so (3.5.28)[65]. The Srotriya Brahmins were donated virgin territory, which they could bequeath to their heirs (2.1.7). They could take fruits, flowers, rice and barley for ritual purposes from Crown lands (2.24.30). The Brahmins were also appointed as ambassadors as they were more immune than others (1.16.14, 15) were. Even they could give judgment for different matters as Judges (3.20.22). It was noted in the Shatapatha Brahmana that property of a Brahmin was exempt from the royal claim. Even the remains of the sacrificial food must be eaten by nobody but by a Brahmin.

According to Kautilya, Kshatriyas were entitled as the 'protectors of the land' (14.3.35). They enjoyed the property rights as per their status and position in the Hindu caste division. A Kshatriya king became the owner of the land of his country and its citizens. It was his rights to rule the country. Therefore, it was the hereditary rights of the Kshatriyas to enjoy the property rights of their ancestors. But they could not cross the limits as the Brahmanas in the context of the property rights in the Brahmancal Hindu society. The people belonged to the Vaishya caste enjoyed the property rights. As the Vaishya enjoyed the rights of cultivating the land and trading, they could solely accumulate the wealth for their betterment. Therefore, they ultimately became very wealthy caste in the society. Naturally, it was a great opportunity for them to maintain the economic stability of the country. They could acquire wealth mainly by trading and cultivating the possessed land. However, it was an irony of fate that they could not establish their superior position upon the Brahmanas, as the Brahmanas were made the supreme authority in the socio-religious sphere of the Brahmancal Hindu religion. Therefore, it was the hereditary rights of the Vaishyas to enjoy the property rights of their ancestors. But the Sudras were not given any rights to acquire wealth and to keep property for themselves. Even they were not

empowered to enjoy the property rights as such the Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. They were treated as property of the twice born Hindus in the caste ridden society like the slaves, bondage labour etc. In fact, the so-called Manu, ancient lawmaker and others wrecked the property rights of the Sudras and brought down their status and position below the rank of the animals and beasts in the so called Brahmancal Hindu society. But they could enjoy the property rights in the early Rig Vedic period. We notice that they were very wealthy class in the-then society and enjoyed property rights as the other class if we go through the different hymns of the Rig Veda. Even they were stronger than the others in the perspective of property, wealth, animal etc. The so-called Aryans prayed to God Indra to destroy them and help them by providing their acquired property. The women were not empowered for holding properties in the early Vedic period (Baudhayana II.3.46) in the context of inheritance. They were treated as properties like cattle, land etc. (Gaut. XII. 39; Vasistha XVI. 18). Once they enjoyed the liberty of widow-marriage and Niyoga. Therefore, they had always a husband or a son to look after them. But with the increasing restriction of widow-marriage and Niyoga in the course of time their rights and privileges had rapidly changed. Apastamba (II. 6. 14.9) and Vishnu (XVII.18) noted the right of women to inherit a share of their husband's property in default of a male issue or an adopted daughter (Gaut. XXVIII.21). Vishnu mentioned vividly that 'the wealth of a man who dies without male issue goes to his wife, and on failure of her, to his daughter.' (XVII. 4-5). Kautilya noted that 'if one has only daughters, they shall have his property' (Artha. III.5). But 'no division of property takes place between husband and wife; for, from the time of marriage, they are united in religious ceremonies.'(Ap. II. 6. 14-16). Not only that but also 'a husband who forsakes a blameless wife shall be punished like a thief.' (Vishnu V. 163). However, three acts only made women outcasts, viz. the murder of the husband, slaying a learned Brahman and the destruction of the fruit of their womb.' (Vasistha XXVIII.). 'If a husband is of bad character, or long gone abroad, or a traitor to the king or likely to endanger the life of the wife or an outcast or impotent, he may be abandoned by his wife'. (Artha.III.2).

But Manu noted about the property rights of women in few exceptional cases. He told that unmarried daughters were permitted to one-fourth of the share of patrimony received by their brothers. Even they could get share out of the estate of their maternal

grandmother on the basis of love and affection. The individual property of the mother (Stridhana) was to be given to unmarried daughters only. If a man had no male child, the property of him would transfer to his wife or in her absence to his unmarried daughters. Manu prescribed the line of dividing share[66] between sons as follows:

Table 12: Share Distributions between Sons and Unmarried Sisters

Sons	Share
Eldest son	½ share of property and best of cattle's
Middle son	1/40 (1/2 of the eldest)
Youngest son	i/80 (1/4 of the remaining)
Unmarried sister	All brothers had to give ¼ of their money to unmarried sisters

The king had no right to appropriate the property of a Brahmana if he died and left no heirs. But his property must be distributed to the virtuous Brahmins and if no such Brahmins are to be found, it should be distributed even to a person who were members of the Brahmin caste (ibid, IX, 189).

A girl could find herself a husband even from another Varna (4.12.20) if her father was indifferent about her marriage at the time of puberty. A widow did not inherit all the property of her husband; if there were no heirs, the king took the property leaving only the amounts needed for her maintenance (3.5.28)[67]. She could establish control over her dowry and jewellery after the death of her husband, so long as she did not remarry (3.2.19). If she re-married without getting permission of her father-in -law, her new husband was obliged to return all her property to the other family (3.2.23). A re-married woman had to return the properties to the sons of her first marriage. If a Brahmin had only one son by a Sudra wife, 2/3 of the property was to pass on to his relatives and 1/3 to the son and the son born of a Sudra mother could not perform the rites for his father (3.6.22,23) By the regulations of caste, the Brahmins could play a vital role as the chief adviser of the king, Judges of the court etc. A widow did not inherit all the property of her husband; if there were no heirs, the king took the property leaving only the amounts needed for her maintenance (3.5.28). She could establish control over her dowry and jewellery after the death of her husband, so long as she did not re-marry (3.2.19). If she re-married without getting permission of her father-in -law, her new husband was obliged to return all her property to the other family (3.2.23). A re-married woman had to return the properties to the sons of her first marriage. If a man from any of the three higher Varnas had wives from different

Varnas, the shares[68] of the sons shall be according to the Varna of the mother, as given below:

Table 13: Discriminations of Share Distribution for Different Mother's Caste (Shares 3. 6. 17, 18)

Varna of wife	Varna of husband		
	Brahmin	Kshatriya	Vaishya
Brahmin	4	-	-
Kshatriya	3	3	-
Vaishya	2	2	2
Sudra	1	1	1

An alternative arrangement operates in case a man had only two wives, one of the same Varna and another from a Varna next below.

Table 14: Caste based Shares[69] (3.6.19, 20) Distributions.

Varna of Wife	Varna of Husband		
	Brahmin	Kshatriya	Vaishya
Brahmin	1	-	-
Kshatriya	1	1	-
Vaishya	-	½ or 1	1
Sudra	-	-	½ or 1

j. In case a Brahmin has only one son by a Sudra wife, that son shall have only one third of the property... (3.6.22, 23).

k. Even children born of parents of mixed Varna shall have equal shares. (3.7.39).

l. A self-mortgaged Arya shall have the right to inherit his father's property. (3.13.14). But the property of a slave shall be inherited by his relatives; if there are none, his master shall inherit it. (3.13.22).

2.8.9. Caste System and the Law of the State

The law and order of the state was framed according to the norms of the caste rules for each caste group. The main motto of it was to rule the country as per the norms of the caste system. Generally, the Brahmins got opportunity to enjoy all sorts of rights and privileges whereas the Sudras were kept under the dark rule. If they violated the norms and restrictions of the caste system in the course of the state regulations, they were punished severely according to their caste position and status in the society. Therefore, the social order of the Hindus was founded upon the concept of caste discrimination and caste hierarchy which sanctioned by the so-called Brahmanical Hindu religion. The conceptions of caste discrimination were profoundly permeated

by the notion of inequality and inhumanity among the different castes and sexes. The concept of inequality and inhumanity between the different caste divisions were reflected in the administration of law and justice of the state. The state had to maintain the regulations of the caste system to fulfill the requirement of the unnatural social divisions. That is why, the law of the state was made in connection with the four divisions of caste. Actually, caste rules itself a death warrant to the Sudras. Different types of punishments were assigned for the same offence of different caste groups. Actually, distinctions were made in both civil and criminal law between castes and sexes. The punishments were determined by the status and position of the accused in the context of the caste regulations. Even a differentiation was made for murder of different caste divisions in the time of the later Samhitas and Sutras. According to the Sutras, different caste groups had to provide the following amount for the same offence like murder. A Khatriya had to give 1000 cows, of a Vaishya at a hundred and of a Sudra at ten, with a bull over and above for the king as a reward for his intervention (Apastamba, I, ix, 24, 1-4; Gautama, XXII, 14-16). The wergild payable for women was the same as that fixed for a Sudra (Bodhayana, I, x 19, 3). According to Kautilya, the following punishments were assigned to the four caste groups if they violated the norms of food and drink regulated by the so-called ancient lawmakers of the Hindu Sastras. Those who partook of prohibited food or drink were liable to be deported (Arthsastra, Mysore edition, p. 232).

Table 15: Punishments allotted to Four Castes for Prohibited food and drink[70].

Prohibited food and drink (If taken by the four castes)	Punishments
Brahmin	Highest sp
Kshatriya	Middle sp
Vaishya	Lowest sp
Sudra	54 Panas

Kautilya mentioned different types of rules regarding caste discriminations in the context of law of the state. The society was clearly cut up into two caste groups, viz. Aryas of the four castes (Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras) and pre-Aryas who remained outside this pale. An Arya could never be treated as a slave[71] (3.13.4) . Therefore, different types of punishments were allotted for different castes as follows:

Caste based Cremated Grounds

What is more, people from different castes were cremated in different grounds as per law of the state. Kautiya noted very clearly that the cremation grounds shall be designated for the higher Varnas in the northern or eastern part and for the lower Varnas in the southern part[72] (2.4.20, 21).

He also pointed out that Heretics and Chandalas shall stay in land allotted to them beyond the cremation grounds (2.4.23). But cremating a body in a ground not reserved for that Varna shall provide fine of lowest SP (2.4.22).

Discrimination of Caste based Punishments

The punishments for the same crime were different for different castes. In general, the lower caste was severely punished for a particular offence whereas the punishment for the higher caste for the same was more nominal than the lower castes. It was clearly described in the Shatapatha Brahmana that the murder of a Brahmin was treated as a more heinous crime than that of killing any other man. A heavy ritual could only expiate it.

Exemption from all Taxes and Corporal Punishment for Brahmins

A Brahmin was also exempt from the payment of taxes and tolls (ibid, VII, 133-136). Brahmin and its property were absolutely inviolate. Stealing the gold of a Brahmin and killing a Brahmin were regarded as heinous sins. Willful murder of a Brahmin was, of course, inexpiable. Even the Brahmins were exempted from corporal punishment[73].

Rigorous punishments for Chandalas

A chandala was imposed heavy fine of 100 panas for touching an Arya woman (3.20.16)[74]. They were employed by the state as guards for the safety of the land between villages (2.1.6). Even they had to pay highest fine for theft of small animals than the other caste groups.

g. Punishments for seller, buyer or mortgager of an Arya:

Table 16: Discriminations of Punishments for offences Against Arya Minors[75] (3.13.1,2).

Offender	Minor of the same Varna	Minor of Different Varna
Sudra	12 panas	Lowest SP
Vaishya	24 panas	Middle SP
Kshatriya	36 panas	Highest SP
Brahmin	48 panas	Death

Cheating a bonded labourer or depriving him or her of the rights as an Arya[76].

Table 17: Discrimination of Punishments for Cheating as an Arya (3.13.7)

Sudra	6 panas
Vaishya	12 panas
Kshatriya	18 panas
Brahmin	24 panas

Punishments for Defamation[77] to a Brahmin or non-Brahmin.

Table 18: Caste based Punishments for Defamation to a Brahmin.

If Brahmin was Defamed by the following Castes	Penalty must be given as Caste Position
Kshatriya	100 Panas
Vaishya	150 Panas or 200 Panas
Sudra	Corporal Punishments

Caste based Punishments for defamation[78]of various Castes by Brahmins

Table 19: Punishments for defame a non-Brahmin by Brahmin.

If Brahmin defamed the following Castes	Penalty must be given by Brahmin
Brahmin	12 Panas
Kshatriya	50 Panas
Vaishya	25 Panas Panas
Sudra	12 Panas

Severe Punishments for Sudras

A Sudra passing himself off as a Brahmin was punished with the blinding of both eyes (4.10.13) and anyone violating the sanctity of a Brahmin's kitchen had his tongue rooted out (4.12.21)[79]

A Sudra who insulted a twice-born man with gross invective was liable to have his tongue cut off[80]. If he mentioned the names and castes of the twice-born with contumely, an iron nail ten inches long should be thrust red-hot into his mouth, and if he arrogantly taught Brahmanas their duty, the king should cause hot oil to be poured into his mouth and into his ears[81].

If the limb, hand, or foot of the lower castes caused hurt to a person of the twice-born man that limb, hand, or foot should be cut off in case of assault[82].

If low caste man desired to take seat of the twice-born people, he should be branded on his hip and banished or the king should cause his posteriors to be gashed[83].

Sudra trying to hear the Vedic texts shall have his ears filled with molten tin or lac; if he recites the Veda his tongue shall be cut off, and if he assumes a position of equality with twice-born men, either in sitting or going along the road, he shall receive corporal punishment.

A Sudra, committing adultery with women of the twice born, shall suffer capital punishment, or shall be burnt alive tied up in straw. If he intentionally reviles twice-born men or criminally assaults them, the limb with which he offends shall be cut off.

But a Sudra can be abused by a Brahmin without entailing any punishment. Goutama forbade a Snataka to accept water given by a Sudra.

A Sudra committing adultery with an Aryan woman shall have his organ cut off and his property confiscated.

Discrimination of Punishments for Theft

In case of theft, a Vaishya and a Kshatriya are liable to pay double and four times the fine payable by a Sudra; but a Brahmana thief is liable to eight or even sixteen times the fine[84].

But the Brahmana was exempted from capital punishment; he was liable to be deported with his property[85].

The punishment for adultery except in the case of a Brahmin was death[86].

A man of low caste who made love to a maiden of a higher caste was liable to corporal punishment[97].

A Sudra who had intercourse with a woman of the twice-born group was liable to be punished severely, if the woman of the higher castes left unguarded, with the

deprivation of the offending organ and all his property; and if she was guarded, with loss of everything, even his life[88].

If a man of the lower caste or an outcaste insults a man of higher caste, the insulted person (Narada, XV-XVI, 11-14) could whip him on the spot.

l. Monopoly Rights of the Brahmins to interpret laws:

Only a Brahmana could be appointed by the king to interpret the law and the king should under no circumstances allow a Sudra to settle the law[89].

m. Discrimination of Caste regarding Witness:

In the case of witness, it was generally asserted that a Brahmin witness normally spoke the truth. However, a Kshatriya witness was ordered to speak the truth. A Vaishya witness must be ordered to speak the truth on pain of being visited with the sin of theft of kine, grain and gold. Even a Sudra witness should be ordered to speak the truth on pain of incurring the sin of all degrading crimes[90].

But the death of a Brahmana, a Kshatriya, a Vaishya or a Sudra caused by the declaration of the truth, a falsehood may be spoken, for such falsehood is preferable to truth. Such witness may expiate the guilt of the falsehood by certain penances[91].

Severe Punishments for dishonouring Guru

A person of higher Varna beating or kicking a guru - cutting of a hand and a foot or 700 panas fine (4.10.12)[92].

Caste based different rate of Interest

Kautilya prescribed differential rate of interest for debts according to Caste, a Brahmin being charged 2 %, a Kshatriya 3%, a Vaishya 4% and a Sudra 5%[93].

Aryas never lose its Arya status

As an Arya, a Sudra could never be a slave (3.13.4). Even if he had bonded himself and his family, his children did not lose their Arya status (3.13.13)[94].

2.8.10. Caste and the question of Cleanliness (Especially Gupta Period)

The question of cleanliness relating to caste appeared very seriously mainly in the rule of the Gupta emperors in the context of purity, impurity, touchable, untouchable, pollution, food habits and others with the revival of the Brahmancal Hindu religion. Even the people of the lowborn had no rights to touch anything. The touch of them on anything created impurity, pollution and destroyed the holiness. Naturally, the upper caste Hindus, especially the Brahmins did not take that article or food. They did not use it without purification according to their norms. Therefore, the tendency of touch – me – not –ism became the common phenomenon among the twice born men towards the ill-fated lowborn peoples. The main motto of it was to keep them quite pure, holistic, touchable and free from any kinds of pollution relating to food habits and others in the eyes of the common people rather than Buddhism. Therefore, it can be said that the revivalism of the Brahmanical religion in the Gupta age stirred the very foundation of the so-called Hindu society. The mechanism of the Caste Institution was severely applied to re-establish the supremacy of the Brahmanical religion upon the common people. The main motto of it was to keep in tact the class interest of the Brahmins. The rise of Buddhism and Jainism weakened the very foundation of the Brahmanical Hindu religion in the age of Goutam Buddha and Mahabir. Naturally, the Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra caste got opportunity to fulfill their cherish dream in the society by following the path of Goutam Buddha which was based on the principle of scientific outlook, rational argument and humanitarian approach. Therefore, the essence and management of Buddhism ultimately paved the way of protecting the human rights and privileges of the lower strata in the society. Naturally, most of the toiling masses were very much satisfied with the content and simplicity of Buddhism whereas they did not like the Brahmanical Hindu religion, which wrecked their all sorts of rights and privileges and brought down their status and position below the position of beasts and animals in the society. In fact, the socio-religious customs, manners, rules and regulations of the-then Brahmanical Hindu religion were based on the norms of the caste institution that framed by the so-called ancient lawmakers like, Manu and others. However, the social revolution under the leadership of Goutam Buddha greatly changed the socio-religious outlook of the common people and stirred their mind at a large. Naturally, the impact and

importance of the Brahmanical Hindu religion upon the lower classes in the society was reduced rapidly under these unavoidable circumstances. Not only that but also the inhuman mechanism of the caste system and the deplorable condition and dismal picture of the Brahmanical Hindu religion under the impact of Buddhism was nakedly exposed in the-then society. However, Chandra Gupta Maurya, a Sudra emperor of the Maurya dynasty played a vital role to establish the religion of Buddhism.

But the revivalism of the Brahmanical Hindu religion in the Gupta period heralded an epoch making event in the history of ancient India. There were numerous reasons behind this perspective. First of all, the main motto behind it was to establish the solid foundation of the Brahmancal Hindu religion in the society in perpetuity to abolish Buddhism. Secondly, to create a contemptuous atmosphere towards Buddhism. Thirdly, the followers of the Brahmancal Hindu religion were compelled to live in the society on the basis of the norms of the caste system. Otherwise, they were expelled from their socio-religious position in the society. Fourthly, the concept of purity and impurity were introduced to protect the class interest particularly, the Brahmins. Fifthly, to introduce different policies for controlling the food habits of their followers to establish superiority. Sixthly, the concept of touchable and untouchable increased rapidly to maintain cleanliness. In fact, all these measures were adopted just to establish the superiority of Brahmanism over Buddhism. Even the norms of the caste institution were made mandatory during the rule of the Gupta period with a motto of controlling social fabric. But it was not made mandatory in the times of Manu. Every caste group had to maintain the norms of the caste rules. Even the concept of purity and impurity was developed in course of time. The question of cleanliness attached to the daily life of the lowborn caste.

Besides; the Brahmins realized the essence of Ahimsa that attracted the popularity of the common masses in the context of Buddhism. Therefore, they made policy to oust the Buddhists from their place of honour and respect which they had acquired in the minds of the common peoples by their opposition to the killing of the cow for sacrificial purposes. That is why; they wanted to become vegetarians to defeat the Buddhists. Therefore, the Brahmins adopted the policies of cow-worship and gave up beef eating. Naturally, they did not want to put themselves merely on the same footing in the eyes of the public as the Buddhist Bhikshus. Not only that but also they

ultimately became vegetarians with a motto of vanquish Buddhism. Naturally, cow-killing was made a Mahapataka, a mortal sin or a capital offence in the course of time to defeat Buddhism. Even there was a time when Hindus – both Brahmins and non-Brahmins – ate not only flesh but also beef. But both of these groups ultimately abandoned to take flesh and beef as food item to become superior and most pure than the Buddhists in the eyes of the common people. Therefore, the Hindu notion on the issue of purity and pollution was very important in the context of caste and its food habits. Purity was closely associated with good omen, i. e., those things, which were pure, were supposed to bring good results or fortune, by their association, as good omens do and impure things would bring misery. That is why; the concept of purity, impurity, pollution, touchable and untouchable was developed in the course of time. Manu noted physical defilement, psychological defilement and ethical defilement. He treated birth, death and menstruation as the source of impurity. However, the defilement of death was more extensive than others. According to him, Brahmin was 'ever pure'. Even he said that food offered by the polluted person would not be acceptable. He clearly noted different rules for purification of all sorts of defilement. Even the concept of filthy occupation relating to the creation of untouchability was not solely dependable explanation. Apart from these it can be highlighted that the laws made by the Gupta Emperors to prevent those who killed cows. The main target behind it was to create a superior as well as clean image before the common people. However, it did not apply in the case of the untouchables. Naturally, the people who ate the flesh of dead cow, worn the torn garments and lived in a very filthy conditions in the remote corner of the village generally known as untouchable. That is why; the concept of untouchable and untouchability did not disappear from the-then society. The Brahmins and non-Brahmins ultimately left beef eating and cow killing and became purely vegetarian whereas the untouchables were not compelled to leave their food habits in connection with death cow's meat or other death animal's flesh. Naturally, they became impure as well as untouchable in the eyes of Brahmancal society. Even those who violated the norms of purity were treated as impure and untouchable as a whole.

2.9. Conclusion

The issue of caste is itself an instant incurable canceristic source of psycho-mental disease of the so-called Brahmanical Hindu religion in India. It did not recognize the inborn qualities of lowborn man. It propagated the unquestioned superiority of the class interest of the Brahmins. They were equated with the God. Naturally, the concept of liberty, equality, fraternity and humanity were not established due to the formation of inhumane caste institution. Therefore, ill-fated people of India were forcibly compelled to abide by the norms of their death warrant (Caste rules) prepared by the ancient lawmakers, especially by Manu in respect of the concept of human rights, occupation, marriage, property rights, law of the state, socio-economic, politico-religious status and position and others. Its pernicious impact can be explained shortly in the opinion of the following scholars. Dr. John Wilson carried out an extensive research on the Indian Caste for twenty years and gave a commendable opinion on this issue as follows:

"It is among the Hindus, however, that the imagination of natural and positive distinctions in humanity has been brought to the most fearful and pernicious development ever exhibited on the face of the globe. The doctrine and practice of what is called Caste, as held and observed by this people, has been only dimly shadowed by the worst social arrangements which were of old to be witnessed among the proudest nations and among the proudest orders of men in these nations."[95]
He also pointed out; "Indian Caste is the condensation of all the pride, jealousy and tyranny of an ancient and predominant people dealing with the tribes which they have subjected and over which they have ruled, often without the sympathies of a recognized common humanity"[96].

Even the true picture of the heartless mechanism of the Indian Caste system can be traced from the following poem of the Black poet Patrick Tamers:
"Step into my shoes, wear my skin,
See what I see, feel what I feel
And then you shall know,
Who I am, what I am and why I am."[97]

John Wilson also highlighted the fact that "It is dishonouring alike to the Creator of man and injurious to man, the creature. It is emphatically the curse of India and the parent of India's woes. It is the great enemy of enlightenment and improvement and advancement in India. It is the grand obstacle to the triumphs of the Gospel of peace in India. Its evil doing of late, it is not too bold to say, have moved earth below, heaven above, and hell beneath. . ..... India alone has striven to keep itself in obscurity and darkness."[98]

The violent antipathy and hatred of race and religion, thus early manifested, have continued to be among the most potent and injurious elements of caste to the present day.[99] Even the most learned persons of India after the passing of thousands of years are the passive followers of the caste in the work - span of their daily life. They always try to show themselves as free from caste convictions and open minded in the political, educational, cultural, social, religious, economic, administrative and other fields either individually or collectively. However, it is well known to all that they are very conservative in disguise in their individual or family life towards the issue of caste in respect of marriage, inter-dying and other factors. Practically speaking, they are playing a vital role to uphold the concept of caste like the face behind the mask in the society in the name of their ancestors' experiences.

References

1. Wilson, John; Indian Caste, Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1976, p.12.
2. Encyclopaedia Britannica Ready Reference, Encyclopaedia Britannica (India) Pvt., Ltd., New Delhi, Vol. 2, 2005, p. 173.
3. The New Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 2, Micropaedia Ready Reference, Encycopaedia Britannica, Inc., London / New Delhi, 15th edition, 2005, p.931.
4. Biswas, Nanigopal and Biswas Renuka: Tulanamulak Samikha, Published by Kasishsar Sarkar, Ramakrishna Sarada Printing, Kolikata-6,1987, pp.39-40.
5. Sharma, S.P; History of Ancient India, Mohit Publications, New Delhi, 1996, p.99.
6. Ibid, p.98.
7. Ibid, p.55.
8. Ibid, p. 56.
9. Muir, John; The Original Sanskrit Text, Vol. I, London, p.13. Quoted in Moon, Vasant, (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.7,Published

by the Education Department Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 1990, p. 134.

10. Ibid, p.14. Quoted by Ambedkar in Vol. 7 of his Writings and Speeches, op. cit., p.135.

11.Griffith, Ralph T. H; Hymns of the Rig Veda, Vol. II, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1999, p.409.

12. Ibid.

13. Sharma, S.P; History of Ancient India, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

14. Ibid, p. 100.

15. Ibid, p. 101

16. Ibid.

17. Jha, Ganganath; Manusmriti (with the 'Manubhasya' of Medhatithi), Vol. 7 (English translation), Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Delhi, p. 297

18. Sharma, S.P; History of Ancient India, Mohit Publications, op. cit., pp. 101

19. Ibid.

20. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.7, Published by the Education Department Government of Maharashtra, Bombay,1990, pp.135-139.

21. Muir, John; The Original Sanskrit Text, Vol. I, London, p.17.

22. Ibid.

23. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 7, op. cit., p. 98.

24. Ibid., pp. 21-64

25. Ibid., p. 69

26. Ibid., pp. 70, 211-213.

27. Ibid., p.77.

28. D.S. Triveda; The Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XX,p.62. Quoted by Ambedkar in Vol. 7 of his Writings and Speeches, p.75.

29. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 7, op. cit., p.114.

30. Ibid, p. 116

31. Ibid, p. 118

32. Ibid, p.121

33. Muir, John; The Original Sanskrit Text, Vol. I, op. cit., p.366. Quoted in Moon, Vasant; (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.7, p.122.
34. Ibid, p.126
35. Ibid, pp. 129; Quoted by Vaidya in Mahabharata Upasamhara, p. 200
36. Senart Emile; Caste in India - The facts and the system, ESS Publications, Delhi, 1975, p. 192
37. Muir, John; The Original Sanskrit Text, Vol. I, op. cit., p. 366.
38. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 7, op. cit., pp.107-108.
39. Ibid, pp.109-110
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid, p.110-111
42. Ibid, p. 112; Quoted in Roy's Translation, Vol. II, p. 197
43. Ibid, p. 81
44. Ibid, p. 83-85
45. Ibid, p. 86
46. Dutta, Nripendra Kumar; Origin and Growth of Caste in India, Firma K.L.Mukhapadhyay, Calcutta, 1968, p. 121.
47. Ibid, p. 122.
48. Ibid, p. 125.
49. Ibid, p.120.
50. Ibid.
51. Altekar, A.S.; The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization, Motilal Banarsidas Publishers Private Limited, Delhi, 1999. p. 83.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid, p. 84.
54. Ibid, p. 84.
55. Ibid.
56. Kapoor, Subodh; ed. Ancient Hindu Society, Cosmo Publications, New Delhi, 2002, Vol. 4, p. 1152.
57. Ibid.
58. Altekar, A.S.; The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization, op. cit., pp. 200-201. Quoted in A.V., XI, 5, 18.
59. Kapoor, Subodh; ed. Ancient Hindu Society, op. cit., p. 1153

60. Ibid, p. 1162.
61. Ibid, pp. 1161-1162.
62. Ibid, p. 1165.
63. Rangarajan, L.N.; Kautilya The Arthashastra, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 1992, p.66.
64. Ibid, p.46.
65. Ibid.
66. Kapoor, Subodh; ed. Ancient Hindu Society, op. cit., p. 1165.
67. Rangarajan, L.N.; Kautilya The Arthashastra, op. cit., p.66
68. Ibid, p. 420.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid, pp.496-497.
71. Ibid, 48.
72. Ibid, p. 193.
73. Ibid, pp. 77, 179.
74. Ibid, p.51.
75. Ibid, p. 453.
76. Ibid.
77. Kapoor, Subodh; ed. Ancient Hindu Society, Cosmo Publications, New Delhi, 2002, Vol. 3, p. 827.
78. Ibid.
79. Rangarajan, L.N.; Kautilya The Arthashastra, op. cit., p. 47.
80. Sen Shastri, Murolimohan; Manusamhita, Dipali Book House, Kolikata, 1994, (Bengali version), Chapter- VIII, Verse 270, p. 346.
81. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 271-272, p. 346-347. See also, Manu, VIII, pp. 267-272.
82. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 279-280, p. 348. See also Kapoor, Subodh; ed. Ancient Hindu Society, p. 827.
83. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 281, p. 348. See also, Manu, VIII, pp. 279-281.
84. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 337-338, p. 359.
85. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 123-124, 380; pp. 315-316. See also Arthasastra, Mysore ed., p. 220.
86. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 359, p. 363. See also, Manu, VIII, pp. 371-372.
87. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 364, 366; p, 364.
88. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 374, p. 366.

89. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 20, p. 292.
90. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 88. p. 308.
91. Ibid, Chapter VIII, Verse 103, p. 311.
92. Rangarajan, L.N.; Kautilya The Arthashastra, op. cit., p.475.
93. Manu, VIII, 142; Yajnavalkya, II, 37 and quoted in Kapoor, Subodh; ed. Ancient Hindu Society, Cosmo Publications, New Delhi, 2002, Vol. 3, pp. 826-827.
94. Rangarajan, L.N.; Kautilya The Arthashastra, op. cit., p. 48.
95. Wilson, John; Indian Caste, Vol. I, London, 1877, pp. 10-11.
96. Ibid, p.11
97. Coleman, James C.: Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life, 1976, Bombay, pp. 633.
98. Ibid, p. 12.
99. Ibid, pp. 315-316.

Chapter 3

The Attitude of the 19th Century Reformers and the Role of the British Government towards the Issue of Caste

3.1 Introduction

How far the impacts of Renaissance were truly realized and utilized in the context of caste and untouchability in the Indian society is still a matter of controversy. The pioneers of the so-called Indian renaissance as Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Annie Besant, and Swami Vivekananda etc. were highly venerated and accredited. Could they really succeed in bestowing the true significance of 'Renaissance' in the India society? Could they really making revolutionary changes in the socio-religious upheavals to eradicate caste institution in perpetuity along with the pernicious and inhuman concept of caste and untouchability from the Hindu society? That is why; their role and contributions would be discussed categorically in the context of the Indian society from the epoch-making viewpoint of the Italian as well as European Renaissance. Besides, their attitudes towards the issue of caste and untouchability would be examined methodically to prove their honesty of purpose for bringing a radical change in the Hindu society or the greater interest of the Indian Nation. Therefore, it can be noted that the pioneer thinkers of the Indian Renaissance had to face numerous problems relating to the issue of caste and untouchability. They initially came forward to highlight the burning social issues, evils, superstitions and its inhuman nature and peculiarity regarding the institution of caste and untouchability that wrecked the rights and privileges of the lower strata of the so-called Hindu society. However, most of the Renaissance men of India failed to change themselves completely as per the specific required necessity of the trend of Renaissance in the Indian society. Even they did not succeed to abolish permanently these two institutions. They confined themselves only by ideal talking on these issues. In fact; the so-called 19th century Renaissance and Reformation Movement led by the emerging intelligentsia in Colonial India failed to bring radical change in the domain of Hindu society, polity, economy, religion etc. in connection with the protection of human rights and its privileges based on the principles of equality, liberty and

fraternity in all spheres of their individual as well as national life as a whole. The role and contribution of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Annie Besant and Swami Vivekananda etc. towards the issue of caste and untouchability may be mentioned in this connection.

3.2. Conceptualization of Italian and European Renaissance

Therefore, I have to denote the meaning of the term Renaissance, its features, and the novel mission of the Reformation Movement before going to elaborate the role and contribution of the above-mentioned personalities towards the issue of caste and untouchability in the domain of the Indian society. In fact, the term 'Renaissance'[1] generally means're-birth', 'Risorgimento' etc. The greatness of which was mainly based on the principle of scientific rationalism, humanism, nationalism etc. The motto of it was to bring a radical change and an evolution into the minds of the humankind from the so-called traditional trend of darkness to modern concept of scientific rationalism. It stirred the mind set up of everyone to justify everything and to pay due attention before taking any decision or accepting any social customs or religious matter whatever may be that would be considered on the basis of scientific analysis, humanistic approach, rationalistic and logical point of view. It is very much interesting to learn that countless efforts have been made in order to find a true, precise and satisfactory definition of the term 'Renaissance'. We are far from getting such a much-awaited answer. It is a vague idea or an attitude, which first influenced in Italy and gradually spread in Europe. The concept of Renaissance stands for the rebirth of humankind from the shackles of medieval darkness. It generated a pledge to known the unknown, to explain the unexplained, to explore the unexplored. It radically affected every sphere of human life from medicine to astronomy and from art to architecture. Thus it will not be exaggeration to say that Renaissance produced a socially, economically, morally and uplifted human race through humanism, rationalism and the principles of equality, liberty and fraternity. However, the idea of rebirth lies at the heart of all Renaissance achievements; artists, scholars, scientists, philosophers, architects, and rulers believed that the way to greatness and illumination was through the study of the Golden Ages of the ancient Greeks and Romans. The Italian Renaissance was one of the most colorful, vital, and exciting phenomenon in history. The Renaissance in Italy flourished in the 15th century and

spread throughout most of Europe in the 16th century. Italian life in the 14th and 15th centuries was lived among the vast ruins of the ancient Roman Empire. The cruelty and barbarism of Rome had long been forgotten, and the splendor of that lost civilization's ruins suggested a glorious, golden past. The Renaissance began in Florence, Italy in the late thirteenth century. It subsequently spread to the rest of Italy particularly Rome and then to northern Europe, where it developed somewhat differently. The best-known expressions of the bold new Renaissance spirit can be trace out in the painting, sculpture, and architecture of the period. New attitudes were also found in education, politics, and philosophy; in Northern Europe new ideas of social reform developed. It was basically an elitist movement. A negative development of the age was the deterioration in the power and position of women in society. Other artists during the Italian Renaissance period such as Giovanni Bellini began to express their art through secular and religious themes and ideas that were exhibited through landscapes and portraits as new styles, it was developed.

The characteristics of Renaissance were humanism, nationalism, a new approach to life, and a new spirit in art, architecture, literature and learning, the growth of the vernaculars, and scientific investigation. The Renaissance stood for humanism, the sympathetic and devoted study of humankind, instead of the theological devotion of the Middle Age. Patriarch was regarded as the Father of Humanism.

It laid emphasis on the importance of critical examination and evaluation of ideas and principles. Several Renaissance scholars such as Francis Bacon and Leonardo da Vinci were the products of this great movement. The Greeks and the Romans who had led richer and fuller lives than what was known in Western Europe during the previous one thousand years inspired these scholars. These scholars helped Europe to take giant steps in the fields of literature, art and architecture, painting, music and science, during the Renaissance period.

3.3. Was the Indian Renaissance the out come of Italian and European Renaissance?

There was a great controversy among the Indian scholars, historians, philosophers, sociologists, economists, educationists and social scientists etc. regarding the nature, character and features of the 'Indian Renaissance'. Most of the scholars in different

disciplines had differed in their respective approach to this issue. Some prominent scholars in different fields did not accept the theory of the 'Indian Renaissance' as because it failed to bring revolutionary changes in all spheres of individual or national life as like the concept of the 'Italian Renaissance'. They raised a provocative question that the emerging 19th century intelligentsia of India mainly worked for their class or caste interest not for the common interest as a whole. Not only that but also they did not express their willingness to discard their age-old authoritative caste based socio-religious symbol of the 'sacred thread' either individually or collectively. It was an irony of fate that the so-called Indian renaissance was led by their thoughts and beliefs without considering the needs and demands of the common people of the so-called Brahmanical Hindu society. In fact, most of the emerging 19th century intelligentsia had come from the upper caste Hindu family except few exceptions. Almost they had strong economic background. The sons of the Zaminders, property owners and wealthy persons etc. got opportunity to take part in the Western education. They were very much influenced by the Western liberal ideas and thoughts. Not only that but also they were inspired by the thought-provoking and revolutionary influences and changes of the Italian and European Renaissance which stirred their mind set up at a large. But they did not cross the socio-religious barriers and limitations in case of the caste system and untouchability that were based on the strategy of inequality, injustice, disparity and inhuman nature which brought down the low strata of the Hindu society into the status and position of animals, beasts and slaves. It was generally said; What Bengal thinks today, India will think tomorrow? However, the 19th century Bengal intelligentsia did not capable to utilize the true concept of the Italian and European Renaissance in the context of the Indian society for the abolition of the caste institution and untouchability. They expressed their grievances against these two institutions only by ideal talking, not by launching a direct movement against these inhuman arrangements due to the pressure and vehement opposition of the Orthodox Hindus and their family convictions and personal limitations and inability. They realized the gravity and importance of its abolition from the Hindu society. The utmost necessity of the time was the abolition of these two institutions. Inspite of that they did not dare to abolish these institutions from the Hindu society that had yet been creating numerous incurable socio-religious problems in the Hindu society. It is generally said that a new trend of development and radical change in all spheres of life was emerged in the context of society,

religion, culture, science, art and architecture etc. in the 19th century India especially in Bengal, which accelerated the process of eradication the darkness of the medieval age from the society and gave birth to the ideology of rationalism and humanism that is called 'Renaissance'. It played a vital role to make modern and progressive India. Raja Ram Mohan Roy had most probably compared the 19th century Bengal with the 16th century Renaissance of Europe. He told Alexander Duff as follows: 'I began to think that something similar to the European Renaissance might have taken place here in India.'[2] Even Bankim Chandra, Keshab Chandra Sen, Aurobindo, Bipin Chandra Pal etc identified the 19th century Bengal as the age of Renaissance. However, there was a great controversy among the historians and scholars on this issue. Obviously most of them accepted the view that the 19th century was the age of Renaissance in the context of Bengal as well as India. But it had several negative and positive outlooks. Binoy Ghosh said, 'The upper-caste Hindus who became bhadralok or 'babus', by their-caste and status and English education, were completely enslaved and logically made inferior through and through'[3].Ramesh Chandra Majumdar pointed out that the Renaissance of Bengal was the out come of the Hindu nationalism[4]. Sumit Sarkar pointed out that the trend of renaissance of whole Bengal was nothing but a xerox copy of English renaissance. In India, full scale colonial rule lasted the longest, and there was ample time for the growth of dependent vested interests, the elaboration of a hegemonic infra-structure producing 'voluntary' consent side by side with more direct politico-military domination. The English-educated intelligentsia in its origins was very much a part of this system, nowhere more so than in Bengal (Rammohun Roy and the Break with the Past). He also remarked about the modernity of Rammohun that not of full-blooded bourgeois modernity, but of a weak and distorted caricature of the same which was all that colonial subjection permitted. Not only that but also he said about the role of Young Bengal that its impact on Bengali society as a whole, as distinct from its intelligentsia crust, was very nearly nil (The Complexities of Young India)[5]. Asoke Mitra said that the Zamindar community gained much profit by the exploitation of the poor peasants through the land revenue settlements of the British Government and transferred their wealth to Calcutta as there inhabitant, which ultimately hastened the process of cultural renaissance in the city of Calcutta. Suprakash Roy said that there was no similarity between the European Renaissance and the Bengal Renaissance. Its historical perspective was completely opposite to each other. But he also highlighted

the progressive outlook of the social reform movement. It was nothing but the effect of renaissance. He identified the property owners of the land revenue settlements into two categories; one was progressive and another was conservative. Raja Ram Mohan and his followers belonged to the progressive group and Radhakanta Deb and the Orthodox Hindus belonged to the conservative group. Prof. Sushaban Sarkar pointed out that the Bengal Renaissance had two trends; one was Western another was revivalism of the Golden past. However, the first phase was more important than the second one. Binoy Ghosh said, "What we call 'Bengal Renaissance' ... turned out to be nothing but a historical hoax" [6]. It did not touch the major portion of the society except the nominal portion of the upper class society. But the Indian renaissance was nothing but a myth in the context of the Indian society. Aurobindo Podder wrote, 'A renaissance which assured the people neither recognition nor a place in the manifestation of its will was from its very inception, from both qualitative and quantitative considerations, a distorted sapless renaissance[7]. England having been its wet nurse, it was, as it were, an English renaissance in quite a different garb enacted on India, s soil. Prof. Barun De, Asoke Sen and Summit Sarkar highlighted the fact that the renaissance of the 19th century Bengal was emerged under the patronage of the British imperialism. The emerging 19th century intelligentsia was the pioneers of the Bengal renaissance and they were the supporters of the British imperialism. In fact, it had no connection with the common people. Some scholars did not completely deny its progressive trend. Amlan Datta stressed on the importance of the 19th century Bengal renaissance inspite of its numerous limitations. He also said that the Bengali was known only for this renaissance. It was emerged only by the role of the middle class service holders. There was a great controversy regarding the name of the pioneer of the 19th century renaissance. He also noted the name of Raja Ram Mohan Roy relating to the origin and growth of the 19th century renaissance and its results. However, David Kopf pointed out that the pioneer of the 19th century Renaissance of Bengal was the Western Britishers. To him, Warren Hastings was the pioneer of this renaissance and the emancipator of the Orientalists. He also noted the fact that Wellesley played a vital role for the Bengal renaissance by establishing the Fort William College. According to him, 'The Bengal renaissance was the child of eighteenth century cosmopolitanism and pragmatic British policy build around the need for an acculturated civil service class[8]. The 19th century intelligentsia of India was very much influenced by the thought-provoking trends and ideas of the European

Renaissance, Reformation and Enlightenment. The impacts of which inspired them to reform the religion and society. They wanted to break the so-called age-old superstitious traditions and customs. Prof. Dilip Kumar Biswas highlighted the fact that the revivalism of science, technology, art, architecture and literature etc. was held of both the cases of Italy and India in connection with the traditional past. The assimilation of the traditional culture and modern trend opened up a new dimension in all sphere of life[9]. David Kopf also said that 'The rediscovery and revitalization of a golden Hindu age was probably the Orientlist's most enduring ideological contribution to modern India's cultural image'[10]. He also pointed out on the line of Mirtunjaya Bidhalankar that the Bengal Renaissance was nothing but a trend of Hindu revivalism. He cited also the instances from the writings of Vidyasagar and Vivekananda in this perspective. According to Prof. Sushaban Sarkar there were two trends in Bengal Renaissance viz., Western trend and traditional revival trend. He ranked the contribution of westernism higher than that of traditionalism in the history of Bengal Renaissance. To him, Young Bengal was not only the representative of westernism but also they were radical. Bankim Chandra was comparatively conservative and the representative of revivalism. In comparison of these two aspects[11].He pointed out that 'It is permissible to doubt whether the change has been a gain our national life'. Even he highlighted the differences between the Italian renaissance and Bengal renaissance in his Bengali story 'Rabindranath O Banglar Nabajagaran' as follows;

Firstly, Italian renaissance brought radical change in the field of religion that hastened the process of the decline of the old society and economy and established a new lease of life in respect of agriculture, industry, trade and commerce. It ultimately opened up a new dimension in all sphere of human life. However, the Bengal intelligentsia did not try at all to establish a new set up of life in the society on the ruins of the traditional structures of the past.

Secondly, the Italian Renaissance was held under complete free and liberal environment whereas India had not been possessed such type of conditions.

Thirdly, the sources of the European renaissance were the thoughts and ideas of the Greeks. But the inspiration did not come from the traditional India but from the

Western renaissance. It can be stated that most of the 19th century intelligentsia were very much inspired and influenced by the thoughts and ideas of the Elizabethan England to Victorian England than Italian Renaissance except few personalities like Michael Madhusudhan Datta, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and Bankim Chandra etc.

Prof. Amalesh Tripathi said that 'Bengal went to school not at Athens of Pericles, not at Rome of Augustus but at England of Shakespeare, Milton and Byron, Bacon, Locke and Bentham, Gibbon, Hume and Macaulay, Burke, Spencer and Mill'[12]. Some scholars pointed out very boldly that the possibility of European Renaissance was completely impossible in the Indian soil due to the existence of the caste system. Nehru remarked on the issue of 19th century Bengal Renaissance that that 'A number of very remarkable men rose in Bengal in the nineteenth century, who gave the lead to the rest of India in cultural and political matters, and out of whose efforts the new nationalist movement ultimately took shape'[13]. The main feature of the European Renaissance was the emergence of the bourgeois capitalism from feudalism. It completely brought the fundamental change of the social structure. The emerging wealthy trading class opened up a new dimension of life. As a result, the production system was completely changed. It transformed gradually the mind set up of the people by the way of scientific innovations and the development of rationalism and cottage industry turned into the labour based industry. Naturally, superstitions were abolished and a struggle was started to establish the ideology of unity and equality. In fact, the system of serfdom was gradually reducing in course of time on the ruins of the feudal system. But the social structure of Bengal was completely different. The Western educated 19th century intelligentsia of Bengal took the leading role to introduce Renaissance in Bengal with the help of the wealthy landlords and the Western educated middle class under the rule of the British administration. They had not taken any initiative to establish bourgeois capitalism instead of feudalism. Actually, there was no scope to establish such an environment in Bengal. However, these classes were basically the supporters of the British rule for their interest. Even Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Vidyasagar were depended upon the British government for their social reform works. Therefore, the perspective of Bengal renaissance was completely different in comparison with the European renaissance. In fact, we cannot identify the 19th century renaissance of Bengal in the context of a meaning of the term of renaissance as a revolutionary change. In spite of the numerous limitations of the

Bengal renaissance, the role and contributions of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Vidyasagar etc. can not be denied. Women emancipation, opposition of the caste system, spread of education etc. were their issues of discussion and protest. Young Bengal extended its helping hand to them on these issues. But they did not come forward to protect the interest of the poor peasants and the common people. They were indifferent towards these problems and the Permanent Settlements except by ideal criticism. Most of the leaders were either Zamidars or intermediaries. Even they did not support the peasant revolts of the 18th and 19th century. Not only that but also they did not take part in the revolt of 1857. The Hindus were the main architect of this movement. Naturally, they did not cross the barriers of the Hindu religion and society. A large part of the population belonged to the Muslim community. However, the so-called Hindu Renaissance did not touch the Muslim community at all. After all, it did not touch the nation as a whole. The so-called educated sections of the Hindu society were to some extent benefited by their movements. They did not alter the deteriorating conditions of the downtrodden classes of the Hindu society. Naturally, the so-called 19th century intelligentsia of India did not consider their hope and desire to live and let live as human being on equal terms and conditions based on the Western liberal thoughts and ideas. Therefore, the common people did understand the gravity of this movement. The anti-Sati movement was more or less successful but the widow remarriage movement of Vidyasagar was not popular. Polygamy was not prohibited. Actually, they wanted to bring some progressive reforms of the religion and society without changing its basic structures. They did not want at all to bring social revolution. They did not play the role of Chaitanya and Kabir in this perspective. Not only that but also Raja Ram Mohan Roy to Young Bengal did not emphasis on the issue of economic exploitation. Raja Ram Mohan welcomed the investment of the British capital as well as indigo cultivation of the Sahib. He was completely silent about the destruction of the 'native tatis' by the deindustrialization. Sushaban Sarkar pointed out that the impact of the 19th century Renaissance in Bengali literature, cultivation of science, painting, art etc. were an epoch making event. Rabindranath was influenced by the Western thoughts and cultures and the glorious traditional past. He combined the two very successfully in the context of literary development. The initial phase of Renaissance was started on the eve of his birth but the later part of the 19th century renaissance was completed by him. Apart from this, the name of Scientist Gajadish Chandra Bose (1858-1937), Acharya Prafulla Chandra Roy (1861-1944),

Upendranath Bramachari (1875-1946) etc. may be mention in connection with the cultivation of science and their discoveries. Not only that but also Tagore family had a great contribution in the field of painting, art etc. The name of Gaganendranath Tagore (1867-1938) and Abanindranath Tagore (1871-1951) may be mentioned in this regard. Gaganendranath Tagore was the pioneer of the 'Indian Society of Oriental Art'. Abanindranath Tagore was initially influenced by the Western thoughts but later he left it and adopted the Indian style in this connection. His two disciples viz, Nandalal Bose (1882-1966) and Jamini Roy (1887-1972) earned name and fame on these issues.

The multi-dimensional socio-political, educational and other factors like the influence of the Western education, establishment of new associations and societies in India, rise of Nationalism, establishment of Western political institutions, establishment of Indian National Congress, influence of the Western political literature, Social legislations etc. were more or less responsible for the conceptualization of Indian Renaissance movement.

The main motto of the Colonial Government was to create a class of civil servants to fulfill their administrative requirements by introducing English education in India. The following important features of the Western education were very much thought provoking to boost up the mind set up of the Western educated Indians such as intellectuals, rationalism, individualism, and critical attitude to scriptures, synthetic approach to religion, secularism, cosmopolitanism and humanism. The Western education had created revolutionary thinkers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Mahadev Govind Ranade and Vivekananda etc. The 19th century Renaissance thinkers of India imbibed all the thought provoking features of the Western education. Therefore, the impact of the Western education in the Indian society was very important for the new awakening and reconstruction of Indian thoughts.

The impact of the Western education accelerated the process of the formation of different associations and societies in India. The various aims of these organizations like Brahmo Samaj of RajaRam Mohan Roy, Arya Samaj of Swami Dayananda, Satya Shodhak Samaj of Jatirao Fule etc. to reform the society, polity, religion and so

on. All these new associations and societies encouraged new thinking and reconstruction of social institutions on the pattern of ancient Indian specimen.

The rise of nationalism was the out come of Renaissance in almost all the colonial countries of the world including India. The eminent patriotic scholars' writers and poets played a vital role to create intense sentiments of nationalism and patriotism. The name of Bankim Chandra (patriotic novel Ananda Math), Aurobindo, Swami Dayananda, B. G. Tilak (the Kesari and the Maharashtra), Vivekananda, Tagore and Gandhiji may be mentioned in connection to nationalism and patriotism.

The establishment of different Western political institutions such as the Law Commission, the Supreme Court and others were responsible for the awakening of nationalism and reconstruction of Indian thought. Naturally, the Indian nationalists were demanding more and more political rights and equality before law. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Dadabhai Nauroji, Surendranath Banerjee and Gokhale etc. demanded for the introduction of British type representative political bodies in India.

The foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 was the out come of Indian nationalism. The name of A. O. Hume and S.N.Banerjee were very important in this connection. The motto of Hume was to create a class of thinkers who could advise the British to introduce necessary reforms in India. This Congress organization ultimately became a platform for the demand of complete freedom from the British yoke. Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal etc. played a vital role on this issue. However, the rise and growth of the Indian nationalism heralded an epoch making event under the leadership of Gandhiji in 1920 whose ultimate demand was to obtain Purna Swaraj. The leaders of the Congress were active in social and political activities beyond their political demands. They tried to find out solutions relating to socio-political reforms of India based on the Western thoughts and Golden traditional past.

The Britishers introduced Western political literature in India. Some of which were imported from the West such as the works of Karl Marx, Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler, Spencer, Mill, Tolstoy and Ruskin etc. which stirred the mind set up of the Indian leaders like Surendranath Banerjee, Lala Lajpa Rai, and V.D.Savarkar etc. at a large. The name of Iqbal, Aurobindo and Rabindranath Tagore may be noted in this respect.

But the literature was produced by the Indian writers also introducing the life and works of the leaders of Western society to the Indian people.

All these above-mentioned factors hastened the process of intellectual awakening and a demand for social legislation in different fields. It is noted that most of the Renaissance thinkers were very much pained at the condition of women and low-caste people of India. Different social reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and others demanded social legislation in every field of social life. They demanded the abolition of Sati custom, the emancipation of women and elimination of all the drawbacks of the downtrodden elements in the society. The Britishers were indifferent towards these demands but ultimately compelled to think that resulted in social legislation in different fields leading to social and political emancipation of the backward class. The most important among these movements were the Adi Brahmo Samaj of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Brahmo Samaj of Keshab Chandra Sen, Ramkrishna Mission of Vivekananda and Arya Samaj of Swami Dayananda etc. may be mentioned in this connection. In fact, these movements ultimately noted how the Renaissance thinkers led to a reorientation of the Golden past and worked out social implications of ancient ideals and principles.

3.4. Intellectual Dichotomy in Colonial India towards the Issue of Caste and Untouchability (Raja Rammohun Roy to Rabindranath Tagore)

The 19th century Renaissance and Reformation Movement failed to eradicate the problems of the Caste System and Untouchability from the so-called Hindu society. Most of the 19th century intellectuals continued the tradition of the Indian National Congress in this respect although there were a few exceptions who demanded the abolition of caste system, untouchability etc. They expressed their views and opinions theoretically in a very limited way and did not come forward spontaneously to launch a direct movement against the abolition of the Caste System and Untouchability from the Hindu Society. Realizing the importance of its abolition, they did nothing but ideal talking. They knew it very well that India cannot be developed as a 'Nation State' without its eradication. Even they differed in their respective approach to this issue. Naturally, they were unable to start a crusade that would radically reform the

Indian Society. The name of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Annie Besant, Swami Vivekananda and others may be mentioned in order to understand the truth.

a. Raja Rammohun Roy (1773-1833)

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was called the pioneer of modern India. He was born on 22 May 1772 in Radhanagar village of Bengal. He belonged to a Brahmin family. His family background displayed an interesting religious diversity. His father Ramkant was a Vaishnavite, while his mother Tarini was from a Shakta background. Therefore, he was very much influenced by the socio-religious environment of his family. However, he became the learned person under these unavoidable environments and ultimately he was identified as the great product of the 19th century Indian intelligentsia. His first published work was 'Tuhfat-ul Muwahhiddin (A Gift to Deists) and he exposed in it such irrational religious beliefs and corrupt practices of the Hindus as the belief in revelations, prophets and miracles, the seeking of salvation through 'bathing in a river and worshipping a tree or being a monk and purchasing forgiveness of their crime the high priests' and the 'hundreds of useless hardships and privations regarding eating and drinking, purity and impurity, auspiciousness and inauspiciousness'[14]. Raja Ram Mohan Roy highlighted the need in the introduction to his Bengali translation of the Sama Upanishad 'to correct those exceptionable practices which not only deprive Hindus in general of the common comforts of society but also lead them frequently to self-destruction'[15]. He identified himself with the victims of religious orthodoxies, which, he noted in Tuhfat, 'have become causes of injury and detrimental to social life and sources of trouble and bewilderment to the people, instead of tending to the amelioration of the condition of society'. Realizing the gravity of the situation, he said that 'many learned Brahmans are perfectly aware of the absurdity of idolatry, and are well informed of the nature of the purer mode of divine worship. But as in the rites, ceremonies, and festivals of idolatry, they find the source of their comforts and fortune; they ... advance and encourage it to the utmost of their power, by keeping the knowledge of their scriptures concealed from the rest of the people'[16]. However, Charles Heimsath pointed out about the importance of the Atmiya Sabha, Brahmo Samaj etc. for social reform that secular reformist crusades, usually for legislative social enactments or caste reform, succeeded in drawing

adherents, but alterations in personal and family lives in India required revising religious beliefs and practices. Raja Rammohun Roy foresaw this connection, as Gandhi did a century later[17]. Rammohun Roy adopted three policies to socio-religious reform;

Firstly; exposing and discrediting those religious dogmas and practices, which were irrational or contrary to social comfort.

Secondly; the promotion of modern Western education.

Thirdly; state action in support of both these programmes. He found many false and various objectionable dogmas and doctrines in Hinduism as well as in other religions. He said that these must be rejected for which he offered the following justification:

He also said, 'If mankind are brought into existence, and by nature formed to enjoy the comforts of society and the pleasure of an improved mind, they may be justified in opposing any system, religious, domestic or political, which is inimical to the happiness of society, or calculated to debase the human intellect'[18]. It was generally said that the 19th century Indian intelligentsia was also impressed by the concepts of social liberty and equality of the West. Raja Ram Mohan Roy felt that the same liberty and equality should be created in the Indian society for the greater interest of the Indian nation. Therefore, he tried his level best to do something better for the greater interest of the Indian society. Therefore, he raised voice against all sorts of exploitation imposed upon the common people from generation to generation in the name of God, religion, Sati system and Caste Institution etc. That is why; he worked hard to abolish their disabilities and bring out not only social reforms but also political reforms through the enactment of new social legislations. However, he did not over come the so-called obstacles of the caste institution and untouchability owing to the pernicious attitude of the Orientalists thoughts and beliefs. Not only that but also he did not dare to discard the 'sacred thread' of the so-called symbol of the caste institution. His attitude towards the caste system was somewhat ambivalent. While he practiced some of the over, caste rules (e.g., the wearing of the sacred thread), he noted that God makes no distinction of caste and that 'our division into castes ... has been the source of want of unity among us'[19]. Prof. D. S. Sharma pointed out that Raja Rammohun Roy was a great champion of freedom and a lover

of humanity and that is why he pleaded for religious and social reforms.[20] He did not believe in the existing formalistic religion of the Hindus and introduced his conception of ideal and inspirational religion based on strict monotheism and humanism. In the words of Dr. Iqbal Singh: "For him the practical expression of such faith must always be in ethical conduct, in dedication for the good of the society. The devotion he claims, which is most acceptable to the Creator consists in promoting union of human hearts, with mutual love and affection for all one's fellow beings, without distinction of caste or creed, race or colour'[21]. Therefore, the intellectual dichotomy of Raja Ram Mohan Roy towards the issue of caste and untouchability did not influence significantly the spirit of Renaissance in the context of the Indian society at a large. His pioneering role to raise voice against the pernicious social issues and evils were just like an intellectual game. He knew it very well that the inhuman 'Sati' system was the out come of the socio-religious dogmas and believes of the so-called Orthodox Hindus. In fact, he was a genuine product of the Western education and Orientalists beliefs. Naturally, he played a vital role to synthesis these two ideologies and worked for the betterment of the Hindu society as a whole and ultimately he was known as the pioneer of the Indian Renaissance. Therefore, he became the Father and Patriarch of Modern India, an India with a composite nationality and a synthetic civilization; and by the lines of convergence he laid down, as well by the type of personality he developed in and through his own experiences, he pointed the way to the solution of the larger problem of international culture and civilization in human history, and became a precursor, an archetype, a prophet of coming Humanity. In fact, he was called the modern man of India for this reasons.He synthesized the Western liberal ideas and thoughts with the Indian traditional beliefs. His main motto was to develop India socially, spiritually, economically, educationally, culturally and so on. He was very much impressed by the Western liberal thoughts and beliefs. Therefore, he decided to apply these ideologies for the betterment of the Indian society. He earned name and fame for obtaining mastery over different subjects. His attitude towards the issue of caste and untouchability was outwardly good. He could not free himself from age-old socio-religious dogmas, traditional faiths and believes on the issue of caste and untouchability. He did not like to support the practice of priestly hypocrisy, idol worship, rituals, human and other sacrifices for yagya etc. in the field of religion. He advocated monotheism, or the worship of one God. Not only that but also he denounced that rituals, which were

meaningless and giving rise to superstitions. He published Bengali translations of the Vedas to prove his honesty of purpose on those points. The lower strata of the Hindu society were severely affected by the multidimensional socio-religious superstitions and age-old religious dogmas. Therefore, he determined to do something on the line of the Western liberal ideas and doctrine for the betterment of the Hindu society. In the field of Hindu society, Raja Ram Mohan Roy vehemently opposed all inequality, child marriage, sati, bigamy, caste discrimination and the rest of problems that beset Hindu society. Therefore, he involved himself to eradicate numerous social evils like sati, polygamy and child marriage etc. and demanded property inheritance rights for women. He realized the never-ending importance of the Western education and the synthesis between the ancient tradition and the Western liberal thoughts in this connection that would be helpful for the implementation for social reform. Therefore, he emphasized on the principles of equality, liberty, fraternity based on the Western educational thoughts and beliefs to abolish socio-religious superstitions from the so-called Hindu society. He took initiative to spread Western education in India for the sake of humanitarian ground because only it would open up the greatness of human mind that was urgently needed for the Hindu society. In fact, only the true concept of Renaissance and Reformation would uproot numerous socio-religious superstitions, evil customs and dogmas of the Hindu society. The role of education to build up strong human mind and its increasing confidence, efficiency in decision-making process, importance of self-respect of an individual and creating ability to judge any thing based on scientific rationalism and humanism was utmost urgent. That is why; he set up the Brahmo Samaj campaign in 1828 to fight against social evils. His tiredless effort towards the eradication of the burning social problems of Sati was really praised with noteworthy. He appealed to the Governor General Lord William Bentinck to ban the inhuman Sati System that was the curse of the Hindu social system and symbol of tyranny towards women. Under these unavoidable circumstances Lord William Bentinck, take necessary steps to make sati illegal through an act in 1829.In 1814, with the help of Young Indians, he set up the Amitya Sabha to propagate rational religious ideas. He started the Brahmo Samaj movement, one of the first Indian socio-religious reform movements to fulfill his target. He left remarkable influence in the fields of politics, public administration and education as well as religion. He is well known to his efforts to abolish the practice of sati, a Hindu funeral practice in which the widow sacrifices herself on her husband's funeral pyre.

But the Brahmo Samaj, which established by him ultimately came to be an important spiritual and reformist religious movement that has given birth to a number of stalwarts of the Bengali social and intellectual reforms. He is regarded as one of the most important figures in the Bengal Renaissance for these contributions to society. Therefore, he paid due attention to spread Western liberal education in India. He played a vital role to set up the Hindu College at Calcutta. He supported induction of western learning into Indian education. He also set up the Vedanta College, offering courses as a synthesis of Western and Indian learning. The name of his most popular journal was the Samvad Kaumudi, which covered different issues like freedom of press, induction of Indians into high ranks of service, and separation of the executive and judiciary. Not only that but also he realized the futility of the evil social customs that created numerous difficulties in social life of the Hindu society. He saw in British rule of India the best things that were beneficial to India. He adopted the West European philosophy of democracy, liberalism and humanism. He attacked some Hindu traditions and features among them caste system, child marriages, Sati - burning of the wife over her dead husband's pyre, idolatry and other beliefs. He tried to change the popular Hindu traditions and claimed that the popular Hindu traditions were different from the real Hindu beliefs. His organization 'Brahmo Samaj' tried to change the social order of India. He convinced the British in 1829 to abolish Sati system.

It is an established fact that Raja Rammohun Roy always tried to protect his class interest. He did not advocate the Caste discrimination, Sati system etc. except the Permanent Settlement. He strongly supported the British Government to introduce the Permanent Settlement. None but Ram Mohan Roy who was completely indifferent towards the problems and issues of the toiling masses relating to the Permanent Settlement. He did not express grievances against the ill-fated conditions of the poor peasants and workers. Their hungry and cry did not stir the mind set up of him. Therefore, the labourers were bound to remain in the same distress conditions as before. Not only that but also Raja Rammohun Roy did not raise voice against the over Caste rules like the use of 'Sacred Thread' and its discrimination. He did not arrange to launch a direct protest movement against all sorts of inhuman Caste rules that wrecked the freedom and rights of the common people of the so-called Hindu society in India. Even he did not convince the Orthodox Hindus to leave all sorts of

Caste discrimination to establish equal human rights for the protection of the lower strata of the Hindu society. Apart from these, it can be said that Raja Rammohun Roy's role towards the burning issues of the Sati's in the then Brahmancal Hindu society was really thought provoking and appreciating. However, the Sati system was prevailed among the so-called upper Caste Hindus. It did not disturb the normal life of the lower Caste Hindus. Practically speaking, this type of inhuman system like Sati was not prevailing among them. The barbaric mechanism of the so-called Sati system for the exploitation and deprivation of the upper Caste women was completely based on the negation of humanity. But this system was mainly limited only among the minor portion of the Hindu community. Therefore, it cannot be denied that the major portion of the Hindu communities were completely out of the space of the Sati custom of the Hindu society. That is why; the anti-Sati movement of Raja Rammohun Roy benefited the minor portion of the Hindu society. But a large portion of the Hindus, especially the lower Varnas (Castes) were greatly affected by the so-called Caste system of Manu (an ancient lawmaker) and untouchability. Raja Rammohun Roy did not come forward to start a direct movement to abolish these inhuman institutions in perpetuity except ideal talking. The hue and cry of the toiling masses against these institutions did not touch the heart and mind of Raja Rammohun Roy. Therefore, it can be said that Raja Rammohun Roy was very much conscious to protect his Caste or class interest in particular rather than to protect the common interest of the whole society in general. It is generally asserted that nothing is better than everything is. Was it true that Raja Rammohun Roy did not realize the cruelty of the institution of the Caste system and Untouchability? Actually, he could not apply the Western thoughts of liberty, equality, fraternity and so on to establish the true concept of human rights and its protection into the Hindu society. In spite of that, he held up before men a new faith which was universal in its sympathies, but whose cardinal principle was that 'the service of man is the service of God'[22]. However, he was moved by the consideration of humanity in solving social problems. He condemned the division of Hindu society into castes and sub-castes. Castes divided the Hindus in such a way that the community as a whole became weak. In a letter written on January 18, 1828, he wrote, "The distinction of castes, introducing innumerable divisions and subdivisions among them has entirely deprived them of patriotic feeling, and the multitudes of religious rites and ceremonies and the laws of purification have totally disqualified them from undertaking any difficult

enterprise"[23]. He suggested for solving various social problems were inter-caste marriages, widow re-marriages and education for all, in the interest of a better-integrated humanity[24]. His socio-religious activities bring out clearly that he was a great humanitarian. In the words of his biographer Miss Sophia Dobson Collett, "Rammohan stands in history as the living bridge over which India marches from her unmeasured past to her incalculable future. He was the arch, which spanned the gulf that yawned between ancient caste and modern humanity, between superstition and science, He embodies the new spirit, which arises from the compulsory mixture of races and faiths and civilizations . . . He embodies its freedom of enquiry, its thirst for science, its large human sympathy, its pure and sifted ethics, along with its reverent but not uncritical regard for the past"[25].

b. Pandit Iswarchandra Vidyasagar (1820-91)

Pandit Iswarchandra Vidyasagar left no distinctive mark in the field of caste and untouchability. He did not play a significant role to eradicate it from the so-called Hindu society. His attitude towards the issue of caste and untouchability was very much surprising. He did not come forward to launch a direct anti-caste movement to establish social justice. Being an orthodox Brahmin by caste, it was perhaps very much difficult for him to overcome the contemporary social customs and traditions. His pioneering work was completely based on widow re-marriage, female education and Bengali literature. But he did not work straightway to abolish caste and untouchability. His emergence in the 19th century India was an epoch-making event in the history of widow re-marriage and Bengali literature. Therefore, it can be said that his untiring efforts in this context made him successful to achieve his cherish dream. He was born in a learned Kulin Brahmin family in Birsingha village of Midnapore in West Bengal, 1820. But his real name was Iswar Chandra Bandyopadhyaya. The title 'Vidyasagar' means 'ocean of knowledge' was given to him as an honour of excellence. The name of his mother was Bhagavati Devi. He spent his childhood in extreme poverty. His untiring affords in education and ceaseless struggle for existence under this unfavourable economic background of his family built up his mind set up on a strong hold to fulfill his aims and objectives. He was influenced by the great trend of 19th Renaissance. Practically speaking, he had a great contribution in Bengali literature as well as women education. He was a Bengali polymath and a

pillar of the Bengal Renaissance. He was a philosopher, academic, educator, writer, translator, printer, publisher, entrepreneur, reformer, and philanthropist. He became renowned personality in Bengal as well as India for the modernization of the Bengali prose along with the introduction of the widow re-marriage and women education. He played a vital role in education, women emancipation, widow re-marriage etc. to bring a radical change in the socio-educational environment of Bengal as well as India. But his attitude towards the issue of Caste and untouchability was very much discouraging. He did not take initiative to launch a direct anti-caste and anti-untouchability movement to establish the human rights and privileges of the downtrodden sections of the so-called Hindu society. His pioneering work was based mainly on widow re-marriage and mass education. Therefore, he wanted to spread education among the people of the grass root level. Therefore, he did not want to confine the facilities of education within the circle of the limited opportunist classes. The extension of mass education was his principle motto. He preferred mother tongue as the medium of instruction of education. That is why; he wanted to open the gate of education for the common masses irrespective of caste, class, sex, Varna and religion. He did not hesitate to open the gate of Sanskrit College for the education of the non-Brahmin classes; i.e., the Kulin Kayasthas [26]. Not only that but also he took responsibility to write and publish books for the interest of the common people. He realized the importance of synthesis of the Western education and traditional education of India. Therefore, he introduced the Western modern thought of education into the traditional institution of India. In 1850, he became a Professor of Sanskrit College in Calcutta and ultimately became the Principal of this college. None other than the Brahmins was allowed to study in Sanskrit College. However, he changed that rule and opened the close-door of Sanskrit College for everybody. But it is known from a letter sent to the Education Department by Vidyasagar that he vehemently opposed to the demand of the Subarna Banik of Calcutta for their admission in the Sanskrit College due to their low Caste[27] position. As a reformer in widow re-marriage and educationist in Bengali literature, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar made his mark in Indian history. Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar and his fellow-worker, Akshay Kumar Datta played a vital role in the progress of literature. In 1846 appeared his first work in Bengali prose, the Twenty-Five Tales of a Fetal. This was succeeded by his Sakuntala in 1855, and by his greatest work, The Exile of Sita, in 1862. These were marked by a grace and beauty, which Bengali prose had never known before. In

fact, these three writers were generally recognized as the fathers of Bengali prose literature. Vidyasagar was a first-rate linguist. He reconstructed the Bengali alphabet and reformed Bengali typography into an alphabet of twelve vowels and forty consonants. Vidyasagar contributed significantly to Bengali and Sanskrit literature. In the final years of life, he chose to spend his days among the Santhāls, an old tribe in India.

He played a vital role for female education. It was quite possible for him to open 1200 government-aided schools for women education in those early days. He realized that there was no pace for women education in the society. Therefore, his tireless efforts to uplift the status of women in the society were praised worthy. He adopted some measures to establish some Girl's schools in different places of Bengal. There was no good Bengali textbook for basic Bengali education. Therefore, he took initiative to write Bengali books with basic language construct and fundamentals, like, Barnaparichay, Bodhoday, Kathamala etc. and then easy grammar books like Upakramonika and Byakaron Kaumudi. Not only that but also he introduced some basic books for Mathematical logic. That is why; Rabindranath Tagore called him as the 'Father of Modern Bengali Language'. Apart from these, he translated some masterpieces of Sanskrit and English literature into Bengali like betaal panchabingshati, Sanskrit Kathasarit sagar, shakuntala, bhranti bilaas , sitaar banabaas and some important edited books like raghubangsha, kumarsambhab etc. He gave equal importance to English, Sanskrit and Bengali. He did not fear to replace useless themes of Oriental Philosophy with useful Occidental themes.

Michael Madhusudhan Datta pointed out that 'Vidyasagar had the genius and wisdom of an ancient sage, the energy of an Englishman and the heart of a Bengali mother.' Dr. Amalesh Tripathi pointed out that Vidyasagar was a mixture of the traditional past and the Western liberal ideas. He treated Vidyasagar as the 'traditional modernizer' of India. He was very much conscious about the liberal thoughts and ideas of the Western education. He picked up the social reform work where Ram Mohan Roy left it. However, Ram Mohan was more influenced by the European Renaissance than Vidyasagar. But his contribution to the Bengali society was far more than just scholastic. His versatile knowledge in Bengali literature, Sanskrit and English opened up a new chapter in the history of education in Bengali. He

vehemently opposed widowhood, child marriage etc. He struggled for the introduction of widow remarriage, women education etc. He also did not like polygamy. His philanthropic role for the education of the non-Brahmin was encouraging. He was also known for his charity and philanthropy and was called as "Daya-r sagar" - ocean of kindness.

He was the great product of the 19th century Renaissance of Europe. But he could not bring radical change in the Hindu society except little exception in the case of widow re-marriage. He did not pay due attention to solve the issue of caste system and untouchability from the so-called Hindu society. Practically speaking, Vidyasagar did not move probably to eradicate the inhuman problems of these two institutions due to the following reasons;

Firstly, he belonged to a high caste Brahmin family. Naturally, the problems of the lower strata of the Hindu society did not stir the mind set up of him.

Secondly, the problems of the widow re-marriage basically confined within the circle of the upper caste Hindus, especially among the Brahmins.

Thirdly, he noticed it very clearly that the Orthodox Hindus had already forgotten about the genuine evidences of the Hindu Shastras regarding the issue of widow re-marriage in which it was vividly mentioned that the re-marriage of widows were permissible.

However, in course of time, the system of widow re-marriage was strictly prohibited by some how. Therefore, it became a bad headache of the 19th century Renaissance man like Vidyasagar and others to draw attention on the issue of widow re-marriage based on the evidences of the Hindu Shastras. That is why; Vidyasagar was very busy to protect his class interest. Although it cannot be denied, that Vidyasagar left marks on Bengali literature, language, women education and widow re-marriage etc. for the greater interest of Bengal as well as India. In fact, he earned name and fame in Bengal as well as India mainly for the re-introduction of widow re-marriage, women education and literary contributions in different dimensions.

It is generally said that the greatest achievement in the life of Vidyasagar was the introduction of widow re-marriage in the Hindu society with the active help of the British Government. Even he said that the ever first honest work of his life was the

introduction of widow re-marriage that was mentioned in a letter written to his brother Sambhu Chandra on 31st Sraban, 1277 Bangadha. He was very much shocked by the ill-fated conditions of the widows and numerous socio-religious dogmas of the Hindu society. His untiring efforts help him to find out the evidences of widow re-marriage from the Hindu Shastras in ancient days. After extensive research, he saw that widow re-marriage was completely based on the evidences of the Hindu Shastras. He cited the evidences from the 'Parasar Samhita'[28], one of the Shastra of the Hindu religion, which clearly noted the fact that widow re-marriage was totally based on Hindu Shasras. Not only that but also Vidyasagar highlighted the fact that Rishi Boudhayan and Rishi Narad etc. mentioned this verse on the issue of widow re-marriage. Besides, widow re-marriage was recognized in the Agni Puran and other Puranas. On the other hand, widow re-marriage was normally prevailed among the Sudras and the lower caste people's in spite of the strict prohibition of widow re-marriage among the upper caste Hindus. Some scholar pointed out that Vidyasagar got inspiration from the social system regarding the widow re-marriage of the lower caste peoples. He explained clearly the verse of the Rishi Parasara on the issue of widow re-marriage and pointed out that widow re-marriage was admissible as per the instructive content of the Hindu Shastras if husband died, disabled, handicapped, flew away or fallen. Therefore, it can be said that it was not at all a difficult task for Vidyasagar, a renowned Sanskrit scholar to prove the content of widow re-marriage on that basis.

Not only that but also Vidyasagar played a vital role for the introduction of widow re-marriage to fulfill his novel mission. Therefore, he published a book on the issue of widow re-marriage in January 1855. He wrote numerous articles in support of the widow re-marriage in the Tattabodhuni Patrika. Ram Mohan did not generally want legal support to prohibit the inhuman Sati system. However, Vidyasagar realized it very clearly that without the active legal support of the British Government the previous custom of widow re-marriage could not be established. Realizing the futility of the movement Vidyasagar took drastic measures to collect the genuine consent of 1000 peoples and their signatures to strengthen his widow re-marriage movement. The name of Debendra Nath Tagore, Justice Darokanath Mitra, Akshay Kumar Dutta, Paricharan Sarkar and Dakshinaranjan Mukherjee etc. may be mentioned in this connection as the main signatories of the memorandum. Besides, the Zamindars of

Burdwan, Dacca, Nabodip, Pune, Sekendrabad, Bombay, Surat and Ahmedabad etc. sent their prayers for the re-establishment of the widow re-marriage system, which accelerated the process of the Widow re-marriage movement of Vidyasagar. However, it would be noted that a strong opposition group vehemently opposed the widow re-marriage movement. They collected 50-60 thousand peoples signature under the leadership of Radhakanta Deb who was against the widow re-marriage initiative. Under this unavoidable tussle between the liberal and orthodox groups on the issue of widow re-marriage, the British Government passed the historic Widow Remarriage Act XV in 1856 to fulfill the demands of Vidyasagar. However, with valuable moral support from people like Akshay Kumar Dutta, Vidyasagar introduced the practice of widow remarriages to mainstream Hindu society. In earlier times, remarriages of widows would occur sporadically only among progressive members of the Brahmo Samaj. The prevailing deplorable custom of Kulin Brahmin polygamy allowed elderly men - who might sometimes be in their advanced ages - to marry teenage girls or even prepubescent girls, supposedly to spare their parents the shame of having an unmarried girl attain puberty in their house. After such marriages, those girls would usually be left behind in their parental homes, where they might be cruelly subjected to Orthodox rituals. Many of those most unfortunate girls would then turn to prostitution. Vidyasagar took the initiative in proposing and pushing through the Widow Remarriage Act XV of 1856 in India. He had discovered that the ancient Hindu scriptures did not enjoin perpetual widowhood, and in 1855, he startled the Hindu world by his work on the Remarriage of Hindu Widows. Such a work, from a learned and presumably Orthodox Brahman, caused the greatest excitement, but Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar remained unmoved amidst a storm of indignation. Associating himself with the most influential men of the day, like Prosonno Kumar Tagore and Ram Gopal Ghosh, he appealed to the British government to declare that the sons of re-married Hindu widows should be considered legitimate heirs. The British government responded and the act was passed in 1856, and some years after Iswar Chandra's own son was married to a widow. In the last years of his life, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar worked against Hindu polygamy. That is why; he was well known for his charity and wide philanthropy for his educational and social reforms.Vidyasagar proposed the widow remarriage act in 1856. Widows could not marry again in those days. There was strong protest from the upper caste and Orthodox people of the society. He encouraged his son to get married to a widow.

Sometimes, he spent money from himself to get widows married. He wanted to stop the Hindu men from getting married to many women. Not withstanding the miserable condition of Hindu widows, he introduced 'Hindu Family Annuity Fund'. In an unflinching manner, Vidyasagar championed the uplift of the status of women in India, particularly in his native Bengal. Unlike some other reformers who sought to set up alternative societies or systems, he sought, however, to transform Orthodox Hindu society from within.

In fact, the first widow re-marriage was arranged during the time of Vidyasagar in 7 December 1856 between the Srisachandra Vidyaratna of Khatura village in the district of 24 Paragana (South) and widow Kalimoti Debi of ten years old who was the daughter of Brahmananda Mukherjee of Palashdanga in the district of Burdwan. Ramgopal Ghosh, Digambar Mitra, Ramaprasad Roy, son of Rammohun Roy, Parichand Mitra, Kaliprasana Singh attended that widow re-marriage ceremony. Sibnath Shastri gave a detailed description about this widow re-marriage ceremony in a book namely, 'Men I have seen'. The second widow re-marriage incident was held between Madhusudhan Ghosh (Kulin) and the widow daughter (12 years) of Iswarchandra Mitra at Panihati village of the South 24 Paragana. The third and fourth widow re-marriage incident was happened in the family of Rajnarayan Bose. But he had to face numerous obstacles due to this case. However, the widow re-marriage trend was rapidly reduced largely in the decade of 1860. Under this unavoidable circumstances, Narayan the son of Vidyasagar had married widow Bhabasundari. But Vidyasagar had to face different troubles in his family. Vidyasagar wrote a letter to his brother Sambhuchandra and noted the fact that he was the pioneer of widow re-marriage and they had taken initiative for widow marriage. Therefore, he could not keep his prestige intact in the society of the Bhadraloks if his son would marry virgin lady instead of widow woman. Narayan glorified his mission to marry a widow woman spontaneously. Brahma Samaj always supported the widow marriage movement of Vidyasagar. However, there arose a controversy later on in the Brahma Samaj regarding this issue and the revivalism of Hindu religion, both these factors accelerated the process of deteriorating condition of this movement. In fact, the impact of the widow marriage movement spread in other parts of the country like Maharastra and Pune etc. Widow marriage Association was formed in Maharastra in

1883 and the first widow re-marriage was held there in the same year. Dhando Keshsab Karve had married a widow Brahmin in 1893 in Pune.

However, his attitude towards the issue of caste and untouchability was very disappointing. He was very much silent towards these problems. That is why; it can be said that Vidyasagar did not individually as well as collectively over come the social barriers of the caste system and the Himalayan hurdles of the untouchability of his age. He realized the inhuman nature, character and features of these two institutions. But he did nothing without ideal talking. It is an irony of fate that the lower stratum of the so-called Hindu society was not much benefited by the social reform policy of Vidyasagar like high caste Hindu. His benevolent activities were confined mainly within the 'Dwija' circle as it did not touch the common interest of the common people of Bengal as well as India. In fact, there was no problem of widow re-marriage in the lower strata of the Hindu society. It was a genuine problem of the upper caste Hindu society.

The trend of widow re-marriage movement was matured under the leadership of Vidyasagar. In fact, widow re-marriage was normally prevailed in the ancient period. It was gradually prohibited in the medieval period among the upper castes. But it was not completely abolished in the course of time. Joy Singh, the king of Jaipur, Rana Jalim Singh and Parsuram Vhao, the high official of the Peshwar court took active part for the introduction of the widow re-marriage in the Mughal age. A Telegu Brahmin wrote a book before Vidyasagar in 1837 in support of the widow re-marriage in the 19th century. A high caste Brahmin of Nagpur delivered his lectures in favour of widow re-marriage in 1841. This movement was started in Bangladesh before Vidyasagar. Many articles were published in favour of widow re-marriage in different news journals. Nilkomal Banerjee, Brajanath Mukherjee, Kalikrishna Mitra and some other reputed personalities tried to introduce widow re-marriage. However, they failed. In fact, the base of this movement was prepared under these environments. Besides, the support of Young Bengal, Brahma Samaj and the role of the 19th century intelligentsia accelerated the process of the widow re-marriage movement in the time of Vidyasagar. But it can not deny that this movement would not succeed under the leadership of Vidyasagar without the active help of the British Government. He solely struggled for widow re-marriage with few hands in Bengal.

However, he was very much shocked and disheartened by the inhuman role and behaviour of man. He noted the fact that the Orthodox mentality of the Hindu religion was the main obstacle of his progressive social reform works. In fact, his widow re-marriage mission was partially successful. But he did not eradicate Kulinism and polygamy with the help of the British Government. He failed to introduce laws by the British Government to ban these inhuman customs. He played a vital role for the spread of women education. However, he did not give any attention to the education of his daughter. Prof. Asoke Sen wrote – 'Vidyasagar had no sufficient means to link up tradition and modernity in any meaningful sense of that convergence ... Vidyasagar was a victim of the illusions which he shared with his stage of history, about the prospects of modernization under colonial rule'[29]. However, he was completely indifferent and silent regarding the Revolt of 1857 and Indigo Revolt that was really a tragedy in the life history of Vidyasagar. But he advocated labour-rights and agriculture to boots up the mind of the common people regarding these honourable works as others. In fact, he failed to deal the emerging socio-economic and religious problems of the then Indian society excluding the case of widow re-marriage, female education and literary development in Bengali.

c. Swami Dayananda Saraswati (1824-1883)

The emerging 19th century intelligentsia of India created a changing environment in the domain of the Hindu society and religion under the influence of the European Renaissance. The changing socio-religious trends of the Hindu society mainly organized by different Renaissance men from Raja Ram Mohan Roy up to the death of Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar. However, the emergence of Swami Dayananda Saraswati heralded a new epoch of Hindu revivalism on the line Vedic traditions. He was the pioneer of the Hindu revivalism movement. He pointed out that the Vedic culture was the Civilization of humankind for the good of the entire human community. He treated the Vedas as 'India's Rock of Ages'. He believed that the Hindu religion and the Vedas on which it was based were eternal, unalterable, infallible and divine. Therefore, he raised a slogan 'Go back to the Vedas' and 'the Vedas are the sources of all knowledge'. He rejected the authority of the later Hindu scriptures like the Puranas, which in his view were responsible for the evil practices of idol worship and other superstitious beliefs in the Hindu religion. His slogan 'Back

to Vedas' was inspired to revive the true Vedic religion. He founded the Arya Samaj with a motto of social reforms. It stood for the fourfold Varna system to be determined by merit and not by birth. The Arya Samaj stood for equal rights of man and woman in social and educational matters. It opposed untouchability, caste discrimination, child marriage and supported widow re-marriage and inter-caste marriages. He provided the Arya Samaj with a code of social conduct and moral values. The Arya Samaj played a very progressive role in the earlier stages of national awakening when it attacked religious superstitions, the supremacy of the Brahmins, polytheism, untouchability and when further it adopted the programme of mass education, elimination of sub-castes, and equality of men and women. Swami Dayananda Saraswati was born at a time when Hindu society was suffering from many social evils and in fact had completely degenerated itself. Religion was being wrongly interpreted and in fact, many of those who claimed to know religion did not know as to what religion essentially meant. The society was also suffering from such evils as caste system, child marriage etc. So he came forward to challenge the social evils and to interpret religion in its true form. He followed the path of his Guru Virjanand whose only mission in life was to rid the Hindu society of its evils. Swami Dayananda Saraswati came from a deeply religious family. He was born in 1824. The religious orthodoxy of his father Karsanji Lalji Triwari and the tender humanitarian outlook of his mother made young Dayanand a true devotee of the existing religion.

Munshi Ram Jigyasu pointed out that 'Dayanand's profound scholarship, his magnetic powers of persuasion, his powers of bombardment of an impregnable orthodox position with bombs carefully selected from the armoury of sastric learning, his fiery eloquence inspired by righteous indignation and a heart aglow with unselfish love of humanity which transfused his words and made them scalding and scorching, and above all his infinite pity for his suffering fellowmen carried all before them'[30]. Through the book 'Satyartha Prakash' Dayanand tried to highlighted the fact that the Vedas presented a scheme of life for the acceptance of humankind. Tarachand, his biographer, pointed out that 'The Rishi holds out a promise that through the Veda the world's good shall be promoted. Through the teachings of the Veda peace shall come on earth and happiness rule every home. Through the Veda shall be hastened the advent of the Golden Age, the age of which the poets have sung. The philosophers dreamt and to which the prophets have pointed'[31]. The sole aim of his book

'Satyartha Prakash' was to create environment for human welfare. However, the ill-fated conditions of the downtrodden classes shocked him very much. Realizing the inhuman nature and treatment of the so-called Hindu society towards the lower castes peoples, Swami Dayananda Saraswati decided to address the problems of them. In fact, they were condemned by the Hindu society. Doors of knowledge had been closed to them. There was no provision by the social laws, whereby they could attend schools and colleges. They had a lower status than men in the Hindu Society. The great teaching of Hindu religion that all were equal without distinction of sex had been ignored. Swami Dayananda Saraswati did not like caste system. He openly condemned this system. He noted clearly that it was not with the sanction of any religion but it was a subsequent arrangement brought about by certain selfish people to suit the convenience[32]. That is why; he said that caste system should only be based on the functions that one actually performed in his life rather than on birth, as presently was the case. He believed in the inherent right of every individual to the choice of his profession. What pained him was that in caste it was not the profession but birth, which was coming to the forefront. As a social reformer, Swami Dayananda raised his voice in favour of the widows. The society had put an unnecessary bar on widow re-marriage. It had made the life of thousands of Indian women quite miserable. This restriction was promoting moral degeneration. The society was rapidly becoming corrupt. So he pleaded that there should be widow re-marriage because a woman was widowed not because of her fault but because what lay in store for her. He said that woman should be given their due and rightful place in the society. Therefore, all-social bondage imposed upon woman should be removed. They should be properly educated. There was no harm in mixing of girls and boys in a healthy atmosphere. They should be given their due place socially, economically and politically. Dayananda pointed out that 'If the people of India came to know of their past history there shall be a social revolution and every one shall be filled with great energy. He, therefore, asked that let each and every Indian study the history of India with attention and care'[33].

It is the duty of each member of Arya Samaj to look after the physical, social and religious welfare of all. Education should be widespread and illiteracy should be wiped out. Each individual is free to think in terms of his personal welfare but in collective welfare, all are bound to each other. He made it obligatory on the part of

Arya Samajists to stand for widow re-marriage and to oppose child marriage or caste system and other evils or similar institutions vehemently that had corrupted the Hindu society. Therefore, it can be said that his attitude towards the issues of caste and untouchability was very much liberal and democratic than Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Vidyasagar. He prayed to God to inspire the souls of men for evolving one great religion on the earth. He wrote in his book 'Satyartha Prakash' that "The object aimed at by this criticism (of various religions) is to contribute to the elevation of the human race and to enable all men to sift truth from falsehood."[34] Not only that but also he interpreted the Vedas, Shastras, Upanishads and Bhagavadgita to understand castes. Realizing the futility of castes he was dead against any differential or preferential treatment being given to any person due to his birth in high or low castes. He noted the fact that there was no such thing as caste by birth. His interpretation of the last three mantras of the Rigveda shows that he was against untouchability and denial to the Sudras right of free association with others, of participating in social and religious ceremonies and of reading the sacred texts of the Vedas (Rigveda, m.10; su 191, mantra 2,3,4.)[35]. In support of his views against untouchability and denial of equal rights to the Sudras, Dayanand gave references from the Yajurveda (the sixth mantra of the 40th chapter) and the Atharvaveda (kanda 19, Sukta 15, mantra 6). He established that from the Vedic times down the advent of the Muhammadan invasion there was no such class of people as bhangis for removing the night soil. He clearly noted the fact that the disorganized Hindu society could not be made to work out the high ideals in social, religious and political life unless the untouchability based on birth was not removed, unless Sudras were not given full rights of social equality[36]. Inspired by the teaching of Swami Dayanand, his disciple Swami Shradhanand and others organized the 'Dalitoddhar' (uplift of the depressed classes) and 'Achhut-Shuddhi' (reform of the untouchables) movements. The ground prepared by Swamiji and his disciples became the foundation of Gandhiji's movement for the uplift of the Harijans. In fact, Dayanand suggested guna (character), karma (action) and swabhav (nature) as criteria rather than birth as the basis of caste. According to him, the caste of a person was to be determined by his character, by the actions he performed in society and by his nature. He said that a chandala had every right to become a Brahmin if his character (gun) and action (karma) justified it. To him, 'a Brahmin who is disqualified for his work, becomes at once a Sudra and a Sudra who qualifies for it, becomes at once a Brahmin ...' He actually played a vital role to open the flood

gates for a social revolution in Hindu society. He denounced untouchability as inhuman and tried to prove that it was contrary to the dictates of Vedic religion. To him, a Sudra who was clean in body and mind had the right to be a dwija, twice-born. Therefore, it can be said that his role towards the issue of caste and untouchability was very much liberal and democratic to establish the concept of social justice.

d. Jyotiba Govindrao Phule (1828-1873)

Jyotiba Govindrao Phule organized a powerful non-Brahmin movement in different parts of Maharastra in the last phase of the 19th century. He was born in 1828 in a Mali family. He came from a Sudra caste. He realized the utility of organizing a united low caste political movement in India. He really understood it very well that politics is the key factor of all sorts of power and position. That is why; he encouraged the low born peoples to be united under a united low caste front to occupy the state-power to destroy the caste based power and position of the so-called higher castes. He declared that without capturing politically the state-power, the ill-fated poor conditions of the Sudras that were created by the Brahmins and Dharma Shastras's sponsored could not be permanently eradicated. But, Jyotiba Phule was the first historic Sudra in colonial India. He heralded an epoch making event in Indian history to raise a united voice of the Sudras, Untouchables and the toiling masses of India against the age-old oppression, tyranny, and exploitation done by the Brahmins, Priest-hood and socio-religious ordinances prepared and imposed by the so-called Manu and other ancient law-makers relating to the inhuman concept of the Caste Institution, Untouchability, pollution, purity, impurity, touchable untouchable etc. Jyotiba Phule dedicated his whole life for serving the poor and untouchables to develop their socio-spiritual, political, economic, educational etc. status and position in the society. He realized it very well that they could not progress themselves due to the lack of education, consciousness etc. His education, his personal experiences and association with the Chriastian missionaries, made him critical of the prevailing Hindu religion and customs. That is why; he launched a direct reform movement to establish the human rights, status and position of the Sudra society against the supremacy of Brahmanism in the so-called Hindu society. Jyotiba Phule strongly criticized the autocrat Brahmins. He identified the Brahmins who were and are the main source of obstacles that did not help to establish the fundamental rights and

privileges of the toiling masses, ill-fated poor, untouchables and low caste peoples in India. That is why; he launched a plan to the over-all development of the caste-stricken peoples of India. Therefore, he asked the common people to liberate themselves from the age-old and traditional yoke of the so-called Hindu Shastras written by the privileged Brahmin caste. His main target was to liberate the helpless, untouchables and ill-fated caste-stricken citizens of India from the yoke of the higher caste peoples. He realized it very well that it was not possible without capturing the state power politically. So his intention was to destroy the authority and supremacy of the higher caste peoples in colonial India.

Besides, he was a great supporter of the re-marriage of widows. However, he strongly opposed to the Sati system and child marriage. He preferred women emancipation. He favoured Western education. He demanded free education for the children and compulsory education for all especially, for the Depressed Classes and untouchables. Dhananjoy Keer was a biographer of Jyotiba Phule. He narrated Jyotiba Phule as the 'Father of Social Revolution'[37] in Maharastra. He pointed out that Maharastra had to be freed from the tyrannized yoke of Peshwas. But the ill-fated caste-stricken peoples were severely exploiting by the privileged Brahmins and the intellectuals in Maharastra. Jyotiba Phule was a great democratic personality in India who not only fought for the rights and privileges of lowborn peoples but also fought for the equal status and privileges of the Muslims and Christians. He praised the greatness of the British Government for the introduction of Western education and the creation of job opportunities in India. He launched a direct social movement for the development of man. The Satya Shodhak Samaj played a vital role to implement his cherish dreamt. His movement was limited within the protest of the anti-serfdom policy and the welfare measures of the toiling masses.

Jotirao Phule was a militant advocate of their rights. He was very much inspired by the ideas of the book of Thomas Paine viz., 'The Rights of Man'[38]. He was very much aware of the iniquities of the caste system for the first time in a wedding of one of his Brahmin friends where he was insulted and abused by the relatives of his friend due to the his low status in the caste society. That is why; he decided after that incident to defy the caste system and came forward directly to serve the Sudras and women who were deprived of all their rights as human beings under the caste system. He realized

the necessity of education and gave top priority to spread education among the lower classes and women in the society. His reform movement was started with the establishment of a girl school. The foundation of evening schools for adult education accelerated the progress of his reform movement. In 1854, he opened a school for the Untouchables. He had a violent dislike of the Brahmin priesthood. Jyotiba Phule made up his mind set-up to educate his wife Savitribai and opened a girls' school in 1848. In spite of the constant opposition of the Brahmins and the high caste peoples, Phule succeeded in achieving his dream. However, it was temporarily closed later on due to the want of money and the opposition of the Brahmins. The untouchables were admitted as students in this school. The orthodox opponents threatened the teachers to leave the school. Even they threw stones on Savitribai who taught the girls in the schools. Jotirao re-opened this school once again. Govande and Valvekar helped him in this connection. He also founded a coed school for the lower classes, especially the Mahars and Mangs. He realized the importance of primary education that was neglected among the common masses in Bombay Presidency. That is why; he noted that 'a good deal of their poverty, their want of self-reliance, and their entire dependence upon the learned and intelligent classes' could be attributed to the 'deplorable state of education among the peasantry'[39]. He blamed the British Government for spending major portion of revenue to the higher classes. Naturally, they got chance of access to all the avenues of knowledge, influence and higher offices. Therefore, the Brahmins occupied most of the important posts under the British Government. Therefore, he encouraged the lower classes to resist the tyranny of the Brahmins. He denounced the Brahmins as cheats and hypocrites.

Apart from this, Jotirao Phule founded an orphanage[40]. It was possibly the first such institution for the orphans. He came forward to save the life of the widows who gave birth to illegitimate children and left them on the streets. It was held due to the ban of widow re-marriage in the upper castes Hindus. He gave assurance to the pregnant widows that the orphanage would take care of their children. A Brahmin widow gave birth to a boy in 1873 and Jotirao Phule adopted him as his son. He made no distinction between non-Brahmins and untouchables. To liberate the depressed classes and make them conscious of their rights by educating them, he founded the Satya Shodhak Samaj in 1873. The main motto of establishing the Satya Shodhak Samaj was to create a united front of the Dalits to fight to finish the concept of

Brahmanism, Priesthood, caste, untouchability, inequality and disparity and to establish the concept of human rights, liberty, equality and fraternity. Jyotiba Phule was very much influenced by the the-then socio-religious and political environment of Mharastra as well as India. Gopalhori Deshmukh wrote different types of essays and articles against the socio-religious superstitions, prejudices and religious dogmas. He propagated these essays continuously through the journal of 'Pravakar', 'Lokhhitbadi' that had severely stricken the very base of these prejudices. Even the role of Pandit Bishnu Shastri was very important in this context. He strongly advocated widow re-marriage and propagated it in Maharastra. He was called the 'Vidyasagar of Maharastra'. Apart from these, Arya Samaj passed opinions against the Caste system from Bombay. Under these environments, Jyotiba Phule played a vital role to introduce an anti-caste movement in Maharastra. He pointed out that all sorts of superstitions and orthodoxy were the brainchild of the Brahmins. Some scholars pointed out that he was completely anti-Brahmins due to different reasons. They were the symbols of the landlord system, Mahayani system and tyranny of the Peshwas in Maharastra. That is why; Jyotiba Phule severely attacked them by the propaganda of the exploiter Brahmins. Therefore, the movement of Jyotiba Phule hastened the process of deterioration of Brahmanism in India. He was the first man among the Indians who played a positive role for the betterment of ignorant low caste peoples in India. He encouraged them to fight against the injustice, inequality, disparity and anti-humanity. He boosted up their mind for self-respect, self-reliant and self-depended. Most of the social reform movements either led by the Brahmins for the benefit of their classes or non-Brahmins for their interests centered around the cities. However, his movement was almost village centered. A large number of branches of this organization were established in different parts of South India. The most important among these branches were Maharastra, Vidharva, Nagpur etc. Even the numbers of followers of this organization were increased rapidly. Dinmitra (poor's friend), a Marathi paper, played an important role to preach its subjects. He raised a violent protest movement against the Caste System and tyrannized oppressions done by the upper caste Hindus upon the low caste peoples in India. As a result of it, anti-caste movement transformed into an economic and political movements in India. The followers of the Satya Shodhak Samaj organized a peasant movement at Satara of Maharastra against the landlords, money lenders during the Non-Cooperation movement. Therefore, it can be said that the Satya Shodhak Samaj

really brought the attention of the British Government as well the Indian political leaders to think for the betterment of the oppressed toiling masses in India. This movement was spread rapidly under the leadership of Mukundo Rao Patil after the death of Jyotiba Phule. The cause of the poor was so dear to him that when he met the Duke of Yorki, he presented himself in a lion-cloth as the true representative of the poverty-stricken Indian peasant. Not only that but also he published 'Slavery' in 1873. He highlighted the ill-fated conditions of the toiling masses in this book. The Sudras and Ati-Sudras were suffering hardships and were leading miserable lives. His main target was to uplift them socially, educationally, politically and economically. He described vividly in the book of 'Slavery' the shameless manner in which the Bhats oppressed the helpless Sudras and Ati-Sudras through the four poems composed by himself. He remarked about the necessity of opening schools for girls and boys of the Sudras as follows:

"Let there be schools for the Sudras in every village, but away with all Brahmin school masters! The Sudras are the life and sinews of the country, it is to them alone, and not to the Brahmins that Government must ever look to tide them over their difficulties, financial as well as political. . . "[41]

Physical slavery (slavery of the body) was bad enough but mental slavery (slavery of the mind – psychological and spiritual) slavery was most degrading and demoralizing, for its victims. Jotirao hit the nail on the head on this count also. He revolted against the unjust caste system under which millions of people had suffered for centuries. He upheld the cause of the untouchables and took up the cudgels for the poorer peasants. He arranged to give access to the untouchables to a small bathing tank near his house in 1868. He traced out the origin of the Brahmin domination in India and pointed out that their main object in fabricating these falsehoods was due to dupe the minds of the ignorant and to rivet firmly on them the chains of perpetual bondage and slavery, which their selfishness and cunning had forged. Besides, he criticized the authority of the 'Manawa Dharma Shastra' for making the Brahmins Almighty as the God. He denounced the rules and regulations of Manu, the pioneer of the hereditary caste institution in the so-called Hindu society. To him, the Brahmins were really the great culprit to humankind. But in the course of time the depressed and down-trodden masses in India were freed from the physical slavery of the Bhats

as a result of the advent of the British rule in India. Jotirao Phule said that his main object was to tell the Sudra brethren through the book of 'Slavery' "how they had been duped by the Brahmins, but to open the eyes of the British Government to that pernicious system of high class education which had hitherto been so persistently followed, and with broad universal sympathies, are finding to be highly mischievous and pernicious to the interest of the Government"[42]. Not only that but also the Sudra brethren should place before the Government the true state of their fellowmen due to emancipate themselves from Brahmin thralldom. According to Ambedkar, "Mahatma Phule-The Greatest Shudra of Modern India who made the lower classes of Hindus Conscious of their Slavery to the higher classes and who preached the gospel that for India social democracy was more vital than independence from foreign rule".[43] Jotirao Phule highlighted the pitiable condition of the masses in 'The Ballad of the Conquered Slaves (Sections 3 and 4) and exhorted them to take education at any cost. In 'The Untouchables' Apologia', he noted the visit of Her Majesty to India (particularly to Bombay Presidency as it than was). When Queen Victoria visited the poor hovels of the untouchables outside the village limit in Bombay Presidency, Mahars and Mangs told her about their sub-human conditions under the British Raj they requested Her to arrange public utility works, liberal educational reforms and to introduce modern agricultural methods. Therefore, it can be said that Jotirao Phule possibly the first Indian who directly launched an anti-caste movement to establish the concept of Social Justice in the Indian society. Practically speaking, he was first Indian Sudra[44] who fought for the civil rights and privileges of the depressed classes in India against the Brahmins and encouraged them to be united to capture the state power for the destruction of the opportunist groups as well as privileges sections of the society. He introduced a new chapter in the history of the lower caste people's movement in India.

e. Sri Narayan Guru 1856-1928

The emergence of Sri Narayana Guru in the social horizon of Kerala as the undisputed spiritual leader of the downtrodden people when they were oppressed and tyrannized by the caste discrimination and the so-called divine supremacy of the Savarnas over the Avarnas who were definitely below the rank of the Sudras. Sri Narayan Guru was the pioneer of the lower caste movement in South India. He was a

great a champion of the humble and the downtrodden sections in India. He had to fight all sorts of social, religious, economic and other inequalities and injustice that were imposed upon the Avarnas by the Savarnas for their privileges[45]. The case of the Nambudiris in the socio-religious matter may be noted to make out the real conditions of the Avarnas in the Keralian society. The Nambudiris or Kerala Brahmins enjoyed superior position in the Savarna caste hierarchy in Keralian society. Next in the rank was The Kshatriyas and the Sudras or Nairs had the lowest caste position in the society. The Avarna hierarchy had Ezhava (Thiyya or Chovan) at the top followed by Pulaya, Paraya, etc. with the Nayadi occupying the last rung. The Avarnas were below the rank of Sudras. The differenciation of Savarna and Avarna was so deeply felt that professional castes like tailor, barber, washerman, etc. existed separately for Savarnas and Avarnas. But surprisingly Kerala has no Vaisya caste. The Nambudiris represented the highest rank. Even the Kshatriya was not allowed such privilege as to enter the inner sanctum of temples. The Nambudiris followed the rule of primogeniture according to which the eldest son of the family inherited the property. Moreover, only the eldest son was allowed to marry, that too from within the caste. For the convenience of the younger sons, a peculiar system called Sambandham - a morganatic marriage-with Nair or Kshatriya women was devised. By this system, the woman was not given the social status of a wife, nor could the children inherit the paternal property. The children were forbidden to touch their father, lest they pollute him. The matriarchal system of the Nair families was quite convenient to the Brahmins, as the maternal uncle became the guardian of the children, thus cleverly eliminating the responsibility of the father to provide for the wife and children. Prof. S. N. Sadasivan referred to this arrangement as a sexual luxury without the social obligation. The Nairs were quite convinced that it was the duty of the Nair men to serve, and the duty of the Nair women to please the Brahmin. Even Kshatriya families believed that the seed of a Nambudiri could produce better and more efficient Kings. It took hundred of years and generations for the community to realize and react against this sexual exploitation. But the Nambudiris failed to remedy the miseries of this system. Many a woman had to suffer compulsory maidenhood all her life because only one man from a family could marry. Alternatively, she had the choice to become one of the several wives of a Nambudiri who could be old enough to be her father or grandfather. Young widows among Nambudiri women were quite common. There were nearly three hundred compulsory taxes imposed on the Avarnas exclusively,

some of which will look ridiculous and nonsensical to the modern mind. These taxes appear laughable, but the implied humiliation and tragic fate of the people who had to bear them was breath taking. On realizing the illegitimacy, impropriety and inhuman nature of these taxes, Rani Gauri Laxmibai of Tranvancore issued a proclamation in 1851 and sought to abolish them. However, the social humiliations continued to be in force, because there was a firm belief that the lower castes defiled the higher in a spiritual or ritualistic sense. Hence, the principle of untouchability and inapproachability was maintained very strictly. Even Savarnas were victims of this vile system. Since the Nambudiris were alledged to be the highest and most sacred, even the Kshatriyas were regarded as polluting the Nambudiris by touch and approach. The Kshatriya was therefore compelled to keep a distance of two feet away from the Nambudiris and the sanctum sanctorum of the temple. Similarly, the distance to be observed[46] by the others was:

Nair..... 16 ft.
Ezhava ..... 32 ft.
Pulaya .....64ft.
Paraya .....64ft.
Nayadi .....Not to come within the sight of a Brahmin.

Apart from these, the following severe inhuman humiliations[47] were imposed upon the Avarnas:

i. The sight of a Nayadi at a distance would force the Brahmin to undergo ritual purification.

ii. The use of public highways was restricted.

iii. Anyone to pass within polluting distance of a Savarna would be cut down at once.

iv. To recognize such castes, they were required to remain naked above the waist. This applied to women too.

v. The proper salutation of an Avarna female to persons of rank was to uncover her bosom.

vi. The use of footwear, umbrellas, fine clothes and jewelry were forbidden to the Avarnas.

vii. The holding of umbrellas in public places was prohibited to all castes except Brahmins and kings. The others were expected to protect themselves with plantain leaves.

viii. Restrictions were imposed about the type of house an Avarna could build for himself. The area, the height of the house, the number of windows and ventilators, were also restricted.

ix. While talking to the caste superiors, the Avarnas were forced to use a special idiom like the following examples:

a. when referring to oneself, he should not say 'I', but should say, 'your slave'
b. they were to commence speaking, 'your slave has permission to observe....'
c. while speaking, he must place his hand over his mouth, lest his breath go forth and pollute the person he was addressing,

Therefore, it can be said that the Savarnas had monopolized all social, economic and political opportunities of the state in the beginning of the nineteenth century. They had taken care to see that the Avarnas did not get any opportunity worth the name for individual or communal development.

However, the emergence of Sri Narayan Guru stirred the very foundation of the above-noted Caste based socio-religious conditions in Kerala and heralded a new epoch making event in the history of the low caste movement in India. He was born on 22 August 1856 in Kerala. His nickname was 'Nanu'. He was known as Nanu Asan. He was one of the best scholars and reformers of his age. Narayan Guru was very much influenced by his family environment. Madan Asan was his father and Kutti Amma was his mother. Madan Asan was a farmer and the village schoolmaster and his wife Kochupennu was a kind- hearted pious woman. The father of Sri Narayan Guru was not only a farmer but also Asan too. Asan means 'Acharyan'-a teacher. He was well versed in Sanskrit and studied Astrology and Ayurveda, the system of Indian medicine. The people of the village highly respected him. He used to help the rustics by advising them on many matters. He was well versed in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, the two great Epics of the Vedic age. He used to give talks on the subjects of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata in a very simple language once a week before the village people, sitting in the verandah of his house. The people of the village used to gather and listen to him with great interest. Even Sri Narayan Guru attentively listened to those episodes with great interest. Sometimes he had to give the talks in absence of his father on those subjects before the village

peoples. His mother was very much intelligent and full of kindness. She was ever calm in her work. So Sri Narayan Guru was very much influenced by his parents and family environment. Once Nanu Asan left home due to fulfill his ambition. But he had to return home to see his father, who was on his deathbed. It was a great joy to the father to see his son after a long time. He was proud of his son who had become an Asan too. He addressed him as a Vidwan (scholar). He also desired to be fed with his sacred hands.

But Sri Nanayan Guru launched a ceaseless struggle to establish the social rights of the lowborn peoples in South India. He fought for socio-religious equal rights and privileges against the caste system. He belonged to the Ezhava Sect[48] that was the largest community in Kerala among the untouchables. The untouchables had the rights only to worship Goddess Kali and Chamunda. But Sri Narayan Guru founded the Shiva temple[49] for the untouchables. Therefore, the untouchable got the opportunity to worship God Shiva. In course of time near about 60 temples of God Shiva were established in South India for the untouchables, as they were not allowed to enter inside the Savarna temples. Therefore, Sri Narayana Guru tried to emancipate them in this way. It was a surprising matter that Sri Narayan Guru established a temple where he wrote the gospel of life in the words of truth, duty, kindness and love[50] instead of installing God or Goddess idol in the temple, 1922. He worked for the welfare of the toiling masses in India who were severely tyrannized by the so-called caste system and its Brahmin thinkers. Many anti-caste Sanghas were established in different parts of India like, Cochin, Kalikot, and Tribankur to preach the ideology of Sri Narayan Guru. Therefore, the social movement of Sri Narayan Guru played a vital role in creating a consciousness for democratic environment in the near-future politics of Kerala. He preached the gospel of brother-hood for all. That is why; his ceaseless struggle and fighting spirit against the ill effects of the caste system was very important that prevailed in the so-called Hindu society in those days. Sri Narayan Guru did not care for the rules of untouchability in the childhood because he did not find any logic in it. He used to mingle freely with the untouchables who worked in their farm and then threaten to touch the elders in the house with his 'polluted' hand. Some scholars pointed out that Sri Narayana Guru was a great saint and reformer who led a quiet but significant social revolution in India. He was a champion of the ill-fated untouchables in India. His prime object was to establish the

concept of 'One Caste, One Religion, and One God for all men'[51]. He lived with the poor and ate the food given by the untouchables. He discussed religion with Christians and Muslims. He found that 'Varna' and caste system and its direct off shoot untouchability were absolutely baseless, artificial and arbitrary. They were against the spirit of Advaitha and offended human dignity. They had to be broken down. People should not think, say or ask about caste. On further meditation he arrived at the logical conclusion that there is only one caste i.e. humanity, one religion-Humanism and one God-the Universal Spirit. He was firmly convinced of this principle. This principle became the dynamic centre from which he would act. It was not an easy task to make the poor ignorant people realize the presence of the universal spirit within them. He also understood that the social degradation of the Avarnas started when they were denied entry into the temples and with the denial of education. The Avarnas were not allowed even to come near the compound wall. However, offerings from them in the form of cash or kind were always accepted. Such shameless exploitation of the people by their caste superiors was to be met with in a telling manner. That is why; he consecrated a Shiva temple at Aruvippuram, about 40 km south of Trivandrum in 1888. It was an open challenge to Brahmin priesthood. In a caste-ruled society, an Avarna Hindu, an untouchable, had performed the installation of a deity defying all codes and norms. The Brahmin priesthood could not take it very easily. Their authority had so far been unchallenged. Therefore, a great Brahmin scholar questioned the right of an Avarna, an Ezhava to install a deity. The answer given by the Guru has become famous: "This is not a Brahmin Shiva this is an Ezhava Shiva"[52]. The revolutionary spirit that prompted this reply needs no explanation. Without distinction of caste or birth, without hatred of other religions, we all live here in brotherhood! This is the ideal that is here; Let everyone of you know this "This is a model abode, where all men shall live without caste distinctions and religious rivalries." [53]

'Gurukulam' and a Sanskrit school were also started at Aruvippuram to give religious training to the young men of the lower strata of society through lessons in scriptures. This was the beginning of a Movement for Social Reform by Sri Narayana Guru. 'Untouchability', animal sacrifice to please the gods, and the evil of drink existed in Travancore (Kerala) State also, as in all the other parts of India. The people forgot the fact that 'all are men'. But Sri Narayana Guru freely mingled with the

people, and tried to make them understand their follies. He argued with them in a gentle manner. He won their hearts and worked hard to put an end to the practice of animal sacrifice. He made them pull down the temples meant for such sacrifices. He had new temples and schools built on the very spot by them. In this way, the compassionate Sri Narayana Guru travelled for over fifteen years in the land of Malayalam. He tried to wipe out the superstitious beliefs and practices of the lowly and the lost in society. In short, he tried to transform the very way of life that the people followed. He also taught them the need to lead a life of cleanliness, keeping their houses and surroundings free from dirt. He taught them the way to lead a good life.

Many young men were attracted to mission taken up by the Guru. They founded an institution called 'Sree Narayana Dharmaparipalana Yogam'. Very soon, Varkala also became a place of pilgrimage. The Guru started a Sanskrit school there. Poor boys and orphans were taken under his care. They were given education. They were also taught some useful art. There was no caste distinction at all. The Guru himself was absorbed in some work during the greater part of the day. In 1913, the Guru founded an Ashram at Alwaye. It was called 'Advaita Ashram'. This was an important event in the life of the Guru in his spiritual quest. That Ashram was dedicated to a great principle - 'Om Sahodaryam Sarvatra' (all men are equal in the eyes of God). This became the motto of the new Ashram. The worship of God in a very simple manner, and the equality of all in the eyes of God - these principles he had practiced. His main aim was to dispel all superstitious beliefs and practices. The members of the Narayana Dharma Paripalana Yogam worked for this aim. They thought of securing the right of temple entry to people of all castes. They tried to organize this Reform Movement on the lines of Satyagraha taught by Mahatma Gandhi. However, it was only in 1936 that the Travancore State Government issued an order in the name of the Maharaja and gave the right of entry to temples to the Harijans also, for the first time in the whole of India. On 20 September, the Guru passed away in 1928 at Varkala.

Apart from these, Narayana Guru wrote a number of books both in Sanskrit and in Malayalam. 'Jati Mimamsa' (an enquiry into caste), a poem in five stanzas is of great significance. It discussed concisely the Guru's philosophy of life. The first stanza is in Sanskrit. The rest of the stanzas are in Malayalam. According to his philosophy the

recognition of any difference among human beings in respect of caste is meaningless and absolutely unjust. His aim was to build a society without caste distinctions.

Sri Narayan Guru firmly believed that the community needed economic power, and it would come only through industry and commerce. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the Reformation Movement of Sree Narayana Guru was totally different from all the others. The leaders of Brahma Samaj and Prarthana Samaj were mostly born in high caste, well-to-do families; and had enjoyed the privileges of modern westernized education. They had been inspired by the ideas of western humanism reflected through the slogans of liberty, fraternity and equality. Sri Narayana Guru was born in a low-caste family, and never had the privilege to learn English, nor did he come in touch with Western civilization. His education was purely traditional, Sanskrit-based. But Narayana Guru also preached human equality, and worked for liberty from serfdom of downtrodden people. His ideals of liberty and equality were based on spiritualism and godliness. His firm conviction was that 'All are one.' When he preached his dictum, 'Ask not, say not, think not caste,' the people had reached such a social level, that they could ignore caste and live. Therefore, it can be noted that the role of Sri Narayan Guru for the upliftment of the low caste peoples in India heralded an epoch making chapter in the history of India.

f. Ramkrishna Paramhansa (1835-1897)

The emergence of Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deb under the caste based unavoidable socio-religious and cultural environments were an important event in the history of Bengal. He did not create an epoch-making role to ban the Caste system and Untouchability from the so-called Hindu society. He was a great saint in Bengal as well as India who was a great worshiper of 'Ma Kali'. But he did not launch a direct movement to abolish the age-old evil traditions and superstitions like Caste system and Untouchability from the Hindu society. His nickname was Godadhar. Sri Ramakrishna emerged in Bengal under these unavoidable caste based socio-religious and cultural environments. Sri Ramakrishna was born in an orthodox Brahmana family. His father followed all the principles that were prescribed by the scriptures. He spent most of his time in spiritual activities and scriptural study. At the same time, he also strictly observed all the social rules of a Brahmana. Though poor, he did not accept anything from a non-Brahmana, not even from those Brahmanas who accepted

gifts from Sudras. His family members were also not allowed to do so. His adherence to Brahmanic rules and his renunciation and asceticism made him so distinguished that everybody in the village had great respect for him. Nobody bathed in the pond before he took his bath, nor would anybody pass him by without showing him proper respect. But Dr. Krishna Verma highlighted the attitudes of Sri Ramakrishna towards the issue of caste and untouchability in his article, 'Sri Ramakrishna and the Caste System' in a different way. But he did not pay due attention to show the dichotomy of Sri Ramakrishna on that particular issues. Many scholars pointed out that the most serious social problems in India were the existence of the caste system and untouchability, which gauged the progress of the Indian Nation. The social condition in medieval Bengal was categorized into two principal caste divisions i.e., Brahmanas and Sudras. There were no significant Kshatriya or Vaishya castes. Vaidyas, Kayasthas belonged to the Sudra caste. They considered themselves superior to these people like goldsmiths, blacksmiths, weavers, peasants, washermen and fishermen who belonged to the Sudra caste also. But the cobblers, tanners, burning-ghat workers and sweepers were known as untouchables. The Kayastha Zamindars or goldsmiths were economically very strong than the Brahmanas. However, the social position of the Brahmanas was much higher than the Sudras. The Sudras had to show respect to them in every way, and they had authority over them in all religious and social activities that a non-Brahmana wanted to perform. The staunch Brahmanas did not perform priestly activities in a non-Brahmana house and accept anything from them. A Brahmana woman must have to use the suffix Devi (divine person) before mentioning her name, whereas a non-Brahmana woman must have to use dasi (servant) for the same.

His Attitude towards Other Castes

In those days, only Sudra woman could function as a midwife in the Brahmana house. It is also noted in the caste rules that without performing the upanayana, sacred thread ceremony of a boy of the Brahmana family after reaching a certain age, none could obtain the position of a full-fledged Brahmana. The boy was given the Gayatri mantra at that time. The boy could enjoy the right of religious activity by maintaining these caste based socio-religious rules and customs. Not only that but also completing these formalities to become a Brahmana, the boy has to live as a brahmacharin for a certain

period. He had to manage his food by begging at that time and sleeping on the floor. The Brahmana woman had the privilege to give the first alms to a brahmacharin. The first lady who gives him alms was known as his bhiksha-mata, the 'alms-giving mother'. Dhani Kamarini[54], a blacksmith woman, had a secret desire to become Sri Ramakrishna's 'bhiksha-mata'. But it was not permissible by the caste rules. However, Sri Ramakrishna somehow knew it and promised her to become his 'bhiksha-mata'. That is why, he took his first alms from a Sudra blacksmith woman and making her the 'bhiksha-mata' to keep his word by violating the so-called caste rules and traditional believes of his family in this regard.

Sri Ramakrishna sometime played a very exceptional role towards the low strata of the society. He usually heard from the village blacksmiths that dal (lentils) cooked by them had some special taste. Therefore, he was very much interested to taste it. But he knew it very well that it was not permissible for a Brahmana to take cooked food from a non-Brahmana family. Under this unavoidable circumstance, he came forward to ask a blacksmith woman, most probably Dhani, to cook dal for him and ultimately he tasted that dal and remarked as follows: 'I ate the dal but it smelt of the blacksmith.'[55]

Not only that but also Sri Ramakrishna never hesitated to take food from Chinu Shankhari, an old man of the village belonged to the lower artisan caste in Bengal. In fact, Shankharis are those who cut conch-shells and make conch bangles. Besides, it is noted in the Ramakrishna Punthi that Gadadhar ignored caste distinctions and came forward to fulfill the desire of a certain Khetir Mata to feed Sri Ramakrishna at her home who belonged to the carpenter caste[56].

In the nineteenth-century Bengal, all non-Brahmanas were termed as Sudras. But Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa had 16 Sannyasin disciples, out of which nine were non-Brahmanas. Among them, eight were Kayasthas and one belonged to a shepherd family. Apart from this, he had twenty-five intimate householder disciples. The names of them were noted in the Sri Ramakrishna Bhaktamalika. Among them, nineteen were non-Brahmanas. Most of them were Kayasthas while some belonged to the Vaidya caste and some to the Vaishya caste. From this point of view, it can be

noted that Sri Ramakrishna did not count the caste parameter in the context of choosing his disciples. Inspite of his orthodox family background and tradition, he discarded the narrowness and psychological egos of caste superiority by the way of love and devotion to God. But the orthodox Hindus objected to his eligibility for Sannyasa when Vivekananda obtained high esteem in the society. They pointed out that a Sudra had no right to Sannyasa[57].

Sri Ramakrishna maintained purity of mind and devotion to God, which were the only criteria for judging a man. In his estimate, Kayasthas Narendranath (Swami Vivekananda) and Kayasthas Rakhal Chandra (Swami Brahmananda) were spiritually much higher than many Brahmanas. By the grace of Sri Ramakrishna, Latu, the shepherd boy of Chapra who was a domestic help at Ramchandra Datta's house, was transformed into Swami Adbhutananda, a great Sadhu. Adhar Sen and Mani Mallick belonged to the caste of a Subarna-banik and a Teli respectively who were the devotees of Sri Ramakrishna who used to visit their houses and take food there by violating the caste rules. Once, on the occasion of Durga Puja, Sri Ramakrishna went to Adhar's house who was a lower caste people. Kedar Chatterjee, an orthodox Brahmana devotee, went there to meet his Master Sri Ramakrishna. Inspite of his unwillingness, Mr. Kedar followed his Master, took part in dinner together there with the other devotees, and later broke into tears before him for his hesitation. But Sri Ramakrishna told him at that time, 'One can eat food even from an untouchable if the untouchable is a devotee of God'[58].

Secondly; the conversation also revealed Sri Ramakrishna's high esteem for a devotee. Repeatedly we heard him say, 'Devotees do not belong to any caste'; 'Blessed is he who feels longing for God, though he eats pork. But shame on him whose mind dwells on "woman and gold", though he eats the purest food - boiled vegetables, rice, and ghee'[59].

We also find Sri Ramakrishna saying, 'Hazra said that a man could not be liberated unless he was born in a Brahmin body. "How is that?" I said. "One attains liberation through bhakti alone. Shabari was the daughter of a hunter. She, Ruhidas, and others belonged to the Sudra caste. They were liberated through bhakti alone." [60]

Rani Rasmani, a very rich lady of the Kaivarta caste, was founded the famous Dakshineswar Kali temple. But no Brahmana agreed to officiate as priest in a temple constructed by a Kaivarta Rani as she belonged to Sudra caste. Ultimately, Ramkumar who was the elder brother of Sri Ramakrishna was agreed to engage his brother to do that work. But Sri Ramakrishna refused to take food from low caste Kaibarta family. His elder brother convinced him through arguments that there was no harm in taking food at such a holy place like the temple of the Divine Mother situated on the bank of the Ganga. So he started living in the Kali temple complex and gradually began taking food there too. Reason always had great appeal for him. After some time he was entrusted with decorating the image in the Kali temple, and later became the priest there. Sri Ramakrishna was not a social reformer but a master of spirituality. In the Gospel, where his words were recorded, we find very few references to the caste system. Whenever the topic of caste came up, he discussed it from the spiritual point of view.

The evils of the caste system were a topic of hot discussion. Ashwini Kumar Datta once categorically asked Sri Ramakrishna, 'Do you observe caste?' The answer that Sri Ramakrishna gave was as significant as it was interesting:

'How can I say yes? I ate curry at Keshab Sen's house. Let me tell you what once happened to me. A man with a long beard brought some ice here, but I did not feel like eating it. A little later, someone brought me a piece of ice from the same man, and I ate it with great relish. You see, caste restrictions fall away of themselves. As coconut and palm trees grow up, the branches drop off themselves. Caste conventions drop off like that. But don't tear them off as those fools do.

The last sentence is very important and shows how much Sri Ramakrishna was against anything artificial. Nothing should be done forcibly. If one has not risen above the feeling of superiority or inferiority regarding one's caste or social position, mere eating together or marrying in a different caste will not help. Outwardly, one may make a show of equality but inside there will be hatred and jealousy. Sri Ramakrishna was very much against any type of hypocrisy'.

According to Sri Ramakrishna caste distinctions can be removed only through bhakti, devotion to God. Intense love for God melts away all distinctions. In Sri Ramakrishna's language:

The caste system can be removed by one means only, and that is the love of God. Lovers of God do not belong to any caste. The mind, body, and soul of a man become purified through divine love. Chaitanya and Nityananda scattered the name of Hari to everyone, including the pariah, and embraced them all. A Brahmin without this love is no longer a Brahmin. And a pariah with the love of God is no longer a pariah (155). This, however, is the last word about the caste system. The superiority or inferiority of a man does not depend on his caste or his position in society. It depends upon his mental purity.

Apart from these, it can be said that once he received the invitation of Rani Rashmani and stayed thereafter. He took meals there as he liked. He worshiped there the Goddess 'Ma Kali' in a temple established by Rani Rashmani and said 'Ma Kali' during his prayer 'Seshkale Amake Kaibarter Vat khayali Ma. Ar katodin khayabi Ma'. Godadhar expressed his grievances several times regarding this matter and ultimately took decision to move Brindabon for staying there with Ghangamoni. He drank the water of the river Ganga repeatedly to purify himself and said 'Aktu Suddha Hayenei Ma'[61]. One day Puran Dasi Bhagabati of Mathurbabu touched the legs of Sri Ramakrishna Deb to know her best regards but Sri Ramakrishna Deb suddenly said, "Mago Amar Pai Sing Maccher Katter Jala Anubhav Hoschhe; Gangajal Neye Ayare ... Pata Suddha Kori. Gobindo Gobindo Bole Tini Paye Gangajal Dhalte Thaken." Under this situation, Puran Dasi Bhagabati feared at that moment. Inspite of that Ramakrishna Deb asked in anger,"Amoni Amar Paye Hat Diye Pronam Korli? Torato Asprisha Ta Janis Na?" [62] One day Madhusudhan went to meet Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deb and took part in discussion with his well-known friends who were the devoted disciples of Ramakrishna Deb. His friends prayed to Ramakrishna Deb with delightfully after the discussion with Madhu to say something about Madhu. But Ramakrishna Deb rapidly expressed his unwillingness

to talk with Madhu as he belonged to the Mlecche caste by saying "Akjan Mleschher Sathe Ami Ki Kotha Kobo?"[63]

Another incident may be mentioned to highlight the anti-lower caste mentality of Swami Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deb. This was happened when the never-ending canceristic disease seriously attacked Swami Ramakrishna. He was advised by the doctor to take complete rest in bed and instructed to take hot Payesh to relieve from casceristic pains and inflammation. Naturally, required nursing was inevitable for him. Latu and Gopal played a vital role in this connection. Ramakrishna Deb noticed suddenly when he used to take sit for meal that Latu and Gopal who were the Sudras, stood behind his bed by touching. Ramakrishna Deb became very angry at once and said Naren, "Oder Bichhana Chhere Dite Bal Naren!" Naren did not like this attitude of his Guru Ramakrishna Deb and replied him, "Keno Chharbe? Apanito Dhora Chhoar Opar, Abar a Adesh Keno". He told Naren very sadly, "Brahmaner Sarir Tai Balchhi, Brahmaner Sanskar Jabar Nay re . . . !" [64]

Some scholars made it clear that Sri Ramakrishna expressed his views towards the issues of the caste system and untouchability from the spiritual point of view. But his remarks regarding the case of Rani Rashmani, Laltu, Gopal and Madhu in the context of caste and untouchability were really self-contradictory and self-explanatory to understand the mentality of Sri Ramakrishna. Practically speaking, he never spontaneously came forward to eradicate the institution of the caste system and untouchability that gauged and wrecked the human rights and privileges of the lowborn peoples in India. He was mainly convinced by the traditional beliefs and faiths in these contexts. Therefore, he failed to find out any practical measures to eradicate these inhuman barriers permanently except the idle talking of the spiritual and emotional point of views. He was staunch Brahmin. Therefore, he could not do anything for the betterment of the toiling masses without propagating the spiritual and mechanical devices of Brahmanism that was completely responsible for the rise and growth of the caste system and untouchability.

The emerging 19th century Renaissance men of India like Ram Mohan, Vidyasagar and others came forward to reform the Hindu society on the basis of the evidences of the Hindu Sastras and the principles of humanism. The main motto of the Brahmo

movement was to eradicate all sorts of the socio-religious evils and superstitions from the Hindu society. On the other hand, a new trend of revivalism of the Hindu religion based on the Golden Vedic traditions and cultures was emerged in a different way under the leadership of Swami Dayanand Saraswati and others. Another principal object was to remove the Hindu society from the curse of the Caste system and Untouchability. However, they did not success at all. The emergence of Swami Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deb in Bengal under these unavoidable socio-religious environments did not create an epoch-making role to ban the Caste system and Untouchability from the so-called Hindu society. It is generally highlighted that Swami Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deb was a great saint in Bengal as well as India who was a worshiper of 'Ma Kali'. But he did not remove himself from the age-old evil traditions and superstitions like Caste system and Untouchability.

g. Vivekananda: (1863 –1902)

Vivekananda was better known as Narendranath Dutta who was born in Shimla Pally, Calcutta, on January 12, 1863. His nickname was Bile. He did not believe anything without its evidence. The name of his parents was Vishvanath Datta and Bhuvaneshwari Debi. His mother was a religious woman. In fact, Vivekananda belonged to a Kayastha family. Even when he was young, he questioned the validity of superstitious customs and discrimination based on caste and religion. But his attitude towards the issue of caste was based on the principle of 'Varna Theory' of the Rig Vedic society. He did not believe in the modern hereditary caste system of the so-called Hindu society. But he played a very controversial role towards the issue of caste and untouchability. He vehemently opposed to the tyranny of the priestly class and ritualism. He was the great upholder of the early Vedic Varna system as like Swami Dayanand. The European Renaissance man as like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Vidyasagar did not influence him. He explained the root of the Hindu Caste System and its greatness in a different manner. His vision and mission was to develop India spiritually. The teachings, i.e., "Jiva is Shiva" (each individual is divinity itself) of his Guru. Swami Ramakrishna Paramahamsa greatly influenced the mind set up of Vivekananda which he coined the concept of *daridra narayana seva* - the service of God in and through (poor) human beings. He had no faith in a social reform programme that created an elitist group. Once he pointed out that he did not believed in a God or religion, which could not wipe the widow's tears or bring a piece of bread

to the orphan's mouth. Besides, the reform movements like Sati-abolition and widow re-marriage would not succeed as they were confined only to the upper one percent of the population. He treated every man a traitor who had been educated at the expenses of the ill-fated hunger and ignorant toiling masses but paid no heed to them. He also pointed out that the new India was to arise from the farmer's plough, the fritter-seller's oven, from the huts, from the forests, from the peasants and the working classes. In fact, he offered a synthesis between the old and the new. He played a self-contradictory role towards the issue of caste. Once he pointed out that "Kick out the priests who are always against progress, because they would never mend. Their hearts would never become big. They are the offspring of centuries of superstition and tyranny. Root out priestcraft first... The Brahmanas suck the blood of these poor people, without even the least effort for their amelioration – is that a country or hell? Is that a religion or the devils dance?" [65] Vivekananda said, "Priestcraft is in its nature cruel and heartless. That is why religion goes down where Priestcraft arises."[66] He also said, "I must tell you that I am neither a caste-breaker nor a mere social reformer. I have nothing to do directly with your castes or your social reformation..."[67] Not only that but also he did not like untouchability. He expressed his grievances towards the issue of untouchability and said that "Touch-me-not-ism' is your creed and the kitchen-pot your deity, you cannot rise spiritually. . . Don't touch us! Don't touch us! Is there any compassion or kindliness of heart in the country? Only a class of 'Don't – touchists'; kick such customs out!"[68] Vivekananda knew it very well that liberty of thought and action is the only condition of life, of growth and well-being. So he said, "What it does not exist, the man, the race, the nation must go down. .. Caste or no caste, creed, any man, or class, or caste, or nation, or institution which bars the power of free thought and action of an individual-even so long as that power does not injure others – is devilish and must go down"[69].

He said that "The present religion of the Hindus is not in the Vedas, nor in the Puranas, nor in Bhakti, nor in Mukti – religion has entered into the cooking-pot. The present religion of the Hindus is neither the path of knowledge, nor that of Reason – it is 'Don't-touchism'...'Don't-touchism' is a form of mental disease. Beware!"[70]

It is very interesting to note that Vivekananda expressed his grievances against the Priesthood but ultimately by the introduction of 'Kumari-Puja' in the Mahastami in

the Durga Puja, he re-established the supremacy of the so-called Brahmanism, Priesthood and the superstitious concept of the Caste System. Not only that but also he advocated the pernicious method of the caste system on the line of birth circle that was institutionalized by Manu, the so-called ancient lawmaker of the Hindu Sastras. First of all, he should/ would not use the term 'caste' instead of 'class' in the context of the 'Varnashrama Dharma' as because it was completely based on the division of labour on the basis of three Gunas i.e., Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas that were the only parameters of the upward mobility and downward mobility of an individual from one class circle to another class circle. Besides, he did not free himself from the age-old superstitious conviction, which was mentioned very clearly in his book viz., 'Caste, Culture and Socialism' that 'The Brahmin, by his very birth, is the Lord of the universe. Even the most wicked Brahmin must be worshiper priestcraft is the bone of India... The priest knows the gods and communicates with them; he is, therefore, worshipped as a god.'[71] Once he wanted to ban priest and priesthood because they could not avoid their responsibility for all the irrational developments in the Hindu Society in the form of regulations about food, marriage, untouchability, etc. that created numerous socio-religious problems in the so-called Brahmancal Hindu religion. However, he said, 'all caste either on the principle of birth or of merit is bondage' which was self-contradictory, self-explanatory, indecisive, inclusive and unscientific attitude of Vivekananda towards real context of the Varna theory of the Rig Vedic society. His unscientific and multi-dimensional attitude towards the issue of caste as follows was really discouraging and disappointing;

"Caste is a natural order...Caste is good. That is the only natural way of solving life."[72] This argument of Vivekananda was nothing but an expression of Orthodox Hindus towards the issue of caste. As because he did not overcome the psychological limitatations relating to caste due to his profound believe in the Hindu caste philosophy. Otherwise, he did not think it. He did not mind about the unnatural existence of the caste system in the so-called Hindu society, which wrecked the power, position, status, privileges, liberty to live honourably etc. of the lower strata in Hindu the society and brought them into the position of animal, beast and slave. There was no existence of caste system as such the so-called Hindus at all in the world society. However, the opinion Vivekananda relating this issue created numerous contradictory and unscientific outlooks, which did not help us to solve the

problems of caste in the Hindu society. Not only that but also his argument for caste was really ridiculous and illogical. He said, "It is owing to caste that three hundred millions of people can find a piece of bread to eat yet."[73] In fact, he had perhaves forgotten about the several thousand millions of people who lived and enjoyed beyond the Hindu caste institution more or less all sorts of privileges, liberty etc. in the society. Not only that but also Vivekananda did not mention about them who managed to find out their livelihood freely in their own way beyond Hindu caste system?

He gave top priority to the Vedic Varnashrama system that was completely based on the theory of Karma (action), virtuous deeds and the principal of three Gunas i.e., Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas and emphasized for the abolition of the present day hereditary caste system. But this Varnashrama system was based on the principle of class not on caste. Only the Purusha Sukta, the interpolated verses of the later Vedic period mentioned the concept of caste in the context of the creation of the human beings in the universe. Vivekananda perhaves missed the term class and used the term caste in the perspective of the Vedic Varnashrama system that was fundamentally opposite to each other. That is why, he wrongly pointed out that "Caste should not go; but should only be readjusted accordingly . . . It is sheer nonsense to desire the abolition of caste."[74] Besides, his following explanation regarding the Indian caste and the European caste was not logically justified. As there was no such caste concept like the so-called caste system of the Hindus at all, which was completely based on hereditary birth circle that was introduced by Manu, the ancient lawmaker of the Hindu Sastras rather than class in Europe:

"Indian caste is better than the caste which prevails in Europe or America . . . , it is absolutely good." Not only that but also, his following attitudes towards the basis of the Indian social order can not be logically and scientifically approved:

"What is the basis of the India's social order? It is the caste law. I am born for the caste; I live for the caste. ...Born in the caste; the whole life must be lived according to caste regulation. . . . It is the caste that determinates all that."[75]

He gave the following instruction for the solution of the Indian caste problem was nothing but an idealistic approach only:

"In the beginning of the Satya-Yuga (Golden Age) there was one caste, the Brahmanas; and then by difference of occupation they went on dividing themselves into different castes; and that is the only true ...The solution of the caste problem in India, therefore, assumes this form – not to degrade the higher castes, not to crush out the Brahmana."[76]

He wrote a constitution for Ramkrishna Math-Mission in which he mentioned in article no. 19 "Only the Hindu boys of good family will be admitted in this mission"[77]. His explanation regarding the priest and the so-called Brahmana was self-contradictory. He noted them as a medium of communication between man and God. Another point was that Vivekananda himself highlighted the matter that human body is itself a temple and a living place of God. To serve Jiva means to serve God itself. The following statement of him was really very important:

"God is present in every Jiva (individual man); there is no other God besides that. 'Who serves Jiva, serves God indeed."

The attitude of Vivekananda towards the issue of caste and untouchability was discouraging. He was a great upholder of the so-called Hindu Caste System. He vividly narrated the utility and its inevitability to protect our society and when this necessity for self-preservation will no more exist, they will die a natural death. Not only that but also he pointed out that the existence of the institutions of caste system and untouchability were utmost necessity to protect us as a nation. He said that there was no caste in religion. A man from the highest caste and a man from the lowest may become a monk in India and the two castes become equal. Caste is a social custom, and all our great preachers have tried to break it down. From Buddhism downwards, every sect has preached against caste, and every time it has only riveted the chains. Beginning from Buddha to Ram Mohan Ray, everyone made the mistake of holding caste to be a religious institution and tried to pull down religion and caste altogether, and failed. That is why, his argument towards the reforms of the Hindu society in connection with caste and untouchability was astonishing as follows:

In religion, there is no caste; caste is simply a social custom[78]. Reform does not mean wholesale breaking down. .. In fact, a person belonged to the lower or higher strata of the so-called Hindu society could change his profession as he liked during the Vedic age and enjoyed the privileges to become a Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya. But it was completely depended upon his requisite qualifications. That is why; Viswamitra and Parashurama enjoyed the opportunity to become a Brahmana and a Kshatriya respectively. Even the following argument of Vivekananda can not be accepted as because every caste rules were made for the undue privileges, status, position and superiority of the so-called Dwijas (twice born), especially the Brahmanas but the exploitation, humiliation, suppression, negation of humanity imposed upon the lower strata of the Hindu society in the time of Manu, the so-called law maker of the Hindu Sastras:

"In the land of Bharata (India), every social rule is for the protection of the weak. Such is our ideal of caste, as meant for raising all humanity slowly and gently towards the realization of the great ideal of spiritual man, who is non-resisting, calm, steady, worshipful, pure and meditative."[79]

h. Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920)

Tilak was not a social reformer in the sense in which Rammohan Roy is entitled as a social reformer. He was a Puritan. He favoured re-marriages of widows, advocated female education, opposed untouchability and condemned discrimination that based on castes and creeds. He was a great lover of ancient Indian tradition and culture. He pointed out that there could be no social reform without political reform, no national education without a national government. His declaration of sympathy for the poor and the depressed classes was of course appreciating. But he was not in favour of violent social reform. He played a vital role in awakening the national spirit through the Shivaji and Ganapati festivals which gave birth of Muslim communalism. He was a militant nationalist. But he did not give emphasis on radical social reforms. His approach was totally based on Indian tradition and socio-cultural heritage. Prof Dev Raj Bali pointed out in his book, 'Modern Indian Political Thought' that Tilak was a social reformer. His declaration of sympathy for the poor and the depressed classes was much appreciated. But he was not in favour of violent social reform. He also pointed out that Tilak wanted genuine reform of the society and not blind imitation of

the West. He was a lover of peace, lover of Indian culture and tradition and wanted reform with respect for Indian tradition. He wanted social reform movement that would not run counter to the religions and patriotic susceptibilities of the Indian people. He also said that all reforms grow from within and unless people are sufficiently prepared by the assimilation of liberal ideas it was useless to march ahead. Tilak pointed out that we should not want to anglicize our institutions and to denationalize them in the name of social and political reforms. He refused to be hoodwinked by the outbursts of the reformers that social reform was the necessary antecedent of political progress. He was opposed to the proposition that social reformism was the necessary antecedent for obtaining political right from the British rulers. He wanted political rights because only after obtaining them the proper atmosphere could be created for the development of the comprehensive activities of the nation. Meantime, by the teachings and precepts the consciousness of the nation was to be gradually prepared for the acceptance of social transformation. Therefore, it can be said that Tilak's attitude to social reform was dictated by his comprehensive conception of politics and culture. But he was a nationalist and his purpose of organizing festivals was to awaken the national spirit. He said that religious education was necessary because the study of high principles kept us away from evil pursuits.

He highlighted the necessity of the divine arrangement of the caste system. He strongly advocated the inevitability of the caste system to maintain statuesque in the arena of social discipline. His caste philosophy was not fundamentally different of his predecessors. He said that caste system played a vital role in respect of social control. He supported the physical structure of the caste system that was helping to each caste to become expert on a particular work. The hereditary experience of a particular work ultimately accelerated the pace of development. He identified the Indian caste system as a secular and social organization that was based on the distinction of occupation etc. Prof. V.P.Verma said that Tilak had identified three purpose of the caste system.

Firstly, it had preserved the knowledge of industrial arts.

Secondly, it had checked the abuse of despotic political power.

Thirdly, it had kept up feeling of morality, self-respect and superiority amongst the people.

Tilak was a conservative social reformer. Once he said, "I am a liberal Hindu. We have always been advocates of reform, reform we say, but not of rebellion or licence."[80] According to V.S.Patil, "Tilak had sympathy towards untouchable and he work for the eradiction of untouchability'[81]. Tilak asked wealthy class and especially the social reformers to donate one percent of their annual income for the social reform works. He donated Rs. one lakh for the social reform works of the race in 1916.

j. Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941)

Rabindranath Tagore obtained the Nobel Prize for the writings of 'Gitanjali', which earned name and fame for him and his country. He developed a positive view of life and love of humanity under the inspirations of the liberal ideas and philosophical traditions of the Upanishads and the humanist tradition and the teachings of Goutam Buddha. He pointed out that the teachings of Goutam Buddha would cultivate our moral power to the highest extent in the field of our activities, which would not found to the plane of our narrow self[82]. Besides, Rabindranath Tagore realized the importance of love for all humankind irrespective of caste, creed and sex by the interpretation of the idea of divine manifestation in Kabir's poems through which Kabir raised his voice against all kinds of dogmas and superstitions of Hinduism. Therefore, he highlighted the social structure of the Hindu society of his time, noted its age-old evils, and gave proposals for remedies. However, his attitude towards the issues of the caste system and untouchability was mainly based on the principal approach of humanism and synthetic. Varnashram system was the backbone of the Hindu society. He noted very clearly on the basis of this system that "The Indian mind has ever been oriented towards that transcendentalism which does not hold religion to be ultimate but rather to be a means to a farther end. This end consists in the perfect liberation of the individual in the universal spirit across the furthest limits of humanity itself."[83] He was a great admirer of the Varnashram system. But he condemned the term 'dwija'. He also criticized the use of this term in a narrow sense for Brahmins. He said that it should be used for all classes. Knowledge channels should be properly utilized and opened to all classes. But the caste based Indian society has suppressed rights of a section of class. So he condemned everything based on supernatural powers. He "was a severe critic of caste system'[84]. He also pointed

out that the caste system and their attendant practices of untouchability were among the darkest blots of Indian society."[85]

Tagore strongly condemned caste system along with untouchability practiced in the Hindu society. He highlighted the malady in all its details. He noted in details the feelings of the untouchables, their disabilities through his dance drama 'Chandalika' and his novel 'Gora' and proposed remedy. That is why; he made solid efforts for the removal of untouchability. He made a Scouting Team named 'Brati Balak' for fighting untouchability. He noted social evils prevalent in rural India by the novel 'Gora'. He said, "Gora saw the image of his country's weakness, naked and unashamed, ... The tradition which merely divided men into classes and separated class from class ...only put obstacles at every step ...."[86] Paresh Babu in Gora noted the wrath of untouchability as follows:

"There is no harm in a cat sitting by and eating right besides you. But if certain men so much as enter the room, the food has to be thrown away. How can one not condemn the caste system which has resulted in this contempt and insult of man by man?"[87] He pointed out that the intolerable aversion of man for man in our country and how it divided and sub-divided our people shocked him. That is why; he wanted the society in which the distinctions of caste, untouchability and religions should go. He said in the words of Gora, "Today give me mantra of that deity who belongs to all, Hindu, Mussulman, Christian and Brahmo alike – the doors of whose temple are never closed to any person of any caste, whatever, He who is not merely the God of the Hindus but who is the God of India herself."[88]

Rabindranath Tagore highlighted the age-old socio-religious problems of the Sudras and the untouchables by his article named 'Sudra Dharma' in 1925. His main motive behind this article was to draw attention to the countrymen regarding the inhuman nature, character, illogical, and unscientific bases of the caste system and untouchability that were against the ideas of liberty, equality, fraternity and the progressive trend of the nation as well as the country. He did not favour the socio-religious division of Varna based on different professions. Not only that but also, he highlighted the irrelevant content of the Sastras as follows: Sadharme Nidhang Sreyo: Parodharmo Vayabhaya: that compelled every man to stay within their Varna circle

until death. Therefore, it is illogical and unscientific[89]. Man can work repeatedly as a mechanical instrument for the same Varna very easily without the versatile manifestation of his knowledge for the benefit of the nation as a whole[90].

Therefore, it can be pointed out from the above noted discussions that the 19th century Renaissance and Reformation Movement failed to eradicate the problems of the Caste System and Untouchability. Most of the 19th century intellectuals continued the tradition of the Indian National Congress in this respect although there were a few exceptions who demanded the abolition of caste system, untouchability etc. They expressed their views and opinions theoretically in a very limited way and did not come forward spontaneously to launch a direct movement against the abolition of the Caste System and Untouchability from the Hindu Society. Realizing the importance of its abolition, they did nothing but ideal talking. They knew it very well that India can not be developed as a 'Nation State' without its eradication. Even they differed in their respective approach in this issue. Naturally, they were unable to introduce a crusade that would radically reform the Indian Society. The name of Raja Rammohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Annie Besant, Swami Vivekananda and others may be mentioned in order to understand the intellectual dichotomy towards the issue of the caste system and untouchability.

3.5. The Role of the British Government towards the Issue of Caste

The role of the British Government can categorically be analyzed in order to understand their attitude towards the issue of caste and the problem of untouchability. Their imperialist rule from the battle of Plessey to the independence of India was very important in this connection. The first phase began with the grant of Diwani in Bengal Bihar and Orissa to the East India Company of the British Crown. The main motto of this Company was to extent their monopoly business in India. As a result, India ultimately came under their direct economic preview. The Company consolidated its power and position to bring the Bombay and Madras Presidency within their direct politico-economic rule. However, the company did not adopt any welfare measures in connection with the caste system and untouchability for the greater benefit of the toiling masses in India. It was natural as because the Company came India for economic gain. The Company got chance to establish its imperialist

rule with the help of the British Government. Naturally, a large conquered territory of India came under the Company rule. It severely exploited India. But the British Government introduced the Regulating Act of 1773 by which the Governor-General-in-Council were empowered to make rules, ordinances and regulations for the better Government of the Company's entire territories. It was the beginning of the law making power of the Government in India. Therefore, it can be said that the issue of caste and untouchability was not a matter of headache to the Company as well as the British Crown in this phase. But it was noted in the Bengal Judicature Act of 1781 that the rules and forms of the Supreme Court were to respect the religion and usages of the people of India. Therefore, it was vividly clear that the British Government adopted completely inactive decisions relating to the Caste System and untouchability. They firmly took the decision not to interfare on this issues that would create problems of their administrations. Even the Company got privileges for another 20 years in India by the Charter Act of 1793. Charter Acts were passed after every 20 years, i.e., 1793, 1833 and 1853. However, the Charter Act of 1813 opened India to all British citizens for trade and commerce. The Governor General of India was given full authority by the Charter Act of 1833 to 'superintend, direct and control' Government of the remaining parts of India in all matter, relating to the civil, military and revenue administration. A duty was laid on the Governor-General-in-Council to pass legislation for improving the condition of Indians without injuring their sentiments. The Indian Slavery Act and much later progressive legislation were the results of this policy. A Law Member, for purely legislative purposes, was added to the Governor-General's Council. Practically speaking, the British Government did not adopt any radical measures to change the ill-fated social conditions of the downtrodden relating to Caste and Untouchability as it was not possible for them with out directly interfering for eradicating the unscientific and divine superstitions of the Brahmanical Hindu social norms and ordinances. Their main object was to rule India with full economic gain without disturbing their existing socio-religious conditions from the imperialistic point of view. But a provision was included in this Act to make legislation for improving the conditions of the Indians that was a pioneering work on behalf of the British Government towards the benefit of the Indians, irrespective of caste, class, creed, religion, sex etc. Even the Board of Control was authorized by the Charter Act of 1853 to make rules and regulations governing appointments to the services in India. As a result, the Indian Civil Service Examination was thrown open

to the public and entry to that service was made possible through an open competition irrespective of caste, class, sex and religion. Therefore, the greatness of the British Government towards the lower strata of the Hindu society was vividly mentioned. But the Government of India Act was passed by the British Parliament in 1858 after the suppression of the Revolt of 1857. As a result, the East India Company was abolished. The Act transferred the Government of India from the Company to Crown and India was henceforth, to be governed directly in the name of the Crown. The various changes introduced by the Act were formally announced in India by a Proclamation of Queen Victoria on November 1, 1858.

Apart from these, the Indian Council Acts of 1861, 1892 and 1909 were passed respectively with a motto of legislation. The Indian Council Act of 1861 was an important landmark in the Constitutional History of India. Indians were given privileged to be nominated for the first time to the Supreme Legislative Council for the purpose of legislation. However, the greatest evil of the Minto-Morley Reforms Act of 1909 was the grant of separate electorate to Muslims. But the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 (The Government of India Act) provided for the establishment, for the first time in India, of a Public Service Commission. The Communal or Separate Electorate, injected into body politic of India under the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909, was further extended to the Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Christians in Provinces where the influence of these Communities could be weighty. Therefore, it can be said that the British Government introduced these policies to 'divide and rule' India to fulfill their target without considering the basic needs and demands of the Depressed Classes and the untouchables.

In fact, the British did little to modify India's socio-religious customs in the initial phase. They adopted then 'hands off policy' to produce planned social change. They promised complete religious neutrality and freedom of worship to the people. Some exceptions were that the civil statutes (for example, Removal of Caste Disabilities Act) and courts sometimes regulated marriage and that the criminal courts, in stead of the caste councils, decided cases of assaults, adultery and rape. In spite of the legislation of inter-caste marriage by the Special Marriage Act of 1872, these never became numerically important. The British transferred the judicial powers of the caste councils to the civil and the criminal courts which affected the authority which

panchayats held over their members. Therefore, it can be said that the British Government passed some Acts (Caste Disabilities Removal Act of 1850, Widow Re-marriage Act of 1856 and the Special Marriage Act of 1872) under the pressure of the emerging 19 th century intelligentsia to remove some of the social disabilities of untouchables. All these legislations were passed by the British Government purely for administrative reasons and not because it wanted to eradicate the caste system. Some scholars pointed out that most of the activities of the British Government were dictated by prudence of administration and not by a desire to reduce the rigidity of caste. But the British Government did not implement uniform rules over the three Presidencies. In Bengal one of the Regulations, while recognizing the integrity of caste institution, permitted suits for restoration of caste to be entertained by the ordinary courts[91]. Even cases of expulsion from different associations were of an entirely different nature from excommunication from caste. But in the case of Bombay Presidency it was completely different in nature as the pertinent regulation mentioned that 'no court shall interfere in any caste question, beyond the admission and trial of the alleged injury to the caste and character of the plaintiff arising from some illegal act of the other party'[92]. The social privileges in the context of caste were totally brought within the jurisdiction of the caste. It was held only when a complainant alleged that a legal right either of property or of office was violated by his exclusion from the caste that a suit might be entertained by a court of law[93]. The establishment of British courts, administering a uniform criminal law, removed from the purview of caste, many matters that used to be erstwhile adjudicated by it. Naturally, the British courts played a vital role to take decision in case of assault, adultery and rape. As a result, the caste council had lost its former importance in proportion. Although the intention of the British Government was not to interfere in case of civil law, such as marriage, divorce, etc. that were guiding by the caste norms but various decisions of the High Courts set aside the authority of caste.

The Bombay authority deputed two officials, like Borradaile and Steele to make compilations of the various usages and customs of the many castes of the Presidency. They made it. But the same compilations were not prepared in other provinces. It was mentioned in the clauses of the Widow-Remarriage Act of 1856 that while legalizing the marriage of a Hindu widow, this Act deprived such a re-married widow of all her rights and interests in her deceased husband's property. But the court had taken a

reasonable decision later on and had decreed that this Act would only applied to those widows who could not, without the aid of the Act, remarry according to their caste-usage. Naturally, widows of castes allowing remarriage forfeited their rights and interests in their deceased husband's property only when caste-usage enjoined such forfeiture[94]. The Bombay High Court gave a verdict in 1876 that 'Courts of law will not recognize the authority of a caste to declare a marriage void, or to give permission to a woman to remarry'[95]. But certain decisions of the High Courts had emboldened the non-Bramanic castes to dislodge the Brahmins from their monopoly of priesthood. It was generally held in Bengal and in North India that that anyone could perform priestly service who was deputed by the householder and got some fees from him. Even there was no office of priest[96].

The non-Brahmin castes of Maratha country when launched a reform movement to perform their religious rites without the aid of the Brahmin priests who lodged a complain against them for violating their hereditary rights. But the Bombay High Court gave a verdict on this issue where it was clearly noted that people could engage any priest whom they liked and they were not compelled to call the hereditary priest to perform their religious services. But the Madras High Court gave a verdict on the same issue with few exceptions. It was noted here that the hereditary priest must be paid some fees by way of compensation[97]. The Castes-Disabilities Removal Act of 1850 stirred the very foundation at the integrity of caste. It was noted in this Act that a person did not forfeit his ordinary rights of property by loss of caste or change of religion. Normally, the marriage between the two different castes was strictly prohibited and it was treated invalid unless specially sanctioned by customs. But the British Courts had given varied decisions relating to this issue. The Court did not declare a marriage null and void that was held between a Sudra Hindu and a Christian woman in Madras[98].

Apart from this, the Special Marriage Act of 1872 gave an opportunity for the Indian to make a valid marriage with a person belonging to any caste or creed. Social reformers continued their agitation to liberalize the marriage law. The British administrators ultimately came forward to placing untouchables on a footing of civil equality as they were devoid of many civil rights. The Bombay Government considered the case of a Mahar boy who was denied admission into the Government

School at Dharwar. The Government announced in a press-note in 1858 that "although the Governor-in-Council does not contemplate the introduction of low-caste pupils into schools, the expenses of which are shared with Government by local contributors and patrons who object to such a measure, he reserves to himself the full right of refusing the support of Government to any partially aided school in which the benefits of education are withheld from any class of persons on account of caste or race and further resolves that all schools maintained at the sole cost of Government shall be open to all classes of its subjects without distinction."[99]

Another press-note of 1915 referred to the "familiar sight of Mahar and other depressed class boys in village schools where the boys are often not allowed to enter the school room but are accommodated outside the room on the verandah." As a result, the Government declared that no grants would be paid to any aided educational institution, which refused admission to the children of the Depressed Classes in 1923. Therefore, the depressed class students got opportunity to sit in their classes like the caste Hindus in the Local Board, Municipal schools and in the Central Division of the Presidency. The Government of Bombay came forward to enforce the right of the Depressed Classes on equal treatment in the eyes of law. But the Madras Government codifying a law for empowering village Magistrates to punish the offenders of the lower castes by imprisonment though the Government pledged itself in 1914 to discontinue this inhuman practice[100].

Under these unavoidable circumstances, a Bill was introduced in the Madras Legislative Council to open all public roads, streets, pathways etc. for giving entry to any public office, place, well, tank etc. to all classes of people including the Depressed Classes[101]. Even the Depressed Classes got special opportunity to represent themselves in local and Legislative bodies by nomination. The British Government introduced uniform laws. They did not recognize any kind of disabilities as lawful that was imposed upon the non-Brahmin castes. First all Brahmins were greatly benefited by English education. Their antipathy towards the lower strata of the Hindu society, role of the sympathetic officers of the British and the constant demand of the reformers to abolish all sorts of disabilities imposed upon the depressed classes and untouchables greatly influenced the British Government to take special measures to save the life of these half-sub-merged castes. As a result,

Chatfield, the Director of Public Instruction in Bombay granted some special privileges to these castes in 1878. He adopted some special measures to consider the fees of the students of that caste in primary schools and made arrangement for scholarships for those boys in secondary schools and colleges. The non-Brahmin leaders strongly demanded special representation for their castes both in the services and in administrative bodies. The Maharaja of Kolhapur raised this demand once again when Mr.Montague came to India. The main motto of Mr. Montague was to consult the Government of India along with the people of India relating to the future form of constitution of the Government. He reframed the reformed constitution and it was declared that non-Brahmins were provided with special representation through mixed electorates. Naturally, the Hindu population was categorically divided into three sections in the Bombay Presidency such as; Brahmins and allied castes; the intermediate classes formed by Marathas and others and the backward classes including the so-called untouchables[102] Even the Finance Department of the Bombay Government adopted a resolution in this connection dated 17 September 1923. It was clearly resolved here to prohibit recruitment from the advance caste of Brahmins and others to the lower services until the members of the intermediate and backward castes or classes filled up a certain proportion of the posts[103]. The Census of 1901 was prepared under the guidance of Sir Herbert Risley that played a vital role in this connection. The British government did not recognize caste as a unit empowered to administer justice. Even they did not set aside the customs of a caste in respect of civil law unless they opposed to public policy. Naturally, it retained its cultural integrity. However, Mr. Middleton, one of the two Superintendents of Census operations of 1921 said about the effects of the British administration on caste in the Punjab. He expressed the following views:

'I had intended pointing out that there is a very wide revolt against the classification of occupational castes; that these castes have been largely manufactured and almost entirely preserve as separate castes by the British Government. Our land records and official documents have added iron bonds to the old rigidity of caste. Caste in itself was rigid among the higher castes, but malleable amongst the lower. We pigeonholed every one by caste, and if we could not find a true caste for them, labeled them with the name of a hereditary occupation. We deplore the caste-system and its effects on social and economic problems, but we are largely responsible for the system which

we deplore. Left to themselves such castes as Sonar and Lohar would rapidly disappear and no one would suffer... Government's passion for labels and pigeon-holes has led to a crystallization of the caste system, which, except amongst the aristocratic castes, was really very fluid under indigenous rule... If the Government would ignore caste it would gradually be replaced by something very different amongst the lower castes."[104]

The Bombay Government submitted a memorandum to the Indian Statutory Commission (1928) and complained that the District School Boards where the non-Brahmins have had a majority,' have almost in every case attempted to oust the Brahmins regardless of all consideration of efficiency.' But the British Government tried to find out the causes of the revolt of 1857 in the hereditary pattern of the caste system. They noticed that the Bengal Army was made of higher castes Brahmins and the Rajputs. Many higher officers of the British Government realized the necessity of recruiting different castes in the Army. Major-General H.T. Tucker emphasized on keeping the country under British domination through the policy of divide and rule. His policy was to divide different bodies and separate various castes for the recruitment into the Army. Sir Lepel Griffin, a higher officer of the British Government pointed out that caste was useful in preventing rebellion[105]. Roman Church accommodated caste in its practical programme with a motto of propagating its faith in India inspite of the opposition to the humanitarian principles of the Church. As a result, Pope Gregory XV played a vital role to sanction caste rules in the Christian Churches in India[106]. The dichotomy of higher-caste social reformers and militant role of Jotirao Phule and humanitarian approach of Sri Narayan Guru forced the British Government to re-think about the curse of caste and untouchability created by the Brahmins. Montague and Chelmsford had to grant some demands like, the representation for all classes of the Hindus in all the local bodies, the services and institutions of them in their political reforms in India[107].

Apart from these, the establishment of the British paramountcy in colonial India ushered new social, economic and political conditions in India. It had far-reaching consequences. The economic foundations of the caste were deteriorated in a large scale by the new economic forces and forms. The process of industrialization in colonial India created new vocations and modern cities that stirred the very

foundations of the caste system in India. The introduction of a network of railways and buses played a vital role to undermine the hereditary professions of castes and exclusive habits of their followers. Naturally, the people of different castes had to move from one place to another willingly or unwillingly for their works by trains or buses. As a result, different castes were more or less bound to travel together in trains or buses for their livelihood that reduced caste tension. They were forced to adjust with different castes in respect of occupations, industrial sectors and means of communications. The people got opportunity to move town for joining to other vocations by leaving their hereditary professions. They got greater options with the creation of the right to own property in land. The proportionate industrial development in the colonial India and the deteriorated rural economy forced the farmers to move to cities where they became factory workers or domestic servants that broke the very basis of caste system. None was able to follow caste-dictated functions under these unavoidable circumstances. Economic necessities and ambitions bound the educated Brahmins to become a leather trader or a merchant, or a clerk who would have been identified with horror before the British came in India[108]. Necessity to associate with the members of other castes at social functions and different industrial sectors hastened the process of breakdown of the caste integrity. Even the Brahmins bound to take meals from hotels or restaurants with a Sudra or low caste people, as there was no other option to them. Naturally, the peoples of different castes were forced to rub their shoulders with the lower castes or untouchables during their journey by trains or buses. The paraphernalia of modern social existence did not recognize caste or communal divisions. The British Government played a vital role by introducing a uniform system of law in colonial India that dealt a severe blow to the social and legal inequalities and disparities rampant in the Hindu society. The concept of equality before law, irrespective of caste, class, creed or religion was established with a new ideas. The people of India ultimately divided into different categories like, capitalists, merchants, land labourers, doctors, lawyears etc. this horizontal division on new class lines rapidly weakened the old vertical caste-lines. Even the lower castes, untouchables and upper castes peoples fought unitedly for their common interest to increase wage and improving their working conditions. Besides, the British Government adopted a liberal and secular education policy for India. As a result, it made accessible to anyone, irrespective of caste, class, creed or religion. The emergent 19th century intelligentsia was the

product of the liberal education policy of the British Government who prepared the ground of anti-caste revolt in India.

Under these unavoidable circumstances, Ambedkar – the leader of the Depressed Classes tried to transform these classes into a political army and pressed their political claims which were conceded in the Constitution of 1935 in the form of special representation of these classes. He fought for equal social rights to the untouchables. He criticized the role of the British Government on the issue of untouchability. He submitted a memorandum to the Simon Commission on 29 May 1928 relating to the safeguards for the protection of the Depressed Classes as a minority in the Bombay Presidency. Ambedkar demanded protection through the educational benefit of the Depressed Classes, unrestricted recruitment of them in the army, navy, police force and effective representation of them in the Local Bodies. But the Simon Commission strategically under-evaluated the needs and claims of the Depressed Classes. Ambedkar complained against the attitude of the Simon Commission. His urged for equal citizenship, eradication of untouchability and caste discrimination. He advocated the demand of Dominion Status of the Indian nationalities. Realizing the gravity of their demands, the Government of Britain extended its helping hand to solve their age-old problems by declaring the 'Communal Award'. Ambedkar, the leader of the Indian Dalits, got opportunity to raise their age-old oppressed, suppressed, tyrannized and exploiting conditions in the Round Table Conferences and gained some special concessions for the Depressed Classes relating to the arrangement of separate electorate system for them inspite of the constant opposition of the Indian National Congress under Gandhiji. However, Gandhiji opposed it and signed the Poona Pact of 1932 with Ambedkar. Therefore, it cannot be denied that the Government of Britain ultimately came forward to save the life of the Depressed Classes by the 'Communal Award'. Their liberal educational policy opened the age-old closed door to all irrespective of their caste, class, creed and religion. The common people of India were satisfied with the practical concept of equality before law that they did not enjoy before their establishment in India.

3.6. Conclusion

Therefore, it can be concluded that the impact of the Italian and European Renaissance greatly influenced the 19th century Intelligentia of India. Most of them belonged to the upper caste Hindus. So they could not dare to break the existing Caste rules. Naturally, they failed to start a crusade against the Caste System and Untouchability. But they expressed their views theoretically in a very limited way relating to these issues. So the 19th century intellectual dichotomy was very much astonishing and discouraging. They did nothing but ideal talking. They knew it very well that these two Institutions had snawtched away the rights and privileges of the low born peoples and they were brought forcefully to remain in a very distressed condition in the society. That is why, the 19th century Renaissance and Reformation Movement failed to eradicate the problems of the Caste System and Untouchability from the Indian society. The name of Raja Rammohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Swami Vivekananda and others may be mentioned in order to understand the real truth. Jyotibe Phule, Narayan Guru and other low born social reformers realized it that problems of the Caste System and Untouchability would not be solved by the caste Hindus as it protects their Class interest. So they raised voice against the evils of the Caste System and Untouchability and launched a direct crusade to reform the Hindu society on the basis of the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity with a motto to eradicate these two Institutions from the Indian society. Ambedkar was a true follower of this movement. He explained logically the exploitative content of these two Institutions and fought for their abolition. But Gandhiji profoundly believed in the Caste System and he was an ardent follower of it. Even the colonial Government was very conscious to take any action in this context due the fear of unrest. But they utilized it as a weapon against the Nationalist Movement. In spite of that they ultimately decided to solve these problems by declaring the 'Communal Award' of 1932 with a motto to render Social Justice among the Depressed Classes. But Gandhiji and his Congress did not tolerate it. He vehemently opposed it. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the role and position of Gandhiji against the'Communal Award' of 1932 disheartened Ambedkar who save the life of Gandhiji for the sake of humanity by signing the 'Poona Pact' of 1932.

References

1. Encyclopaedia Britannica Ready Reference, Encyclopaedia Britannica (India) Pvt., Ltd., New Delhi, Vol. 2, 2005, p. 143.
2. Kabiraj, Narahari; (ed.), 'Unish Sataker Banglar Nabajagoran-Tarka O Bitarka, K. P. Bagchi & Co. Kolkata, 1997, p. 132.
3. Ghosh Binoy, 'The Bengali Bhadralok' Frontier, October, 19, 1974.
4. Majumdar, R. C; Glimpses of Bengal in the 19th century, Calcutta, 1954, p. 123.
5. Kabiraj, Narahari ;(ed.), 'Unish Sataker Banglar Nabajagoran-Tarka O Bitarka, op. cit., p.188. See also, Sarkar, Sumit; Rammohan Roy and the break with the Past, in "Rammohan and the process of modernization in India", ed. V. C. Joshi, p.55.
6. Ghosh Binoy; A Critique of Bengal Renaissance, Frontier, Sept. 25, 1971.
7. Paddar, Arabinda; Renaissance in Bengal-Quests and Confrontations (1800-1860), Calcutta, 1970, pp. 245-46.
8. David, Kopf; British Orientalism and Bengal Renaissance, University of California, 1969, p. 283.
9. Biswas, Dilip Kumar; Rammohun Samiksha, Sarsata Library, Kolikata, 1994, p.209.
10. David Kopf – British Orientalism and Bengal Renaissance, op. cit., p: 248.
11. Sarkar, Susobhan; Bengal Renaissance and Other Essays, People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1970, pp. 18-19, 119-21, 152-59.
12. Tripathi, A; Bengali Literature in 19th century, History of Bengal, Calcutta, 1948, p. 474.
13. Nehru, J; The Discovery of India, Oxford University Press, 1946, p.371.
14. Biswas, Dilip and Gangopadhyay, Prabhat (ed.); Sadharan Brahmo Samaj, Calcutta,1962; A Chapter of the book by Collet, Sophia Dobson on 'The life and Letters of Raja Ram Mohan Roy', pp.60-61.As cited by Sumit Sarkar in V.C.Joshi, ed. , op. cit. , p. 50.
15. Bishop D. H. (ed.); Thinkers of the Indian Renaissance, New Delhi, Wiley Eastern, 1982, p.7. As cited in Radharaman Chakraborty, 'Rammohun Roy: His Vision of Social Change', in A. K. Mukhopadhyay, Ed. The Bengali Intellectual Tradition, Calcutta, K.P. Bagchi, 1979, p.23.
16. English Works of Rammohun Roy (Calcutta: 1947), Vol. 2, p.44.

17. Heimsath, Charles H.; 'Rammohun Roy and Social Reform', in V. C. Josh, ed., op. cit., p. 154.
18. Majumdar, Bimanbehari; History of Indian Social and Political Ideas, Calcutta, Bookland Pvt. Ltd., 1967, p.27.
19. Pantham, Thomas and Deutsch, Kenneth L.; edited, Political Thought in Modern India, Sage Publications, New Delhi, p.42. D. H. Bishop, op, cit., p.21.
20. Sharma, D.S.; Hinduism Through the Ages, Bombay, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1955, p. 69.
21. Singh, Dr. Iqbal; Raja Rammohun Roy-Life Writings and Speeches, New Delhi, Asia Publishing House, p. 78.
22. Shastri, Shiv Nath; extract from the History of Brahmo Samaj, Quoted by V.S. Narvane (Modern Indian Thought, p.31, New Delhi, Asia Publishing House, 1964).
23. Extracts from a letter by Ram Mohan Roy, dated January 18, 1928.
24. Bali, D.R; Modern Indian Thought, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1980, p.13.
25. The English Works of Rammohan Roy, op.cit; Introduction, p. 28.
26. Sarkar, Susobhan; On the Bengal Renaissance, Calcutta, p. 105.
27. Biswas, Sipra; Anweshan, Pratham Khanda, Adalbadal (Patrika, Kolikata), 1996, p, 250.
28. Iswarchandra Vidyasagar, Bidhoba Bibaha Prachalita Hoya Uchit Kina Atadbisaya Prostab, Vidyasagar Rachana Sangraha, Vidyasagar Smark Jatiya Samiti, Ditiya Khanda, p. 26.
29. Sen, Asok; Vidyasagar and his illusive milestone, pp. 150, 154.
30. Jigyasu, Munshi Ram; The Arya Samaj and its Detractors, Hardwar, Gurukala, 1910, p.6.
31. Deumal, Tarachand; The life of Swami Dayananda Saraswati, Punjab Printing Works, Lahore, 1915, p.162.
32. Sharma, Urmila and Sharma, S. K.; Indian Political Thought, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, p.146-147.
33. Ibid; p.148.
34. Swami Dayanand; Satyartha Prakash (translation into English, 'Light of Truth by Dr. C. Bharadwaja), Allahabad, The Star Press, 1906, p.737.

35. Bali, D.R; Modern Indian Thought, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1980, p.26.
36. Ibid; p. 26-27.
37. Keer, Dhananjay; Mahatma Jotirao Phule: Father of the Indian Social Revolution, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 1962, p.1.
38. Patil, P. G (Translated); Collected Works of Mahatma Jotirao Phule, Vol. I, Slavery, Published by the Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, First Edition, 28th November 1991, p. xvi.
39. Ibid; p. xvii.
40. Ibid; p. xviii.
41. Patil, P. G (Translated); Collected Works of Mahatma Jotirao Phule, Vol. I, Slavery, Published by the Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, First Edition, 28th November 1991, p. cover page.
42. Keer, Dhananjay, Malshe, S. G. (ed.); Mahatma Phule Samagra Vangmaya, Maharashtra Rajya Sahitya ani Samskriti Mandal, Mumbai, Third revised edition, 1988, p. 83 and 144.
43. Patil, P. G (Translated); Collected Works of Mahatma Jotirao Phule, Vol. I, Slavery, Published by the Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, First Edition, 28th November 1991, p. cover page.
44. Ibid, p. 5.
45. Prasad, Swami Muni Narayana; The Philosophy of Narayana Guru: D.K. Printworld, 2003, New Delhi, pp. 12.
46. http://www.narayanguru.org/Book/chapt-5.html
47. Ibid.
48. Balakrishnan, P.K.; ed. Narayanaguru (A collection of essays), March 2000, (First Edition 1954), Kerala Sahitya Academi, Trichur, Kerala, p. 4.
See also http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/narayan_guru
49. http://www.chempazhanty.com/guru
50. http://www.sreenarayanguru.in/index.php
51. Prasad, Swami Muni Narayana; The Philosophy of Narayana Guru, op. cit., pp.15 and ibid.
52. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/narayan_guru
53. Ibid.
54. Swami, Saradananda; Sri Ramakrishna the Great Master, trans. Swami

Jagadananda, Chennai: Sri Ramakrishna Math, 2001, p. 63-4.

See also http://www.rkmrajkot.org/gal_kamarpukur.php

55. Gupta, Mahendranath ; *The Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna* (translation from Bengali by Swami Nikhilananda, with assistance of Joseph Campbell and Margaret Woodrow Wilson; foreword by Aldous Huxley), Published in one volume by Ramakrishna Vivekananda Centre, New York and in two volumes by Sri Ramakrishna Math, Chennai, 2002, p. 564.

See also http://www.ramkrishnavivekananda.info/gospel/volume_2/29_durga_puja.htm

56. Sen, Akshay Kumar; *Sri Sri Ramakrishna Punthi*, Udbodhan Office, Kolkata, 1953, p.32.

See also http//:www.eng.vedanta.sriramkrishna and_the_caste_system.php

57. Basu, Shankari Prasad; *Vivekananda O Samakalin Bharatvarsha*, 7 vols. (Kolkata: Sunil Mandal, 1-6, 1983; 7, 1988), pp. 3.123 and ibid.

58. Gupta, Mahendranath Gupta; *The Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna, op. cit.*, p. 576.

See also http//:www.ramkrishnavivekananda.info/gospel/volume_2/29_durga_puja.htm

59. Ibid, p.564 and ibid.

60. Ibid, p.591.

See also http//:www.eng.vedanta.sriramkrishna and_the_caste_system.php

61. Sri Brohma; Nirdharan Ramkrishna, Vivekananda Athoba Ambedkar; published by Dr.B.R. Ambedkar Library and Research Centre, Garden Road, Kolikata, 1992 p. 10-11.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. Swami Vivekananda, Caste Culture and Socialism, Advaita Ashrama, Kolkata, 2001, pp. 71-72. See also The Collected Works of Swami Vivekananda, Vol. V, Mayavati Memorial Edition, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1989, p. 10.

66. Ibid, p. 74.

67. Ibid, p. 91.

68. Swami Swananda; The Collected Works of Swami Vivekananda, Vol. V, op. cit., p.29.

69. Swami Vivekananda, Caste Culture and Socialism, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

70. Ibid, pp. 97-98.

71. Ibid, p. 65.
72. Ibid, p. 75.
73. Swami Swananda; The Collected Works of Swami Vivekananda, Vol. V, op. cit., p.307.
74. Swami Vivekananda, Caste Culture and Socialism, op. cit., p. 51.
75. Ibid, pp. 23-24.
76. Ibid, p. 8-9.
77. Sri Brohma; Nirdharan Ramkrishna, Vivekananda Athoba Ambedkar; op. cit., p. 78.
78. Swami Vivekananda, Caste Culture and Socialism, op. cit., p. 57.
79. Ibid, p. 9.
80. Patil, V.S; Bal Gangadhar Tilak: Maker of Modern India, in Political Thinkers of Modern India (ed.) by V. Grover; p.489
81. Ibid, p.490
82. Tagore, Sadhana, London, Macmillan and Co., p.57
83. Tagore, RN., The Religion of Man, George Allen and Unwin, 1932, p.191
84. Sinha, S., Social Thinking of Rabindranath Tagore, Asia Publishing House, 1962, p.7
85. Kabir, H., Social and Political Ideas of Tagore, p. 146
86. Tagore, R.N., Gora, Macmillan, London, 1963, p.368
87. Ibid., p.120
88. Ibid., p.407
89. Rabindranath Thakur, 'Sudradharma', p.290-91
90. Ibid., p. 291
91. Kikani, L. T; Caste in Court, 1912, p.iii
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid, p.132
94. Mayne, J.D (ed.); A Treatise on Hindu Law and Usage, 1914, pp.779-82.
95. Mandlik, V.N (ed.); Vyavahara Mayukha, 1880, p.430.
96. Kikani, op. cit., p. vi.
97. Latthe, A. B; Memoirs of His Highness Shri Shahu Chhattrapati Maharaja of Kolhapur, 1924, Vol. ii, p. 373.
98. Mayne, J.D (ed.); A Treatise on Hindu Law and Usage, op. cit, pp. 108-9.
99. Wilson, John; Indian Caste, Vol. II, p.45.
100. Forward (Calcutta), 7th November, 1923.

101. Bombay Chronicle, Ist May, 1925.

102. Ghurye, G.S.; Caste and Race in India, Popular Prakashan Private Limited, New Delhi, 1994, p. 277.

103. Ibid.

104. Punjab Census, 1921, pp. 434-4.

105. Ghurye, G.S.; Caste and Race in India, op. cit., p. 285.

106. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th (ed.), Vol. V, p. 468 (a).

107. Wilson, John; Indian Caste, op. cit., p.89.

108. O'Malley, L. S. S.; Indian Caste Customs, 1932, p.310.

Chapter 4

The Socio-Political Environment of Gandhiji and Ambedkar

4.1 Introduction

Gandhiji was called the father of the Indian nation whereas Ambedkar was entitled as a modern man in India. They played an epoch-making role in the Indian history. Both of them were opposite to each other in their socio-political, religious and economic thoughts and beliefs. After ceaseless efforts and endeavour, Ambedkar established himself as the leader of the 'Depressed Classes' and the Untouchables in India. In contrary to him, Gandhiji rose to power in Indian politics from a bania family of the Hindu society. He had a strong social and economic background. Naturally, it was not a very difficult task at all for Gandhiji to become a national leader from a high profile Dewan family. He ultimately became a national leader of the Indian National Congress. Therefore, the name of Mohandas Karmachand Gandhi and Ambedkar were inscribed as two distinct shining stars in the Indian history. They had played a never-ending epoch making role in Indian history, which had been expressed by themselves in opposite directions to each other. Both of them were opposite to each other's in their socio-political, religious and economic thoughts and beliefs and on the issue of Caste and Untouchability. In fact, the class characters of both of them were completely different and distinctive. In fact, the emergence of Gandhiji as a national leader from a 'Vaishya Bania Caste[1]' was easier than Ambedkar. But Ambedkar had to face Himalayan problems to rise as a national leader from 'an untouchable Mahar community' within the low stratum of the four-fold Varna system. Naturally, they were very much eager to protect their class interest in their own ways. Gandhiji played an important role to keep the interests of the privileged sections of the society intact whereas Ambedkar vehemently opposed the policy of Gandhiji and fought for the cause of the toiling masses in India. Some scholars pointed out that both of them played a vital role to establish the concept of 'Social Justice' in the Indian society. Under these unavoidable circumstances, Gandhiji came forward to serve the interest of the Harirjans in India, became famous worldwide and was entitled as the prophet

of the Harijans in India. In fact, the emergence of Ambedkar as a leader of the 'Depressed Classes' and Untouchables in India was a rare case like the blooming lotus in the cow dung. However, Gandhiji ultimately became an undisputed leader in the Indian National Congress who chose to protect the class interest of the privileged sections of the society. However, the political recognition of Ambedkar as a 'Dalit' leader was not an easy task under the then socio-political, religious and economic environment in the society. Gandhiji earned name and fame easily in Indian society. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the social inheritance and status of a person in the Casteist Hindu society was an important factor leading to political inheritance and status in the society, polity and economy in India. Both the cases of Gandhiji and Ambedkar were true in the real sense of the terms in this perspective. Therefore, the socio-political environment of the-then India under which Gandhiji and Ambedkar were reared up needs a close analysis as the following:

4.2. Deplorable Conditions of the Hindu Society before the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar:

The Hindu society had already come under the direct control of the caste system and untouchability before the emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in India. None dared to violate these inhuman misconceptions by launching a direct crusade except a few exceptions and without much force. Naturally, they had been deprived of the basic civil rights and privileges so far. Caste system and untouchability did not even recognize the values of tranquility, liberty, equality, fraternity etc. In fact, the concept of caste and untouchability were really the negation of humanity that went completely against the doctrines of 'Human Rights and Social Justice'.Although there was no such untouchable Varna in the Rig Vedic Society at all. Manu the ancient lawmaker, who first institutionalized Caste System on the basis of heredity brushing aside the doctrine of Karma and virtuous deeds completely. The original four Varnas became watertight compartments and degenerated later into the present Caste System. However, its rigidity during the period of our study had reached extreme level in the Hindu society. The notion of Untouchability was the outcome of defilement, pollution, contamination etc. As a result inequality, disparity and hatred increased very rapidly among different caste-class sections that ultimately divided man from man, haves from haves not , privileged from unprivileged and proletariat from

capitalist. The never-ending psychological virus of the caste system and untouchability greatly stirred the social mind of the so-called Hindus during this time and they became the ardent followers of its. Even, most of the so-called intellectuals did not think beyond the circle of the caste system and the doctrine of 'touch-me-not'. Its impacts greatly affected the social health and political mind more than the time of Manu. Man, belonging to the low strata were gradually compelled to become slaves of these doctrines. The conditions of the 'Twice born babies' (Dwijas) were remained same as before. The Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya belonged to the privileged group. The chief architect of it was the Brahmana. Apart from these, there prevailed some inhuman-superstitious customs and practices framed by the Brahmins (such as Sati, prohibition of widow marriage, polygamy, polyandry, fear of sea voyage etc.) that created different types of acute social problems, which complicated the life style of the Hindu society in India. They gradually monopolized their rights and privileges in the society, polity, religion, economy, culture, administration etc. Even the British did little to modify India's religious and social customs. They adopted 'hands-off policy' to produce planned social change in their favour. They promised to keep complete religious neutrality and freedom of worship to the people. Under such conditions, many of the customs connected with caste continued to flourish. However, the Brahmins always tried to promulgate many dogmas to perpetuate their supremacy that gave strong religious backing to the maintenance of caste barriers throughout the ages. According to Ghurye; 'Most of the activities of the British Government were dictated by prudence of administration and not by a desire to reduce the rigidity of caste'[2].

As a result, caste and politics influenced each other during this time. Caste acted as a barrier to social progress. In fact, the doctrines of caste and untouchability became ultimately a death warrant to the untouchables (Sudras, Ati-Sudras etc.) in course time. Naturally, the dormant vibration of them stirred their ignorant minds to raise the voice against these inhuman practices. The term Dalit was used to denote the untouchables whereas Gandhiji marked them as Harrijan. They were traditionally considered as outcaste. They did not belong to the Four-Fold Varna System of the Hindu society. Generally, they belonged to the Pancham (fifth) Varna. But there was no such Pancham (fifth) Varna in the Vedic period at all. They were compelled to adopt the most ignonimous professions or works in the society. Their position was

below the beasts and animals. They were bound to remain in the never-ending distressed conditions under the so-called socio-religious, political and economic environment. Even they were seldom treated as human beings. Their main jobs consisted of killing or disposing of dead body of human corpses or cattle or working with their hides or cleaning, washing, wearing the torned garments of the dead bodies or eating the remaining part of the used plates or dices, etc. Naturally, they took initiative to adopt other religion to get rid of the discrimination. In the long run, Indian law had now recognized and categorized the Dalit under the name of Scheduled Caste and had accorded their certain special privileges. Their day-to-day life had been very much inglorious and miserable. They were known in different names in different parts of the country viz. Out Caste, Untouchables, Pariahs, Panchamas, Ati-Shudras, Avarnas, Antyajas and Namashudras. They were treated as 'sub-humans, less than men, worse than beasts'[3] by the so called Caste Hindus. Therefore, their social disabilities were numerous and harsh. Caste Hindus compelled the downtrodden to follow the principles prescribed by the lawmakers of the so-called Hindu Sastras. The Caste System itself a self-functionary and automatic machinery that always snatched away the rights of the ignorant masses. So the illiterate Untouchable community did not get chance to improve their lot against the Himalayan-Caste hurdles. They even were unconscious about their rights and privileges. Therefore, they were not able to unite themselves to fight against their ill-fated conditions, status, position, civil rights and privileges in the Indian society. Not only that but also the ruthless behaviour of the Hindus and their religious rules compelled them to remain in the same distressed conditions for ever. The Hindus treated the 'Voice', 'Shadow' and even 'Touch' of the Untouchables as 'Polluting'. Even they had no right to use the public roads. If they violated the rules, they were rebuked or beaten very badly. They had no rights to acquire knowledge through Public or Government schools and to accumulate wealth. Besides, they did not enjoy the worship of the Hindu God and Goddess as per the customs laid in the Sastras. They had no option to obtain minimum civic amenities to lead their day-to-day life. Under these unavoidable circumstances, the Untouchables did not get any chance to improve their socio-political and economic status, position and lot. Apart from these, their day-to-day life became hell under the inhuman policies based on the Sastras of the so-called Hindu Religion, which were adopted by the Caste Hindus towards the Untouchables. The Untouchables were forbidden to use certain metal ornaments,

choices- able dress and others. They had no right to take desirable food, dress, footwear etc. They were compelled to stay in the dirty, dingy and unhygienic outskirts of towns and villages. Their living places were miserable, smoky shanties or cottages. They were restricted to use public wells for drinking and other purposes. Naturally, they were forced to take filthy water to serve their day today purposes. Besides, they were forbidden from entering the Hindu temples. Even the barbers and washer men refused to provide their services to them. However, the Caste Hindus did not show minimum sympathy for the Untouchables. They did not give a little drop of water to the Untouchables. Their positions were brought down below the animals. They welcomed persons of other religions and threw sugar to their domestic pets and dogs rather than the Untouchables. Therefore, the Untouchables did not get any chance for bettering their socio-economic and political conditions. In fact, they were born as Untouchables, lived as Untouchables and ultimately died as Untouchables. It was the general rule prescribed in the so-called Dharma-Sastras. Apart from these, the Caste Hindus humiliated them in different ways. They were strictly forbidden to acquire knowledge of the Vedas. In fact, it was a very ridiculous matter that the Untouchables were allowed to worship the Gods of the Hindus and observed the same festivals yet. These types of dismal pictures of their social conditions and miseries did not end now. All services including police and military forces were closed to them. Under these inhuman and repressive measures, the Untouchables were compelled to follow the prescribed and hereditary occupations such as street-sweeper, scavengers, shoemakers etc. Some of them were compelled to live as village servants. They had to spare their day today live with the problems of insufficient accommodations, in sanitary surroundings and others along with acute and common social segregation of their livelihood. Hand to mouth was the main stay in their daily life. Under these unavoidable circumstances, they were born in debt and perished in debt for ages. But there was a great controversy regarding the origin and growth of Untouchability in the so-called Hindu society. According to some scholars, Untouchability was a perverted out come of the Caste System. However, Dr.P.T.Borale opined that the Untouchables originally were 'Broken Men' and then the followers of Buddhism. They did not assimilate themselves with the Vedic Hindus. They also did not give up beef eating. In the course of time, they were brought down in a degraded and segregated position as "Untouchables"[4]. However, the Orthodox Hindus gave a different opinion on this issue. They said that the Aryans abode this system to

preclude the possibility of racial mixture with the original inhabitants in India. The Untouchables did not accept the Aryan suzerainty. Therefore, they disturbed the presence of the Aryans in India by kidnapping their children, woman and harassed them by looting their wealth. As a result, the Aryans in course of time imposed several insufferable measures and disabilities upon them and they were ultimately entitled as Untouchables in Indian society.

4.3. Political conditions of India before the emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar

The emergence of different political associations before and after the 1857 made an epoch making event in the history of the political movement in India. These types of associations were founded with a view to protect their class-caste interest in a systematic way against the mighty British Government in India. The initial motives of these associations were based on myopic view. In course of time, they changed their outlook to raise their voice against the injustice imposed upon the Indians by their different policies. Under these circumstances, the so-called educated persons in India realized the gravity, necessity and importance of forming a united unanimous platform to fight against the British Government in India. As a result, the 'Land-Holders Society' of 1837 was established for protecting the class-caste interest of the Zamindars of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Radhakanta Deb was its president. The emergence of 'Bengal British Indian Society' also came out to protect the interest of the Indians in general in 1843. However, these two organizations unitedly formed the 'British Indian Association' in 1851. Raja Radhakanta Deb was its first president and Debendranath Tagore was its first secretary. Apart from these, the 'Madras Native Association' and 'Bombay Association' were formed beyond the close contact of the Zamindar class in the year of 1852. The wealthy Zamindar class played a vital role in forming and leading the associations for their stake before the revolt of 1857. The middle class too took active part in forming and leading different associations after 1857. Dadabhai Naroaji established the 'East Indian Association' in London in 1866 with its branches in India. The motto was to raise the problems of the Indians before the Englishmen of England. Justice Ranade founded the 'Poona Sarbajanick Sabha' in 1870. It was mainly the association of the high caste Brahmins. It addressed not only the problems of the upper and middle class but also the problems of the farmers.

Besides, the 'Bombay Presidency Association' was established in 1885. The 'Madras Mahajan Sabha' was formed in 1884 with a view of uniting hundred Samities of different areas of the Madras Presidency to organize a large-scale National Movement. It demanded the separation of the judicial department from the Revenue department and the extension of the Legislature. The 'Indian League' was established as a rival organization of the 'British Indian Association' in 1875. The main aim of this organization was to create the ideal of nationalism among the people. The name of Sisir Kumar Ghosh as a founder member of it may be mentioned in this connection. Surendranath Banerjee founded the 'Indian Association' in 1876 with a view to protect the class interest of the middle class and riots. On behalf of the farmers, the association declared in 1880 as follows: "The riots are practically unrepresented and the Association has undertaken the solemn duty of making known their wants and grievances"[5]. However, the British Government took repressive measures towards this movement and arrested their leaders. Under this situation owing to the issues of Ilbert Bill and the black rule of Lord Lytton, Surendranath Banerjee realized the necessity of a Nation-based conference to raise the voice against the British Government. The Colonial Government arranged of an international exhibition at Calcutta in 1883 and the people of different parts of India took part in it. As a result, an All-Indian Conference was called from 28 December to 30 December in 1883 at Albert Hall of Calcutta. It was perhaps the first greatest Political Conference in India. Surendranath Banerjee, 'The objects of the National Conference were not sectional, nor regional, but truly national. Our idea is to bring the national forces into a focus; and if possible to concentrate them upon some common object calculated to advance the public good'[6]. The meeting of the Indian National Congress was held at that time in Bombay. The 'Indian Association' of Surendranath Banerjee merged with the Indian National Congress for the sake of national interest. However, the foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 heralded a new epoch in the history of the Indian politics. It added a new dimension in the context of the protest movement against the British Government in different aspects. The class characters of its members were purely based on the privileged sections of the society and the twice born babies were its chief architect. However, the emergence of Gandhiji in the Indian National Congress transformed its class character and social pattern and its membership was open handed and extended up to the grass-root level of the village irrespective of caste, class, sex, creed and religion. The policy of the Indian National

Congress against the British from 1885-1915 was mainly centered around the political needs and benefits of India. Even the Congress did not adopt any uniform policy unanimously to address the social problems like the caste system, untouchability, etc. during this period. It was divided into two camps on these social issues in course of time. Naturally, the minor group of the Congress did not success on these issues. It was completely guided and motivated for the sake of the upper caste Hindus and their political needs and personal benefits in the name of nationalism, autonomy, etc. In fact, the so-called leaders of different associations of India did not address the issues of caste and untouchability properly for permanent abolition before and after the revolt of 1857 at a large. Both the issues were the common factors in the social conditions of the Hindu life, which created the utmost obstacles of their daily life.

4.4. 1 Socio-Educational and Political Background of Gandhiji: Philosophical Influence upon Gandhiji

Mohandas Karmachand Gandhi was well known as the greatest thinker in the Twentieth century world. He was an undisputed leader of the Indian freedom movement. He was truly the real modern engineer of the doctrine of 'Ahimsa' (Non-violence) that was preached by Goutam Buddha[7] and Mahavira[8] in ancient times. His political philosophy and day-to-day works were completely based on the principles of 'Satyagraha' and 'Ahimsa'. The Bhagbad, the Gita and the Upanishad of the Hindu Religion and the Teachings of Jesus Christ[9] were the primary sources of his inspiration in the context of Satyagraha and Ahimsa. Besides, he was very much impressed by the thoughts and believes and the writings of the contemporary thinkers. The name of John Ruskin[10], Henry Thoreau[11], Leo Tolstoy[12] and others may be mentioned in this connection. In fact, he became an ardent follower of the doctrine of Ahimsa after the reading of a book of a Russian writer, Leo Tolstoy. The name of that famous book was 'The Kingdom of God is within you'. Apart from these, he was also influenced by the ideal of love in the context of Ahimsa as inlaid in the Bible. He made religion and politics inseparable. The Vedic literatures as well as the Hindu Sastras and scriptures were the primary sources of his social philosophy. He believed in God, Caste system, Untouchability, idol worship and the doctrine of incarnation and the other things that were described in the Hindu Sastras[13]. His attitude towards

the issue of caste and untouchability were completely traditional in nature and peculiar in character. He changed his attitude towards these issues in course of time when Ambedkar raised the voice against the socio-religious, political and economic injustice imposed upon the untouchables by the so-called caste Hindus and their Sastras. After signing the Poona Pact in 1932, Gandhiji gradually increased his attention to the problems of the Harijans. So he came forward to emancipate the Harrijans that made him renowned worldwide. In fact, he could not do any thing beyond caste. Naturally, the political compulsion of the Congress on the problems of the Harijans forced Gandhiji to adopt required measures to deal with their problems. But he could not always keep his word to establish civil rights and privileges of the Harijans by launching Satyagraha movement against the Çaste Hindus. Apart from this, his economic philosophy could not improve the lot of the Depressed Classes as a whole. Even his education policy towards the Harrijans and women were completely based on caste discrimination as well as communal vibration. The political philosophy of him was based on idealistic point of view. Actually, he renewed the principles of Ahimsa and Satyagraha of Buddhism, Jainism etc. in this context. Most of his followers did not imbibe these principles into their hearts. Gandhiji was an ardent follower of these principles in his individual life. Naturally, most of the freedom movements launched by him became violent by his followers. Jinnah once pointed out that Gandhiji was the man who was responsible for turning the Congress into an instrument for the revival of Hinduism. He also considered Gandhism as dangerous to the Muslims[14]. However, it cannot be denied that Gandhiji was the only man who first time brought the common people under the umbrella of the Indian National Congress to fight against the mighty British to obtain independence. Again, he was the only Congress leader who came forward to establish the civil rights and privileges of the Harijans for the sake of humanity.

However, there are many divergent views about Gandhiji's personality and his methods and techniques on the issue of caste and untouchability. Perhaps his most important contribution to India's struggle for independence was his spiritual leadership, and his consequent influence over the mass of India's population. All his life he adopted two fundamental principles, i.e., a belief in 'Ahimsa' (non-violence), and the concept of Satyagraha (truthfulness) as he said; 'My uniform experience has convinced me that there is no other God than Truth'. 'What is more important is

'inner perfection, truth and love', in self-abnegating closeness to God who is the source of all life. Christ must be obeyed not for fear of hell, or sin, but because he teaches Truth. For Gandhi, it was all right to hate sin, but not the sinner; to fight aggression, but not the aggressor[15] According to Gandhiji, 'Morality is the basis of things, and that truth is the substance of all morality. Truth became my sole objective' since there is no religion higher than Truth. His religion had always been morality. To him, 'Truth was God' and non-violence was the force created out of Truth and love. He was convinced that the non-violence preached by the Brahmins was mere passivity[16]. His role in establishing the civil rights movement of the Indians in South Africa and Harrijan movement in India was really an epoch making event in the world history. He became a major political and spiritual leader of India and the Indian independence movement. He became the pioneer of Satyagraha-resistance to tyranny through mass civil disobedience, firmly founded upon ahimsa or total non-violence-which led India to independence and inspired movements for civil rights and freedom across the world. Having led his people to freedom, he was to lay down his life for their sake. He is commonly known in India and across the world as 'Mahatma Gandhi' (Great Soul) and as 'Bapu' (Father in Gujarati). Green Martin pointed out very clearly that Gandhiji was particularly influenced by the writings of Tolstoy in developing his political philosophy both in South Africa and India, albeit it took quite some time for the non-violence to take shape as the fundamental creed[17]. However, Gandhiji ultimately became a great political leader and social reformer in India.

4.4.2. Family Background of Gandhiji

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on 2nd October in Porbondar of Kathiawar in 1869, the capital of a small principality in what is today the state of Gujarat in Western India, where his father Karamchand Gandhi, was a Diwan (Prime Minister). The name of his mother was Putlibai. She was a Hindu of the Pranami Vaishnava order. The term 'Gandhi' means grocer. Mohandas Karmachand Gandhi belonged to 'Bania by Caste' and devout Vaishnava Hindus by religious practice. However, for three generations, from his grandfather, they had been Prime Ministers in several Kathiawad States. His father Karamchand Gandhi was a lover of his clan, truthful, brave and generous. His mother Putlibai was a profoundly religious Hindu woman. She would not think of taking her meals without her daily prayers. One of

her daily duties was to go 'Haveli', the Vaishnava temple. She fasted every alternate day during one 'Chaturmas'[18]. Literally a period of four months. A vow of fasting and semi-fasting during the four months of the rains. The period is a sort of long lent. But she vowed not to have food without seeing the sun during another 'Chaturmas'. In fact, to keep two or three consecutive fasts was nothing to her. She did not interrupt the observance of 'Chandrayana'[19] vow during her illness. Living on one meal of a day during 'Chaturmas' was a habit with her. She and the rest of the Gandhi family belonged to a branch of Hinduism in which non-violence and tolerance between religious groups were considered very important. Living with a devout mother and surrounded by the Jain influences of Gujarat, Gandhiji learned from an early age the tenets of non-injury to living beings, vegetarianism, fasting for self-purification, and mutual tolerance between members of various creeds and sects. However, some scholars pointed out that Gandhi family of Gujarat was an 'Orthodox Vaishnava'. It was one of the main principles of Gandhian family to follow the rules and regulations very rigidly of Vaishnava Religion in the context of food habits, manners and others. Liberal views and ideas were not present in the context of religious thinking of the internal pattern in Gandhian family. His family background had later been seen as a very important explanation of why Mohandas Gandhi was able to achieve the position he held in Indian society. According to Hardiman David, "Although Gandhi was brought up in an atmosphere of religious tolerance; he developed an early antipathy to Christianity, which he experienced as a colonial subject. When still a boy in Rajkot, he had paused to hear a missionary who was preaching in the street and was disgusted by the way he poured abuse on the Hindus and their gods"[20].

4.4.3. Educational Background of Gandhiji

Gandhiji belonged to a wealthy and well-to-do casteiest- bania family. The nickname of him was 'Mohania'[21]. Perhaps he got admission into a primary school of Sri Birji Kamdar or Lanra Master at Porbandar in 1875 where most of the family members of Gandhi had completed primary education. However, his father left Porbandar after one year for Rajkot to become a member of the Rajasthanik Court and naturally, Gandhiji was put there into a Branch School of Rajkot. He read in class one and class two in the Gujarati Branch School at Rajkot during the session of 1877-1878. He got

admission in class three into the Main (City) Taluk school of Gujarati Branch of Rajkot on 21 January 1879. This Taluk School was traditionally and historically very famous at that time which was established in 1837. He attended the school for only 74 days out of 222 days in standard three. Therefore, he was not permitted to attend in the final examination for that session. Gandhiji read there up to class four until on 2 October 1880. He passed class three and four from this school and obtained first position in the Gujarati Standard 3 and 4 respectively. After completing primary education, Gandhiji got admission into Kathiaward High School in Anglo-Vernacular Standard one on 1 December 1880 at the age of eleven years two months and two days. He read in the class of Standard five in December 1884 and ultimately he was promoted in the class of Standard six. Standard 6 was called as pre-matriculation class. He read in the Kathiaward High School from Standard one to Standard 7. He spent seven years in this school to complete his high school education. He used to be very shy and avoided all company. He did not mix easily with the other children. His books and his lessons were his sole companions and he spent all his free time alone reading. However, the role and character of Harischandra and Shravana of the two different plays left a deep impression on his mind regarding the living realities of his life during his school days[22]. Besides, he was well versed in Gujarati grammar but he was very much weak in history, geography and mathematics. He had no special attention in school education as like his elder brothers. He was a mediocre student. However, Gandhiji was only thirteen when he was asked to be married soon. His parents had already chosen his bride. The bride-to-be lived in Porbandar and her name was Kasturba. In May 1883, at the age of 13, Gandhi was married through his parents' arrangements to Kasturba Makhanji (also spelled "Kasturbai" or known as "Ba"). Therefore, he had to marry Kasturba at the age of 13 in 1883. His father was very ill at that time. Therefore, he had to devote more time to serve his father. Naturally, he lost one year in his academic life due to this unavoidable circumstance. However, the constant inspirations of his teachers Gandhiji overcome this problem and able to obtain good result in the final examination in that year. Morarji, the teacher of Gandhiji, was the constant source of inspiration in his educational life. However, his father died at the age of 63 in 1885. Gandhiji broke into tears and felt woes in all his life, as he was not present at the time of the death of his father. However, Gandhiji passed the Metric Examination with good result in 1887 under the University of Bombay at the age of 18.

4.4.4. Gandhi's Attitude towards the Issue of Caste and Untouchability during his Study Life

Gandhiji was very much acquainted since his childhood regarding the curse of untouchability. His attitude towards these problems since childhood was very interesting. Gandhiji clearly stated in this regard that he was often touched by untouchables when he read in the school and he did not keep secret this incident to his parents. His mother told him that the best way of touching immediately the nearer Muslim friends for bringing immediate purity of him and he often did it most obediently to know his best regards to his mother. But he was deeply shocked on the issue of untouchability[23] Once Gandhiji said, " Cause without the people is a dead thing. Love of the people brought the problem of untouchability early into my life. My mother said, "You must not touch this boy, he is untouchable." "Why not, "I questioned back and from that day my revolt began"[24].

Gandhiji got admission into the Samaldas College of Vabanagar in Gujarat in 1888 and spent there some time for college education. He was unhappy at the college because his family wanted him to become a barrister. However, his aim was to become a doctor and to serve the ill-fated poor in the country. His family members did not like it and ultimately he had to go London to obtain law degree under the proposal of one of his family advisors. Therefore, there arose a great controversy among the members of the same caste and the same community of Gandhiji regarding the issue of his going abroad and ultimately they were agitated very badly over his going to London. They vehemently opposed to the decision of Gandhiji for studying abroad. However, Gandhiji was a man of strong determination and he did not change his plan of going aboard under the pressure of his caste-people. In fact, Gandhiji obtained his mother's permission and blessings in this perspective. His mother allowed him on some conditions which Gandhiji promised to follow. However, he became an outcaste in the eyes of the Orthodox Hindus on the issue of foreign journey. He was very much excited to fulfill his cherish dream. Therefore, Gandhiji dreamt of going to England. However, his caste-peoples were agitated over his going to abroad. A general meeting was summoned and Gandhiji was called to appear before it. He came before the meeting without the slightest hesitation. The Sheth - the headman of the community said, 'In the opinion of the caste, your proposal to go to

England is not proper. Our religion forbids voyages abroad. We have also heard that it is not possible to live there without compromising our religion. One is obliged to eat and drink with Europeans!'[25] Gandhiji answered straightway that it was not at all against his religion to go to England. He said that he intended to go there for further studies. He noted the fact that no Modh Bania had been gone to England up to now and if he dared to do so, he ought to be brought his name to book. He also stated that he had already solemnly promised to his mother to abstain from three things (fish, meat and wine) she feared most. He vividly noted that he was sure the vow would keep him safe. Therefore, Gandhiji could not alter his decision to go to England. The Sheth-the headman of the community said, 'But, will you disregard the orders of the caste?' Gandhiji said, 'I am really helpless. I think the caste should not interfere in the matter'. That is why; the Sheth pronounced his orders: 'This boy shall be treated as an outcaste from today. Whoever helps him or goes to see him off at the dock shall be punishable with a fine of one rupee four annas'[26]. Under this ordinance of the Sheth-the headman of the community, the brother – in –law of Gandhiji refused to give him money for his journey and clearly stated that he could not afford to lose caste. Under this unavoidable situation, Bandrabandas Patwari appeared before Gandhiji and extended his helping hand to him. He gave financial assistance to Gandhiji for the expenditure of his foreign journey. Gandhiji stated that the storm in his caste over his foreign voyage was still brewing. It had divided the caste into two camps, one of which favoured him, while the other that identified him as an outcaste on the line declared by the Headman of their community. To please the opposition group his brother took initiative to give a caste dinner. That is why, his brother also arranged to give Gandhiji a bath in the sacred river before the preparation of a caste dinner[27]. Taking his will to be law, Gandhiji mechanically acted as his brother wished. Practically speaking, the trouble about re-admission to the caste of Gandhiji was thus over. Gandhiji stated that he never tried to seek admission to the section that had refused it. Even he did not feel mental resentment against any of the headman of that section. Gandhiji scrupulously avoided hurting their feelings in spite of their opposition. He pointed out very clearly on the issue of caste problem as follows: 'I fully respected the caste regulations about excommunication'[28]. Under these circumstances, Gandhiji did not alter his decision to go to London for studies. After passing his high school examination, Gandhiji went to England to study and ultimately become a lawyer. But a headline was published on the historic departure of

a Bania student for England in the Kathiawar Times on 12 August, 1888. Gandhiji was given farewell in the local High school by his friends and well-wishers. They said, "We are certainly justified in entertaining the hope that you will make it an object of your special care and attention to promote the interests of India in England at the same time that you compete for medals and prizes"[29]. He was the first Bania from Kathiawar who proceeded to England to prosecute his study for the Barrister's Examination.

Gandhiji was opposed by his same caste peoples relating to the Law Degree in London. On September 4, 1888, Gandhiji left Bombay for England. After reaching there, he made up his mind to fulfill his cherished dream. Therefore, he got admission into the 'Inner Temple' in London on 6 November 1888. However, Gandhiji did not touch fish, meat and wine in London. Therefore, he kept his word in course of time given to his mother Kasturba before his journey to London. In London, young Gandhi found everything around him strange. His attempt was to be an Englishman lasted only about three months, and then he gave up the idea. He soon became a serious student, and concentrated very hard on his studies. He tried his level best to complete the law degree and ultimately obtained law degree. Towards the end of his second year in England he came across two Theosophists brothers, in 1889, they talked to him about the Gita. They were reading Sir Edwin Arnold's translation – The Song Celestial – they invited Gandhiji to read the original with them. However, he felt ashamed and said that he had not read the Gita still now. Ultimately, he began reading the Gita with them. Gandhiji stated that the Verses of the second chapter made a deep impression on his mind and they still ring in his ears. However, this book struck him as one of priceless worth in life. He was introduced to Mrs. Anne Basant, the leader of the Theosophists Society during this period. He also came close to Narayan Hemchandra, the famous Gujrati writer, in England at that time. Although Gandhi experimented with adopting English customs—taking dancing lessons for example—he could not stomach his landlady's mutton and cabbage. She pointed him towards one of London's few vegetarian restaurants. Rather than simply go along with his mother's wishes, he read about, and intellectually embraced vegetarianism. He joined the Vegetarian Society, was elected to its executive committee, and founded a local chapter. He later credited this with giving him valuable experience in organizing institutions. Some of the vegetarians he met were members of the Theosophical

Society, which had been founded in 1875 to further universal goodwill, and which was devoted to the study of Buddhist and Hindu Brahmanistic literature. They encouraged Gandhi to read the Bhagavad-Gita. Not having shown a particular interest in religion before, he read works of and about Hinduism, Christianity, Buddhism, Islam and other religions. But Gandhiji ultimately passed the law examination. On June 10, 1891, he was called to the bar of England and Wales by Inner Temple. He admitted as a lawyer and the next day was formally enrolled in the High Court. The following day, June 12, 1891 he sailed for India.

4.5. Eventful Professional life of Gandhiji in South Africa

After obtaining the law degree, Gandhiji left England on 12 June 1891 to come back India. He heard the sad news of his mother's demise after returning to India. He spent some days with his family in Rajkot. He already set up his mind to practice as a lawyer in Bombay. However, after an unsuccessful beginning, he realized it very well that 'he was not qualified enough to practice law'. Naturally, Gandhiji decided to prepare himself to get another job. An offer suddenly came to him to go to South Africa on behalf of Dada, Abdulla & Co. The opportunity to see a new country and new people excited Gandhi, and he accepted the offer. It was painful for him to be parted from Kasturbai once again very soon, but he was determined to go. In April 1893, he left Bombay for South Africa. In South Africa Gandhiji noticed that the Indians were treated as untouchables there in every sphere of their day-today life. He had to face various troubles during his journey from India to South Africa. The Indians were hated there for their complexion. They were called as 'Coolie'and Gandhiji was identified as 'Coolie Barrister'[30] in South Africa. The Indians living in the South Africa had no civil right and privilege. Realizing the hard realistic conditions of the Indians in South Africa, Gandhiji said, "Some of the classes which render us the greatest social service, but which we Hindus have chosen to regard as 'untouchables' , are relegated to remote quarters of a town or a village, called in Gujarati dhedvado, and the name has acquired a bad odour. Even so, in Christian Europe the Jews were once 'untouchables', and the quarters that were assigned to them had the offensive name of 'ghettoes'. In a similar way today we have become the untouchables of South Africa"[31]. Gandhiji fought for establishing their civil rights and privileges in South Africa. In fact, Gandhiji became a symbol of civil rights and justice to the Indians in South Africa and the blueprint and tactical

measures adopted by him in the Civil rights movement in South Africa were implemented in the Indian Independence movement.

4.6. Gandhi: A Native Indian identified as untouchable during his train Journey in South Africa (1893)

Gandhiji went to South Africa in the month of April 1893, as a legal advisor on behalf of Dada, Abdulla & Co. However, Gandhiji had to face severe troubles during the way of journey to South Africa. During the journey from Durban to Pretoria Gandhiji was vehemently insulted by a white man in 1893 who forcibly pushed out Gandhiji from the first class compartment. Therefore, he had to spend one night in a very cold and extremely bitter weather in the waiting room. Apart from this, he was compelled to sit on a coachbox of a driver in spite of his first class ticket of the train by the white man in charge of the coach. He told Gandhiji not to sit with the white passengers. What is even more surprising Gandhiji was once severely beaten when he refused to sit on the footboard of the coach as per the instruction of the white man? Besides, he showed his first class ticket during his journey when the guard came to examine it. However, the guard was angry to find him there and said to remove to the third class. There was only one English passenger in that compartment who opposed it. Therefore, the guard muttered: 'If you want to travel with a coolie, what do I care?' and ultimately went away[32]. Several biographers have acknowledged these incidents as a turning point in his life, explaining his later social activism. It was through witnessing firsthand the racism, prejudice and injustice against Indians in South Africa that Gandhi started to question his people's status, and his own place in society. It was a long journey from India to South Africa. Gandhi reached the port of Natal towards the end of May 1893. The first thing he noticed was that the Indians were treated there with very little or no respect at all.

4.7. Gandhi's Civil Rights Movement in South Africa (1893–1914)

He left for South Africa on behalf of a company. His experience on racialism in South Africa led him to raise the voice against social injustice and take up the rights of the Indian community and he soon emerged as their leader. He instituted a campaign of

passive resistance in response to the Transvaal Government's discriminatory policy, coining the term Satyagraha (truth force) for this new revolutionary technique. This method of resistance was later used to great effect in India's struggle for independence. Gandhiji realized it very well that the Indian immigration to South Africa started in 1890 when the White settlers there recruited indentured Indian labour, mainly from South India, to work on their sugar plantations. They and their descendents were mostly uneducated and had practically no knowledge of English. The merchant class that followed the plantation workers was mostly Muslims from Gujarat, and they too had practically no knowledge of English. The Indians suffered racial discrimination and humiliation but they had come to accept that as a way of life. On realizing, the importance of the condition mentioned above Gandhiji expressed his desire to better the conditions of Indians there and ultimately took initiative to call a meeting of all the Indians in Pretoria. This was the first public speech in the life of Gandhiji. His motto was to raise a voice for the establishment of civil rights and privileges among the Indians settled in South Africa against the oppressive and suppressive rule of the Pretoria Government. He also arranged to publish their agony in different newspapers to draw the attention of the world. He wrote an article in the 'Natal Advertiser' with hatred and anger on their ill-fated conditions and raised different questions as; 'Is this behaviour of the Christians?' 'Is this truthfulness?' 'Is this Justice?' 'Is this civilization?' 'I am waiting for reply'[33]. Gandhiji formed the 'Natal Indian Congress' in South Africa on 22nd May 1894 in connection with the model and inspiration of the Indian National Congress and arranged to start self-defense movement of the Indians. With a great deal of success, he introduced a method of non-violence in the Indian struggle for basic human rights. The method, Satyagraha – "truth force" – was highly idealistic; without rejecting the rule of law as a principle, the Indians should break those laws that were unreasonable or suppressive. Each individual would have to accept punishment for having violated the law. However, he should, calmly yet with determination, reject the legitimacy of the law in question. This would, hopefully make the adversaries – first, the South African authorities, later the British in India – recognized the unlawfulness of their legislation. South Africa changed Gandhi dramatically, as he faced the discrimination commonly directed at blacks and Indians. One day in court at Durban, the magistrate asked him to remove his Durban. Gandhi refused and stormed out of the courtroom. Gandhi extended his original period of stay in South Africa to assist Indians in

opposing a bill to deny them the right to vote. Though unable to halt the bill's passage, his campaign was successful in drawing attention to the grievances of Indians in South Africa. He founded the Natal Indian Congress in 1894, and through this organization, he molded the Indian community of South Africa into a homogeneous political force. In January 1897, when Gandhi returned from a brief trip to India, a white mob attacked and tried to lynch him. In an early indication of the personal values that would shape his later campaigns, he refused to press charges against any member of the mob, stating it was one of his principles not to seek redress for a personal wrong in a court of law. Gandhi spent three years in South Africa and ultimately he succeeded in organizing the Indian Settlers to raise their voices against different social injustices imposed upon them.

Ultimately he became a well-known figure. Everyone recognized his frockcoat and turban. His practice was going very well and he knew that the people there wanted him with them. So in 1896, he went back home to bring his wife and children to South Africa. Gandhi was becoming more and more involved in public activities; his way of life became simpler. It was 1901; six years after Gandhi had brought his family to Durban that he felt his future activity lay not in South Africa but in India. Upon his arrival to India, Gandhi went on a tour of the country. The annual meeting of the Indian National Congress was being held in Calcutta under the Presidentship of Dinshaw Wacho. Gandhi attended the session. It was the first contact with the Congress, which he was to lead so gloriously in the future. Gandhi settled down in Bombay and started practice as a lawyer. He did well, much better than he had expected. In December 1902, however, a cable reached him from South Africa requesting him to return. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, was arriving from London on a visit to Natal and the Natal Indian Congress wanted Gandhi to present their case before him. Gandhi reached Natal in time to lead the Indian deputation, but the Colonial Secretary gave the deputation a cold reception. Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain, was the Radical-turned-ultra-Tory, whose son Neville became Prime Minister in the 1930s. Chamberlain Sir agreed that the treatment of Indians was barbaric but appeared unwilling to push through any legislation about this however. Gandhi now decided to stay in the Transvaal to fight the color bar. He realized that now he would not be able to leave the country, as he had hoped to do. Gandhiji earned name and fame as a barrister within three years in South Africa and

came back to India for six months in 1896. He highlighted the distressed conditions of the Indian settlers in South Africa at that time and returned South Africa with his children and wife in December 1896. However, a meeting was held in Durban to oppose the presence of Gandhiji once again to South Africa because the white people of Natal decided that since Gandhiji was the troublemaker, he and his family would not be permitted to disembark. Therefore, Gandhiji did not enter the city. He was allowed only after twenty-three days to enter the city after physical torture and mental harassment.

At the onset of the South African War, Gandhi argued that Indians must support the war effort in order to legitimize their claims to full citizenship, organizing a volunteer ambulance corps of 300 free Indians and 800 indentured laborers called the Indian Ambulance Corps, one of the few medical units to serve wounded black South Africans. Gandhi urged Indian population in South Africa through his columns in 'Indian Opinion' to join the war, his own words, "If the Government only realized what reserve force is being wasted, they would make use of it and give Indians the opportunity of a thorough training for actual warfare." But the Boer war was started in 1899. Gandhiji formed a relief camp to serve the British army. Inspite of his sympathy towards the Boer the British army received their assistance. However, the relief camp was withdrawn after servicing the British army within few months in February 1900.

Gandhiji left Natal with his family in November 1901 for India. The Indian settlers in Natal welcomed him. He advised the organizer to form a 'Trustee' for the welfare of the Indians settled in South Africa. That is why, Gandhiji returned their valuable gifts given him in that auspicious occasion. He came back to India and arrived in Bombay on 19 December 1901 to take part in the meeting of the INC held in Calcutta. He stayed there more than one month to introduce himself with different national level leaders of the INC like, Gokhale, P.C.Roy, Kalicharan Banerjee and Justice Mitra. He also took part in different public meetings at that time. He traveled Benaras, Agra, Jaipur and Palanpur during his journey to Rajkot. Even he went to meet Mrs. Anne Basant at that time. He was praised with noteworthy for the relief campaigns done during the Boer war to the British army by the British newspapers and ultimately the Boers were compelled to surrender on 31 May 1902. Gandhiji was given a medal[34]

for his great gesture. He opened an office in Bombay in June 1903 to practice law. However, he responded to the call of the Indian settlers in South Africa and ultimately went to Natal in December 1902. After arrival Pretoria in January 1903, Gandhiji moved for the cases of the Indian settlers there in the court. He began his practice as a lawyer of the Supreme Court of Johannesburg. He argued for the benefit of the Indians there in the court. The Indians were strictly prohibited to enter Transvaal without legal permission of the authority at that juncture. Apart from these, Gandhiji devoted himself to the service of the plague-stricken people in South Africa and arranged to form a temporary hospital[35] to deal with this affair in March 1904. Even he played a vital role to boost up the common people to intimate the importance of the water-soil treatment.

He published a weekly newspaper, 'Indian Opinion' in April 1904. It was published in different languages, as Gujrati, Hindi, and Tamil etc. in the course of time the 'Unto the Last' of Ruskin greatly influenced the mind of Gandhiji, which was read by him during the journey of Durban. Besides, he established an 'Ashram' near the Phoenix city based on the ideology of 'equal society'. The book of 'The Kingdom of God is within you' of Tolstoy impressed Gandhiji very much in this regard. He played a vital role as a leader of the 'Indian Relief Force' along with another 24 volunteers during the Julu war. His devoted service and sacrificial mentality for the public welfare can be traced from a letter of him that was written to his elder brother Lakshmidas Gandhi. He intimated his willingness by this letter to his brother about the distribution of all his properties among the poor for their welfare[36]. In August 1906, the Transvaal Government issued an ordinance requiring all Indian men, women, and children to register themselves, obtain a personal certificate bearing name, and thumb impressions. This card was to be carried by all individuals at all times and had to be shown on demand. Anyone failing to produce the certificate was liable to be fined, or imprisoned. The police even had orders to enter private houses and check certificates. Gandhiji strongly supported the 14 demands raised by the Indian settlers in South Africa against the 'Transvaal Ordinance' on 22 August 1906. Therefore, Gandhiji organized a meeting of 3000 Indian settlers at the theatre hall of Johannesburg to oppose the Transvaal Ordinance and encouraged them not to register their names. Gandhi saw there the need for passive resistance, or 'Satyagraha'. To the people, he explained his concept of Satyagraha. First, he said, they must be

prepared to observe non-violence. The authorities would take all measures to put down the agitation. They might use violence, arrest people, and send them to jail, but they would continue without resistance. A big bonfire was lit, and more than two thousand certificates were burned. Many Indians openly crossed the border into the Transvaal, where their presence was illegal. Gandhi and many of his compatriots were imprisoned several times in the course of the agitation. When Gandhi was released from jail, the Indians held a meeting and decided to send a deputation to England to acquaint the British Government with the real situation in South Africa. Gandhi and Seth Haji Habib were asked to go to London and present the grievances of the Indians. Accordingly, they went, but the mission was a failure. They returned with grim determination to fight to the end.

In 1906, the Transvaal Government promulgated a new Act compelling registration of the colony's Indian population. At a mass protest meeting held in Johannesburg on September 11 that year, Gandhi adopted his still evolving methodology of Satyagraha (devotion to the truth), or Non-violent protest, for the first time, calling on his fellow Indians to defy the new law and suffer the punishments for doing so, rather than resist through violent means. This plan was adopted, leading to a seven-year struggle in which thousands of Indians were jailed (including Gandhi), flogged, or even shot, for striking, refusing to register, burning their registration cards, or engaging in other forms of non-violent resistance. While the Government was successful in repressing the Indian protesters, the public outcry stemming from the harsh methods employed by the South African Government in the face of peaceful Indian protesters finally forced South African General Jan Christian Smuts to negotiate a compromise with Gandhi. Gandhi's ideas took shape and the concept of Satyagraha matured during this struggle. He also went to London as an Indian representative on 3 October 1906 and submitted a memorandum of 14 demands to Lord Elgin, the-then secretary of the Indian colony. As a result of it, the Indian settlers assembled in the field of Pretoria Masjid and took oath not to take their identity card from there. They responded to the call of Gandhiji and decided not to register their names. Only 500 Indian settlers registered their names out of 13000. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji morally succeeded in achieving the support of the people in this regard. But the Government did not alter its decision at that very moment. Tactically Gandhiji launched the first 'Satyagraha' movement in his life in a public meeting of Pretoria Masjid on 31 July

1907. Gokhale's wire encouraged him now. The Commissioner of Police called Gandhiji to discuss the matter on 27 December 1907. But the discussion had gone without result. Therefore, the Indian settlers were asked either to register their names within 48 hours or to leave the Transvaal immediately. Gandhiji did not mind their order. He continued the Satyagraha along with the Indians settled there. As a result of it, Gandhiji was arrested and sent to the court and two months imprison was given to him by the court along with his 150 supporters in 1908. It was the first time imprison in his life. Under this situation, the Prime Minister of Transvaal met with him and promised to withdraw that Ordinance. So he was temporarily released. Gandhiji went back to Pretoria and interpreted the matter in the midnight before 1000 Indians settled there. But he was assaulted by Mir Alam and other three Pathans in course of time. Yet he pardoned them. It was an irony of fate that the Ordinance was not withdrawn as per the version of General Smart. Practically General Smart did not keep his word on this matter. That is why; Indian settlers assembled in the field of Pretoria Masjid to protest against the Government and raised their voice by burning their identity cards. Gandhiji and other Indian leaders were arrested on this excuse. But the Indians settled in London raised their voice against the government and ultimately Gandhiji was released on 13 December 1908. He firmly determined to continue the Satyagraha movement against all sorts of injustice imposed upon the Indian settlers in South Africa. That is why; he entered Transvaal along with other six companions without any objection. The name of Ratan Tata may be mentioned in this connection to highlight his financial contribution to this Satyagraha movement of Gandhiji. He donated Rs. 25000/ to strengthen the Gandian movement in South Africa. Besides, it can be noted that Aga Khan also provided financial assistance to the South African 'Relief Fund' of Gandhiji. He wrote a letter to Gokhale on 25 April 1910 in details on the Satyagraha movement under his leadership for the rights and privileges of Indians settlers in South Africa. Not only that but also he established a 'Tolstoy Firm'[37] in Kallen Black of Johannesburg, which was situated in the Transvaal Province. The covering areas in acres were 1100. His German-Jewish friend and follower, Kallenbach donated these lands to him for the same and it ultimately became a base ground for his plans in South Africa. The Indian National Congress and the Indian Muslim League as well as the Nizam of Hyderabad also gave a helping hand in organizing the Tolstoy Farm. Here Gandhi took a vow not to drink cow or buffalo milk since cruelty was used to increase their production. His austerity reached its

climax when he vowed to live on fruits and nuts alone with some olive oil[38]. He emphasized on Satyagraha at that very moment to oppose the Government and its injustice imposed upon the Indian settlers in South Africa. As a result, Gandhiji declared to maintain non-cooperation towards the policy imposed upon the Indian settlers there by the Government in respect of different matters. He advised his followers to adopt the principles of Non-violence and Satyagraha into their hearts to oppose injustice mainly to establish civil rights and privileges for the Indian settlers in South Africa. Gandhiji highlighted very vividly in the 'Hind Swaraj' or 'Indian Home Rule' in details in 1909 on the tactical points of Satyagraha that focused the politico-economic thoughts and views of him at a large. Besides, he sent a letter to Tolstoy for giving his valuable opinion on the issue of Satyagraha at that juncture. Tolstoy responded on 6 April 1910 on that matter. However, Gandhiji received this letter after the death of Tolstoy that helped him much in this regard. But the government released all the Satyagrahis on 1 June 1911. In the mean time, Gokhale arrived at Cape Town to deal with this problem. He played a vital role to settle down the problems between the Satyagrahis and the South African Government. Gandhiji helped Gokhale at that very moment. Gokhale delivered a speech in a meeting organized by the Indian settlers in the Pretoria town hall of South Africa on 15 November 1912. Gandhi found the Government relentless in its actions against minorities. There seemed no solutions in sight. He had to take further measures. In October of 1913, Gandhi organized a march of over 6,000 Indian workers from the Natal mining area into the Transvaal, although crossing into the Transvaal without a permit was not allowed by law. Gandhi and many other Indians were imprisoned. The 'Satyagrahis' were beaten and flogged to force them to go back to work, but without success. The authorities could not make them return to work. Gandhi had aroused in them the spirit of quiet, dignified resistance.

However, the Honorable Supreme Court of the Cape gave a verdict on the marriage of the Hindus, Parsis and Muslims and declared that these marriages were illegal, as it was not done as per their law. Even the Government of there strongly supported the verdict. Under these unavoidable circumstances, Gandhiji once again launched the Satyagraha movement against the verdict of the court. The Indian settlers in South Africa at once responded to the call of Gandhiji to protect their rights and privileges and took part in the Satyagraha movement organized by Gandhiji. The followers of

Gandhiji moved with barefoot from Transvaal to violate the ordinances of the Government. As a result, they were arrested. In fact, it was declared on the part of the Government that nobody was allowed to enter there without their proper identification card. Therefore, the followers of Gandhiji in South Africa took part in the Satyagraha movement on foot. They carried only one woolen swal and own dress from themselves. They determined to protect their self-respect under any circumstances. Therefore, they prepared themselves for the sake of the movement. They moved on bare foot from Newcastle to Transvaal. The world intelligentsia strongly supported their movement that ultimately boosted up their movement at a large. As a result, Gandhiji was arrested on 11 November 1913 for nine months. That is why, Gandhiji firmly determined to propagate extensively the aims and objective of the Satyagraha movement on 1 January 1914. However, the Government formed a Commission of some anti-Indian persons to solve this problem. The followers of Gandhiji in South Africa boycotted this Commission, as there was not a single member taken from them. Inspite of that the demands of the Indian settlers in South Africa were recognized and they ultimately succeeded in achieving their civil rights and privileges. Soon the movement of passive resistance, or Satyagraha, spread all through Natal and Transvaal. The Government did not know what to do, because none yielded to their cruel treatment. In December 1913, Gandhi was released, but he would not give up the struggle. Gandhi had been active in South Africa for twenty-one years and had contributed much to the welfare of the Indians of South Africa. Gandhi now felt that his mission in South Africa was over, and he wanted to return to India. However, Gandhiji came back India on 19 December 1914 along with his wife Kasturba.

4.8. Rise of Gandhi's Leadership in India

After long 12 years, Gandhiji ultimately came back India. A great reception awaited him in Bombay. Many national level leaders gave him welcome at that time. He went to Rajkot and then Porbandar to meet his relatives. His traveling experiences in different parts of India and his contact with the common masses helped him to understand the-then socio-political conditions of India. On realizing the gravity of its importance, he made a plan of his works in India. The news of his achievements in South Africa had already been spread to India, which helped him very much in this

connection to fulfill his cherished dream. In only a few years, during the First World War, he became a leading figure in the Indian National Congress. Through the interwar period, he initiated a series of non-violent campaigns against the British authorities. At the same time he made strong efforts to unite the Indian Hindus, Muslims and Christians, and struggled for the emancipation of the 'untouchables' in Hindu society. While many of his fellow Indian nationalists preferred the use of non-violent methods against the British primarily for tactical reasons, Gandhi's non-violence was a matter of principle. His firmness on that point made people respect him regardless of their attitude towards Indian nationalism or religion. Even the British judges who sentenced him to imprisonment recognized Gandhiji as an exceptional personality.

Gandhiji established an 'Ashram' in a small Cochrar village of Amedabad on 25 May 1915 to fulfill the needs of a Satyagraha centre in India. He named this new institution as 'Satyagraha Ashram'. However, this ashram was shifted later to the bank of the river Sabarmoti and it became a first Satyagraha centre in India. Gandhi's constructive work began with the foundation of this Ashram. He did 'not lay so many stores by agitation as by working for the moral, material and economic regeneration of his country-men'. All who lived there wore a simple uniform style of clothing. They took their food together in a common kitchen and strove to live as one family. He noticed a 'Charka'[39] first time in his Ashram to a Gujarati woman. Inspired by her active devotion in it, Gandhiji started to woven khadi garments with the help of Charka, which stirred the mind and life of him at a large. In fact, Charka became a part of the mission of his life and he tried his level best to do the best job by Charka for the common people. But the Orthodox Hindus became very angry with Gandhiji when he provided shelter to an untouchable family[40] in this Ashram. He even did not agree to quit them from his Ashram in spite of their opposition. Under this unavoidable situation, the Orthodox Hindus stopped their financial support to run the Ashram. Naturally, the economic condition of the Ashram worsened rapidly day by day. Failing to recover this condition, Gandhiji decided to close this Ashram. Under this turmoil condition, an unknown person extended his helping hand to recover the economic condition of this Ashram by donating of Rs. 13000/, which bounded Gandhiji to alter his decision. Gandhi's constructive work began with the foundation of this Ashram. Gokhale, the political guru and closest ally of Gandhiji died in

February 1915. However, Gandhiji did not take part in the Servants of India Society, which his guru had founded in 1905 with a motto of educating the backward classes and organizing political works due to political opposition. Gandhiji spent the year of 1915 and much of 1916 by traveling different places of India in order to get to know the socio-political condition of his country and to make himself known to his fellow citizens.

However, Gandhiji got opportunity to come in close contact with the common masses of India through the three regional movements of Champaran (in North Bihar), Kaira (in Gujarat) and Ahmedabad. In Champaran, Gandhiji dealt with the problems of peasants against property owners, in Kaira that of farmers against revenue-officials and in Ahmedabad that of mill-workers against mill-owners. The Satyagraha movement started under his leadership against the Government in every case. But the achievements of his South African Satyagraha movement had already been stirred the mind set up of the Indian people which helped him very much in this connection to fulfill his cherish dream. It is very much important to note here that the South-African Satyagraha movement built up his faith in the capacity of the Indian peoples to participate in and sacrifice for a cause that moved them. He adopted the policy of Ahimsa and Satyagraha to combat the mighty influence of British imperialism in India. He implemented the blueprint of his Satyagraha and Ahimsa movements of South Africa in Indian politics. His role against injustice, exploitation, disparity and deprivation attracted the common people at a large scale. They were very much spellbound by the name of Gandhiji. They treated him as their saviour. Under this situation, Gandhian charisma rapidly increased among the toiling masses in India. However, Gandhiji completely exploited this situation for his political purpose. He noted clearly that his passion was confined for the service of the suppressed classes, as God would be tracing out more often in the lowliest. That is why; he would not render this service without entering into politics. His activities in South Africa transformed him from a shy and youthful pleader with no experience of public life into a mature idealist and leader. He realized the gravity of the Hindu Muslim co-operation and its unity and the curse of untouchability in the socio-political mobility in the Indian society.

4.8.1. Gandhi's participation in the Champaran Satyagraha Movement (1917)

Champaran, the land of king Janaka, situated besides Nepal and the Himalayas. The British planters dominated the arable land of it and imposed there a complete feudal system for their stake. Under this mind set up of the British planters, Champaran was totally brought under their controlled. They did not think at all for the betterment of toiling masses. Besides, the impact of the First World War greatly affected the day-to-day life of the peasants. Every thing was going beyond their capacity to purchase the essentials of life. The peasants of Champaran were forced to do indigo-cultivation of 3/20 parts of their lands and hand over the indigo harvest to the British planters as a part of the rent as per the provisions of the 'tinkathia' system. In fact, indigo plantation was no longer profitable as before due to the discovery of artificial dye that had already been capturing the market. However, the Sahib indigo planters forcefully imposed unequal contracts as well as dictated extra taxes upon the ill-fated peasants instead of stopping the indigo-cultivation. Naturally, they were very much angry at this system. It stirred the mind of the peasants to raise their voice against the extra burdens imposed upon them by the British indigo planters. The dormant unrest of the peasants became explosive in the course of time. Rajkumar Shukla, a local leader of Champaran, came forward to fight against these injustices. However, he ultimately went to Gandhiji for the same. In response to the invitation of Rajkumar Shukla, Gandhiji entered into Champaran to raise voice against these injustices. Gandhiji ultimately delivered a speech on 9 February 1917 in the 'Imperial Citizenship Association' on serfdom. He took part in the meeting of the All India Congress Committee in Calcutta on 9 April 1917. At the same time, he met with the Commissioner on those issues and informed the head of the Indigo Planters Association and the Commissioner of Champaran that he took decision to investigate the grievances of the sharecroppers. However, the Commissioner called Gandhiji, bullied him, and ultimately advised him to leave Champaran immediately. But Gandhiji in his self centered style violated the instruction of the Commissioner and came close contact with the ill fated peasants of Champaran and met with the 'tenant' of different parties on 19 April 1917. With the passive resistance, Gandhi started a great agitation on those issues. He went to Bombay and consulted all the Indian leaders there. They fixed May 31, 1917, as the last date for the abolition of indentured

labour. He then traveled throughout the country to get support for this view. Meetings were held in all-important places. Everywhere there was a great response. As a result of the agitation, the Government announced that the system of indentured labour would be stopped before July 31, 1917. In fact, the presence of Gandhiji itself an encouraging force for the toiling masses. Naturally, the crowds became unmanageable under this situation. This was his first act of civil disobedience against the British Government at Champaran in India. Under this political environment, Champaran was ripe for agitation. Gandhiji made direct contact with ordinary people through the traveling in different parts of rural areas in Champaran. He talked about the injustice imposed upon them by the Planters in the language that they understood. The so-called leaders of the Congress had never practiced the novelty of his political strategy and technique ever before. This was the first time the peasants were brought down into political agitation under the novel policy of Gandhiji in Champaran. The leading papers of Bombay Presidency and Bengal published the factors of grievances of the peasants against the Government's policy. Gandhiji's magnetic personality favoured the peasants cause that compelled the Government to appoint an Enquiry Committee (June 1917) and Gandhiji was one of the member of this Committee. As a result of it, 'tinkathia' system was withdrawn, burden of taxes were reduced up to 20-26% and ultimately the Sahib indigo plantation were forced to leave that district. However, Gandhiji succeeded in raising the question of the Champaran peasants at the national level. They did not account the role of Gandhiji. To them, the presence of him was everything. They treated his appearance before them as the emergence of God itself. Naturally, Gandhiji earned name and fame as a versatile personality by the Champaran movement. He established his national position into the mind set up of the toiling masses in India. The ignorant lower classes as well as many educated fellows ultimately became his disciple in the socio-political arena of India. This campaign gave him 'an all-India public reputation.' Apart from this he first time took initiative to establish a school at the village of Betiar on 13 November 1917 and second time founded a school to a land of a temple donated by a saint on 20 November 1917. The motto of him behind these was to bring the villagers under the purview of education.

4.8.2. Gandhi's participation in the Kaira Satyagraha Movement (1917- 1918)

Kaira (Kheda) was a district in Gujarat in the Bombay Presidency. It was an agricultural area with smallholdings. The peasants of Kaira (Kheda) demanded immediate relief from the land-revenue and ill-fated conditions that caused out of the wartime conditions, natural calamity, heavy rains etc. They became completely frustrated and devasted after 1899 due to the repeated occurrences of natural calamities and heavy rains that damaged huge crops during the season of 1917-1918. Besides, the impact of the World War greatly affected day-to-day conditions of the peasants. Under these unavoidable conditions, Gandhiji came forward to safe the life of the peasants. He played a vital role as a President of the Gujarat Association. However, his policy of prayer and petition ultimately became failure and it did not bind the Government to consider their demands. He asked the peasants to boycott taxation. Gandhiji along with Vallabhbai Patel, Mahadev Desai, etc. went to the rural villages and inspired the Satyagrahis to continue their non-violent resistance. Under this situation, the Colonial Government announced that the land-revenue taxation was withdrawn only from the poor peasants. They were relieved from all sorts of burdens. Naturally, Gandhiji withdrew his Satyagraha movement. Judith Brown noted clearly that 'in Kaira (Kheda) it led neither to an independent enquiry nor to the suspension of revenue he had first demanded'. But Gandhiji had also created a fresh glamour to the public image for himself in the Kaira incident.

4.8.3. Gandhi's participation in the Amedabad Satyagraha Movement (1918)

The conditions of the Amedabad mill workers were greatly affected by the policy of the mill-owners, the impact of the World War and so on. Gandhiji supported the demands of the mill-workers for 50% wages. He did not like the withdrawal of extra benefits (bonus) given to the mill workers for the fear of plague in 1917. Therefore, he directed a Satyagraha campaign against the mill-owners of Amedabad, not Government officials (February-August, 1918). Gandhiji extended his helping hand towards the movement of the Amedabad mill workers. Their main demand was to increase 50% remuneration of the works. To fulfill their demands, Gandhiji played a

vital role in this connection. However, he failed to make a negotiation with the mill-owners. That is why; Gandhiji declared his intention of fasting until a settlement was made. As a result, he launched a hunger strike in this connection. It was the first time hunger strike based on the principle of Satyagraha in the life of Gandhiji in India to compel the mill-owners to settle down the industrial disputes by peaceful arbitration. Naturally, they came forward to make a settlement that 'saved face for both parties'. But the motto of Gandhiji behind it was to win over the opponent. As a result, the mill-owners agreed to increase 35% wages for the mill-workers and ultimately Gandhiji withdrew hunger strike in this perspective.

Gandhiji dealt with the peasants' problems of Champran, Kaira (Kheda) and the workers of Ahmedaba. The first two movements were basically anti-government whereas the mill-workers movement were not anti-government but against the mill-owners of Ahmedabad. Both the first two cases, he adopted the strategy of Non-violent and Satyagraha. But he first time called 'hunger strike' on 15 March 1918 against the policy of the mill-owners of Ahmedabad. However, it was noted by a scholar that the ill-fated workers of Ahmedabad became frustrated for the dealings of Gandhiji with the mill-owners as he took part in their different occasions. Naturally, the workers had no other alternative without joining their duties. Even they did not like the relation of Gandhiji with the capitalist classes. Realizing the gravity of this situation, he launched hunger strike to motivate them. However, the Marxist scholars pointed out that Gandhiji did not belief in the theory of class struggle between the owners and the workers. To him, 'the relation is to be made between them by the silken thread of love'. However, the movements of Champaran, Kheda and Ahmedabad were more or less partially successful and magic of the name of Gandhiji stirred the mind of the nation. His strategy attracted the Indian masses, irrespective of their caste, class, creed, religion and sex. The emerging political leaders of India got inspiration from the activities of Gandhiji and they traced out fighting leadership qualities in him.

4.8.4. "Jallianwalla Bag Massacre" (1919) and Gandhi's Response

In the meantime, the political environment of India was clouded by the publication of the Rowlatt Committee's Report in January 1919 as because it was completely anti-

Indian. That is why; the political agitation against this report was spread more or less throughout India. But the vacuum in Congress leadership at that very moment due to different reasons provided Gandhiji an opportunity to emerge as a leader to fill up this gap. The charisma of the name of Gandhiji played a vital role in this connection. Besides, the old important leaders of the Congress had already cut themselves off completely from the Congress due to various reasons. Under this condition, Gandhiji came forward to tackle the political situation of India. He played a vital role for the transformation of the Congress into a new body, with a new ideology and a new strategy to achieve his goal. His political importance was recognized for the first time in the Congress session of December 1918. His protest against the Rowlatt Committee's Report took the form of a Satyagraha movement in April 1919. He first conceived the idea of an all-India strike as the beginning of the Satyagraha movement. The leaders at once took up the suggestion and gave much publicity to the forthcoming strike. The date was fixed for April 6, 1919. The people had received only short notice for the strike, but it turned out to be most successful. That was the first great awakening of India in her struggle towards independence from the British. In Bombay, the strike was a great success. Not a wheel turned in any factory. Not a shop was kept open. All over India, the strike was observed. Gandhi had asked the people repeatedly to be peaceful and not to be provoked to violence by the Government's actions. In spite of this, violence broke out in many places. There were disturbances in Ahmedabad and in Punjab, so he decided to go to these places to promote a non-violence system. In Punjab, the situation was very critical. It was true that there were disturbances on the part of the people, but the measures adopted by the Government to check the disturbances were too severe. The leaders were trying to keep the people peaceful, but the stern measures of repression taken by the authorities had few parallel in history. It was announced that a meeting was to be held in a garden called Jallianwala Bag, to make a protest against the Government's actions. General Dyer took no measures to prevent the meeting. He reached the place soon after the meeting began and he took with him armored cars, and troops. Without giving any warning he ordered, 'Fire until the ammunition is exhausted'. The garden was surrounded by walls and buildings and had only one exit. At the first shot, the exit was jammed and there was no hope of escape for the crowd. There were between six and ten thousand people there. The soldiers fired over sixteen hundred rounds into the unarmed mass of people. Once a garden, it was now a scene of merciless

massacre. Hundreds of men, women, and children were butchered. Leaving the wounded and dying on the ground, the troops marched away. The words 'Jallianwala Bag' became a synonym of massacre. But it would be noted here that the Provincial Government treated this as a 'rebellion' and suppressed it by 'such measures as no civilized Government in modern times had ever been known to take against its own subjects' As a result, Rabindranath Tagore relinquished the title of 'Kinghthood' given him by the British Government, to give voice to the protest against this dark anguish of terror. Sir Sankaran Nair, a former Congress President resigned his Membership of the Viceroy's Executive Council in July 1919 as a protest against the continuance of martial law for an unnecessarily long period. Naturally, Gandhi's influence on the Indian people was steadily growing. The old leaders, many of them with liberal policies, were vanishing from Indian politics. By the close of 1920, Gandhi was the undisputed leader and head of the Indian National Congress. In fact, the Rawlatt Satyagraha movement of 1919 accelerated the process of Gandhian politics in all over India. To Rabindra Kumar, 'The Rowlatt Satyagraha rested upon a moral instead of an economic grievance'. He ultimately became a chief architect of Indian freedom movement from 1919-1947. Naturally, Gandhiji became the centre point of the national movement of India that was organized in different phases during this period.

4.8.5. Khilafat Movement (1918-1923) and Gandhiji

Gandhiji realized the importance of the Hindu Muslim unity in the-then socio-political conditions in colonial India. To him, 'Co-operation between the two (i.e. Hindus and Muslims) is an indispensable condition of the salvation of India.' He also noted clearly in the 'Hind Swaraj' that 'The Hindus, the Mahomedans, the Parsis and the Christians who have made India their country are fellow countrymen and they will have to live in unity, if only for their own interest.' But he mixed politics with religion for the first time in the context of the Khilafat issue of the Muslims in India. His main object was to utilize the Muslim Strength for the purpose of the freedom movement. That is why; he was trying to devote his life to establish permanent unity between Hindus and Mohammedans and Satyagraha. Gandhiji pointed out in the Young India on this perspective that 'I am bound as an Indian to share the sufferings and trials of fellow Indians. If I deem the Mohammedan to be my brother it is my

duty to help him in his hour of peril'[41]. Even he promised the Muslim leaders that the Hindus would support their Khilafat cause. Naturally, they stopped the cow killing to strengthen reciprocal relations with the Hindus. Therefore, Gandhiji proposed to call a strike by observing the 'Khilafat Day'. However, their initiative did not inspire all. The main demands of the followers of the Khilafat movement were as follows;

1. ***To keep intact the geographical boundary of the Khalifa.***

2. ***To establish His supremacy over Arab, Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia.***

3. ***To prohibit foreign interfere into the holy place of Macca and Medina of the Musalmans.***

Gandhiji supported all these demands of the Muslims. The Central Khilafat Committee arranged to send a group representative to submit a memorandum with these demands to the baro-lords and they clearly stated that they would launch a non-cooperation movement against them on 1 August if he did not accept these demands. Naturally, they had to start this movement after utter despair. It was decided that the movement would be organized under different four phases; namely, the honour and title conferred upon them by the British Government be discarded, resignation from the post of military and other government service, boycott of taxes and resignation from the Council and boycott the election. However, Nehru, Chitaranjan Das etc. opposed the last two points. Lajpat Rai supported Gandhiji. However, the utility of this movement was expired due to the abolition of the post of Khalifa and Kamal Pasa formed the government in Turkey and declared Turkey as a secular state in 1922. However, confusion on the issue of Satyagraha was observed between the two groups. But the importance of the Khilafat movement cannot be ignored as because this movement some how brought the two distinct communities very close on that issue that created a nationalist spirit in the independent movement. Judith Brown highlighted it very clearly that 'Tension between Gandhi's ideal of Satyagraha and the Khilafat leaders' adopted of it as a political technique remained a constant feature of the Khilafat movement as long as the Muslims needed Gandhiji as a guarantee of Hindu support[42]'. After the Rowlatt Satyagraha Gandhi's standing in Congress had risen considerably, but the leadership of Khilafat agitation gave him real power among Hindu and Muslim politicians, enabling him to exert leverage on both because he was the guarantor of the hopes and fears of both. But Judith Brown noted that the mechanism by which Gandhiji had gathered widespread Muslim support was also a

political boomerang. But it cannot be denied that the spirit of the Khilafat movement created an atmosphere for the quick emergence of Gandhiji as a national leader.

4.8.6. Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement (1920-1922)

Gandhiji ultimately launched the Non-Cooperation movement against the British Government. The main objectives of this movement were intended to secure remedies for two wrongs:

Firstly, for the failure of the Indian and Imperial Governments in their duty towards Mussalmans of India on the Khilafat question;

Secondly, for getting justice against the Jallianwalla Bag Massacre for the guilty of the officers.

He was very much dissatisfaction with the Hunter Commission's Report. General O Dyer got rid of from his 'Jallianwalla Bag murder case' by the Hunter Commission that disappointed Gandhiji at a large. Naturally, his hope regarding the British rule rested upon utter despair. That is why; Gandhiji became angry at their false statement and said that 'The present representatives of the Empire have become dishonest and unscrupulous. They have no real regard for the wishes of the people of India and they count Indian honour as of little consequence. I can no longer retain affection for a Government so evillymannedas it is now-a-days[43]'. Therefore, his realization about the greatness of the British rule was gradually disappeared. He treated the British government after then as the 'Satanic Government'. Therefore, he pointed out that the traditional method of the Congress did not success to remove the injustice imposed upon the Indians by the Britishers. Realizing the gravity of the situation Gandhiji adopted and implemented a new policy, a new technique, a new strategy; i.e. Ahimsa and Satyagraha, to stir the very foundation of the British rule in India. He organized the Indian people irrespective of their different economical and social position to fight against the British Government under these two ideological viewpoints. He explained the situation in the Young India on 9 June 1920 and said that 'If the acts of the Punjab Government be an insufferable wrong ... it is clear that we must refuse to submit to this office violence. If we are worthy to call ourselves a nation, we must refuse to uphold the Government by withdrawing co-operation from it'[44]. An absolute majority passed his proposal for the Non-Cooperation Movement in the Nagpur Annual

Session of the Congress in spite of the opposition of C.R.Das, Jinnah, and B.C.Pal etc. However, Gandhiji accepted their 'Swaraj' demand. In fact, he got opportunity to emerge as an undisputed leader of the Congress at that very juncture. The deteriorating position of Annie Basant, S.N.Banerjee etc. and the vacuum of the genuine leadership for the death of Gokhale, Mehate, Tilak etc. accelerated the process of emerging the Gandhian leadership in Indian politics. Therefore, it can be said that the hollowness of political leadership in the Indian Independence movement provided Gandhiji a chance to emerge himself as a national leader. Besides, the role of Gandhiji in South Africa for the civil rights movement, the charisma of the name of Gandhiji among the common masses in India and his participation in three different regional peasants and labours movements in India had already created a deep confidence into the minds of the Indian peoples that brought him into the limelight of national politics. In fact, an understanding was ultimately made between C.R.Das and him to start that movement against the British rule. The aim of this movement was to redress the Punjab incident, to solve the Khilafat problems and to establish 'Swaraj' within one year. However, none had defined the term Swaraj. Therefore, there was a great confusion regarding this term. To Gandhi, it would be achieved by the ideology of Ahimsa and Satyagraha and Non-Cooperation was the way to gain 'Swaraj'. That is why, Gandhiji noted some proposals to strengthen the Non-Cooperation movement; such as, surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies; refusal to attend official and non-official functions; gradual withdrawal of children from officially controlled schools and colleges; gradual boycott of British courts by lawyers and litigants; refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia; boycott of elections to the Legislative Councils by candidates and voters; boycott of foreign goods. National schools and colleges were to be established. Private arbitration courts were to be set up for the settlement of private disputes. His proposed constructive programmes were based on three principles; such as, promotion of Swedishi, particularly hand spinning and weaving; removal of untouchability among the Hindus; promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity. But many leaders did not support him in all cases. C.R.Das opposed the Council boycott policy of Gandhiji. Rabindranath, Asutosh, Lajpat etc. did not like his school, college-boycotting policy. Even Surendranath did not support the Non-Cooperation Movement. Only Nehru and Roma Rolla ultimately supported him. But the Non-

Cooperation had two dimensional importances, such as Boycott, Swadeshi and another was the Constructive Programmes'

Therefore, Congress gradually became a platform for the common people irrespective of their caste, class, creed, religion, sex, etc. and it completely transformed the class character under the leadership of Gandhiji. Its volunteers were extended more than one crore to strengthen the movement. The 'Tilak Swaraj Fund' was established to organize this movement at a large. In fact, the Non-Cooperation Movement was actually initiated by Gandhiji on 1 August 1920 on his own authority before the matter was placed a month later before the Calcutta Congress Session. He organized the Congress as the mouthpiece of the nation. Not only that but also he decided early in 1922 to launch a no-tax campaign at Bardoli in Gujarat and announced in a letter to the Viceroy that 'aggressive civil disobedience would be taken up only when the Government refuses to provide to the people of India'. However, the Chauri Chaura incident compelled him to call off the Non-Cooperation Movement in February 1922, he was arrested in March in 1922, and six years imprisonment was given to him. The Government adopted repressive measures to crush the Non-Cooperation Movement. However, it cannot be denied that the whole movement centred around one person and his removal from active leadership 'gave a death-blow to it, at least for time being'. His intension towards the social problems of untouchability was very good but he did not success to abolish it. His role to bring consciousness about the curse of untouchability was a matter praise worthy. He played a vital role to stir the very foundation of the British administration. In spite of that the British Government did not alter its decision. R.P.Dutt noted it from the Marxist point of view that 'The dominant leadership of the Congress associated with Gandhi called off the movement because they afraid of the awakening mass activity; and they were afraid of the mass activity because it was beginning to threaten those propertied class interests with which they themselves were still in fait closely linked. Not the question of 'violence' or 'non-violence', but the question of class interest in opposition to the mass movement, was the breaking point of the national struggle in 1922. This was the rock on which the movement broke. This was the real meaning of Non-Violence'[45]. Many leaders blamed Gandhiji to call off the Non-Cooperation Movement from multi-dimensional angles. Even Nehru, Mahadev Desai, Subhas Ch. Bose did like the decision of Gandhiji in this perspective. However, Gandhiji explained the causes of it

that rested upon the theoretical (Moral) and practical values and its implications. Therefore, he did not support the violent role of the Chauri Chaura peasants. To him, ideology was above all. He told that 'The drastic reversal of practically the whole of the aggressive policy may be politically unsound and unwise, but there is no doubt that is religiously sound"[46]. He also gave direction to his followers that 'The patriotic spirit demands loyal and strict adherence to non-violence and truth. Those who do not believe in them should retire from the congress organization"[47]. Gandhiji said about himself that 'I must undergo personal cleansing. I must become a fitter instrument able to register the slightest variation in the moral atmosphere about me"[48]. He did not like violence. He had already postponed two times the Bardoli Satyagraha movement due to the unexpected occurrence of violence. Therefore, it cannot be pointed out that Gandhiji suddenly suspended the Non-Cooperation Movement. It was held completely under Chauri Chaura violence. It was very much difficult to imbibe the principle of Ahimsa and Satyagraha by his followers. They did not make out the gravity and reality of its importance. So more time was required to prepare them. However, Gandhiji launched this movement in hurry without thinking its pros and cons. The national importance of this movement cannot be ignored. Its multidimensional character boosted up different regional factors that hastened the motion and strength of the movement. The Non-Cooperation Movement was really the first national movement in all over India organized by Gandhiji. Lala Lajpat Rai took the leading role in Punjab for the class boycott of the students in January1921. U.P. became the centre of the Non-Cooperation movement. The impact of it in all over India like Bihar, Bengal, Assam, Gujarat, etc. stirred the very foundation of the British rule. Judith Brown pointed out that 'As non-cooperation penetrated the localities the clash of interests particularly of caste and community was sharpened rather than softened by Gandhi's tacties'[49].

4.8.7. Gandhi's Salt Satyagraha and Civil Disobedience Movement

In 1928, peasants in Bardoli, Gujarat were agitated by grievances and Gandhi advised them to resort to Satyagraha and the non-payment of taxes. A new determination, to force the Government to act, filled the minds of the people. Jawaharlal Nehru was elected President of the Congress at the insistence of Gandhi. India now demanded full independence. The whole country was excited. Everyone waited for the go-ahead

from Gandhi. After two months of suspense, the great leader announced a Salt Satyagraha. The salt tax was to be attacked and the salt laws were to be broken. On March 12, at 6:30 in the morning, thousands of people watched as Gandhi started from his ashram with seventy-eight volunteers on a march to Dandi, a village on the seacoast 241 miles away. For twenty-four days, the eyes of India and the world followed Gandhi as he marched towards the sea. The Government did not dare take the risk of arresting Gandhi. With each passing day, the campaign grew. Hundreds and thousands of people joined the procession. Men, women, and children lined the route, offering flowers and shouting slogans for the victory of the march. The march ended on April 5 at Dandi. Gandhi and his selected followers went to the seashore and broke the salt law by picking up salt left on the shore by the sea. Gandhi then gave a signal to all Indians to manufacture salt illegally. He wanted the people to break the salt law openly and to prepare themselves for non-violent resistance to police action. All over India people swarmed to the nearest seacoast to break the salt law. The Government waited for sometime before taking any action, and then the retaliation began. Two English officers, with pistols, accompanied by many Indian police officers armed with rifles, arrived at Gandhi's ashram in the middle of the night. They awakened Gandhi and arrested him. Gandhi's arrest had created a great sensation in India and abroad. Representatives were sent from all parts of the world to the British Prime Minister asking the Government to release Gandhi and make peace with India. The Government under pressure, at last released Gandhi. As soon as Gandhi was out of prison, he asked for an interview with the Viceroy, Lord Irwin. The interview was immediately given. Gandhi and Irwin met, but the two men seemed to have come from two different worlds. In 1931, Gandhi-Irwin pact was signed between the two. Gandhiji placed the demands of the Congress but rejected by the British Govt. Naturally, the Civil Disobedience movement was once again started by Gandhiji. According to Judith Brown, "The conclusion of the Gandhi-Irwin pact probably marked the peak of Gandhi's political influence and prestige in India"[50]. In 1932, the British Government proposed to introduce a separate electorate in the Indian Constitution not only for the Muslims but for the Untouchables as well. As a result, Gandhiji decided to fast unto death against this proposal of the British Government. On reaching an agreement, replacing the separate electorate, he broke his fast. On 11 February 1932, the first issue of Harijan was published. He decided to raise a fund for the welfare of the Harijans. Gandhiji settled in Sevagram in 1936 to

fulfill his cherish dreamt. He gave emphasized on 'Basic Education'. The British Government agreed to set all political prisoners free in return for the suspension of the civil disobedience movement. Furthermore, Gandhi was invited to attend the Round Table Conference in London as the sole representative of the Indian National Congress. The conference was a disappointment to Gandhi and the nationalists, as it focused on the Indian princes and Indian minorities rather than the transfer of power. Furthermore, Lord Irwin's successor, Lord Willingdon, embarked on a new campaign of repression against the nationalists. Gandhi was again arrested, and the government attempted to destroy his influence by completely isolating him from his followers. This tactic was not successful. In 1932, through the campaigning of the Dalit leader B. R. Ambedkar, the government granted untouchables separate electorates under the new constitution. In protest, Gandhi embarked on a six-day fast in September 1932, successfully forcing the government to adopt a more equitable arrangement via negotiations mediated by the Dalit cricketer turned political leader Palwankar Baloo. This was the start of a new campaign by Gandhi to improve the lives of the untouchables, whom he named Harijans, the children of God. In 1932, he established the 'All India Untouchability League' to reform the ill-fated conditions of the Untouchables. He profoundly believed in the Caste System. But he did not believe in untouchability. On May 8, 1933 Gandhi began a 21-day fast of self-purification to help the Harijan movement. In the summer of 1934, three unsuccessful attempts were made on his life.

4.8.8. Quit India Movement

In 1942, the British Government sent Cripps Mission to India with the new constitutional proposal. But this Mission could not satisfy Gandhiji and his Congress. In August 1942, the All-India Congress Committee met in Bombay, and was presided over by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Again, the demand to set up a provisional Government was made. The "Quit India" resolution was drawn up and passed by the meeting for presentation to the Government. Nehru moved the resolution and Sardar Patel seconded it. The resolution also announced the starting of a mass struggle on the widest possible scale. The Government did not wait for the mass movement to begin. Overnight Gandhi was arrested, and many other leaders in various parts of India. Gandhi was confined to the Aga Khan's palace in Poona. With the leaders in jail, India did not remain idle. The people took up "Do or die". There were mass

movements everywhere, great outbursts of violence throughout the country. People began to destroy government buildings and whatever else they considered symbols of British imperialism. All over India, there were strikes and disorder. Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy, attributed all this to Gandhi. Gandhi had incited violence, he claimed. In a long series of letters to Lord Linlithgow, Gandhi tried to persuade him to retract this charge against him. Failing in this, Gandhi decided to undertake a fast as "an appeal to the Highest Tribunal" (Geoffrey, 1980) against the unjust charges. Gandhi fasted for twenty-one days in February 1943. It was a great ordeal, but he survived. The demand for Indian independence had now grown into a worldwide question. Apart from India's own attitude, America and other countries pressed Britain to grant freedom to India. Two months later in May 1945, the Labor party came into power in Britain and Attlee became the Prime Minister. A few months later, the British Government announced that they expected to grant self-government to India as soon as her internal problems could be solved. This was a victory for India. It was a victory for non-violence. Britain, defeated by the peaceful revolution, could not hold into India any longer. Britain agreed to a planned withdrawal from India, without bitterness and in friendship.

All through his life, Gandhi had worked for unity between the Hindus and the Muslims. But he had not had much success. There was a large section of nationalist Muslims in the Congress, but the heads of the Muslim league were drifting further and further away. Gandhi was not the man to give up hope, however, and he pursued his efforts to bring about a settlement. On the other hand, Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League, was hostile to the idea of unity. He demanded a separate Muslim state before freedom was given to India. "We can settle the Indian problem in ten minutes if Mr. Gandhi agrees to the creation of Pakistan," said Jinnah. "Cut me in two," cried Gandhi, "but do not cut India in two" (Geoffrey, 1980). In February 1946, the British Government sent a Cabinet Mission to India. The task of the Cabinet Mission was to study the situation and suggest what should be done. After careful consideration, the Cabinet Mission issued a statement proposing the withdrawal of British authority from India. They wanted a united India. On June 3, 1947, Attlee, the British Prime Minister, announced the plan for partition. The Congress and the Muslim League accepted it. Thus on August 15, 1947, India's long struggle and

suffering for freedom was over. A new nation, although split in two, was born, i. e. India and Pakistan. Gandhiji did not like the partition of India

From the above discussions it can be pointed out that Gandhi rose to power as a national leader in the Indian politics. He returned to India in 1915 and gathered knowledge about the socio-political and economic environment of the country. Even he was involved in the peasant and labour movement in Amedabad, Gujarat and Bihar and ultimately he became president of the Indian National Congress in 1925. His first major clash with the British Government in India came in 1919 over the Rowlatt acts, and he then introduced the hartal, a strike during which the people devoted themselves to prayer and fasting. However, when his policies resulted in violence he abandoned the programmed of mass civil disobedience. For a period, Gandhiji withdrew from politics and travelled throughout India preaching the cardinal tenets of his doctrine, Hindu-Muslim unity, the abolition of untouchability, and the promotion of hand spinning. He adopted the peasant's homespun cotton dhoti and shawl, a gesture that won the people's hearts, and he became known as Mahatma (the great soul). During the struggle for independence, he was imprisoned many times and this, together with his use of the hunger strike, adversely affected his health. He vehemently opposed the concessations given to the Depressed Classes in the 'Communal Award' by the British Government. In 1934, he resigned his leadership of the Congress, completely involved in the Harijan movement for the sake of their humanity, and ultimately earned name and fame for their emancipation in the world. Although he had remained a powerful influence upon the common masses in India, yet he did not stop the trauma of partition in India. His ceaseless struggles against partition ultimately created an unmitigated evil, until he realized its inevitability. However, on Independence Day, 15 August 1947, he refused to celebrate and spent the day fasting and in prayer. He preserved in his work for unity and in 1948 in Delhi, he undertook a fast to the death for peace between the two warring communities. However, his pleadings for co-operation had aroused hostility amongst the militant section of the Hindus and Gandhiji was died on 30 January 1948 by the shot of Nathuram Godse.

4.9. The Socio-Educational and Political Background of Ambedkar

Ambedkar belonged to an Untouchable Mahar[51] community. He was born in April 14, 1891 at Mhow, near Indore, in Madhya Pradesh. He had to struggle every moment of his life for existence and also against the so called Caste Institution and its impacts on the the-then socio-religious, cultural, political and economic environment in India. Therefore, it is very much interesting and surprising to note the historical facts and events that how did Ambedkar become the real pioneer of social justice to the Depressed Classes and the father of the Indian constitution. Ambedkar itself made history and changed the age-old traditional beliefs and socio-political conditions in India. Nobody could do ever before him. In fact, his ceaseless struggles and ardent efforts made Ambedkar the symbol of social justice in Indian politics. He started his socio-political carreer as a Dalit leader from zero. Therefore, it was not a very easy task at all to become a renowned Dalit leader in the Casteist Hindu society. The life of Ambedkar as an Untouchable was replete with various problems since his childhood that can be noted as follows:

4.9.1. Family Background

Ambedkar emerged from a Mahar family of Untouchable community. The name of his parents was Ramji Sakpal and Bhimabai. His grandfather was Maloji Sakpal who belonged to the Mahar community of Untouchables. The name of his ancestral village was Ambavade, a small town in the Ratnagiri district. But his mother Bhimabai came from an Untouchable Hindu family of Murabad in the Thana district of Bombay state. Her father and other six uncles were all Subhedar Majors in the Army. They belonged to the Kabir school of thought. In fact, the Mahars were the most robust, adaptable, intelligent, fighting, brave, virile and leading community among the other Untouchable communities in the so called Hindu society. According to some scholars, they were the original inhabitants of Maharashtra i.e., Mahar-Rashtra[52]. But the family of Ambedkar was the followers of the Kabir school of thought. They believed the ideas and thoughts of Kabir because the principle motto of it was to abolish the Caste rigidity and paved the way of worship to God irrespective of Caste, Class and creed. The following song was sung with their master as follows:

"Jat Pant Puchhena Koi,
Har Ko bhaje so harka hoi!" [53]

Therefore, it can be said that Ambedkar was very much influenced under this circumstances. His father lived a very industrious and intensely religious life[54]. Ramji Sakpal read and recited to his children the great national Epics, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata the two unfailing sources of divine inspiration, the motive force, which had nurtured and moulded the lives of great men in India in every generation. He was not only interested in the spiritual development of his children but also cared for the worldly betterment of his sons. But Subedar Maloji, the father of Ambedkar realized the never ending importance of education. So he tried his level best as a teacher in an Army school to educate his sons. He became a headmaster in the military school and obtained the rank of Subhedar-Major in the second Grenadiers and designated as Subhedar Ramji. Apart from this, he was very much conscious about the social problems of his community. He fought for the unjust orders of the Govt. of India in 1892. The main target of it was to ban the recruitment of the Mahars in the Indian Army. So he asked Ranade to appeal the Govt. of India to withdraw the unjust orders. Therefore, the fighting attitude of Ramji Sakpal against injustice greatly influenced the life of Ambedkar.

4.9.2. Academic Environment

The struggle-full life of Ambedkar was itself an epoch-making instance to establish social justice in the Indian history. But it was not so easy at all for him to do that as an Untouchable. He had to face every moment Himalayan troubles in his academic life. His primary education was started at Dapoli at the age of five along with his elder brother. But his father Ramji Sakpal had already retired when Bhim was hardly two years old. So he left Dapoli and moved to Bombay and there he obtained a job in the military quarters at Satara. But Ambedkar lost his mother at the age of six years old and ultimately he was reared by his aunt Mirabai after the marriage of his two elder sisters' viz., Manjula and Tulsi. After completed primary education, he began high school education. But Ambedkar realized the hard reality about the stigma of Untouchability during his student life. They had shifted to Bombay for better

education where their lived in a small room in a Chawl called the Dabak Chawl at Lower Parel which was situated in the labour area with an environment of the underworld.

Subedar Ramji Sakpal made arrangement to admit his children into schools. But the authority of the school refused to admit the children of a Mahar. That is why; Subedar Ramji Sakpal left his native district of Ratnagiri and moved to Satara for the education of his children. He ultimately went to Bombay to settle down for the same. But he was then economically very weak to bear the expenditure of both of his sons. So he decided to afford educational support and facilities to Ambedkar, one of his sons. Realizing the importance of these unavoidable circumstances, Ambedkar became very much attentive in his studies. But it was also beyond the capacity of his father to continue the educational expenses of Bhim. Manjula and Tulsi, the two elder sisters of Ambedkar, gave money to continue his education, by pawing their ornaments[55], which were provided them by their father as marriage gifts. He redeemed them from his monthly pension of Rs. 50/. In fact, his main motto was to make Ambedkar a man of letters and light and Bhim was ultimately admitted into the Elphinstone High School. Bhim became serious and did hard working for the progress of his studies.

4.9.3. Conditions of Study-Cum-Living Room of Ambedkar

Realizing the hard reality of life, Bhim became serious of his studies at home. His father Ramji Sakpal did not make an arrangement of a tutor for him. But he always encouraged Bhim to be attentive to overcome the problems of his studies. But the conditions of his study-cum-living room were nothing but a picturesque of ceaseless struggles for existence of Ambedkar. There was no option for two men's sleeping at a time in that room. His father solved this problem by a rotation-wise sleeping arrangement between them. It was really an ever-first tragic event in the world history which was happened in the life of Ambedkar. His father regularly followed a method for the study of Bhim by sitting up all night until two in the morning and awakening Bhim for study and then go to bed for sleeping. This was the only way out done by his father to solve the sleeping problem between them which was also continued after his retirement.

In fact, the study-cum-sleeping room[56] of Ambedkar was full of domestic articles and utensils. The atmosphere of that room was smoky and unhygienic. It served the necessary purposes of their family, as like kitchen, a parlour, a lying-cum-study room, etc. All their required arrangements more or less were done within this one room. Apart from these, there was a store of firewood above head and also in the corner of that room. A fire place was in the other corner of that room. It was a irony of fate that a she-goat panted below his legs and near the head of Bhim lay a grindstone huddle into the wall. Bhim followed the instructions of his father and went to bed early and studied till early morning. He had to study regularly at night without a chimney of a flickering kerosene oil-lamp. He took bath in the morning if felt sleeping and then went to school in time. Under these unavoidable educational environments at home Ambedkar passed the Matriculation Examination in 1907 from Elphinestone High School. It was really a great achievement of Ambedkar as an Untouchable boy at that juncture. His success in the Matriculation Examination stirred the mind of his community. They made an arrangement of a meeting to honour Ambedkar. S.K.Bose, the-then well-known social reformer, presided the meeting. Krishnaji Arjun Keluskar, another well-known social reformer and a Marathi author was present there. He appreciated the success of Ambedkar and gave him a copy of his new book, life of Gautama Buddha and boosted up the mind of his father to take care and initiative for higher education.

4.9.4. Open-Sheded-Byculla Market Marriage Hall of Ambedka

Ambedkar had to marry after passing the Matriculation Examination as desired by his father. The Open-Shaded-Byculla Market of Bombay served as a marriage hall of Ambedkar. This place was not suitable for marriage ceremony at all. They had no other option due to their ill-fated socio-economic conditions at that very moment. Therefore, the Byculla Market was the only possible place for them to arrange for that occasion. But they could utilize this place at night only after the activities of the day's market. As a result of it, they did not get any chance to prepare this place as per the requirements of the marriage ceremony. Naturally, the bridegroom and their relatives lodged at night in one spacious corner of this market. But the other corner of this

market was managed for the bride and her relatives. The sitting places of both the parties were the stone-platforms of this market. The open shaded whole Byculla Market market was utilized as a 'marriage-**hall**'[57] for their different purposes. There were small gutters of dirty and water underneath their feet. Under these unavoidable difficulties and bad environment, Ambedkar had to marry.

4.9.5. Contributions of the Maharaja of Baroda

Ramji Sakpal always encouraged Ambedkar in education and made arrangement for him to get into admission in the Elphinestone College of Bombay after passing the Inter Arts Examination. So Ambedkar became serious in his studies in right earnest. But his father failed to provide necessary financial supports to Ambedkar at this very moment. Naturally the ardent desire of Ambedkar in education was going to be stopped under this acute problem. But Ramji Sakpal tried his level best to educate Ambedkar at any cost. His firm determination and the financial support and advice of Keluskar at this very juncture boosted up the mind of Ambedkar in education. So Ambedkar paid deep attention in studies to fulfill his cherished dreamt.

Keluskar (Krishnaji Arjun Keluskar) informed the Maharaja of Baroda about the ill-fated conditions of Ambedkar and reminded the commitment given by him for helping any worth Untouchable student in the prosecution of higher studies in the Town Hall Meeting of Bombay a few days before. As a result of it, Sayajirao Gaekwad agreed to fulfill his promise and granted a scholarship of Rs. 25/ per mensem to Ambedkar after satisfaction with his answers. Therefore, it can not be denied that without the active support and inspiration of Keluskar and the direct financial help of the Maharaja of Baroda, Ambedkar for higher studies could not success in his academic life. The Maharaja of Baroda appeared before him as a 'God Father'[58] in the life of Ambedkar. But the role of Keluskar can not be ignored in this perspective. He indirectly influenced him to attack the age-old tyranny and oppression of the Caste System. His role as a mediator in obtaining a scholarship for Ambedkar from the Maharaja of Baroda was highly noteworthy. Therefore, it can be said that Keluskar enlightened the path of Ambedkar and added ballast to his brains.

But Ambedkar was very much conscious about the insulting environment and pitiable sights of the down-troddens in the Hindu society. That is why; he made up his mind to prepare himself for the higher attainments. He got help from Prof. Muller of Elphinstone College in this context. So he started serious studies to passing the examination. As a result of it, he became a master of repository of knowledge with every possible missile by the reading of different books except the text books. The reading of different books was the source of the great joy of his life.

But his father Ramji Sakpal went to the Improvement Trust Chawl No. 1 in the meantime at Parel in Bombay. He got there two rooms on the second floor which was opposite to each other, one for household another for study-cum-bed room. But his father always watched Ambedkar and sat out the room when his son was busy in preparing to the forth coming examinations in the room. Ambedkar ultimately passed the B.A. Examination in 1912 and became a graduate. So he went to Gaekawar, the Maharaja of Baroda and thanked him with due honour. But the Maharaja of Baroda offered him a golden opportunity for his further studies in abroad. That is why, he asked Ambedkar whether he would agree or not to go overseas for further studies. Ambedkar agreed at once and intimated his willingness to him. As a result, necessary arrangements were made to send Ambedkar to the Columbia University of New York. But the Maharaja of Baroda also asked Ambedkar to join the profession of his forefathers during the months of waiting before sailing for America. Inspite of his father's disapproval, Ambedkar ultimately joined to the post of a Lieutenant in the Baroda State Forces and acted there for about 15 days in January, 1913. He did not delay a moment after receiving the telegram of his father's illness and went to Bombay at once to look after his father. But the condition of his father became serious and ultimately passed away on 2nd February, 1913. Therefore, Ambedkar was very much shocked and puzzled by the death of his father. He got an opportunity at that very moment to move the University of Columbia for higher studies. He went there to join Columbia University and paid deep attention in his studies. As a result of it, he obtained the M.A. degree from the Columbia University for his thesis "Ancient Indian Commerce" in 1915.

Ambedkar always thought for the betterment of his communities along with the Depressed Sections of the so-called Hindu society. So he did hard working to fulfill

the cherished dream of his father. He delivered different speeches to raise the voice of the Dalits India against the inhuman mechanism of the Caste System. That is why; Ambedkar presented a paper on "Castes in India" before the Anthropology Seminar held at ..... in May 1916. He obtained Ph.D. degree on the thesis of "National Dividend of India: A Historical and Analytical Study" which was later published under the title 'The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India' in June 1916. He also joined the London School of Economics and political Science and Greys Inn for the degree of M.Sc., D.Sc. and Bar at Law in October 1916. But he had to come back India on 21st August 1917 due to the expiry of the tenure of his scholarship without obtaining those degrees. Even the Maharaja of Baroda asked Ambedkar to return India to join the military service of his State. Naturally, Ambedkar joined as a Military Secretary to the State of the Maharaja of Baroda in September 1917. But he resigned very soon from that post due to two reasons, firstly for the misbehaviour of his sub-ordinates and secondly, the Maharaja failed to arrange a house for Ambedkar in Baroda. Ambedkar was not welcomed by his subordinates due to his lowborn strata in the Hindu society. So the Maharaja of Baroda failed to manage a place at that juncture inspite of his best efforts as Ambedkar belonged to the Mahar community of the Untouchables. Realizing the hatred of the Caste Hindus towards the Untouchables, Ambedkar made up his mind to establish himself against the age-old traditions of the Caste System.

That is why; Ambedkar sought for a job and ultimately an opportunity came to him to join as a Professor of Political Economy in the Sydenham College, Bombay in November 1918. But he went to London very soon to accomplish his incomplete studies in 5th July 1920 after resigning the post of Professorship. So he prepared himself very seriously to complete his research works. As a result of it, he obtained the M.SC. Degree from the University of London for the thesis of "Provincial Decentralization of Imperial Finance in British India" in June 1921. He was called to the Bar in 1922. He was also awarded the degree of D.SC. by the University of London for the thesis of "The Problem of the Rupee" in March 1923. After equipping himself with the degrees of M.SC., D.SC. and Bar-at-Law, Ambedkar came back to India in 14th April 1923. After then he began to practice as a Barrister in India in June 1923.

4.9.6. The Curse of Untouchability and its impact in the Academic and Professional Life of Ambedkar

During the school days at Satara, Ambedkar had to face different types of inhuman behaviour from his classmates, friends, teachers, staff of the institution and the surroundings. He had no rights to take sit with his classmates as he belonged to the Mahar community of the Untouchables. So he had to carry a piece of gunny cloth regularly to sit on it in the corner of the class room. Even the school servants did not like Ambedkar due to his low born origin. So they always avoided him and did not touch him. Apart from these, he could not touch the school tap. So he could only quench his thirst if luckily the school peon was there at that very moment to open the tap otherwise not. Therefore, he gathered bitter experiences from the very childhood regarding the hard reality of the Untouchability. But he had nothing to do with this inhuman, superstitious and burning social problem at that very moment. As a result of it, Ambedkar made up his mind to fight to finish this problem.

4.9.7. Role of a Cartman towards Untouchable

Once Ambedkar planned to meet his father at Goregaon who worked there as a cashier. Therefore, he started journey in the summer along with his elder brother and a little nephew and arrived at Padali Railway Station. But his father did not come there to receive them due to some unavoidable circumstances. So they had to face problem to go upto Masur. Ambedkar requested the Station Master to manage a bullock cart for them to move Goregaon. At last, a caste Hindu cart man agreed to move Goregaon. But he ultimately made out that the well dressed boys were Untouchables who were sitting in his cart. That is why; the cartman[59] at once threw them on the road from his cart. He told that the Untouchable boys had destroyed the purity of his domestic animals and polluted the wooden cart. Therefore, they had compelled to pay double fare to the cart man. Therefore, they were forced to move on foot until midnight from the evening. So they became heavy thirsty in their footing journey but none came forward to give them drinking water on the way. But they were every time refused when they requested the people to give them drinking water. Therefore, the role of a cart man stirred up the mind of Ambedkar who decided to raise voice against this type of ill-treatment of a man towards a man in the name of God, Caste and Untouchability. The above noted role of the cart man left a bad

impression into the mind of Ambedkar. So Ambedkar was very much shocked by this inhuman behavour of a man.

4.9.8. Attitude of Caste Hindus towards Thirsty Untouchables

The attitude of the Caste Hindus towards the thirsty Untouchables was very much barbaric and inhuman in nature. According to them, the Untouchables were impure and sinner. The shadow, touch and voice of them were identitycal as impure and untouchable. Therefore, they did not allow them to take pure drinking water from the public wells, ponds and other sources. Ambedkar gathered this type of bitter experiences during their journey to Goregaon. They realized the hard reality about the curse of untouchability at that very juncture. They became heavy thirsty after a prolonged journey till midnight from that very evening and could not eat their meals which were prepared for journey due to the want of drinking water. They asked the people to give them drinking water as they were thirsty and hungry. But none came forward to extent their helping hand to give them a drop of drinking water. Instead of giving them pure drinking water, they told them every time to take either filthy water or go away. As a result, they were forced to move with empty stomach and heavy thirst[60].

Apart from this, one day Ambedkar became mad with heavy thirst for water and was forced to take drinking water from a public water course. But the Caste Hindus suddenly noticed this scene and came forward at once to Ambedkar to know whether he was a Caste Hindu or not. Ambedkar boldly answered to him that he was an untouchable. So he was beaten at once and rebuked by them as because the use of common public water course was completely forbidden to the untouchables. In fact, Ambedkar became very much angry and surprised by the role of the so called Caste Hindus.

4.9.9. Barbar and Washer man's Attitude towards Ambedkar

Ambedkar was shocked by the role of them. One day he came to a barbar to cut his hair. But he refused to cut the hair of Ambedkar. The barbar said that if he cut the hair of Ambedkar the process of it would be defiled the purity of his razor and the touch of Untouchables would pollute his job and him. He said that "Even the buffalo-

shaving as a better and holier affair than tonsuring a human being who was his co-religionist and his country man" [61]. The washerman[62] also refused to wash his dress due to avoid impurity. Therefore, the elder sisters of Ambedkar played a vital role to cut the hair of him and his brothers under this unavoidable social environment.

4.9.10. Teacher's attitude towards Ambedkar

Ambedkar always paid deep attention in the class and sincerely followed the advice and lectures of his teachers. He normally attended the school regularly and did not try to absent from the class. One day he went to school in the heavy rainy day without umbrella. Naturally, his dress was wet by raining. Inspite of the heavy cold with rains, Ambedkar did not abstain from attending the school in that day. Pendse, a Brahmin class teacher looked at Ambedkar and asked his son to go home with Ambedkar to give Ambedkar necessary cloths to wear and to hang up his wet clothes to dry. So the son of the teacher became very happy over the success of getting an off day. But 'his pleasure, however, soon rolled into tears as he was brought into the class and made to sit half-naked'.

Ambedkar was very much near and dear to a teacher whose surname was Ambedkar during the school days. He was the most obedient pupil to this teacher. In fact, this teacher was very much kind hearted to Ambedkar. He provided regularly a part of his meal during the recess to Ambedkar. But the meal was made of different items for different days as for example; boiled rice, bread, vegetables and etc. may be mention to understand the mentality of his teacher. Therefore the role of his teacher left a deep impression into the minds of Ambedkar. Besides, it can be noted very clearly that Ambedkar did not adopt the title of his father, i.e. 'Sakpal'. He actually drew his surname 'Ambavadekar' from his native village 'Ambavade'. Even the Maharashtrian surnames were naturally derived from the names of their ancestral villages. But his teacher changed the title of Ambedkar from 'Ambavadekar' to 'Ambedkar' in the school records according to his surname, Ambedkar'. Therefore it can be noted that this teacher boosted up the mind of Ambedkar in different ways whereas the other teachers did not touch his note books. Even they did not ask him any questions or instruct him to recite poems for the fear of being polluted. So he prepared himself with hard working and industrious labour for the betterment of his results.

Ambedkar could not drink water straight way from the tube well or other source of water during his school days as because he belonged to a Mahar community of Untouchables. So he had to face acute problems to drink water in the school until some one agreed to pour drinking water into his mouths. But the most of his class mates did not come forward to help him in this regard. Ambedkar could fulfill his heavy thirsty if any kind hearted person or classmates extended his helping hand to him. But he had to turn his mouth upwards for this. Therefore, Ambedkar lost his patience in studies. He tried to begin his studies once again under the guidance of his aunt with full attention to achieve his dreamt.

4.9.11. Black Board incident

The environment of the school in which Ambedkar studied was not free from Casteism and untouchability along with the-then prevailing prejudices and hatred. But the school was completely under the Government. Therefore, the environment of school itself became a symbolic reflection of insulting world. One day Ambedkar was asked in the class by a teacher to solve an example in the black board. But his friends and caste Hindu classmates made a heavy noise in the class and shouted loudly by saying that their Tiffin boxes which were full of food and put behind the black board would be polluted if Ambedkar would go to solve the example in the black board[63]. Not only that but also, they hurled their Tiffin boxes so that Ambedkar would not reach there and touch the black board. Therefore, Ambedkar was asked by another teacher to discourse the previous instruction of his teacher under this unavoidable circumstances. In fact, this type of unhappy event happened during the school days of Ambedkar.

4.9.12. Ambedkar was prohibited to Study Sanskrit

Ambedkar was not allowed to take Sanskrit as a Second language during his high school days. So he had to take Persian language instead of it against the ardent desire of him. He belonged to the low born untouchable community of the so called Hindu society. In fact, the Sudras and the Untouchables had no rights to hear or read the Vedas as it was purely written in Sanskrit language. But Ambedkar ultimately began

to study Sanskrit partly by himself and sometimes with the help of some Pandits and consequently he established himself later on a man of letters in Sanskrit language.

4.9.13. Tiffin of Ambedkar left by Workman

Ambedkar used to take Tiffin some pieces of bread and vegetables as meals in the school to eat it in the Tiffin hour. One day Ambedkar noticed that the workman had left the meal of him in the school who worked in the fort area. Therefore, it had left a deep impression into his mind. But he did not react at all as he knew it very well about the ill-fated conditions of the labour classes of the mills. His constant touch with the labour life helped him to realize the ill-fated conditions of them which were full of hardships.

4.9.14. College Hotel keeper and Professional Staff did not give water to Ambedkar

Ambedkar had to face different types of problems during the college days. The case of the hotel keeper may be noted in this regard. He denied supplying water or tea to Ambedkar. He was an orthodox Brahmin. Therefore, he followed the caste rules of the-then society. That is why; he hated Ambedkar as he belonged to Mahar community. Therefore, it can be said that untouchability became the stigma of Hinduism. Ambedkar joined Sydenham College as a Professor of Political Economics and worked there for two years. He earned name and popularity among the students. But the social treatment remained unchanged. Some Gujarati Professors objected to his drinking water from the pot reserved for the professional staff. He was treated by his staff and illiterate peons as leper.[64]. Even he had to suffer humiliation due to the stigma of his caste in the legal practice.

4.9.15. Experience in Baroda for Parsi incident

Ambedkar went to abroad for higher studies and stayed there several years. But he had to come back India very soon due to the completion of the tenure of his scholarship offered by the Maharaja of Baroda. So he went to Baroda to resume his duty. But he was not allotted a quarter or lodge on the part of the Government to stay there. That is why; he had to persuade a Persi Inn keeper to give him boarding and

lodging facilities under the unavoidable situation and ultimately the Inn keeper agreed as there were no other boarders there at that time. But a tragic event was happened there after ten days when a group of Parsis came there with arms and lathis to threaten Ambedkar for defiling there hostel reserved for their community[65]. As a result of it, Ambedkar had to leave this Inn by that very evening. Being confused after this incident Ambedkar asked to a Hindu and a Christian friend for shelter. But the Hindu friend answered him in a very straight way that 'if you come to my home my servants will go'[66]. The Christian friend replied him that he had to consult with his wife. Realizing the importance of this environment Ambedkar ultimately came back promptly to Bombay.

4.9.16 Rise of Ambedkar's Political Leadership in India

Ambedkar became very much offended to the the-then socio-political and religious environment of the Hindu society under which he completed studies. After obtaining degree, he began practice as a lawyer in Bombay. He also joined as a professor for some times in the Governmental law college in Bombay and ultimately became a principal of that college. Naturally, he had to live one of the Bombay Development Department's Chawls at parel for ten years. Therefore, he came to close connection to the problems of the Depressed Classes at this juncture and observed the ill-fated conditions of the workers of Bombay. He also noticed that the workers of Bombay were living there without sufficient facilitated amenities of life that shocked Ambedkar at a large. As the Bombay Development Department's Chawls at Parel were enoyjing but the symbols of age-old exploitations of the workers of Bombay. Ambedkar got opportunity to acquire first hand knowledge of life among the workers of Bombay there. Even the workers of Bombay sought his advice and assistance. Many of them knew him personally. Naturally, a close association between Ambedkar and the workers of there was established which accelerated the confidence of many workers and Ambedkar got an opportunity to establish himself as a leader of the Depressed Classes.

Ambedkar introduced a paper namely, 'Mook Nayak', leader of the Dumb, on 31st January 1920 to raise the voice of the Depressed Classes against the ill-treatment, suppression, oppression, exploitations, untouchability and others which were imposed

upon them by the so called Caste Hindus in the name of God and it was entitled now as "Prabuddh Bharat" (Enlightened India). The role of 'Bahiskrit Bharat' (Excluded India), 'Samata' (Equality) and 'Janata' (People) during the colonial rule was very important in this regard. Realizing the importance of it, Ambedkar took initiative to strengthen their unity and consolidated their movement. He mainly demanded separate electorates and reserved seats in proportion to the untouchable's population. His motto was to organize the untouchables under one banner. Therefore, he established the 'Bahishkrit Hitakarini Sabha'[67] in Bombay on 20 July 1924. He presided at the Provincial Depressed Classes Conferences held at Nipani on 10 and 11 April 1925. On 4 January 1925, a hostel was inaugurated for the untouchable schoolchildren. Actually, the name of this organization kept on changing; it was also called 'Equality League' and 'Depressed Classes Institute' for some time. He started a paper known as "Bahishkrit Bharat" that voiced the grievances of the Depressed Classes. Gandhiji began a very successful Satyagraha movement in the Kolaba district where untouchables were denied access to a tank. He also founded the 'Samata Sainik Dal' (Social Equality Army) in 1926 with the aim of improving discipline and self-control amongst the students. Gandhiji stressed the need for organizing the Hindu society on the principle of human rights and equality for all. That is why; he was invited to Ahilya Ashram, Poona, where a big student's conference was held to fulfill these objectives. The conference declared the Manusmriti, a gospel of physical and mental serfdom of the Sudras according to the decision of this organization[68]. Ambedkar prepared the ground work in this way to launch a mass movement against the caste system, untouchability, religious dogmas and others which divided man from man and compelled them to remain in a dangerous position since the long past. As a Mahar untouchable, Ambedkar had to face the hard reality of life about the touch, voice and shadaw of the untouchables. That is why; he raised the voice of the Depressed Classes against the inhuman activities of the caste Hindus towards those problems in different movements such as Temple Entry Movement, Chowdar Tank Movement and others. The main motto of these movements were to established the civil rights and privileges of the Untouchables so that they can live in the Hindu society with due respect, self-reliant, self consciousness with pride and dignity along with other communities of the Hindu society.

Realizing the age-old sentiments of the caste Hindus towards the monopoly rights and undue privileges of them in the context of society, polity, economy, religion, culture and traditional heritage, Ambedkar very sincerely organized the followers of him and instructed them to be united first before the beginning of any movements against them for their benefits. That is why; he made arrangements to prepare themselves in different ways for organizing mass demonstration with the help of the members of the Depressed Classes. As a result of it; Ambedkar launched the two historically marked and outstanding movements, viz.; Chowdar Tank Satyagraha movement in Mahad and Kalaram Temple Satyagraha movement in Nasik. The object of the first movement was to establish their rights to take water from a certain tank and the target of the second movement was to enter the most sacred temple of the Hindus in Nasik. But the caste Hindus did not agree. So they opposed these movements and took repressive measures against the Untouchables. They made barricade. But the Untouchables went there to take water from that tank. Naturally, the situation became worse. In fact, the caste Hindus used their force against the followers of the movement. As a result, the followers of Ambedkar were beaten and injured by them. Apart from this, the main object of them was to detain the followers of taking water from that tank. Realizing the importance of this situation Ambedkar took help of the police administration at that very juncture to overcome the overwhelming situation for the benefits of the Untouchables and they ultimately gained their point. Therefore, the success of the Chowdar Tank Satyagraha movement of Mahad in the district of Kolaba boosted up the mind and energy of the Untouchables to establish their civil rights and privileges in their individual as well as national life. So they were inspired by Ambedkar to lead the Kalaram Temple Satyagraha movement to establish their rights in that sacred temple as Hindus. But this movement was carried on more than five years. Naturally, they created obstructions to detain the pilgrims at the great annual festival (fair) to such an extent that the festival could not be held and they took bath at a ghat that until then was closed to them. In fact, they were arrested including a large number of women and they ultimately failed to obtain the entry rights in the holier temples of the Hindus. So the Kalaram Temple Satyagraha movement was called off. But the failure of this movement ultimately became the pillars of success in their future movements. Therefore, it can not be denied that Ambedkar declared the first war of independence of the down-trodden with a view to obtain the rights of drinking water from the 'Chowdar Tank'[69] on 19-20 March, 1927. He also founded

the Depressed Classes Education Society with a view to enlighten them. Apart from these, the main motto of the Kalaram Temple Satyagraha movement of Ambedkar was to establish the civil rights for entering the temple.

Ambedkar rose to power as a Dalit leader among the Depressed Sections of the Hindu society after ceaseless struggles and began to work for the benevolence of them. He played a vital role as an Untouchable leader in the Indian politics to establish social justice among them. He was nominated to the Bombay Legislature Council in 1927. He argued and submitted logistic proposals for the over all development of the labours, peasants and others during this time. He ultimately became the elected representative of the Scheduled Castes from Bombay to the Bombay legislative Assembly. Ambedkar strongly demanded the amendment of the Hereditary Offices Act, 1874 on 19 March 1828 because the so-called Hindus forcibly compelled the Mahars to work day and night in their service by this Act. But they gave a very small piece of land called Uatan Land or some coins or two annas etc. to the ill-fated poor Mahars. That is why; Ambedkar introduced the Bill with a motto to break the shackles of serfdom. However, the Muslim members opposed this Bill and ultimately Ambedkar failed to ban this age-old slavery system. He submitted a memorandum to the Simon Commission relating to the safeguards and protection of the depressed classes on 29 May 1928. However, the 'Bahishkrit Hitakarini Sabha' was opposed to the principle of nomination for the representation of the depressed classes. But Ambedkar demanded protection through the following guarantees:

"(1) That the education of the depressed classes shall be recognized as the first change on the revenue of the province and that an equitable and just promotion of the total grant for education should be earmarked for the benefit of the depressed classes.

(2) That the right of the depressed classes to unrestricted recruitment in the army, navy and the police shall be recognized without any limitations as to cost.

(3) That for a period of 30 years the right of the depressed classes for priority in the matter of recruitments to all posts, gazetted as well as non-gazetted, in all civil services shall be recognized.

(4) That the right of the depressed classes to the appointment of a special inspector of police from amongst themselves for every District shall be recognized.

(5) That the right of the depressed classes to effective representation on the local Bodies shall be recognized by the Provincial Governments.

(6) That the right of the depressed classes to appeal to the Government of India, in case of violation of these rights by the Provincial Governments shall be recognized and the Government of India shall be given the powers to compel the Provincial Governments to confirm to the law in the matter." [70]

Ambedkar delivered a speech as a president in the All-India Depressed Classes Congress held at Nagpur on 8 August, 1930 that "A Common Government is often the best instrument one can devise to mould a diverse people into a nation. . . Historically, as well as logically it seems to me not open to any one to urge that the diversity of conditions and people puts a bar in the way of India's self-government. Indeed, if the ideal is that India should be a united nation, I venture to say, self-government would be the most potent instrument for the realization of that ideal"[71]. Ambedkar stressed on the necessity of the depressed classes' entry in public services of the country. He strongly opposed the intension of the Simon Commission that had systematically under-evaluated the needs and claims of the depressed classes. He sailed for London as a leader of the Depressed Classes to participate in the First Round Table Conference. His efforts in the Round Table Conference were fruitful as the downtrodden leader to get political rights through the 'Communal Award'. Ambedkar's participation in the Round Table Conference played an important role in bringing him into the limelight as a leader of the untouchables of India. Even he critically analyzed the shortcomings of the British attitude towards the depressed classes. He launched a ceaseless struggle to establish the rights of equal citizenship with the other peoples of India. He demanded immediate abolition of untouchability and all other forms of discrimination and legal disability and disparity. Even Gandhiji supported the demand of Dominion status along with other nationalities. He demanded separate electorate for the untouchables but Gandhiji vehemently opposed it. He fought for legislation against social persecution. His proposal was to establish the right to adequate representation in legislature by election and not by nomination.

He signed a 'Minorities Pact'[72] after mutual understanding and agreement through negotiation. But the most noteworthy event in his political career was the conflicted rivalry with Gandhiji. Ambedkar demanded certain political safeguards for the Depressed Classes whereas Gandhiji vehemently opposed that demands and fought against that provisions which were incorporated in the 'Communal Award'. Ambedkar criticized Gandhiji and its Congress, as they did not care for the untouchables. He also said that even they did not show a change of heart as far as the untouchables and the depressed classes were concerned. However, Ambedkar worked for the depressed classes in the Second Round Table Conference. Therefore, they were fully satisfied with his work. Meanwhile in India, Mr. Rajah disliked the 'Minority Pact'. Under this unavoidable situation, Ambedkar wrote a letter to M.G.A. Gavai in which he said, "I was shocked to find out that Mr. Rajah has changed his opinion and is now advocating joint electorates. I hope your Association will not follow him in this policy, which is suicidal in every way, but if it does then you must take the consequences of a permanent breach between us and a war among ourselves, which I am trying to avoid at any cost. So don't persist in it."[73] Therefore, Ambedkar decided to hold an All-India Depressed Classes Congress very soon to record the real opinion of the depressed classes on this issue. But Gandhiji vehemently opposed the separate electorate of the untouchables and advocated joint electorate system. Gandhiji did lot like the separation of the untouchables from the mainstream of the Hindu society. He launched a 'historic fast' until death against those provisions of the 'Communal Awards' and its one of the main provisions of separate electorates. Under the brutal pressure and the activities of the Indian national Congress Ambedkar was very much worried on this point. He ultimately came forward to save the life of Gandhiji for the sake of humanity. As a result, the historic 'Poona Pact was signed between Gandhiji and Ambedkar. This pact really deprived the toiling masses at a large. Some scholars pointed out that the 'Pact of Poona of 1932' was nothing but a political game to deprive the toiling India in the name of the united Hindus. It practically issued a death warrant to the Depressed Classes in socio-religious and politico-disguise in India in the name of their emancipation. Ambedkar wrote a letter to Gandhi that he wanted to meet him especially for the discussion about the panal system of Poona Pact. However, Gandhiji ultimately published his views on the benefits of the Panel system in the Poona Pact in Harijan. He said, "So far as I can see and so long as the system of reservation prevails, the panel system is the best adopted

for securing the selection only of those candidates who in the Harijan opinion are best fitted to serve this special interst, whereas I can see nothing but seeds of strife and bitterness in the alternative proposal"[74] But both Gandhiji and Ambedkar opposed the proposal of each other for the abolition of untouchability. They were fundamentally different in their respective approach to eradicate the problem of untouchability from the Hindu society. However, none can deny their prime contributions in removing the taboos and restraints to the depressed classes. Both of them dedicated their lives to the restoration of equality to the Avarna untouchable section of the Hindu society. But Gandhiji did not like the abolition of the caste system whereas Ambedkar fought for the permanent eradication of it. The Depressed Classes observed 19 March 1939 as their 'Independence Day'. Ambedkar pointed out very clearly that "I do not agree with Mr. Gandhi and the Congress when they say that India is a nation. I do not agree either with the foreign Relation Committee of the Muslim League when they say that Hindus and Muslims could not be welded together into a nation"[75].

Apart from these, Ambedkar established the 'Independent Labour Party' (ILP) on August 1936 to raise the united voice of the labour to hasten the welfare of them. He organized and inspired the Depressed Sections very sincerely in the Province of Bombay and Central Provinces at the first elections under the new Act. However, the ILP of Ambedkar secured 11 of the 15 seats reserved for the "Scheduled Castes". In fact; the caste Hindu candidates contested by their party ticket and secured only two seats not reserved for the Depressed Classes whereas the successful Depressed Class candidates were simply non-Congressmen and the followers of Ambedkar in the Central Provinces.

After being a national leader, Ambedkar went to Khandesh district as a member of a committee to investigate certain grievances of the Untouchables and he was welcomed at Chalisgaon by the local Mahars in 1929. But none was agreed to drive him due to his caste except an inexpert Mahar who had no knowledge to drive a Tonga at all. As a result, Ambedkar was seriously injured during his journey to Maharwada, the Mahar Quarters.

Besides; Ambedkar went to Daulatabad Fort along with his fellow workers in the Nizam's Dominions while on a sight seeing tour. They took water from a tank to wash after arrival there. But a bad incident was happened at that time when they were

getting permission to go round, an old Mohammedan ran up and shouting loudly, "The Dheds (Untouchables) have polluted the tank". As a result, the situation became worse and exasperated by them. Ambedkar asked them very politely a question. "Is that what your religion teaches? Would you prevent an Untouchable from taking water from this tank if he became a Mohammedan?" [76] Naturally they kept themselves silence. But the travelers were allowed with an armed soldier to go round the Fort without polluting water any where else. Realizing the content of this fact, Ambedkar pointed out that "While Caste and Untouchability were of Hindu creation, Indian's Mohammedans, Parsis and Christians were not wholly free from Hindu inhibitions on the subject."[77] The movement of Ambedkar was based on the principle of freedom, equality and fraternity. He noted valuable companions in a world that denied none of its treasures to the outcaste among man - the Commonwealth of letters.

However, Ambedkar was appointed as a Labour Member to the Executive Council of the Governor-General of India in July 1942. He struggled for the benefits of the Depressed Classes. He made the Depressed Classes stand on the political evaluation of India clear. He demanded an equal place with Hindus and Muslims in the future constitution.

Realizing the gravity of the situation, Ambedkar submitted a memorandum before the Cabinet Mission on behalf of the Scheduled Castes Federation. Naturally, the Depressed Classes began their movement under the leadership of Ambedkar for their rights and privileges. They demanded a clear-cut clarification of their rights and representation in independent India. As a result, numerous Satyagraha movements were started in different parts of India. Poona, Kanpur, Lucknow and other many places became the centre of these movements. These movements started simultaneously. That is why; Ambedkar sailed for London in September 1946 to plead for Constitutional safeguards for the untouchables after withdrawal of the British rule from India. Ambedkar became an elected member in the Constitutional Assembly from Bengal in November 1946. He played a vital role to keep it up the patience and sacrificed personal and party interests' interest for peace, unity and tranquility in the country. However, he was very much disappointed by the role and activities of Gandhiji and the Congress that did not accelerated the emancipation

process of the untouchables and the age-old victims of the caste institution. That is why; Ambedkar re-opened the controversial topic of joint versus separate electorates once again on 16 July 1947. He was invited by Jawaharlal Nehru to join as First Law Minister of Independent India. Ambedkar thought that he could serve the interests of the Scheduled Castes better from within Government. That is why; he accepted the offer and began to work for the greater interest of the country. He became a Chairman of the Drafting Committee that was made by the Constituent Assembly on 29 August 1947. He introduced a Draft Constitution on 4 November 1948 in the Constituent Assembly. Therefore, the Constitution of India was adopted by the Constituent Assembly on 26 November 1949. Dr. Rajendra Prasad pointed out that Ambedkar worked hard to prepare a draft Constitution for India inspite of his indifferent health condition. He devoted himself in preparing this Herculean task. He had not only justified selection but added luster to the work which he had done. His notable work was the preparation of the Hindu Code Bill[78] that was submitted to the Parliament in October 1948 and was introduced by him on 5 February 1951. He strongly defended this Bill in the Parliament on 20 September 1951. But he failed to pass this Bill due the lack of supporters of its members. Therefore, he devoted himself to the enlistment of the Depressed Classes. Apart from these, he delivered a speech on Marxism vs Buddhism in the World Buddhist Conference in Kathmandu in 1949 and ultimately he embraced Buddhism at Nagpur on 14 October 1956. However, the age of ceaseless struggle and tireless efforts in establishing the concept of 'Social Justice' among the people of India was ended with the death of Ambedkar in 1956.

4.10. Conclusion

The emergence Gandhiji as a national leader was an important fact in the Indian political arena. The socio-religious, educational, cultural and sound economic family background of Gandhiji accelerated the career building process of him in the Indian society. He was practically reared up since the beginning with adequate facilities that helped him very much to fulfill his cherish dream. He was a moral man of India. Everything was examined by him on the principles of truth, non-violence etc. He profoundly believed in the Caste system that created by the so-called intellectuals of the Later Vedic period to deny the human rights and privileges of the lower strata of the Hindu society. None but Gandhiji always tried to advocate the class interest of the

wealthy class. He never came forward spontaneously to save the civic rights of the downtrodden section in the Hindu society in his early life. His Harijan movement was practically the out come of the Poona Pact of 1932. It was nothing but a political requirement of his time, otherwise, Gandhiji and his Congress did not protect their class interests. That is why; it can be pointed out that Gandhiji was a champion of the haves and Ambedkar was the leader of the toiling masses in India. But Ambedkar emerged as a leader of the Dalit India from zero socio-politico status and position of his family atmosphere. His position was poor of the poorest. However, his strong mental confidence and tireless efforts helped him much to built up his academic as well as political career at a large. Every moment of his life was full of woes and sorrows since his childhood. None but the King of Boroda came forward to help Ambedkar to complete his studies in abroad. The versatile personality of Ambedkar brought him in the lime light of Indian politics. He was solely not a politician in the true sense of the term. But the the-then socio-political factors bound him to raise voice against the socio-religious and political tyranny that doomed the daily life of the Depressed Classes and Untouchables in every sphere of their individual as well national life. He was a great emancipator of the toiling masses and women in India in the true sense of the terms. His poor family background, helplessness conditions in every walk of life made his iron backbone to build up him as a great champion of social justice in India. He was tortured and harassed by the so-called upper caste peoples in every moment of life. Therefore, it can be said that it was not so easy for Ambedkar to build up him as a leader of the downtrodden sections in India. The abolition of caste and untouchability, social justice, welfare measures of the labours, women emancipation etc. were the prime motto of his socio-political movement in India. But he did not compromise with anything except the life saving Pact of Poona with Gandhiji. He responded only to save the life of Gandhiji by signing this treaty at the call of great humanity. The issue of caste in colonial India created a turmoil condition in the Indian freedom movement. It gave birth to numerous psycho-politico obstacles in establishing a unanimous mass movement in India against the British Imperialist Government. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar fought for establishing the concept of social justice among the peoples of India. But their approaches were quite different to each other especially in respect of caste and untouchability. Gandhian caste-thesis was very discouraging. But Ambedkar's anti-caste thesis was completely based on humanitarian approach. In comparison of both these thesis it can be said that

Gandhiji could not overcome the obstacles of his age in the sphere of caste system and untouchability whereas Ambedkar straightway struggled for the abolition of these two institutions. Gandhiji stressed on the concept of Truth, Satyagraha, Non-violence and others that depends upon moral force. Ambedkar believed in the concept of social democracy, political democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity, protection of human rights and its privileges, emancipation of women, slaves, so-called Sudras made by the Aryans and others. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji did not believe in the liberty, equality and social liberty of the haves not, Indian Sudras and women of different Varnas. His most of the idealistic approaches were not based on materialistic point of view. Therefore, it could not work for the immediate benefit of the common people. His thoughts were based on moral forces that depend upon man to man and it could not implement as a matter of compulsory deed for each persons. His philosophical ideas and spiritual thoughts could not bring radical change into the mind set up of his followers. Naturally, the strategy of the national movement under the leadership of Gandhiji could not success at a large. But Ambedkar solely fought to establish the rights and privileges of the downtrodden sections of India. He raised the socio-religious and cultural obstacles before the British Government that related to the day to day life of the toiling masses in India in the context of the caste and untouchability and forced the British Government as well the Indian National Congress to consider the ill-fated conditions of them in the light of human rights protection movement. He strongly proved that caste system is it-self self-explanatory mechanical devices to exploit the toiling masses of India in the name of divine origin and God – the creator of the universe. Therefore, it can be said that both Gandhiji and Ambedkar – the two shining stars of India worked to fulfill the needs and demands of their class interests. Both of them dedicated their lifetime for the better of the Indian society as a whole. Gandhiji was treated as untouchable in South Africa. But he launched a direct purification movement for the betterment of the Indian untouchables in the later part of his life. Some scholars pointed out that Gandhiji did not come forward to uplift the untouchables if there was not a political compulsion. Even he discouraged them to launch direct Satyagraha movement against the caste Hindus in case of Chowdar Tank Satyagraha movement in Mahad and Kalaram Temple Satyagraha movement in Nasik.

References

1. Gandhi, M.K.; An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth; Desai, Mahadev, translated, Penguin Books, 1982, p. 19.
2. Ghurye, G.S; Caste and Race in India, Popular Prakashan Private Limited, Bombay, Reprinted, 1994, p. 281.
3. Keer Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 2002, p. 2.
4. Ibid, p. 3. See also Borale, Dr. P.T., Segregation and Desegregation in India, A Socio-Legal Study, pp. 62-63.
5. Fourth Annual Report of the Indian Association 1879-80, P. 7-8.
6. Majumdar, R. C. (ed.); British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance, Part 2, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, p. 512.
7. Gandhi, M.K.; An Autobiography, op. cit. , p.157.
8. Ibid, p. 91-93.
9. Ibid, pp. 44-48, 76-78.
10. Ibid, p. 273-275.
11. The Indian Opinion, Gujarati Section, November 23, 1907.
12. Ibid, June 12, 1909.
13. Gandhi, M.K.; Young India, October 12, 1921.
14. Ibid, p. 16.
15. Arne Naess: Gandhi and Group Conflict; an Exploration of Satyagraha; Oslo, 1974, p. 127.
16. Colonel M.N. Gulati, American African Gandhis; published by Manas Publications, New Delhi; p.51.
17. Green Martin: The Origins of Non-violence: Tolstoy and Gandhi in their Historical Settings; New Delhi, 1998, p.3.
18. Gandhi, M.K.; An Autobiography, op. cit., p. 260.
19. Ibid.
20. Hardiman David: Gandhi in his time and ours; Delhi, 2003, p.177.
21. Paschimbanga, Gandhi Sankha, 1995, p. 132.
22. Gandhi, M.K. ; An Autobiography, op. cit., p. 23.
23. Biswas, Nanigopal and Biswas Renuka; Gandhi O Ambedkar: Tulonamulayak Samikhsha, Published by Sri Kasishar Sarkar, Kolikata, 1987, p. 27.

24. Pannalal Dasgupta; Gandhi-Gabesana, Nabapatra Prakashon, Kolikata,1999, P. 295. Quoted in Pyarelal's book of Non-Violence in peace and war, pp. 233-234.
25. Gandhi,M.K. ; An Autobiography, op. cit., p. 52.
26. Ibid. p. 53.
27. Ibid. p. 94.
28. Ibid.
29. Paschimbanga, Gandhi Sankha, op. cit., p. 129.
30. Gandhi,M.K. ; An Autobiography, op. cit. , p. 88.
31. Ibid, p. 264.
32. Ibid. P. 119.
33. Chandra Bipan; Bharater Sadhinata Sangram (Bengali Version), K.P.Bagchi and Company, Kolkata, p. 140.Quoted in Collected Works of Gandhi, Vol.I,p.61.
34. Paschimbanga, Gandhi Sankha, op. cit., p.134.
35. Ibid, p. 133.
36. Ibid, p.134.
37. Ibid.
38. Gandhi, M. K.: Autobiography, pp.302, 418.
39. Paschimbanga, Gandhi Sankha, op. cit., pp. 135-136.
40. Ibid, p. 136.
41. Complete Works of Gandhi, Vol. XVII, p. 475.
42. Brown, Judith; Gandhi's Rise to power, Cambridge University Press, 1972, p. 210.
43. Gandhi, M. K; New India, 28.7.1920.
44. Ibid, 9.6.1920.
45. Dutta, R.P; India Today, Manisha, 1997, p. 353.
46. Fisher, Louis; Life of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 220.
47. Mukherjee, Hiren; India's Struggle for Freedom, p. 158.
48. Fisher, Louis; Life of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., p. 220.
49. Brown Judith; Gandhi's Rise to Power, Cambridge University Press, 2007, p. 328.
50. Ibid, p. 191

51. Jaffrelot Christophe; Dr. Ambedkar and Untouchability, Permanent Black, Delhi, p.19

52. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai,Tenth Reprint 2002, p.8.

53. Ibid, p.9

54. Ibid.

55. Jatava, D.R; Ambedkar Code of Conduct, op. cit., p. 16-17.

56. Ibid , p. 17.

57. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op.cit. p.20.

58. Sharma, H.D; B.R. Ambedkar: A Crusader for Equality, Rupa and Co., New Delhi, 2002, p. 8.

59. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 12.

60. Ambedkar's Speech, the Janata, 20 November 1937.

61. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 13

62. Ibid, p.1.

63. Ibid, pp.17-18. See also Jatava, D.R; Ambedkar Code of Conduct, op. cit.,pp.17-18.

64. Ibid, 34 and Ibid, p.20.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid, p.34. See also Ambedkar's Speech, The Janata, 23 May 1936.

67. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., pp. 54-58.

68. Ibid, pp. 105-106.

69. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 9, Published by the Education Department Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 1990, pp.108-125.

70. Memorandum, Ambedkar Papers, Available in Bombay University Library, Bombay.

71. B.R. Ambedkar, Presidential Address, Nagpur, 8.8.1930.

72. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 9, op.cit., pp. 307-311.

73. Leader, Allahabad, 28.2.1932.

74. Letter from Ambedkar to Gandhi', Sabarmati Series, Set No. 7. Letter No. 155.

75. Times of India, 6.8.1940.

76. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 10, 1990, op. cit., p. 8.

77. Ibid.

78. Shashi Mehra (ed.); Ambedkars' Perspective on State Caste and Social Justice, Sanjay Prakashan, New Delhi, First Edition, 2002, pp. 196-199.

Chapter 5

Theories of Caste: Gandhiji and Ambedkar

5.1. Introduction

The term 'caste' is not an Indian word. This term is derived from the Portuguese word 'Casta'[1]. The Portuguese used this word 'Casta' generally to mean 'cast', 'mould', 'race', 'kind', and 'quality' etc. They applied this word to designate the peculiar system of religious and social distinctions that prevailed in the Hindu society when they first arrived in India. But this word is founded particularly on race. The Indian word 'Jati' is corresponded with the word caste that equivalent to the Latin gens and Greek yevos, 'race or nation'. Even the Indian words Varna, Jati etc. gradually rendèred by caste to represent not only varieties of race, colour etc. but every original, hereditary, religious etc. distinction that is impossible to imagine. Besides, the term caste also comes from the Latin word 'Castus'[2] that means pure. In fact, the Portuguese ordinarily used the term caste to identify the Indian social classification as they thought that the intention of the mechanism in the caste system was to preserve purity of blood. Therefore, there is no satisfactory definition possible to define caste system due to its multi-complexity and peculiarity. Emile Senart defined a caste as 'a close corporation, in theory at any rate rigorously hereditary: equipped with a certain traditional and independent organization, including a chief and a council, meeting on occasion in assemblies of more or less plenary authority and joining together at certain festivals: bound together by common occupations, which relate more particularly to marriage and to food and to questions of ceremonial pollution, and ruling its members by the exercise of jurisdiction, the extent of which varies, but which succeeds in making the authority of the community more felt by the sanction of certain penalties and, above all, by final irrevocable exclusion from the group'[3]. Sir H. Risley said, 'a caste may be defined as a collection of families or groups of families bearing a common name which usually denotes or is associated with specific occupation, claiming common descent from a mythical ancestor, human or divine, professing to follow the same professional callings and are regarded by those who are competent to give an opinion as forming a single homogeneous community.'[4] According to Sir E.A. Gait, 'the main characteristics of a caste are the belief in a

common origin held by all the members and the possession of the traditional occupation. It may be defined as an endogamous group or collection of such groups bearing a common name, having the same traditional occupation, claiming descent from the same source and commonly regarded as forming a single homogeneous community'[5]. Nesfield defined a caste "as a class of the community which disowns any connection with any other class and can neither intermarry nor eat nor drink with any but persons of their own community'[6]. Ketkar defined caste as 'a social group having two characteristics: (i) membership is confined to those who are born of members and includes all persons so born; (ii) the members are forbidden by an inexorable social law to marry outside the group'[7]. But different scholars have formulated a number of theories regarding the origin of the caste system in India. Some scholars like Risley explained the origin of the caste system based on racial differences whereas Nesfield and Ibbetson mentioned its origin on the line of occupational factors. However, Abbe Dubois referred to the role played by the Brahmins had its origin. Hutton referred to belief in Mana in its origin. However, it can be said very clearly that the caste system in India has been discussed in the context of Indological, socio-anthropological and sociological point of view. The Indologists have explained caste from the scriptural point of view. But some social anthropologists have explained it from the cultural point of view whereas some sociologists have discussed caste from the stratificational point of view. Naturally, the important theories regarding the origin of the caste system may be discussed as follows:

Different Theories of Caste:

Traditional Theory of Caste

There is a traditional theory of caste, which is based on the divine origin of the caste system. Many Western and Orthodox Indian scholars have pointed out that the caste system has been created by divine ordinance or at least with divine approval. They said that the Hindus seek intimacy with the Ultimate Reality and explained everything in terms of God and religion. According to this theory, the Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra castes have got their origin distinctively from the mouth, the arms, the thighs and the feet respectively of the Creator (Brahma). The idea of the Purusha Sukta (90.12) of the Tenth Book in the Rig Veda has its origin. This idea of the

creation of the four castes has been gained wide circulation in the Dharmasastras and the Puranas. Manu, an ancient lawmaker has established it without questioning in I.31 and cited it as an authoritative pronouncement on this subject. Besides, the status and role of different castes groups are generally determined in terms of karma and dharma doctrines. This theory viewed it as a normal and natural system. This theory has two explanations viz. mythical and metaphysical. The first version has noted that the four castes have been emerged from different parts of Brahma's body. Even the four-fold division of the caste system was created based on the principles of gunas (qualities) and karmas (functions). Krishna has highlighted the same content in the Gita. After extensive research regarding the origin of the caste system, John Muir had noted the same doctrines of karma and dharma in determining an individual caste. According to the scholars of the traditional caste doctrine, a man is born in a particular caste because of his actions performed in his previous incarnation. If he had performed better actions, he would have been born in a higher caste, that is, birth in a particular caste is not an accident. Srinivas said in this context that man was born in that caste because he deserves to be born there. He said that a man, who accepts the caste system and the norms of his particular caste, is living according to dharma, while a man who questions them is violating dharma. It is generally established that if a man observes the rules of dharma, he will be born in his next birth in a high and rich caste; otherwise, he will be born in a low and poor caste. Secondly, the metaphysical idea explained the hereditary and fixed functions, hierarchy, birth and other norms of the caste system. It has noted a separate function of each caste group that is determined by the swabhav (nature) and the guna (qualities) of the caste members. Apart from these, the hierarchical arrangement of four Varnas considered as four castes in the traditional theory of caste. But Prof. D. Raghaban reviewed the content of the Gita regarding the origin of the Chaturvarna and pointed out that 'The statement of the Gita does not warrant the assumption that according to one's Guna and Karma one may either oneself or through some friends declare oneself as a Brahmana or Kshatriya. The basis of Guna-Karma is to explain rational of the four-fold classification'. He also said regarding the utility of the four-fold Varna system that 'The organization according to Varna has served as a steel frame that has preserved the Hindu Community down the Centuries. Its marriage selection and vocational specialization have contributed to the refinement of the species and the conservation and perfection of its spill; they have eliminated confusion, perplexity and wastage.' In

fact, the followers of this theory search for truth through mysticism and not through science.

Manu's Theory of Caste

According to Manu, an ancient lawmaker, 'The Brahmana, the Kshatriya and the Vaishya are the three twice-born castes; the fourth is the one caste, Sudra; there is no fifth'[8]. He explained the origin of these four castes that were created from the mouth, the arms, the thighs and the feet respectively of the Prajapati (Creator) in the universe. 'The three twice-born castes, devoted to their duties, shall study; but of these the Brahmana alone shall expound it, not the other two; such is the established law'[9]. It has been clearly noted in the Manusmriti that Prajapati had deputed men of different castes in the prescribed works. The man of various castes would normally re-engage themselves after re-birth in the same occupations or professions. Naturally, caste and occupation of a person universally has fixed up. As a result of it, the innovative qualities of a person had been permanently destroyed or refused and caste and profession ultimately became hereditary in perpetuity. Therefore, the role, activities, dignity and status of different castes groups henceforth more or less are going to determine only by birth of a particular caste. Apart from these, Manu said that many castes or Jatis like Murdhavasikta (Brahman and Kshatriya), Mahishya (Kshatriya and Vaishya), Karana (Vaishya and Sudra), Nishada or Parasava (Brahman and Sudra) etc. were created by a series of crosses first between members of the four Varnas or castes and then between the descendants of these initial unions. Besides, different types of castes were made by degradation from the original Varnas or castes on account of non-observance of sacred rites. These are called Vratyas; e.g. Acharjya, Maitra etc. Therefore, it can be said that Manu had fixed up the four-fold division of castes and professions and transforming it into 'Caste Institution' on to be hereditary basis brushing aside the doctrine of 'Karma' (action) and inborn qualities as well as virtuous deeds. He divided the Hindu society mainly into four Castes, i.e., Brahmana, Kshtriya, Vaishya and Sudra and thereby laid the basis of inter-caste hatred and caste-based discrimination which in course of time divided the Indian Hindu society into multiple segments. He made the Caste System hereditary and issued a lease of permanent privilege in case of power, position and status in society, polity, economy, education, culture, religion etc. especially for the benefit of the 'Twice Born' and

particularly for the Brahmins by degrading the condition of the Sudras into the level of animals. The Sudras were denied even a little comfort. They had been compelled to become an unprivileged caste.

Brahmanical Theory of Caste

According to the some scholars of the Brahmanical theory of caste, the caste system originated and developed in India with the initiative of the Brahmins. Hutton, Abbe Dubois (A Description of the People of India, 1817, quoted by Hutton, 1961) and other scholars have highlighted this view. They said that the caste system has nothing but an ingenious device created by Brahmins for the benefits of Brahmins. The Brahmins created mechanism for imposing severe restrictions to preserve their purity on the issue of social restrictions, marriage, eating, drinking etc. with the non-Brahmins. The main motto of them was to satisfy their own desire and to perform pure sacerdotal functions in their own whims[10]. That is why; they established their high status, special privileges and prerogatives in the Brahmanas and other books. The Brahmins are the lords of the so-called Hindu social system. Everything might be a social norm whatever the Brahmins say and they are the owner of the entire property of the society. They could marry many times but could never be severely punished in any matter. They were free from capital punishment. They had to shave only their head for their serious offences whereas other persons are liable to be hanged for the same offences. The Brahmins are the lords of rituals and elaborate rites for bringing salvation of individuals and society. Even the king's prayers and offerings were unacceptable to gods without their performance of the elaborate rites and ministry. It was generally said that Brahmins added to the punya (spiritual merit) for the king as 1/16 of it accumulated by the Purohit (priest) through offerings and sacrifices that went to the credit of the ruler of the land. Ghurye strongly asserted that the Brahmins played a vital role for the creation of the caste system. They excluded the aborigines and the Sudras from religious and social communion with themselves. It is a well-established fact that the Indian Aryans were primarily divided into three different classes. But the Brahmanic literature contemplated it when the fourth class of the Sudras was made as it contradicted to the other three classes. That is why; the Vedic opposition between the Arya and the Dasa was replaced by the Brahmanic classification of the dvijati and the ekajati (the Sudra)[11]. Naturally, the most respected

class in the society could not fail to be imitated by groups that claim respectively. Even the restrictions on marriage and regulations about the acceptance of food, which contemplated only four classes in society, came to be the characteristics of each and every well-marked group. Caste in India is a Brahmanic child of the indo-Aryan culture, cradled in the land of the Ganga and the Yamuni and thence transferred to other parts of the country. But Hutton ultimately gave two arguments to reject the Brahmanical theory of caste on the basis of the following points:

Firstly, caste did not originate later when the Brahmins got political power. But this theory indicates that caste have originated at a date when Brahmins must have got political power. Secondly, Caste could hardly have been imposed by an administrative measure. Both these arguments are illogical as Brahmins obtained high status and special prerogatives not when they got the political power in the end of the second century B.C. but when they wrote the Brahmanas somewhere in the fifth century B.C. Kshatriya, the ruler of the country, refused to accept the superiority of the Brahmins over them and the writings of the Brahmanas were started at that very moment. Naturally, Hutton is not correct in assuming that caste will have originated later. Brahmins did not impose their superiority over others not through administrative means but by arousing the religious sentiments of the people. Therefore, it can be said that the origin of caste cannot be explained only in terms of a single factor like the one the role played by the Brahmins, as Abbe Dubois has done. Racial, religious, economic and other factors must have been responsible in creating the institution of the caste system.

Racial Theory of Caste

Herbert Risley was an ardent exponent of the theory of caste. Eminent scholars like Westermarck, Ghurye, Majumdar and others, have supported him in this context. The main content of this theory is that the clash of cultures and the contact of races crystallized castes in India.[12] It is a well-established fact in the history of the world that conquerors had subdued the opposition group very severely and took their women as concubines or wives but they refused to give their daughters in marriage to them. But complete amalgamation between the conqueror and conquered groups was possible if these two opposition groups belonged to the same race or same colour

otherwise not. If irregular unions held between men of the lower strata and women of the higher groups served the purposes of a caste. Therefore, the relation between the migrant Aryans and the aboriginal inhabitants in India might be considered in the context of the origin and development of the caste system. The ideas of ceremonial purity, racial superiority, patrilineal mentality and others of the Aryans were responsible for the growth and development of the caste system in India. They considered themselves as superior race than the original inhabitants in India. Aryans were patrilineal whereas pre-Aryans were matrilineal. It is generally said that the Aryans had colour prejudice whereas pre-Aryans had nothing. The migrant Aryans married with the daughters of the native inhabitants but they refused to give their daughters to them. The children of such marriages had to be assigned the lowest position in the society and were called the chandals. Therefore, the origin of the group of 'half-breeds' as well as the feeling of racial superiority ultimately became responsible for the origin of the caste system. Risley has mentioned the following six processes[13] that are responsible for the formation of castes:

I. Change in traditional occupation

It is generally followed that if a person changed his parent profession and adopted a new one, his caste or sub-division of caste ultimately developed into a distinct caste.

II. Migration

It was very difficult to maintain contacts with the parental caste for the migrated people of a particular region due to the lack of communication in the early days. Naturally, their relation and communication with the parental caste got gradually cut off and eventually they developed themselves as a new caste.

III. Change in customs

The formation of these new castes as a result of discarding old customs and usages and by adopting the new practices has been a familiar incident of the caste system.

IV. Preservation of old tradition:

Certain castes believed in the bygone sovereignty of the traditions and tried to preserve old traces of an organization. They separated themselves from those who have been assuming new traditions, customs and adopted a new name. As a result, a new caste came into existence.

V. Enrolling oneself into the rank of Hinduism

Sometimes either an entire tribe or a section of a tribe becomes 'Hinduised' and taking a new caste name. It enters into the rank of Hinduism and distinguished itself from the other castes; for example, Maria Gonds of Madhya Pradesh and Rajbanshis of Bengal.

VI. Role of religious enthusiasts

A religious enthusiast sometimes preaches his own doctrines and his followers form a separate sect, which ultimately developed as a new caste; for example, Kabirpanthies.

That is why; Ghurye said that the Vedic Aryans were civilized. They were faired-skinned and had colour prejudice in comparison to the aboriginal inhabitants of India. Naturally, they tried to show off their exclusiveness. They adopted the policy of exclusive spirit in social behaviour and uphold the ideas of ceremonial purity. The migrant Aryans took the policy of hatred towards the natives and imposed various severe restrictions in social interaction with them. It is generally asserted that the indo-Aryans settled in the Gangetic plain in India after migrating from Central Asia near about 2500 B.C. The Indo-Aryans comprising the Romans, the Iranians, the Spanish, the Anglo-Saxons and others. They were called as Vedic Indians. They spoke of themselves as 'Arya' whereas the aboriginals are entitled as 'dark colour' people without nose. Even they were termed as 'Dasas'. The term dasa means enemy in the Iranian language. Westmarck mentioned in his book viz., History of Human Marriage, 1891, that India was the land of the dark-skinned people before the Aryans invaded, conquered and settled in India. They had no racial mentality, colour prejudice and antipathies as like the Aryans, which ultimately hastened the process of the creation of the caste system. Hutton said that racial factor was responsible along another factors for the origin of the caste system. He said that caste system should not be confined to India but other racial groups should find it in all those societies, which have faced the conquests. According to him, caste is not confined to India only but it appeared in a pronounced form in South Africa, Canada etc. In South America, Negroes and other mixed races were cut off from the legal unions with the white race. Risley[14] and Narmadeshwar Prasad[15] mentioned the same phenomenon that was observed among the half-breeds of Canada and Mexico. They did not intermarry with the natives. Marriage was occasionally held only with pureblood Europeans.

However, there is a lot of controversy among the scholars of different fields whether the origin of the caste system is a unique Indian phenomenon or not. Scholars like Dumont, Pocock, Hocart, Hutton, Senart, Srinivas and others pointed out that caste is a unique Indian phenomenon only. But some scholars like Risley, Crook etc said that caste is a universal phenomenon. Some scholars analyzed caste from ethnographic and sociological point of view etc. Leach said that caste is confined to India as a structural phenomenon.[16] Ghurye has made an extensive study on the elements of caste system outside India. He reviewed the social structure of Egypt, West Asia, China, Japan, Rome and tribal Europe to satisfy his quest for the elements of caste outside India. Many primitive people and almost all the major civilizations of ancient times usually recognized the distinction by birth. Privileges and restrictions were very common among the primitive peoples during the medieval times all over Europe. Mate selection was based on birth, which was comparatively infrequent among them. Even occupations became hereditary in the tribal England, Rome and Asian civilizations. The lower classes were not given permission to change their hereditary trades and occupations but the middle and upper classes could change their professions. A man could not enjoy freedom to leave his father's professions if he unconsciously joined in his family's trade. It was impossible for him to move out it and ultimately they were compelled to adopt the hereditary occupations of their ancestors from generation to generation. Even occupations were graded into high and low. Not only that but also society was categorically divided into two (Brazil, Saudi Arabia), three (Mexico, Rome), four (Egypt: soldiers, priests, craftsmen and serfs; Iran: priests, warriors, artisans and herdsmen), five (Japan) well-marked groups, inter-marriage between which was often prohibited. In almost all cultures, the clergy were entitled as members of the nobility. They identified themselves to be more superior to the other classes. They had themselves formed into a sacerdotal organization. Therefore, it can be said that the well-marked status-groups separated themselves from one another by the absence of freedom of inter-marriage, rights and disabilities that may be considered a common features of the social dimension of the Indo-European cultures.[17] In fact, Ghurye tried to establish the fact that the characteristics of caste are found in other societies and cultures in the world beyond Indian society. According to him, caste is not a unique Indian phenomenon at all. But Srinivas, Hocart, Bougle and other scholars have straightway rejected the theory of Ghurye and considered caste as a unique phenomenon in India due to its religious significance.

Srinivas has pointed out that the idea of pollution has been governing the relations between different castes. The concept of pollution is fundamental to the caste system along with the ideology of karma and dharma that has contributed to make caste the unique institution in India. Bougle said that caste system has penetrated into the so-called Hindu society in a level unknown elsewhere. Senart pointed out that 'Caste is peculiar to India since it is determined by ethnological, economic, geographical and psychological conditions, which are essentially native'[18]. Harold Gould has pointed out that caste in its fullest sense is an exclusively Indian phenomenon. Besides, some scholars have said that caste is a typical Hindu institution. Although the main religious groups in India beyond the Hindus are Muslims, Sikhs, Jains etc. and if the caste system is found among Jains and Sikhs, it is because they are basically Hindus. Even the endogamous and closed rank groups of Shias and Sunnis among Muslims and Protestants and Catholics among Christians have nothing to do with religion as castes amongst the Hindus are linked. The theological ideas such as pollution, rebirth, pap (sin), punya (merit), karma, dharma etc. are the unique concept of caste in Hindu society. Davis and Gardner carried out an extensive study on caste and wrote a book viz. Socio-Anthropological Study of Caste and Class, 1968 where he tried to prove that the concept of purity and pollution in a country like America did not exist except the concept of uncleanliness. But the concept of purity and pollution exists in the Hindu society. Therefore, it can be said that caste derives from some essential principle and we should search for that principle not in our minds but in the minds of those people who practice caste system in the Hindu society.

Occupational Theory of Caste

Nesfield was the founder of the Occupational theory of caste. Denzil Ibbetson strongly supported this theory and pointed out that the origin of caste has nothing to do with racial affinity or religion but it is mainly due to functions or occupations. Nesfield pointed out that the technical skill of the occupation was passed on hereditary from one generation to another generation due to practicing the same occupation of their forefathers over a long period of time. That is why; the occupational guilds came into existence and ultimately came to be known as castes. The feeling of the superiority and inferiority of occupations gave birth to the creation of hierarchy in the caste system. It depends completely upon the rank, position and

culture of any caste as high and low in the Hindu society[19]. According to him, Brahmins were specialized in the occupation of sacrifices, hymns and rituals that were most important in the socio-religious life of the Hindus and they ultimately became the most respected people in the Hindu society. They were the first born of castes, the model upon which all the other castes were gradually formed.[20] However, priesthood became hereditary when the Brahmins organized themselves as an exclusive privileged class. Even the other communities organized themselves into different castes and adopted precaution for the sake of defence and privileges for their caste interest. Nesfield said that the origin of castes depends upon two things; viz. occupation and organization of the tribe. Denzil Ibbetson pointed out in his book, viz. 'Punjab Castes', 1916 in supporting Nesfield,s views regarding the origin of castes. He explained three factors that were responsible for the origin and growth of castes, such as tribe, guilds and religion. According to him, tribes developed as occupational guilds and ultimately came to function on religious lines that hastened the process of formation into castes in the way of social revolution. However, many scholars criticized Nesfield's and Ibbetson's theories of castes. Senart raised a question in his book, viz. 'Caste in India', 1930 pointing out the scenario of Russia where total population of many villages is engaged in same occupation like shoe making, pottery etc. and these villages are not assemblies of groups that have merged themselves into a community and these communities pursued a single industry. He said that it is not occupation that results in grouping but it accelerated the process of formation in community of occupation. That is why; he raised a question why should it not be the same in India? Apart from this, D.N. Majumdar criticized the theoretical explanation of hierarchy of castes in the context of the superiority and inferiority of the occupations. He said that status of castes did not depend upon the superiority and inferiority of the occupations but by the degree of purity of blood and extent of isolation maintained by the groups[21]. Hutton said that the occupational theory of castes propounded by Nesfield practically did not explain the social status of various agricultural castes, as the status of same agricultural castes in North India and South India is quite different. Even the status of agricultural castes in North India has higher than the status of agricultural castes in South India. Not only that but also some scholars have criticized the theory of occupational castes of Nesfield as because it is certainly not accountable in the case of Vaishyas and Sudras. Besides, it is well known to all that every human society comes to be stratified into various groups.

These people and their kith and kin having similar occupational roles interact with one another very smoothly. These people together come to form what Harold Gould has called 'sub-cultural groups'[22] each with different standard of living, moral outlook, socialization pattern type and level of education etc. but these sub-cultural groups called castes in India. Indian society with non-industrial civilization had ascription-oriented stratification in which the role and the role-occupant remain merged. Therefore it is held that occupations are inherited at birth, are believed to be transmitted in the blood line and are, therefore, seen as a part of the person himself. This is true with reprehensible and sacerdotal occupations. In fact, this process of internalization of occupations really checked and controlled social mobility that led to the development of static features of our social system. Therefore, it can be noted in spite of its limitations that it cannot be denied that the occupational theory of castes is an important factor in the origin of caste.

Ketkar's Theory of Caste

According to Ketkar, the psychological prejudicial tendencies of human beings from the early tribal atmosphere accelerate the process of the origin of castes. It is nothing but a developed tribes or converted classes. The Indian tribes of different regions did not fuse themselves as the European tribes had done due to the introduction of the customs of endogamy in their society. They involved in struggle with each other due to their conflicting attitude relating to their boundary disputes or girl kidnapping mentality of the opposite group. Therefore, the people of a particular tribal group always try to avoid to make relation with other tribal group beyond their circle relating to marriage, social relations etc. They confined themselves for the interaction in all respect to the members of their own tribes. Ketkar said about the origin of various features of castes as because each features has a history of origin behind it but not the caste system as a whole. According to him, the phrase 'origin of caste' has no meaning, though endogamy has its origin, hereditary occupation and commensality restrictions have their origin, ascendancy of the priests and their exclusiveness have their origin, association of purity and impurity to various objects also has its origin. Thus, each of these various phenomena can have an origin but the origin of caste system can not be conceived of as long as these words (that is, castes) remain a collective expression.[23] He gave psychological explanation of each characteristic that

was the most important element of endogamy in the caste system and endogamy was practiced due to three reasons: firstly, due to the feelings of sympathy and affection for the members of one's own group, secondly, to maintain blood purity and thirdly, because it makes social adjustment with the partner easier. Westermarck noted very clearly that both sympathy and affection strengthened each other. Even the same culture, mode of life etc. strengthened both of these components. But Ketkar also pointed out that the feeling of superiority and inferiority comes from the cause or the result of endogamy. Superior caste did not marry inferior caste. Indians did not marry the natives of Africa when they first migrated there as they considered themselves superior to the natives of Africa. Even the Chinese did not make marital relations with the people of America after their migration in there due to their prejudicial attitude towards the white people. However, it is very much interesting to note that both the Indians and Chinese had no such feelings of superiority or inferiority before their migration in there. In fact, endogamy gave birth to the feelings of psychological hierarchy or superiority-inferiority. Ketkar said that an individual could degrade himself in his own caste by deviating from the caste norms or by taking to a degrading occupation. Therefore, it is natural for every group to think of creating some institution to exercise control over its members. Naturally, the origin of caste panchayats is also a natural phenomenon. Ketkar defined caste as 'a social group having two characteristics; viz., membership is confined to those who are born of members and includes all persons so born and the members are forbidden by an inexorable social law to marry outside the group. Each one of such groups has a special name by which it is called. Several of such small aggregates are grouped together under a common name, while these larger groups are but subdivisions of groups still larger which have independent names'[24] However, Ketka's theory of caste was perhaves a corollary of Rice's totemistic theory. Rice said that castes originated from the belief in totems and taboos whereas Ketkar said that castes originated from tribes. Some scholars pointed out that castes originated from primitive belief in magic. Therefore, it can be said based on the content of Ketkar's theory of caste that Indian caste system was evolved not by the Aryans but by the native Dravidians on aborigines. Besides, scholars like Slator and Pargitor pointed out that caste is essentially Dravidian and it was adopted by the semi-civilised Aryans. But there is a lot of evidences in history that the caste system did not exist in the pre-Vedic period. It was evolved only in the later-Vedic period. Even we cannot ignore

the role of religious and socio-political factors that were responsible for the origin of the caste system. Apart from these, Brahmin's concept of ceremonial purity or impurity, racial superiority or inferiority was definitely the important factors in the origin of castes.

Senart's Theory of Caste

Emile Senart pointed out that caste is the normal development of ancient Aryan institutions that assumed a peculiar form because of the peculiar conditions in India. The process of the formation of caste system in the shape of Varna division to the Indo-Iranian period of history as the fourfold division of society is found both in the Avestan Persia and in Rig Vedic India. There were four classes in ancient Persia, such as Atharvas (priests), Rathaesthas (warriors), Vastriya Fshuyants (cultivators) and Huitis (artisans). But the only difference between India and Persia in the social arena lay with regard to the fourth class i.e. artisan class in Persia and the servile or Sudra class in India. Senart tried to find out the beginning of the caste system beyond the Indo-Iranian period. He said that the Indians, Greek and Romans are all Aryans and their civilizations are the oldest one. He finds out certain similarities of these countries. There are three important groups, viz., family, gotra and caste (Jati) in India; gens, curia and tribe in Rome; family, phratria and phyle in Greece. In fact; gotra is an exogamous group in India; gens in Rome and phratria in Greece which confined their marriages to their own groups[25]. Even the Brahmins of India and the Patricians of Rome enjoyed the hypergamous rights of marriage. Woman after marriage can transfer her gotra to that of her husband's gotra in India; the same custom prevails in Rome also in confarratio. Even the hukka-pani band custom (ex-communication) of India can be compared with the 'interdict acquaet igni' custom in Rome[26] Senart also pointed out that just as Caste Panchayats exist in India and its head is an all-powerful man, in Rome and Greece, in addition, there are similar councils with similar powers. He said based on the foregoing discussions that caste is the normal development of ancient Aryan institutions. But this theory failed to explain the origin of the caste system. Senart highlighted the fact that caste system did not exist in the Vedic age. He clearly noted in the preface of his book (1930, xiv) that there is no allusion to caste in the Vedic hymns; it did not exist, therefore, in the period when these were composed. He noted that the beginning of the caste system is

shown in the literature of the Brahmanas[27]. According to Dahlman, the origin of caste cannot be explained only in terms of religious elements. Such a complex institution must be the result of multiple forces and it has been confused with gotra[28]. Therefore, the foregoing discussions regarding the origin of castes may be concluded mentioning the multi-dimensional approach such as racial differentiation, occupational distinctiveness, the monopolistic priesthood of Brahmins, socio-religious ideas of ceremonial purity, pollution etc. that were responsible for the creation of the caste institution in the Hindu society. The concept of ceremonial purity and pollution first applied to the Sudras in connection with sacrificial rituals and it was extended in the course of time to other groups as because theoretical impurity of certain occupations were responsible for the origin of the caste system in India. Besides, the lack of rigid control of the state over its subjects along with the unwillingness of the rulers to implement a uniform policy of law and order and creating uniform socio-political environment ultimately hastened the process of the formation of the origin of the caste system. Instead of bringing the divergent socio-religious and cultural elements less than one unified umbrella, the authority of different regions of the country fostered the varying norms and customs of different groups as valid. That is why, it can be noted that their tendency was to manage themselves somehow by recognizing the multi-dimensional varieties of different groups or communities to run their state. All these factors fostered the formation of castes based on petty distinctions.

Theory of Gandhian Caste Philosophy

Gandhi's thoughts and beliefs in Varnashrama Dharma, Caste system and Untouchability were completely based on the age-old atrocious traditions of the so-called Brahmancal Hindu religion. His attitudes towards the issues of Varnashrama Dharma and Caste system did not encourage the toiling masses in India. Gandhiji expressed his views and opinions on these issues in different writings and speeches. He pointed out that Varnashrama Dharma was an integral part of Hinduism. He identified himself as a 'Sanatanic Hindu' in all through his life and gave an explanation why he was called himself as a Sanatanic Hindu. He profoundly believed in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and the Hindu scriptures. He advocated the theory of incarnation (avatars) and re-birth. Gandhiji said that he believed in the Varnashrama Dharma in the Vedic sense, not in its present, popular and crude sense.

He advocated the protection of the cow in its much larger sense than the popular. He did not disbelieve in idol worship. Naturally, he advocated Varnashrama Dharma and Caste system. He believed in the hereditary birth circle of man. He advocated hereditary Varna system and pointed out that Varna of a man was determined by his birth. Not only that but also the occupation of a particular Varna was decided by the principle of hereditary professions of his ancestors. He coined the term Harijan to define untouchables. Even Gandhiji was completely unwilling politically to attack Caste Institution. His attitudes towards the issues of Caste and untouchability were very much discouraging and self-contradictory. He said that inter-dinning and inter-marriage were matters of individual choice. Inspite of his unwillingness, Gandhiji was forced to allow untouchables to enter Hindu Temples[29]. Gandhiji discouraged the inclusion of Mr. Agnibhoj who was an untouchable in the Ministry of Dr. Khare. But Dr. Khare clearly noted the attitudes of Gandhiji on these issues and pointed out that 'Mr. Gandhi told him that it was wrong on his part to have raised such aspirations and ambitions in the untouchables and it was such an act of bad judgment that he would never forgive him'[30]. Not only that but also Gandhiji noted the untouchable's problem as the moral stigma that would to be removed by the acts of atonements whereas Ambedkar gave importance to implement the rule of law and constitutional safeguards in protecting the interest of the lowborn peoples. But the Congress wanted to coerce the British Government to transfer its power or to use Gandhi's phrase i.e., hand over the keys to the Congress without being obliged to agree to the safeguards demanded by the untouchables. He identified the untouchable problems as political problem that were a separate element in the national life of India. He profoundly realized the anti-social altitudes of the Hindus towards the issues of the untouchables. It created socio-mental discrimination as a principle of touch-me-not-ism. Once Gandhiji said that he was busy in planning a campaign to win Swaraj and that he had no time to spare for the cause of the untouchables[31]. But Gandhiji changed his attitudes later on towards the issues of the untouchables and propagated untouchability as an evil in the Indian social life. Realizing the ill-fated conditions of the untouchables Gandhiji decided to sacrifice most of his life span to emancipate the untouchables. But Gandhiji did not come forward to implement the historic Bardoli Programme to reform and remove the curse of the untouchable community. But it was irony of fate that Gandhiji never used the weapon of Satyagraha against the so-called Hindus to get them to throw open wells, ponds and temples to the untouchables. He

took initiative to establish Harijan Sevak Sangh and launched Temple Entry Movement in 1933. However, it was very much astonishing to note the fact that Gandhiji excluded the untouchables from the management of the Harijan Sevak Sangh[32]. He said that any attempt to give political safeguards to the untouchables was unnecessary and harmful[33]. But the results of 1937 Election conclusively disproved Gandhiji as well as the Congress claim to represent the untouchables. In course of time, he demanded the abolition of untouchability but favoured Caste system in perpetuity. Naturally, Gandhiji came forward to establish schools, hostels for the untouchable children. He urged to the Hindus to open their ponds, tube wells, roads, temples etc. for the benefits of the Harijans. In these ways, Gandhiji tried to establish 'social justice' for the Harijans. However; Gandhiji stressed on political reform rather than social reform. But Ambedkar was identified as a symbol of social justice. He was a great champion of the Dalit movement in India. His human approach towards the issue of caste and untouchability stirred the very foundations of the Hindu caste system and untouchability. His ceaseless struggles for the establishment of the Dalit human rights in India were an epoch making event in the history of India. The ideas and thoughts of Ambedkar towards the issue of caste and untouchability were completely based on the principle of scientific reasons, liberty, equality, fraternity and after all nationality. He vehemently opposed to the inhuman mechanism of the caste institution and untouchability. Ambedkar expressed his views on the issues of caste and untouchability in a different angle that were reflected in his different following writings and speeches, such as, Caste in India, Annihilation of Caste, Who were the Sudras? Mr. Gandhi and the emancipation of the untouchables etc. According to him, Varnashrama Dharma was itself the source of the productive mechanism of the Caste system and untouchability that was unscientific and irrational that had no far-reaching consequences. He strongly demanded to reform the Hindu society. He knew it very well that it was completely impossible without the eradication of the Hindu caste system as it artificially fostered and created hindrance to social solidarity. That is why; Ambedkar advocated the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity in consonance with the ideology of democracy to set up a new social order. According to Ambedkar, superimposition of endogamy over exogamy was the root cause for the formation of Caste groups. The sub-division of a society was a natural phenomenon and these groups became castes through ex-communication. Caste was not based on the division of labour. It was basically a division of labourers. He proposed to

annihilate caste system. He said that inter-caste marriage would only play a vital role to reduce and solve the caste problems. He emphasized on scientific knowledge, test of reasoning, logistic argument for the betterment of the human conditions. He encouraged the common people to discard the age-old irrational, illogical, inhuman verdict of the so-called Shastras and its prescribed socio-religious customs that were working as the root of creating and maintaining castes and untouchability in the Hindu society. He gave a very important suggestion to 'make every man and women free from the thralldom of the Shastras, cleanse their minds of the pernicious notions founded on the Shastras and he or she will inter-dine and intermarry[34].' Ambedkar expressed his grievances regarding the issues of caste and untouchability and noted a fact that society must be based on reason, not on age-old atrocious traditions of the caste system as nation building process would not be completed within the caste dominated society. Not only that but also untouchability emerged from the caste rules and regulations that created an unequal society in India where human beings lived in fear and with a sense of impending danger in its heart. He said that neither God nor soul can safe the society. He liked to utilize religion only to establish peace and tranquility in the society not to bring down the conditions of the common people into the inhuman position of animal or beasts that was done by the so-called Brahmins. He said that society should play a vital role as a protector of religion not as a victimized object of it. But it can not be denied that the idea of pollution was an important feature of the Caste system as it had a religious flavour and in course of time untouchability became a mental disease in the Hindu social mind. Even all channels of life were rigidly enclosed in caste. Apart from these, the verdict of the caste rules relating to inter-marriage, inter-dining and endogamy restricted the class into an enclosed caste. In fact, the custom of Sati, enforced widowhood, imposing celibacy on the widower and wedding him to a girl not yet marriageable etc. were the out come for the preservation of endogamy against exogamy in the Caste system. He believed in social democracy. He fought for the sake of humanity. He stressed on social reform rather than political reform. He said that socialists would have to fight against the monster of Caste institution either before or after the revolution.

5.2 The Ideas and Views of Gandhiji towards the Issue of Caste

The ideas and views of Gandhiji were fully elaborated in 1921-22 in a Gujaratthi Journal called Nava-Jivan. Gandhiji expressed his views on the-then main social problems in India as like the Caste system, Untouchability and others in this Journal. He said that he profoundly believed in the Caste system, Varnashrama Dharma and the theory of incarnation. According to him, Hindu Society had been able to stand due to the foundation of the Caste system; otherwise, the base of the Indian society would not be made on granite basis. Apart from this, he said that the seeds of Swaraj were to be found in the Caste system. He said that different Castes were like different sections of military division. Each division was working for the good of the whole. A community, which could create the Caste system, must be said to possess unique power of organization. Gandhiji said that Caste had its own mechanism for spreading primary education. It could take the responsibility for the education of the children of its own caste. Apart from these, he pointed out that Caste had a political basis that could work as an electorate for a representative body. He also said that Caste could play a vital role in judicial matters by electing persons to act as judges to decide disputes among members of the same Caste. It could create a defence force to fulfill the necessity of security. Even each Caste could raise a brigade for the same. Gandhiji said that inter-dining and inter-marriage were not required for promoting national unity. Friendship of dining together did not always create solidarity. He said that the act of taking food must be done in seclusion. In fact, he did not advocate inter-dining and inter-marriage. He cited the examples of the Orthodox Vaishnava women who did not eat with the members of the family and even did not drink water from a common water pot. Therefore, he raised a question that had they no love for their family members. Apart from these, Gandhiji pointed out that Caste system could not be identified as bad due to the prohibition of inter-dining and inter-marriage between different Castes. He also noted the fact that Caste was another name for control. It could fix up the limits on enjoyment. It did not give permission to a person to cross caste limits for his enjoyment. That is why; the essence of the prohibition of inter-dining and inter-marriage between different castes was very important in this connection. Gandhiji said that the Hindu should not must give up the principle of hereditary profession that was the soul of the Caste system. According to him,

hereditary principle was an eternal principle. So it should not be changed, otherwise, it might create disorder. He was completely opposite to the direction of the Guna-Karma theory. This notion can be proved by his following comments:

"I have no use for a Brahmin if I cannot call him a Brahmin for my life. It will be a chaos if everyday a Brahmin is to be changed into a Sudra and a Sudra is to be changed into a Brahmin".[35]

Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji did not like to change the caste position of a person in the society by following the norms of the virtuous deeds and pious actions by which a person could change his previous caste position. Instead of giving importance to the essence of the theory of 'Chaturvarna', Gandhiji preached that caste system was a natural order of the Hindu society. It had been given a religious coating in India. Other countries did not realize the importance of the Caste system and were deprived for getting advantage from the Caste system. But India had been enjoying numerous advantages since the beginning from the Caste system. Gandhiji vehemently opposed to all those who were eager to destroy the Caste system. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji was a great upholder and preacher of the Caste system. He played a vital role as a great defender of the Caste system in 1922. He expressed a critical view on the issue of the Caste system on 3 February 1925. Gandhiji said that he supported the Caste system as it meant restraint. But at present it did not mean restrain, it meant limitations. To him, restraint was glorious and paved the way to achieve freedom. But limitations meant chain that binded within the circle. There was nothing commendable in castes, as they existed today. They were contrary to the tenets of the Shastras. There was infinitive number of castes. There was a bar against inter-marriage in the Caste system. It was not a condition of elevation. This was a state of fall. That is why; Gandhiji gave a way out to solve this problem. He pointed out that 'the best remedy is that small castes should fuse themselves into one big caste. There should be four such big castes so that we may reproduce the old system of four Varnas'[36]. Apart from these, Gandhiji was a great upholder of the Varna system. The old Varna system divided the ancient Indian society into four Varnas; viz. Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra. The main occupation of the Brahmins was teaching, learning, and worshiping. But the profession of the Kshatriyas was warfare. In fact, the trading was the occupation of the Vaishyas

whereas the main duty of the Sudras was to serve the other classes. Gandhiji wrote a book in Gujarathi on 'Varna Vayavastha'and explained his Varna system in the following manner:

Firstly, Gandhiji pointed out that he believed that the divisions into Varna were based on birth.

Secondly, there was nothing in the Varna system that would create obstacles for the Sudras to acquiring learning or studying military art of offence or defence. On the other side, a Kshatriya could serve. There was no bar for him in the Varna system. But it was mentioned in his Varna system that a Sudra would not make learning a way of earning a living. Even a Kshatriya would not adopt service as a way of earning a living. In the same way, a Brahmin could learn the art of war or trade and business. But a Brahmin could not make them a way of earning his living. Even a Vaishya could acquire learning or cultivating the art of war, but he could not must make them a way of earning his living.

Thirdly, the Varna system of Gandhiji was connected with the way of earning a living. A person who belonged to a particular Varna could acquire the knowledge of science or arts to become specialized in any subject that belonged to the other Varnas. There was no bar in his Varna system for any person to acquire knowledge on any subjects of the four Varnas. But a person must follow the profession of the Varna to which he belonged so far as the way of earning his living was concerned. It was nothing but a dictated prescription for a person in the Varna system of Gandhiji to follow the hereditary professions of his ancestors.

Fourthly, Gandhiji pointed out that the object of his Varna system was to prevent competition, class struggle and class war. He said that this Varna system fixed up the duties and professions of a person.

Fifthly, Gandhiji noted the fact that Varna meant the determination of a man's profession before he was born.

Sixthly, he clearly pointed out that a man had no liberty to choose his profession in this Varna system. His profession was determined for him by hereditary[37].

That is why; Ambedkar criticized the Gandhian Varna model or Caste model. Gandhian Varna model or Caste model was not based on the principle of democracy. It was completely against the principles of democracy. His arguments on these issues were completely based on irrational and impractical point of view. The first three arguments of Gandhiji were completely unscientific and irrational. According to Rousseau, 'Man is born free but everywhere he is in chain.' The Hindus bound the fourfold divisions of the society to bring under the rigid rules of chains to gauge the voice of the common people. They survived not due the existence of caste but by the conquest of the foreign invaders who did not find it necessary to kill them wholesale. The Hindus were defeated several times by the foreigners due to the lack of solidarity, mobility and unity among themselves. The chaotic condition of the Hindus was accelerated due entirely to the existence of the Caste system. They survived not by fighting but by abject surrender. They failed to organize themselves unitedly to launch a rebellion against the foreign yoke. They were bound to come under the foreign rule as slave. Naturally, they were compelled to accustom with the foreign slavery. It was happened due the existence of the Caste system. Ambedkar vehemently opposed to the way of spreading primary education and judicial judgments relating to different disputes on the line of the Gandhian social philosophy. He said that Caste was not the sole instrument to solve these problems. It was nothing but a worst method of dealing these burning issues. The notion of raising caste based military units was really utopian and fantastic. This was impossible and unthinkable due to the existence of the hereditary occupational theory. Even Gandhiji knew it very well that not a single caste based military unit in his Province of Gujarat had ever formed. It was not possible in the dynamic world. A general mobilization of the people for defence was impossible, as it required a general liquidation of the occupational theory underlying the caste system. The fifth and sixth argument of Gandhiji was totally wrong as per the content of the Vedic literature. Every member of an ideal family was filled up with love and affection although there was no system of inter-marriage among members of a family. But it did not prove that inter-dining and inter-marrying were not required to establish fraternity. Both these factors were absolutely essential in the Hindu society. But Caste system did not advocate these

notions. Naturally, inter-caste dinner and inter-caste marriage were necessary, as there were no other means of communication for binding the different castes together while in the case of a family there existed other forces to bind them together. But Gandhiji failed to realize its absolute value. So he noted inter-dining as bad, although it was capable of producing good results for the Hindu society. He was a great defender of the Caste system. Ambedkar noted him as 'a deep-dyed Hindu' and said, 'Save us from Mr. Gandhi'. Gandhian social philosophy in terms of caste was not worth much for building up moral strength. A man could not satisfy his desire for a woman who was not of his caste. It was severely followed by the caste rules. Not only that but also caste system forbade a man to take food cooked in the house of a man who was not of his caste. Actually, liberties of man and woman were wrecked in Hinduism to gauge the voice of the common people by the mechanistic way of the Caste system. But it did not forbid a man who married hundred women and kept hundred prostitutes within the ambit of his caste. Even it did not prohibit him from indulging in his appetite with his caste men to any degree. Therefore, Ambedkar criticized Gandhi's hereditary occupational theory of Caste. It did not left to the choice of an individual. The class labels were quite unnecessary and could well be eradicated altogether without causing difficulty. A person's class was known only to the service he offered to the society. But Gandhiji made the hereditary occupational theory of Caste compulsory as well as official doctrine. It was quite harmful for the society. A Brahmin sold shoes. Nobody was disturbed because he was not called Chamar. A Chamar became an officer of the State. Nobody was disturbed because he was not called a Brahmin. The whole argument was based on a misunderstanding. Another argument of Gandhiji was that Caste system was a natural system. But it was historically false. Ambedkar said that Manu Smriti showed the Caste system was a legal system maintained at the point of a bayonet. It survived due to the prevention of the peoples from the possession of arms; denying to the peoples the right to education and depriving the peoples of the right to property. Therefore, it was nothing but an imposition by the ruling classes upon the servile classes. Gandhism was opposed to democracy, as there was no difference between the basic notion of his Varna system and the Caste system. The idea of Varna was the parent of the idea of Caste. Both these ideas were evil ideas. It matters very little whether a person believed in Varna or in Caste. But the Buddhist did not believed in the Varna system and mercilessly attacked the idea of Varna whereas the Orthodox or Sanatan Vedic Hindus had no

rational defence to offer. They pointed out that Varna was founded on the authority of the Vedas. They demanded very strongly that the Vedas were infallible. So Varna was infallible. But this argument was not sure enough to save the Varna system against the rationalism of the Buddhist. This Varna idea was survived due to the philosophical foundation given to the Varna system by the Bhagvat Gita. It highlighted the fact that the Varna system was founded on the innate qualities of man. The Bhagvat Gita made use of the Sankhya philosophy to defend the Varna idea. It emphasized on innate qualities.Therefore, it can be noted that the Varna system of the Bhagvat Gita had at least two merits. Firstly, it did not say that Varna was based on birth. It said that man's Varna was fixed according to his innate qualities. Secondly, it made a special point that the profession of a person would be according to his innate qualities, not his ancestor's innate qualities. But Gandhiji gave a new interpretation regarding the Varna system. According to him, Varna was determined by birth and the occupation of a Varna was fixed up by the principle of heredity. Naturally, Varna was merely another name for Caste. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji was basically an orthodox man who made birth as the principle criteria of the Varna system brushing aside the doctrine of karma or virtuous deeds. Apart from these, the Hindu sacred law penalized the Sudras from acquiring wealth. It was nothing but a law of enforced poverty. This example was unknown in the world. But the role of Gandhiji towards this problem of the Sudras was very much interesting. He blessed them for their moral courage to give up property. He said that the Sudras served the higher castes as a matter of religious duty. They would never own any property. Even they had not the ambition to own anything. So they were deserving of thousand obeisances. That is why; the very Gods would shower down flowers on them. Gandhiji's attitude towards the scavenger was very much surprising and horrible. According to the sacred law of the Hindus, a scavenger's progeny shall live by scavenging. They were forced to do it. Gandhiji praised scavenging as the noblest service to the society with a motto to perpetuate it[38]. He said that he might share their sorrows, sufferings and affronts imposed upon them and might try to liberate themselves from those miserable conditions. He loved scavenging. So he liked to reborn as a scavenger. Ambedkar criticized the role and attitude of Gandhiji in this context because he never encouraged the scavenger to give up their traditional, inhuman and exploiting works. Besides, Gandhiji did not advise the people at this juncture to work as scavenger for their own benefits as well as cleanliness. He praised

scavenging instead of encouraging the people do their work with a motto of fixing up this work for the untouchables. He preached that scavenging was good for the Untouchables and for none else and to make them accept these onerous impositions as voluntary purposes of life. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji did not fight for their rights so that they would get chance to choose their professions, as they liked. Even they did not adopt the career of lawyer, doctor or engineer. But he encouraged them to follow their hereditary professions. Not only that but also he was not against Varna system. His Varna system was nothing but a new name for the Caste system that retained all the worst features of it. Gandhiji had killed two birds with one stone by calling the Untouchables as Harijans. To him, assimilation of the Untouchables by the Sudras was not possible. He counteracted assimilation by introducing a new name Harijan and made it impossible. They had no right to choose their profession under Gandhism. In fact, Gandhiji played a vital role to fulfill the law of caste. He remarked that caste was an anachronism[39]. But he did not say that caste was an evil as well as anathema. Gandhiji changed his attitude later on towards the issues of caste, untouchability and others due to political compulsions and other numerous reasons. He delivered a speech in Sri Lanka in 1927 regarding the message of Goutam Buddha through Mohendra to this country and pointed out that it had also to accept the humiliation of having sent him the curse of caste distinctions[40]. He noted before 1930s that caste that was the endogamous sociological category, of which there were hundreds, if not thousands, was "a handicap on progress"[41] and "a social evil"[42] and by the 1940s that it was "an anachronism"[43] which "must go[44]". He distinguished the Caste system from 'Chaturvarna', the scriptural fourfold Varna order of hereditary occupational divisions. But the critique overlooked this important matter. Gandhiji said that caste system was not observed in his own circle. He cited the example of his ashram in this context. He said that Varnavyavastha was not observed as well as executed from the beginning in the ashram due to the distinct position of the ashram from that of the society outside. Gandhiji declared in 1927 that he would not shed a tear if Varnavyavastha would go to the dogs in the removal of untouchability[45]. His first salvo attack on Varnavyavastha in April 1933 was very important. His declaration based on some authoritative texts that Varna could not be perpetuated or determined only by birth. He said, "These and numerous other verses from the Shastras unmistakeably show that mere birth counts for nothing."[46] This was first time Gandhiji attacked Varna. It did not repudiate birth as a criterion for Varna.

Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji changed his views on this issue. Gandhiji said in October 1933 before starting a tour that Jains must gave stress on the fact that their religion knew no Varnashramadharma. Even they convinced the people by telling that the present day Varnashramadharma and untouchability had no place in Jainism. But Gandhiji could not accept this view. In 1935, Gandhiji described the restrictions on inter-marriage and inter-dining imposed in relation to the Varna system as "cruel."[47] His position against the fourfold Varna system became more emphatic in 1945. He discarded some previous conceptions regarding the Varna system. The most important of them was the abolition of the hereditary occupations of the Varna system. Once he said, "Castes must go if we want to root out untouchability."[48] Although he thought that untouchability could be fought separately from caste and the fourfold Varna system. Now he veered round to Ambedkar's line on this question. He was self-contradictory on these issues from time to time. In the later phase of his political activities, Gandhiji was very much influenced by the concept of one Varna. He asked the caste Hindus to become Ati-Sudras not merely in name but in thought, word and deed[49]. Gandhiji advised the caste Hindus without any hesitation that 'today they have all to become Ati-Sudras, if the canker of caste feeling is to be eradicated from Hinduism and Hinduism was not to perish from the face of the earth'[50]. Not only that but also he pointed out that the distinctions between Harijans and caste Hindus would automatically disappear if the caste Hindus would become bhangis of their own will and various divisions and distinctions between them would go. In July 1946, Gandhiji encouraged marriages between dalits and others. He left the conceptual category of Varna implied in the Gita, both of its sociological implication and of its original connotation of fixed classes of humanity determined by birth and distinguished by four categories of occupations. He played a vital role in February 1947 to take measures for removing the foundation of the edifice of Varna distinctions and pointed out that 'Caste must go if Hinduism is to survive'. He also noted the fact that monopoly of occupations would go when all became casteless. He wrote a letter in May 1947 where he mentioned that Goutam Buddha knew no caste and stood for perfect toleration. He pointed out that Caste ought to go root and branch when the stage had come where he found Caste was a serious hindrance for further progress and gave a proposal not only for inter-dining but also for inter-marriages as the means[51].

5.3. The Ideas and Views of Ambedkar towards the Issue of Caste

Ambedkar was a symbol of revolt against all oppressive features of the Hindu society. He played a vital role to establish the concept of human rights as an emancipator that brought international recognition for him as a liberator of humanity from socio-economic injustice. He emerged as a constructive social reformer and legal philosopher in India. His social philosophy relating to caste may be discussed from his different writings and speeches. The most important among these research-oriented papers were 'Caste in India: Their mechanism, genesis and development', 'Annihilation of Caste' etc. His attitudes towards the issue of caste were clearly expressed in these writings. He took part in an International Anthropological Seminar of Dr. A. A. Goldenweizer at the Columbia University, New York, U.S.A. on 9 May 1916. He presented a paper in that Seminar on the topic of 'Caste in India: Their mechanism, genesis and development' to highlight the pernicious notion of caste and its evolution through ages. He vividly noted the mysteries of caste in a different manner and pointed out that it was theoretically and practically a critical institution in life and death. He said that if Caste exists in India, Hindus would hardly intermarry or have any social intercourse with outsiders. If Hindus migrate to other regions on earth, Indian caste would become a world problem[52]. Ambedkar made a commendable opinion on the issue of caste by criticizing the views and thoughts of well-known scholars like Senart, Nesfield, Risley and Ketkar who defined caste mentioned above in their own way. Ambedkar said that all these definitions on caste had missed the central point in the mechanism of the Caste system. None of these definitions was based on concrete, complete, or correct foundations by itself. They had done a grave mistake to define caste as an isolated unit by itself, not as a group within and with defined relations to the system of caste as a whole. All these definitions were collectively complementary to one another, each one emphasizing what had been obscured in the other. That is why; Ambedkar identified only those features common to all Castes in each of the above-mentioned definitions. He criticized the notion of Senart regarding pollution as a feature of Caste. According to him, the idea of pollution was a feature of Caste only in far as Caste had a religious flavour. It was generally originated in priestly ceremonialism to maintain purity. Priest and purity had old associates. Naturally, the relation of Caste with the idea of

pollution may be completely denied without destroying the work of Caste. Nesfield said that the growth of Caste was increased due to the non-observance of inter-dinning and inter-marring beyond the members of its class. He highlighted a new idea on the issue of Caste but had mistaken the effect for the cause. It was a self-enclosed unit and restricted social intercourse within its members. Risley made no new comments on the issue of Caste. Ketkar, a native scholar who defined Caste and paid due attention only those characteristics that were absolutely needed for the existence of a Caste system by excluding the all-secondary features of it. He emphasized on two important features of Caste, i. e. prohibition of inter-marriage and membership by autogency. However, it was nothing but the two aspects of the one and same thing. It was not at all two different things that noted by Ketkar. Actually, the prohibition of inter-marriage restricted the limited membership to those peoples who were born of within the group. Ambedkar clearly highlighted this fact and identified these two things as the obverse and reverse sides of the same medal. But Ambedkar asserted that endogamy was the only essence of caste that might be denied by some scholars on the basis of anthropological grounds. They may be cited the examples of the negroes, the whites and different tribal groups that were identified by the name of American Indians in the United States in viewing of the support of this view. But the case of India was quite different. The population of India was artificially divided into numerous fixed and definite units or Varnas or groups, each dividing group was abstained from fusing into another through the norms of endogamy. Therefore, endogamy was the only peculiar feature to Caste. That is why; Ambedkar tried to explain the gravity of endogamy to prove the genesis and the mechanism of Caste. He identified endogamy as the key to the mystery of the institution of Caste. He said that 'the superposition of endogamy on exogamy means the creation of caste so far as India is concern'.[53]. He clearly narrated the norms of exogamy and explained how exogamy was losing its efficacy with the advance of history. Only marriage was not held among the nearest blood kins. Matrimonial alliance was completely based on the principles of exogamy. Therefore, it can be said that Sapindas (blood kins) could not marry and a marriage even between the Sagotras (same class) was identified as a sacrilege. But the concept of endogamy was basically an imported custom to the people of India. Actually, exogamous was prevailed among the different Gotras in India. Even the totemic organization was connected with this social custom and it (exogamous) ultimately became a creed. In spite of the endogamy in the Caste system

within the group, nobody could deny its entity. But it was very important to note the fact that more rigorous penalties were implemented against them who was violating the norms of exogamy rather than endogamy. In fact, exogamy meant fusion and there could be no Caste if exogamy was existed as a rule of marriage. Therefore, it can be said that the creation of Caste meant the superposition of endogamy on exogamy as far as India was concerned. However, the introduction of the endogamy was creating big problems in the exogamous population of India. Naturally, we can find out the genesis, growth and development of the Caste problems in keeping and executing the preservation of endogamy against exogamy. In fact, the superposition of endogamy on exogamy had hastened the process of the creation of the Caste system. It can be noted that exogamous was the rule of all matrimonial relations before the introduction of endogamy. It was a normal trend to all groups for making a close contact with one another to assimilate, amalgamate and consolidate into a homogeneous society. That is why; it was inevitable to make a dividing line between endogamy and exogamy for creating the Institution of Caste. Naturally, the person of India was compelled to follow the norms of Caste in respect of marriage. Therefore, it was not an easy task to solve the problems of Caste, which emerged from the prohibition of inter-caste marriage. Even artificial restrictions were severely imposed on marriages of two opposite sexes within the same groups. The motto of which was to form a Caste. That is why; it was inevitable to keep a numerical equality between the marriageable units of the two opposite sexes within the same groups to make itself into a Caste. This was the only way through which an equality of such group could be kept intact in respect of endogamy; otherwise, a very large disparity was sure to break it. Therefore, the problem of Caste then ultimately centered itself into one of abolishing disparity between the two opposite sexes of marriageable units within the groups. Much parity between these two units could be realized only when a couple died at a time. It may be happened in rare case. If husband was died before wife, woman must became surplus in the society. That is why; an arrangement was made of disposing this surplus woman either through inter-marriage or she violates the norms of endogamy of the group. In the same manner, if husband survived after the death of his wife, either he might be surplus whom the group had to dispose of through the arrangement of re-marriage within the group or he had an chance to marry outside the Caste that might bring down the norms of endogamy. Naturally, both the surplus man and surplus woman created a threat to the Institution of Caste if

they were not taken care of for finding suitable partners inside their prescribed norms, otherwise they would transgress the boundary, marry outside their norms and gave birth to the offspring beyond the Caste circle. Ambedkar proposed a scheme to dispose of surplus woman in two different members to preserve the endogamy of the Caste. He criticized the norms that were applied to preserve the endogamy of the Caste by the so-called Hindu Sastras to solve the problems of the surplus women in the society. All sorts of arrangements were made by the Hindu Sastras to burn a woman on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband. This custom did not take responsibility to a deceased woman on the part of the society. Therefore, it can be said that it was nothing but a cruel, inhuman and impracticable method to solve the problem of sex disparity. Naturally, it was not fruitful in all the cases. In fact, the surplus woman (= widow) if not disposed of remained in the group, the existence of whom might be created a double danger. She had a chance to marry outside the Caste by violating the norms of endogamy or she had an option to marry within the same group of Caste. Naturally, a widow could take part in competition for re-marriage that must be reserved for the potential brides in the Caste. The existence of widow might create a menace in any case and same thing must be done to her if she would not be barred with her deceased husband. The second remedy was to enforce widowhood to a deceased woman. Ambedkar pointed out that the best solution was to burn a widow than to enforce widowhood of a deceased woman as it eliminated all the three evils; viz. , it did not create the problem of re-marriage either inside or outside the Caste. It was more practicable to enforce compulsory widowhood than to burn a deceased woman. But it was very difficult to keep in tact the morals of the group. Woman could live without doubt in widowhood but it deprived her natural right of being a legitimate wife in future that increased immoral conduct. In this way, the position and condition of a woman was brought down into the extreme ill-fated condition that did not compel her to work as a source of allurement. But the problem of surplus widower was more important and difficult than that of surplus woman in a group to make itself into a Caste. It was well known to all that man had upper hand in comparison to woman as he enjoyed a dominant position in every group. They enjoyed traditional superiority to woman. Naturally, women were forced to be victimized in all kinds of iniquitous injunctions, religious, social and economic. Therefore, the problem of surplus woman and surplus man were quite different into a Caste Institution. But the custom of burning a widower or a man with his deceased

wife was very difficult in two perspectives; firstly, it could not be done simply as he was a man. Secondly; if done caste would lose its supporters who were the asset to their groups. Ambedkar said that there remained then only two solutions that could be easily disposed of him. The role of man was very important to the group but endogamy was still more important than man was. Even the solution must be assured both these ends. Under these circumstances, he might be forced or convinced by social norms to remain as a widower for the rest of his life. This solution was not altogether much difficult as it was the general tendency of some persons to enjoy self-imposed celibacy or renounce the world and its joys. Therefore, this solution completely based on human nature that could hardly be expected to be realized. If the surplus man remained in the group as an active participator in the group activities, he must be a danger to the morals of the group. However, it failed both theoretically and practically to impose celibacy on the surplus man in the group. It was better to keep the surplus man as a Grahastha to protect the interest of the Caste. The problem was to provide a wife only by recruiting a bride from the ranks of those not yet marriageable in order to tie him down to the group. It was practically very difficult to trace out marriageable women within the groups due to their shortcomings. Naturally, it can be said that the best possible solution of this problem was to arrange a marriage between a widower and a woman of a very lower age. The numerical disparity between the two sexes were maintained under the following four principles, firstly; burning the widow with her deceased husband; secondly, compulsory widowhood – a milder form of burning; thirdly, imposing celibacy on the widower and fourthly; wedding him to a girl not yet marriageable. However, the policy of burning the widow and imposing celibacy on the widower were doubtful to preserve endogamy. All the above-mentioned policies practically operated to protect Caste Institution. Some scholars pointed out that Caste and endogamy was one and the same thing. Ambedkar analyzed the general mechanism of a caste in this way in a system of castes. Naturally, we have to scrutinize the solution how the Hindus arrived at to meet the problems of the surplus man and surplus woman. Although it was complex, yet the Hindus presented the following three singular uxorial customs:

Firstly; Sati or the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband.

Secondly; Enforced widowhood by which a widow was not permitted to re-marry.

Thirdly: Girl marriage.

Apart from these, it was generally observed to become Sannyasa among the widows. It was completely happened due to the psychic disposition. There was no scientific explanation given by the scholars even today regarding the origin of these customs. A number of philosophies were established to tell us why these customs were honoured but nothing to tell us the causes of their origin and existence. Ambedkar said that he did not know why compulsory widowhood was honoured. Even he did not find out any one who sang in praise of it though they adhered to it. He said that they were needed to create the structure of caste and the motto of its philosophies was to popularize them. That is why; he said that Sati, enforce widowhood and girl marriage were customs that were urgently needed to solve the problem of the surplus man and surplus woman in a caste and to protect its endogamy. However, endogamy could not be preserved without these customs and caste without endogamy was a fake. There raised a question about the genesis of caste after explaining the mechanism of the creation and preservation of Caste in India. Endogamy was the only characteristic of Caste and he said Origin of Caste meant The Origin of the Mechanism for Endogamy. A Caste was an Enclosed Class. That is why; we have to know what was the class that first made itself into a caste. Actually, caste and class were the next-door neighbours to each other and it was only a span that separated the two. All these customs were rigidly obtainable only in one caste, i. e., the Brahmins. They occupied the highest place in the social hierarchy of the Hindu society. Naturally, the strict observance of these customs and the social superiority arrogated by the priestly class in all ancient civilizations were sufficient to prove that they were the originators of this 'unnatural institution' founded and maintained through these unnatural means. Ambedkar explained how did the institution of caste spread among the rest of the non-Brahmin population of the country. He said that the two questions of spread and of origin of caste were not separated and different. Some scholars generally believed that the caste system was imposed upon the docile population of India by a lawgiver as a divine dispensation, or it had grown normally by some laws of social growth to the Indian people. According to the Western scholars, various castes were formed in India due to the occupation, survivals of tribal organizations, and the rise of new belief, crossbreeding and migration. Ambedkar said that all these factors were complementary to each other. Matthew Arnold identified them as 'the grand name without the grand thing in it.' Sir Denzil Ibbetson, Mr. Nesfield and H. Risley propagated some theories on Caste. According to Nesfield, 'function and function

only . . . was the foundation upon which the whole system of Castes in India was built up. Castes in India were functional or occupational that was a very poor discovery. He explained the process of transformation of an occupational group that turned into an occupational caste. Ambedkar noted that the Hindu society like the other societies was made of classes. These classes in India are identified as the priestly class (Brahmins), the military class (Kshatriya), the merchant class (Vaishya) and the artisan and menial class (Sudras). A qualified person could change his class in the class structure of the society. But the Brahmins socially detached themselves in the course of time from the rest of the Hindu population through the closed-door policy in the course of time that accelerated the process of the formation of caste by itself. The other classes being subject to the law of social division of labour underwent differentiation, some into large, others into very minute groups. The Vaishya and Sudra classes were the original inchoate plasma that made the genesis of the numerous castes of today. The sub-division of a society was quite natural in the open door policy of the class system. But they ultimately lost its open door character and became self-enclosed units and known as castes. It was generally said that they were bound to close their doors to become endogamous or they closed themselves by their own accord. Ambedkar specify the matter and pointed out that some closed the door and others found it closed against them. One was psychological interpretation whereas other was mechanistic. Both these explanation were complementary and necessary to explain the phenomena of caste-formation in its entity. Ambedkar gave psychological interpretation for the creation of these sub-divisions or classes and noted the name of the Brahmins who created the system of self-enclosed endogamy that ultimately became a fashion in the Hindu society. All the non-Brahmin classes ultimately transformed themselves into endogamous castes. They whole-heartedly imitated the self-enclosed and endogamous Brahmins. In fact, the infection of imitation upon the non-Brahmins played a vital role for the formation of Castes. According to Gabriel Tarde, there are three laws of imitation[54] as follows:

Firstly, imitation flows from the higher to the lower. If the nobility got opportunity, they tried to imitate always and everywhere its leaders and its kings, likewise the people intimated the nobility. Secondly, the intensity or extent of imitation varies inversely in proportion to distance. This law of the imitation of the nearest, of the least distant, explains the gradual and consecutive feature of the spread of an example

that has been set by the higher social ranks. Ambedkar asserted that caste was formed by imitation. There were two types of conditions for the imitation. First, the particular source of imitation must be prestigious in the group of the society. Secondly, there must be 'numerous and daily relations' among members of a group. There was little reason to doubt that these two conditions of imitation were present in India. However, it was irony of fate that the ignorant people imitated the inhuman, unnatural, unscientific social norms and verdict of the caste system without justifying and considering its real necessity, impartiality and goodness of humanity in the society that created by the so-called Brahmins. Actually, it was not possible for frail humanity. Thirdly, there was another important way to make out the mentality and attitude of non-Brahmin classes for their imitation towards those customs that hastened the process of the formation of the structure of caste in its nascent days until in the course of history; it became embedded in the Hindu mind. Only the status of a caste in the Hindu society varies directly with the extent of the observance of the customs of Sati, enforced widowhood and girl marriage. Naturally, the imitation theory of Gabriel Tarde has to be applicable relating to 'distance' model in the context of the caste formation in India. They have imitated with strict observance the above noted three customs those who are the nearest castes to the Brahmins. But the less nearest castes to the Brahmins have imitated the enforced widowhood and girl marriage; others, a little further off, have only girl marriage and those furthest off have imitated only the belief in the caste principle. Naturally, it can be said that the whole process of caste-formation in India is a process of imitation of the higher by the lower. The non-Brahmins imitated those social customs from one original caste, i. e., the Brahmins whose socio-religious status and position were very high and unquestionable in the-then society. They closed the door due to their weakness. As a result, others those who were closed out, were closed. This was nothing but the mechanistic process of the formation of caste. Some reputed scholars have identified caste as a unit, not as one within a system of caste. Ambedkar strongly asserted that caste in the singular number is impossible or an unreality. It exists only in the plural number. The Brahmins made themselves into a caste by creating non-Brahmin caste as closed out. If an X group willingly becomes endogamous, Y group has to be so by the constant pressures of inevitable circumstances. That is why; it can be noted that castes are enclosed units. It is then conspiracy with clear conscience that compels the excommunicated to make them into a Caste. The penalty of violating caste norms is

excommunication that gives birth to the formation of a new caste. Some unfortunate groups find themselves as enclosed whereas others are closed them out. In this process caste were creating in the so-called Hindu society. According to Dr.Ketkar, 'All the princes whether they belonged to the so-called Aryan race, or the so-called Dravidian race, were Aryas. Whether a tribe or a family was racially Aryan or Dravidian was a question, which never troubled the people of India, until foreign scholars came in and began to draw the line. The colour of the skin had long ceased to be a matter of importance'[55]. Ambedkar scientifically explained the pros and cons of the future of the Hindu caste system and strongly uphold the view that it is almost impossible to be sustained caste as it rests on belief. He traced out the following four main points on the issues of Caste:

a. There is a deep cultural unity in spite of the composite diversity of the Hindu population.
b. Caste is a parceling into bits of a larger cultural unit.
c. There was one caste to begin with.
d. Classes have become Castes through imitation and excommunication.

Apart from these, Ambedkar was cordially invited to preside the Annual Conference of the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal of Lahore in 1936. He was very much encouraged to know the honest purpose of the emerging intelligentsia those who were the vital members of that Conference. Most of the members of this Organization Committee were either social reformers or big political figures under the banner of the Indian National Congress. Their main motto was to reform the society. That is why; Ambedkar got opportunity for the first time to deliver a presidential speech in the Conference that was completely arranged mainly by the so-called high caste Hindus. He was repeatedly requested to prepare a fruitful speech on this occasion. Being interested as a Dalit leader, Ambedkar prepared a thought provoking research-oriented paper on 'Annihilation of Caste'. He did hard work and cherished a dream to reform the Hindu society. He came forward to help them in connection with social reform. But the content of his presidential speech was completely unbearable to the leaders of the Conference of the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal. So he could not get chance to deliver a lecture on the issue of the 'Annihilation of Caste' due to the sudden cancellation of this Conference. He was very shocked by this incident and ultimately he made necessary arrangement to publish his presidential speech in different languages. As a result, it was published in the title of 'Annihilation of Caste' by his

own initiative in different languages as like, English, Gujarati, Tamil, Marathi, Punjabi, Malayalam, and Hindi that stirred the very mind set up of the upper caste Hindus. He raised different questions relating to caste and expressed his views and thoughts to solve the question of caste. He noted the ill-fated age-old socio-religious conditions of the ill-fated low caste peoples in India. He stressed on the annihilation of caste in India due to uplift their basic conditions, civic demands and urged for the protection of their human rights in all sphere of their individual as well as national life. He explained the role of the social reformers and criticized their caste interest that kept in tact the norms of the caste institution. They came forward to reform the Hindu society only in the context of Sati or the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband, enforced widowhood by which a widow was not permitted to re-marry and Girl marriage. Naturally, they did not deal at all until that date with the question of the 'Annihilation of Caste'. He knew it very well that the Brahmins were authorized by the Shastras to act as a Guru for the three Varnas. Even the learned Antyaja had no rights to act as a Guru. That is why; he was very much surprised to know the daring decisions of the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal for selecting him as a President of that Conference by violating the Shastric injunction in selecting the President. He had no intention to ascend the platform of the Hindus on the issues of castes and social reforms. He expressed his views on those issues from his own platform. However, he agreed to attend that Conference for the sake of humanity, social reforms and benefit of the toiling masses in India. Most of the social reformers in India were belonged either to the upper caste political-minded groups or to religiously orthodox-minded groups. Naturally, the question of social reform was remained unsolved in the Hindu society. Ambedkar urged for the abolition of caste and explained critically and scientifically the nature of religion and politics on the issue of social reforms specially relating to caste. He put the following questions to the members of the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal:

i. ***How to bring about the reform of the Hindu social order?***

ii. How to abolish Caste?

iii. Is your prescription the right prescription for the disease?

iv. Why a large majority of Hindus does not inter-dine and do not inter-marry?

v. Why is it that your cause is not popular?

Ambedkar criticized the role and attitude of the Political Reform Party of the Indian National Congress. It was completely engaged to remove political weakness whereas Social Reform Party was very much busy to remove social evils that were imposed by age-old religious traditions, which wrecked the civil rights and privileges of the low caste peoples in India. They urged for social reforms before political reforms whereas the Political Reform Party encouraged for political reforms as on urgent basis before the social reforms. Congress and its leaders supported the works of the Political Reform Party. Naturally, the Social Reform Party became weak and began to work under the banner of the Social Conference. Therefore, it was irony of fate that most of the educated Hindus came forward for political reforms without considering the basic needs and demands of the ill-fated low caste peoples. He criticized the views of W.C.Banerjee on the issues of social reforms who delivered his speech on those issues as a President in the eight Annual Conference of the Indian National Congress in 1892. He raised a question about the views expressed by Mr. Banerjee in that Conference. Mr. Banerjee said that he had no patience with those who said that they should not be fit for political reform until they reform their social system. He did not find out any connection between the two. He said that their widows remained unmarried; their girls were given marriage earlier than in other countries; their wives and daughters could not accompany them at their friend's house; they did not send their daughters to Oxford and Cambridge etc. It seemed to him that these would not be the causes of their backwardness for political reforms. Ambedkar told those who believed in the importance of social reform to ask, 'Was the argument of Mr. Banerjee on the issues of social reforms final? Did it prove that the victory went those who were in the right? Did it prove conclusively that social reform had no bearing on political reform? Ambedkar noted other facts to make out the gravity and importance of the social reforms. He realized the essence of social reforms. That is why; he indirectly challenged the arguments of Mr. Banerjee on the issues of social reforms by putting an example of burning social issues relating to the case of the untouchables in Maratha. Ambedkar mentioned the ill-fated social conditions in different regions of the untouchables. He especially cited the example of the untouchables in Maratha who were forcefully bound to follow the following social norms during the reign of the Peshwas in Maratha:

"The untouchables were not allowed to use the public streets when the Hindus traveled in the street. Their shadow was treated as impure or pollute. So they were strictly prohibited to travel in the roads due to keep in tact the purity of the Hindus. They had to wear black thread either on his wrist or in his neck as a sign or a mark. It was severely maintained by them due to protect the Hindus from getting themselves polluted by their touch through mistake. They had to keep a sweep in their waist (komor) to clean the roads used by them in Poona, the capital of the Peshwa. It was done due to safe from impurity in the journey of the Hindus in the same route. They had to carry an earthen pot in Poona by hanging in their neck wherever they went for holding their spit. It was strictly followed, as their spit on earth should pollute the Hindus who might unknowingly happen to walk on it[56]. Besides, Ambedkar cited the example of the Balais, an untouchable community in Central India who were tyrannized and oppressed by the Hindus. The high caste Hindus introduced severe rules for the Balais. All the high caste Hindus (Kalotas, Rajputs, Brahmins, Patels and Patwaris) of different villages of Kanaria, Bicholi-Hafsi, Bicholi-Mardana and almost 15 other villages in the Indore district asked the Balais of their respective villages to give confirmation for their following 8th prescribed norms if they liked to live among them :

1. Balais must not wear gold-lace-bordered Pugrees.

2. They must not wear dhotis with coloured or fancy borders.

3. They must convey intimation of the death of any Hindu to relatives of the deceased – no matter how far away these relatives may be living.

4. In all Hindu marriages, Balais must play music before the processions and during the marriage.

5. Balai women must not wear gold or silver ornaments; they must not wear fancy gowns or jackets.

6. Balai women must attend all cases of confinement of Hindu women.

7. Balais must render services without demanding remuneration and must accept whatever a Hindu is pleased to give.

8. If the Balais do not agree to abide by these terms they must clear out of the villages."[57]

But the Balais refused to follow their prescribed rules. As a result, the high caste Hindus became cruel and angry with them. So the Balais were prohibited to take water from the village wells and let go their cattle to graze. It was declared that they would not go to their land through the land owned by a Hindu. Even the Hindus used

the Balais land for cattle grazing. So the Balais submitted petitions to the Darbar against these inhuman measures of the high caste Hindus. But they could not get help against these continuous oppressions in time. Naturally, the Balais were compelled to abandon their ancestral homeland with their wives and children and migrated to adjoining States, namely, to villages in Dhar, Dewas, Bagli, Gwalior etc.

Apart from these, Ambedkar cited another example of the Kavitha in Gujarata. The upper caste Hindus in Kavitha ordered the untouchables not to send their children to the common village school that maintained by the Government. They assaulted even the untouchable women who used the metal pots at Zanu village of Ahmedabad district in Gujarat. An untouchable of Chakwara in Jaipur State arranged to give a dinner to his fellow untouchables of the village as an act of religious piety. But the Hindus came there with lathis and assaulted the host and the guests to serve ghee (butter) in occasion. After putting these examples, Ambedkar reminded the dogma of Mill to the Congressmen that 'one country is not fit to rule another country must admit that one class is not fit to rule another class'. That is why, Ambedkar raised a question whether the Hindus were fit for political powers or not. The Hindus did not like to allow the untouchables, a large class of the society to use public schools, public wells and public streets. They did not permit them to take any food as they like. Even the untouchable women could not use precious ornaments. Naturally, how did the Hindus expect to rule the countrymen who liked to wreck the civil rights and privileges of the low caste people in India? No caste is fit to rule another caste. Both are equally complementary. Therefore, they have to rule the countrymen with mutual understanding and honourable conditions. The Social Reform Party fought for the abolition of the caste system along with other social evils whereas the Political Reform Party mainly dealt with the problems of the widow re-marriage, Sati system, child marriage etc. Most of the enlightened Hindus were the active supporters of the Political Reform Party who did not feel the necessity for agitating for the abolition of the Caste system. They had not any courage to move against it. But Social Reform Party felt the necessity of the reorganization and the reconstruction of the Hindu Society. Naturally, the enlightened people of India did not put the break-up of the Caste System as an agenda in their social reforms policy. That is why, Social Reform Party lost its importance. But Ambedkar clearly noted the fact that political reform can not precede social reform in the sense of reconstruction of society. Ferdinand

Lassalle, a friend and co-worker of Karl Marx pointed out that the makers of political constitutions must take account of social forces. He said before the Prussian audience in 1862, "The constitutional questions are in the first instance not questions of right but questions of might. The actual constitution of a country has its existence only in the actual condition of force which exists in the country: hence political constitutions have value and permanence only when they accurately express those conditions of forces which exist in practice within a society."[58] Apart from these, Ambedkar cited the example of the 'Communal Award' in British India. According to him, the significance of it lies in the fact that political constitution must take note of social organization. The politicians who denied the gravity of the social problem in India were bound to reckon with the social problem in devising the constitution. In fact, the 'Communal Award' was so to say the nemesis following upon the indifference and neglect of social reform. He also noted the instance of Ireland. Mr. Redmond tried to make negotiation between the representatives of Ulster and Southern Ireland due to bring Ulster in a Home Rule Constitution common to the whole of Ireland and said to the representatives of Ulster, "Ask any political safeguards you like and you shall have them". They replied, "Damn your safeguards, we don't want to be ruled by you on any terms."[59] That is why; the emerging intelligentsia of India who blamed the minorities in India ought to consider what would have happened to the political aspirations of the majority if the minorities had taken the attitude, which Ulster took. The Ulster took this attitude because there was a social problem between Ulster and Southern Ireland the problem between Catholics and Protestants, essentially a problem of Caste. There was a social problem of Caste between Catholics and Protestants that prevented the solution of the political problem. Ambedkar also cited the example of Rome to realize the gravity of social reform. He said that there was a strong similarity about the content of the 'Communal Award' and the essence of the Republican Constitution of Rome. The kingly power was divided between the Consuls and the Pontifex Maximus after the abolition of kingship in Rome. The secular authority of the king was given to the Consuls, while the religious authority of the king was given to the latter. Under this Republican Constitution, there was a provision to provide two Consuls, one Consul from Patrician and other from Plebian. This Constitution had also provided that, of the Priests under the Pontifex Maximums, half were to be Plebeians and the other half Patricians. Therefore, it can be said that the Constitution of Republican Rome had to take account of the social

division between the Patricians and the Plebeians, who formed two distinct castes. Naturally, the political reformers could not ignore the problem arising out of the prevailing social order during the making of a constitution. The reflections of the social and political problems were inevitable in the political constitution. Even political revolutions had always been preceded by social and religious revolutions. The religious Reformation of Martin Luther was the precursor of the political emancipation of the European people. Puritanism was a religious movement that led to the establishment of political liberty in England and won the war of American Independence. The religious and social revolution of Goutam Buddha led to the political revolution during of Chandragupta Maurya. The political revolution of the Sikhs was preceded by the religious and social revolution led by Guru Nanak. The political revolution led by Shivaji was preceded by the religious and social reform brought about by the saints of Maharashtra. Not only that but also Ambedkar critically examine the vitality and importance of different sources as like polity, economy, society and religion in order to understand the key strength of the source of power. Some scholars pointed out from the Marxist point of view that labour is the master of wealth in the universe. They are the key architect of the source of economic power and economy is the only unquestionable source of mastery in power in the universe. Some scholars pointed out from the Socialist point of view that Socialist Economy must bring equality, liberty and fraternity to establish more tranquility in the world. The Socialists are trying to apply the economic interpretation of history to the facts of India. According to them, the activities and aspirations of man are tied up by economic facts only and property is only source of power. They uphold theory of economic reform that is the precedence of any kind of reform. However, some renowned personalities marked politics as the master key of all source of power in the world. Many experts identified religion as the source of power. According to some reputed scholars as like Ambedkar etc., religion and society itself work together as the key partner of all source of power in the society in India. They cited the example of India in this context. The forces of polity and economy did not precede the social essence of the Indian masses in respect of their individual as well as national life. That is why; the essence of the socio-religious sources are the key factors of power that should be consider in connection with the strength of polity and economy which could not bring radical change in Indian society. The social status of an individual by itself often becomes a source of power and authority by which the Mahatmas

established their unquestionable authoritative influence over the common people. The social credibility of the Sadhus and Fakirs attract the millionaires in India to obey them. They become the inevitable source of inspiration to the common people and its social influence act as an undisputed source of power and authority. Millions of paupers in India go to Benares and Mecca by selling their only precious wealth to satisfy their aspiration. It is clear in Indian history that religion is the source of power. Even the priests hold the sway and influence over the common people than the magistrate. Beside, Ambedkar cited the case of the Plebians of Rome as an example of the power of religion over man. He pointed out very clearly that you cannot have political reform; you can not have economic reform, unless you kill the monster of the concept of the Caste and its institutions. The defenders of the Caste System pointed out that another name of the Caste System is the division of labour. The caste system is not merely division of labour. It is also a division of labourers. Ambedkar said that it is not only a division of labourers but also it is quite different from the theory of the division of labour. It is a hierarchy in which the divisions of labourers are unequally graded one from the other. It is not spontaneous division of labourers. It is completely depended upon the social status and position of an individual's ancestors. An individual has no liberty to change its professions, as he likes. Caste rules compel everybody to remain in the circle of the division of labour as it prescribed. Therefore, it can be noted that caste is a harmful institution as an economic organization as it restrict man's natural choice.

Besides, the ethnologists expressed their views that men of pure race exist nowhere. There has been a mixture of all races in all parts of the world. D.R.Bhandarkar noted the same view. He said that 'there is hardly a Class or Caste in India which has not a foreign strain in it... Even the Brahmins are not free from foreign elements'. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the idea of maintaining purity of race and purity of blood by the notion of Caste propagated by the so-called Orthodox Hindus or Brahmins is completely based on false philosophical analysis. Ambedkar supported both these views. The existence of Caste and Caste consciousness has served to keep the memory of past feuds between castes green and has prevented solidarity. To Ambedkar, liberty, equality and fraternity should be the basic elements of an ideal society. He vehemently opposed and criticized to the notion of Chaturvarna that leveled the man of the society into so-called for divisions which was completely

irrational, inhumane and illogical. It is nothing but a snare to preserve the notion of birth-based Caste system. He highlighted the military service, suffering and education as physical weapon, political weapon and moral weapon respectively. These three weapons had never been with held by the strong from the weak in Europe. All these weapons were denied to the common people in India's by Chaturvarna theory that deadened, paralyzed and crippled the people from helpful activity. Ambedkar also noted the fact that nation cannot be build up within the parametric existence of the Caste system. The presence of the Caste system made it impossible to make integrated Indian Nation. The evils and harmful influence of the Caste system accelerated pace of disintegrated India. Therefore, India as a Nation can be made after the eradication of the Caste system in the true sense of the term, otherwise not. He gave some proposals to abolish it from the practical point of view. The first step of his scheme was to introduce the implementation of inter-caste marriage for the eradication of the Caste system. This was his basic remedial concept behind it. The good intention of inter-dinning and inter-caste marriage might be accelerated the process of the abolition of the Caste system. He said that Caste is nothing but a mental condition of a man. It was the out come of abnormal psychological mentality and behaviour of the so-called orthodox Brahmins and Hindus. The core of the Caste system was the fundamental elements of the Hindu religion. So the Hindus believed Caste system and religion. But Ambedkar did not blame the peoples who believed in the Caste system. He did not identify them as enemies. But he said that the Shastras were the source of common enemy which taught them to follow this religion of Caste. The second proposal for remedial measures of Ambedkar was to destroy the belief in the sanctity of the Shastras. He criticized the role of the reformers who moved for the abolition of untouchability. They did not estimate the inculcated influence created into the minds of the common people by the Shastras. Naturally, the people would not change their conduct until they would come forward to cease to believe in the Sanctity of the Shastras as because their conduct was formed on the basis of the Shastras. So every man and woman should come forward to make inter-dine and inter-marry if they would want to be freed from the thralldom of the Shastras, cleanse their minds of the pernicious notions that based on the Shastras without asking them to do so. He asked the reformers to discard and deny the authority of the Shastras on the line of Goutam Buddha, Guru Nanak and others that created the notion about the sacredness of Caste into their minds. Therefore, the reformers should come forward to

show that courage. Some religious believes gave birth to the notion of sacredness in Caste. It had the sanctity of the Shastras. Its instruction can not be disobeyed without committing sin. It has a divine basis. That is why; the people of India should destroy the sacredness and divinity with which Caste has been invested. They should destroy the authority of the Shastras and the Vedas. Ambedkar proposed the way of destroying Caste in these ways. He said that the Brahmins would not come forward to destroy the Caste system as because it perpetuated their authority since the inception. It is well known to all that a revolutionary is not the kind of man who becomes a Pope. On the other hand a man who becomes a Pope has no wish to be a revolutionary. So the Brahmins had no wish to become a revolutionary to change the society. A Pope has no wish to become a revolutionary; a man who is born a Brahmin has much less desire to become a revolutionary. To Ambedkar, "In every country the intellectual class is the most influential class, if not the governing class. The intellectual class is the class, which can foresee, it is the class, which can advise and give lead. . . . The intellectual class in India is simply another name for the Brahmin caste . . . . Which has regarded itself the custodian of the interest of that caste, rather than of the interests of the country?"[60] Ambedkar opposed to the myth of the Brahmin Gods on earth. He discussed very critically how and why the Hindus were intentionally taught about the Brahmins as Bhudevas (Gods on earth.). He said that a people should not believe the Brahmins as most of them were either selfish or autocrat for their Caste interest. The Brahmins were the chief architect of the Caste system and they institutionalized it for the benefit of their Caste interest. They established their unchallenging authority in the Contest of the Shastras and gave Shastric explanation to uphold it in perpetuity. Not only that but also they were identified themselves as the only medium of instruction of unknown or unwritten subjects on religion or society. All these factors were responsible to contradict the role of the Brahmins as an emancipator from the thralldom of the Caste system. Even Manu gave an explanation to support this view. Manu said, "If it be asked how it should be with respect to points of the Dharma which have not been specially mentioned, the answer is that which Brahmins who are Shishthas propound shall doubtless have legal force."[61] Ambedkar confidently pointed out that the Brahmins who always tried to keep the rest of the community in its grips by hook and cook to establish their unquestionable authority and supremacy in the so-called Hindu society, polity, economy, religion etc. that were opposed to the reform of Caste. Naturally, the

social reform movement if they would like to start they did not come forward to agendise the eradication the Caste system. Apart from these, Ambedkar gave a logical explanation about the causes that made the destruction of the Caste system impossible. He said that the destruction of the Caste system would not possible by the Marxian economic explanation or interpretation as well as the concept of the Proletariat dictatorship in India due to the existence of the Caste system. He identified different causes behind it. As Caste divided men into various distinctive communities that were in equally graded to each other in the context of the social status and position. Each Caste was arranged in a graded order one above the other to feel pride and its consolidation to remain in the prescribed social position in the Caste circle. As per the superior or inferior status and position of a person in the Caste arena social, religious rights and privileges and Sanskaras were assigned by the verdict of the Caste institution. A person who belonged to superior grade of a Caste could enjoy greater the number of these rights and privileges than the lower or lesser-graded peoples. Therefore, it can be noted that this scaling of creating unequal gradation of Castes among the different communities that made it impossible to organize a common front against the Caste system. Naturally, the Brahmins did not allow the rights to interdine or inter-marry with another Caste that would create a death trap of them. According to them, all are slaves of the Caste system who are not equal in status. Karl Marx excited the proletariat to bring about an economic revolution by telling them that they had nothing to lose except their chains. But the artful way in which the social and religious rights were given among the different Castes whereby some have more or some have less, made the slogan of the Karl Marx quite unless to excite the Hindus against the Caste system. A graded system of sovereignties, high and low was created by the Caste Institution that were jealous of their status and which know that if a general dissolution came, some of them stand to close more of their prestige and power than others do. It is impossible to mobilize the Hindus for the eradication of the Caste Institution. Ambedkar said that the Hindus never tried to discard caste as being contrary to reason. They were basically the followers of the verdict of the Caste Institution that was created and propagated by the ancient lawmakers of different socio-religious law books or Shastras. Manu said that a Hindu must follow Veda, Smriti or Sadachar. He can not follow anything else. According to the Shastras, a Hindu is not free to use his reasoning faculty, he was strictly forbidden to use his reasoning in the examining of the question of Varna and Caste but they

have directed to take care to see that no occasion is left to examine in a rational way the foundations of his beliefs in Caste and Varna. The Hindus break Caste for their gain at one step but proceeded to observe it at the next without raising any question as per the directions of the Shastras to maintain Caste as far as possible and to undergo Prayaschitta when they could not. Naturally, the theory of compromise for a perpetual lease of life was maintained by the way of Prayaschhita. So the Shastras gave a verdict to follow a spirit of compromise if necessary to maintain Caste rules. According to the theory of Prayschhitta, the Shastras had given Caste a perpetual lease of life and had smothered reflective thought that would have otherwise led to the destruction of the notion of Caste. Ramanuja, Kabir and other great saints had tried to abolish Caste and Untouchability. Therefore, the Hindus tried to show act as reformer following their line of thinking. But Manu gave directions to the Hindus to follow the norms of Sadachar that gave higher place than Shastras. Whether it is Dharma or Adharma in accordance with Shastras, contrary to Shastras, must be followed. It was very interesting to note the fact that Smritis directed the Hindus in unmistakable terms not to follow even Gods in their good deeds, if they are contrary to Shruti, Smriti and Sadachar. That is why; Ambedkar said that the main motto behind it was to deprive the true Reformers of using these two powerful weapons, viz. Reason and Morality. So it can not be denied that Reason and Morality are the two most powerful weapons in the armoury of a Reformer. They took all sorts of steps to deprive their powers for using these two weapons. Naturally, people could not break up the Caste system as they are not free to consider whether it connected with morality or reasons. The Brahmins built up a well decorated mechanized as well as impregnable wall around the Caste that is well nigh impossible to break down. That is why; Ambedkar gave directions to apply the dynamite to the Vedas and the Shastras that deny any part to reason to Vedas and Shastras that deny any part of morality. Therefore, you must destroy the Religion of the Smritis and the Shrutis. Nothing else will avail. Ambedkar considered this view in this way. Ambedkar asserted to abolish Hindu religion due to many reasons. Firstly; Ambedkar said that the Hindu religion banned responsibility which was the essence of a truly religious act. Ha said that religion should not be a matter of rules. It must be a matter of principles only. The principle may be wrong but the act is conscious and responsible. The rule may be right but the act is mechanical. Secondly, the Hindu Religion is nothing but a set of rules. According to the Varna of the Vedas and the Smritis, the Hindu Religion is

nothing but a mass sacrificial, social, political and sanitary rules and regulations all mixed up. It is nothing but a multitude of commands and prohibitions. Thirdly; the concept of Religion, in the sense of spiritual principles, truly universal, applicable to all races, to all countries, to all times,. But it is not to be found in the Hindu Religion. Fourthly; the term Dhjarma is used in the Vedas in most cases as religious ordinances or rites. Jaimini defined dharma in the Purva-Mimansa as 'a desirable goal or result that is indicated by injunctive (Vedic) passages.' But the Hindus identified Religion as law or at best legalized class-ethics. These codes of ordinances are identified as Religion. Ambedkar said that this code of ordinances mis-represented to the people of India as Religion that deprieved the moral life of freedom, spontaneity. Therefore, it can be said that Hindu Religion is nothing but a mixture of rules. But the worst evil of this code of ordinances is that the laws it contains must be same yesterday, today and for ever. These ordinances are iniquitous introduced by the so-called intellectual classes or the Brahmin Prophets or law-makers for the lower classes or castes of the Hindu society. But they are freed from all these ordinances. The main objectionable part of this code of ordinances is that it had been invested with the character of finality and fixity. Ambedkar urged for the destruction of such a religion. He also said that the dounden duty of the common people to tear the mask to remove the mis-directed as well as mis-instructed ordinances that as created/ caused by wrong identification this law as Religion. That is why; it is the duty of all to clear the wrong conception of Religion from their mind set up and to enable the common people to discover the real meaning of Religion. He said that the Hindu Religion is not Religion but it is really the law introduced by some ancient sages. So you will be in a position to amendment or abolish the so-called laws or ordinances of the Hindus if you will able to find out the real meaning of Religion in the true sense of the terms. The people who believe it as Religion, they will not come forward to change these laws. It is the general said that Religion is not associated with the idea of change. All know it very well that the idea of law is associated with the concept of change. When they get opportunity to know it that what is called Religion is rally law, old and archaic, then they will be prepare them for change, for people know and accept that law can be changed. Not only that but also Ambedkar strongly condemned a Religion of Rules. But he advocated the essence of a true religion. A true Religion is completely based on principles. The main motto of a true Religion is to establish the concept of humanity, equality and so on among its followers. According to Burke, "True

Religion is the foundation of society, the basis on which all true Civil Governments rests and both their sanction." Ambedkar agreed with this view of Burke. So he gave a proposal to reform the Rules of the Brahmanical Hindu Religion. That is why; Ambedkar cited the following cardinal items to reform this Hindu society[62].

Firstly, there should be only one unanimously accepted and recognized standard religious book of the so-called Brahmanical Hindu Religion. He demanded to abandon all other religious books that were identified as sacred and authoritative by law, such as Vedas, Shastras and Puranas. Ambedkar not only demanded the abolition of these authoritative books but also the propagation of any doctrine, religious or social contained in these books should be legally penalized.

Secondly, Ambedkar strongly demanded the abolition of the Priesthood from among the Hindus. He also pointed out that Priesthood must be banned as hereditary if it would be impossible. He demanded that every person of a Hindu Religion must be given the rights to act as a priest and only law should do it. Apart from these, he gave another proposal that no Hindu should be called a priestn unless he had passed an examination prescribed by the Stateband a Sanad should be issued from the State permitting him to practice.

Thirdly, he said that a priest must have to State Sanad with him to perform ceremony as a priest; otherwise, law to act as a priest should penalize him.

Fourthly, a priest must have to play the role of a servant of the State. He must have to bring under the subject of disciplinary action of the State in connection with his morals, beliefs and worships. He must be a subject with other citizens to the ordinary law of the State, Country.

Fifthly, Ambedkar proposed that the number of priest must be limited as per the requirements of the State by law as like the case of the I.C.S. He also said that law regulates every occupation like Lawyer, Doctor, and Engineer etc. Even everybody those who belonging to these professions must have to show their proficiency before they are permitted to practice their occupations. They must have to obey the law of the land civil as well as criminal. Even they must have to obey the special code of

morals prescribed by their respective professions. However, the priest has not required showing their proficiency. Their profession is not a subject to any code. They are not prohibiting entering a Hindu Temple to worship the Hindu God in spite of their numerous physical diseases as like syphilis or gonorrhea etc. It is enough to be born in a priestly class. The priestly class always get chance to enjoy numerous rights and privileges without performing their duties. That is why; Ambedkar gave a proposal to bring these priestly classes under rigid control by some strict legislation that will prevent them from doing mischief and from mis-guiding people. Naturally, this policy will democratize to depute a priest by throwing it open to everyone. It will certainly help to annihilate Caste system and Brahmanism. He said that Brahmanism is the poison that has spoiled Hinduism. He proposed that you would succeed in saving Hinduism if you will kill Brahmanism. Therefore, you should must come to re-modeling your Religion based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity in connection with democracy either from foreign sources or from Upanishads. It means a complete change in the fundamental notions of life like values of life, outlook or attitude towards men and things. That is why; Ambedkar asked to discard the authority of the Shastras and destroy the religions of the Shastras.

Sixthly, Ambedkar pointed out that the Hindus must examine their religion and their morality in terms of their survival value. They must consider whether they conserve the whole of their social heritage or select what is helpful and transmit to future generations only that much and no more. The principle that makes little of the present act of living and growing naturally looks upon the present as empty and upon the future as remote. Such a principle is inimical to progress and is an obstacle to a strong and a steady current of life.

Seventhly, Ambedkar advised the caste Hindus to accept and recognize the changing situation as change is the law of life for individuals as well as for society. Everything is changeable. There is nothing sanatan (pre-existing), fixed or eternal. Therefore, the caste Hindus should come forward to change their way of life for the betterment of the society and the nation.

Therefore, it can be noted that Ambedkar who had no tool of power, no flatterer of greatness, made these views. He had to fight ceaseless struggle for liberty of the poor

and the oppressed. Not only that but also Ambedkar pointed out that Swaraj for Hindus may turn out to be only a step towards slavery if the Hindu society do not come forward to become a casteless society to defend itself. Naturally, the foregoing discussions regarding the origin of castes made it clear that multi-dimensional approaches such as racial differentiation, occupational distinctiveness, the monopolistic priesthood of Brahmins, socio-religious ideas of ceremonial purity, pollution etc. were responsible for the creation of the caste institution in the Hindu society. Not only that but also the unwillingness of the rulers to implement a uniform policy in the state in connection with law and order over its subjects in different matters relating to socio-religious, political, economic etc. paved the way of creating the environment of Caste formation. Lack of rigid control over the subjects in different parts of the state bound the authority to manage them somehow by recognizing the multi-dimensional varieties of different groups or communities to run their state. Naturally, it can be said that scholars of different schools made their argument to establish the theory of Caste in their own way. Some scholars stressed on racial differentiation, occupational distinctiveness, role of the Brahmins, socio-religious ideas of ceremonial purity, pollution and others. But they failed to reach a definite theoretical explanation regarding the origin of Caste in the true sense of the terms. Every theoretical explanation of different scholars regarding the origin of Caste was complementary to each other. Even Gandhi's theoretical explanation on caste was self-explanatory. His interpretation regarding the origin of caste was based on the line of the traditional theory of caste, Brahmanical theory of caste etc. His views and opinions on the issues of caste and untouchability were published in different writings and speeches. He believed in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and the Hindu scriptures. He advocated the theory of incarnation (avatars) and re-birth. He was an Orthodox Vaishnava. He acted to the line of the traditional beliefs, religious dogmas and others relating to the issues of caste and untouchability. Not only that but also he coined the term Harijan to define untouchables. Even he was completely unwilling politically to attack Caste Institution. He said that inter-dinning and inter-marriage were matters of individual choice. He started Harijan movement under some political compulsions and considerations. He did not like to encourage untouchables to obtain honourable position in the society. Even Gandhiji did not allow temple Satyagraha movement of the untouchables. Realizing the hard reality of the situation Gandhiji ultimately changed his attitudes towards the burning issues of

the untouchables and came forward to safe their life and position in the Hindu society. In course of time, he demanded the abolition of untouchability but favoured Caste system in perpetuity. That is why; he came forward to establish schools, hostels for the untouchable children. Even Gandhiji urged to the Hindus to open their ponds, tube wells, roads, temples etc. for the benefits of the Harijans. In these ways, Gandhiji tried to establish 'social justice' for the Harijans. But he gave emphasized on political reform rather than social reform. But Ambedkar deeply realized the anti-social altitudes of the Hindus towards the issues of the Caste system and untouchables that created socio-mental discrimination as a principle of touch-me-not-ism. His theoretical explanation regarding the origin of the Caste System and untouchability made it clear that Brahmins and the Hindu Shastras are responsible for the formation of the Caste System and untouchability. He identified logically the issues of caste and untouchability. Even his human approach towards the issue of caste and untouchability stirred the very foundations of the Hindu caste system and untouchability. His ceaseless struggles for the establishment of the Dalit human rights in India were an epoch making event in the history of India. His ideas and thoughts relating to these issues were completely based on the principle of scientific reasons, liberty, equality, fraternity and after all nationality. His challenging attacked towards the inhuman mechanism of the Caste Institution and untouchability was published in his different writings and speeches. He said that Varnashrama Dharma was itself the source of the productive mechanism of the Caste system and untouchability that was unscientific and irrational that had no far-reaching consequences. Gandhiji knew it very well that it was completely impossible without the eradication of the Caste System as it artificially fostered and created hindrance to social solidarity and mobility. He said that superimposition of endogamy over exogamy was the root cause for the formation of Caste groups. The sub-division of a society was a natural phenomenon and these groups became castes through ex-communication. Caste was not based on the division of labour. It was basically a division of labourers. That is why; he gave a proposal to eradicate the Caste System. Not only that but also Ambedkar advocated inter-caste marriage that would play only a vital role to reduce and solve the caste problems. He asked the common people to discard the age-old irrational, illogical, inhuman verdict of the so-called Shastras and its prescribed socio-religious customs that were working as the root of creating and maintaining castes and untouchability in the Hindu society. Ambedkar said that society should play a

vital role as a protector of religion not as a victimized object of it. But the idea of pollution was an important feature of the Caste system as it had a religious flavour. He said that untouchability became a mental disease in the Hindu social mind in course of time. Apart from these, the verdict of the caste rules relating to inter-marriage, inter-dining and endogamy restricted the class into an enclosed caste. Not only that but also the custom of Sati, enforced widowhood, imposing celibacy on the widower and wedding him to a girl not yet marriageable etc. were the out come for the preservation of endogamy against exogamy in the Caste system. He believed in social democracy. He fought for the sake of humanity. He stressed on social reform rather than political reform. He said that socialists would have to fight against the monster of Caste institution either before or after the revolution for the greater interest of country ant its citizens.

5.4. Debate on the Question of Caste, Varna and the Hindu Shastras between Gandhi and Ambedkar

There arose a great controversy on the questions of inhuman norms and principles of the Caste Institution, Varna System and the Hindu Shastras between Gandhiji and Ambedkar relating to the day-to-day socio-economic and religious activities of different castes or varnas in the Hindu society. Gandhi was the leader of the privileged castes or varnas of the so called Brahmanical Hindu society. But Ambedkar was the symbol of justice against all sorts of exploitation, humiliation and tyranny of the Hindu society. Gandhiji profoundly believed in the age-old traditional doctrines and customs of the Caste Institution, Varna System and the Hindu Shastras and advocated all sorts of norms and principles of these institutions to preach the gospel of the Hindu religion. In fact, he was very much convinced by the traditions of the Hindu society. He was the ardent follower of the norms and principles of these doctrines. He came forward to protect the socio-religious and economic interest of the priviledged classes of the Hindu society. Even he explained the inner-truthfulness of these doctrines to establish the traditional institutions in perpetuity in the Hindu society. Realizing the hard reality of the down trodden sections of the society Gandhiji came forward to uplift the socio-economic conditions of the Harijans under political compulsions in India. But Ambedkar said that these caste based doctrines were basically against the principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, development and

progress. That is why; Ambedkar expressed his grievances against these exploitative inhuman gospels through his famous writings, viz., 'Annihilation of Caste' with a motto to eradicate the caste conception from the so called Brahmanical Hindu society. The main target of Ambedkar was to establish the concept of human rights and privileges in the Hindu society, irrespective of caste, class, creed, sex and religion. He was a blind supporter of the inhumane Caste Institution. His works and activities in all spheres of life were severely influenced by the so called Brahmanical Hindu traditions, customs and believe. That is why; Ambedkar launched ceaseless struggles against all sorts of exploitations and inhumane norms and principles of the Hindu society. He became the leader of the toiling masses in India. He highlighted the inhuman rules and regulations of the Hindu Religion, Hindu Shastras and the Caste Institutions through the microscopic observations of the Rig Vedic literatures and the Smriti Shastras. He fought against all sorts of inhuman rules and regulations of the so called Brahmanical Hindu religion. That is why, Ambedkar was declared as a hater of the Hindu religion.[63] In spite of his ceaseless opposition to the religion of the Hindus and its Shastras, Scriptures in the context of the anti-caste and anti-varna affiliation, Ambedkar was cordially invited to preside over the annual conference of the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal of Lahore in May, 1936. He prepared himself accordingly. But the Reception Committee appeared to have deprived the public suddenly of an opportunity of listening to the original thoughts and views of Ambedkar who had carved out for himself a unique position in the society. Ambedkar had already declared to deliver a last speech of his life as a Hindu on this auspicious occasion before leaving the Hinduism. He never puzzled by the decision of the cancellation of this conference. Rather on realizing the hard reality Ambedkar replied their rejection by publishing his most wanted speech in the form of an article at his own expense. But Ambedkar's indictment was published in the Harijan under the title of 'A Vindication of Caste by Mahatma Gandhi.' The main vocal questions raised by Ambedkar in his undelivered speech are given below:

1) ***"What are the scriptures?***
2) ***Are all the printed texts to be regarded as an integral part of them or is any part of them to be rejected as unauthorized interpolations?***
3) ***What is the answer of such accepted and expurgated scriptures on the question of untouchability, caste, equality of status, inter-dining and inter-marriages?"***[64]

Gandhiji pointed out that he would answer to these questions raised by Ambedkar in the next issue of the Harijan. As a result of it, he explained the content of the Hindu

Dharmashastras. He said, "The Vedas, Upanishads, Smritis and Puranas including Ramayana and Mahabharata are the Hindu Scriptures. Nor is this a finite list. Every age or even generation has added to the list. Who is the best interpreter? Not learned men surely. Learning there must be. But religion does not live by it. It lives in the experiences of its saints and seers, in their lives and sayings. When all the most learned commentators of the scriptures are utterly forgotten, the accumulated experiences of the sages and saints will abide and be an inspiration for ages to come."[65] He also pointed out that everything printed or even found handwritten was not Hindu scripture. He cited the example of the Smritis in this context. He even said that Smritis could not be accepted as the word of God although it contained much on different things. Naturally, the examples from Smritis in different aspects quoted by Ambedkar had no valid authentication. According to him, everything should be capable of being spiritually experienced to accept as the word of God. He highlighted the fact that caste had nothing to do with religion. It was simply a custom of the Hindus. Even he knew nothing about its origin. But he knew it very well that caste was harmful both to spiritual and national growth. So he did not feel necessity to satisfy his spiritual thirst. He said that Varna and Ashrama were two institutions which had nothing to do with Castes. The law of Varna taught them that they had each one and they had been following the callings of their ancestors for bread. It defined nor their rights but their duties. None but it had mentioned the occupations that were conducive to the welfare of humanity. It also noted the fact that there was no occupation of too low or too high. All were good, lawful and absolutely equal in status. The occupation of a Brahmin (spiritual teacher) and a scavenger were equal. Their due performances carried equal merit before God. But they were unequal before man. In fact, they had given rights to lead their livelihood independently and no more. He tried to draw the attention on the fact that there was no disparity between the earnings of different tradesmen including the Brahmins at Segaon which was inhabited by 600 populations. He also pointed out about the real Brahmins who were living on alms and occasionally came forward to teach the common people freely. Not only that but also they played a vital role to impart spiritual knowledge among the people without any remuneration. This was a great job done by the real Brahmin. Naturally, it would be wrong or improper to judge the law of Varna considering the activities of a person who violated the norms of it belonging to a Varna. It prohibited the superiority status of a Varna over another Varna. Even there was nothing in the

law of Varna to warrant a belief in untouchability. Apart from these, Gandhiji opined that Ambedkar had made a profound mistake in his undelivered speech to depend upon the texts of doubtful authenticity by which he moved to judge the degraded Hindus who were unsuitable specimens. Ambedkar cited numerous evidences to prove the notion of the Caste Institution and the Varna System. In his most wanted undelivered speech, Ambedkar had over proved his case. Gandhiji highlighted the fact that a religion that was preached by Chaitanya, Jnyandeo, Tukaram, Sri Ramkrishna, Rammohan, Vivekananda and other eminent saints or scholars might not be utterly devoid of merit as was made out in Ambedkar's address. He said, "A religion has to be judged not by its worst specimens but by the best it might have produced. For that and that alone can be used as the standard to aspire to, if not to improve upon." [66]

Besides, Gandhiji published an article on the topic of 'Varna versus Caste' in the Harijan at the request of Sri Sant Ramji of Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal of Lahore on 15th August 1936. Sri Saint Ramji pointed out that he had read the opinions and remarks of Gandhiji and Ambedkar on this issue. So he clearly highlighted the fact that they did not invite Ambedkar to preside over their conference as he belonged to the Dalit category. Even they did not distinguish between a touchable and an untouchable Hindu. But the name of Ambedkar was simply considered to preside over the meeting because his diagnosis of the fatal caste disease of the Hindu community was same as theirs. He scientifically highlighted and categorically identified the fact that Caste System was the root cause of the disruption and downfall of the Hindus and its religion. The name of the title of research topic selected by Ambedkar was Caste System. So he investigated this subject thoroughly to examine the hypothesis of his research work. But the main motto of this conference was to persuade the Hindus to annihilate the caste system. But Ambedkar insisted on saying that that was his last speech as a Hindu and was not only irrelevant but also pernicious to the interest of that conference. In spite of their request in several times to expunge that sentence but he refused to do that. As a result, they found no utility in making merely a show of their function. But it was the ever first best learned speech on that subject that would not be denied at all.

Apart from these, Sri Sant Ramji pointed out that Gandhiji made philosophical difference between Caste and Varna that was very much subtle to be realized by the people in general. Actually, Caste and Varna was one and the same thing in all aspects of practical purposes in the Hindu society. Even their function was one and the same, i. e., to restrict inter-caste marriages and inter-dining. Not only that but Sri Sant Ramji also criticized the theory of Varnavyavastha of Gandhiji as impractical in the dynamic age. He highlighted its futility and pointed out that there was no hope at all to revive it in the near future. The Hindus were made slaves through the institution of the Caste System which restricted their choice and liberty for its destruction. Sri Sant Ramji was very much worried about the imaginary explanation of Gandhiji on the issue of social reforms. That is why; he expressed his grievances against Gandhiji in the following manner:

"So when you advocate your ideal of imaginary Varnavyavastha they find justification for clinging to caste. Thus you are doing a great disservice to social reform by advocating your imaginary utility of division of Varnas, for it creates hindrance in our way. To try to remove untouchability without striking at the root of Varnavyavastha is simply to treat the outward symptoms of a disease or to draw a line on the surface of water...dvijas do not want to give social equality to the so-called touchable and untouchable Shudras, so they refuse to break caste, and give liberal donations for the removal of untouchability, simply to evade the issue. To seek the help of the Shastras for the removal of untouchability and caste is simply to wash mud with mud."[67]

After all Sri Sant Ramji came forward to support the views and thoughts of Ambedkar on that issue which was wholly untenable when the Mandal for which he claimed to speak, applauded the whole arguments of Ambedkar's undelivered address. There arose a pertinent question whether the Mandal believed in the Shastras or not. He also pointed out "How can a Muslim remain one if he rejects the Quran, or a Christian remains Christian if he rejects the Bible? If Caste and Varna are convertible terms and if Varna is an integral part of the Shastras which define Hinduism, I do not know how a person who rejects Caste i. e. Varna can call himself a Hindu."[68]

Realizing this hard reality, Gandhiji pointed out that he should cease to call himself a Hindu if the Shastras advocated the existing untouchability. He also noted very clearly that "... if the Shastras support caste as we know it today in all its hideousness, I may not call myself or remain a Hindu since I have no scruples about interdining or intermarriage.... I venture to suggest to Shri Sant Ram that it is the only rational and correct and morally defensible position and it has ample warrant in Hindu tradition."[69]

Ambedkar came forward to reply the questions raised by Gandhiji on different aspects of Caste in the Harijan. Gandhiji accused him on this issue. But Ambedkar never attacked it and praised Gandhiji to publish his undelivered speech prepared for the Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal on Caste. He knew it very well that Gandhiji was completely dissented from his views on the issue of Caste. But the main object of Ambedkar in publishing the speech was to provoke the Hindus to think and take stock of their position on this inhumane issue. He never ran after publicity. He highlighted the fact that Gandhiji had entirely missed the issues raised by him. According to him, Gandhiji failed to identify his indictment on the question of Caste of the Hindus. The prime factors[70] which Ambedkar had tried to focus in his undelivered speech were as follows:

i. *The Caste System had ruined the Hindus.*

ii. *To reorganize the Hindu society on the basis of Chaturvarnya was quite impossible as because the Varnavyavastha was like a leaky pot. Caste was completely incapable of sustaining itself by its own virtue. It has an inherent tendency to degenerate into a Caste System unless legal action can be enforced against every one transgressing his Varna.*

iii. *To reorganize the Hindu society on the basis of Chaturvarnya was quite harmful. It degenerated the people into the Caste System. It created obstructions for them to obtain knowledge disarmed them by denying the right to be armed.*

iv. *The Hindu society must be reorganized on a religious basis recognizing the principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.*

v. *Caste and Varna must be destroyed to achieve the object of religious sanctity.*

vi. *The sanctity of Caste and Varna would be destroyed only by discarding the divine authority of the Shastras.*

Therefore, it can be said that the questions raised by Gandhiji were quite different and irrelevant in connection with the above noted questions raised by Ambedkar. In fact, Gandhiji failed to give attention on the main subjects that were reasonably explained on the issue of Caste. It was nothing but a great misunderstanding on the part of a great man like Gandhiji, the father of the Indian Nation.

In fact; the first question raised by Gandhiji was that the texts cited by Ambedkar in the speech were not authentic.

In reply to this question, Ambedkar confessed that he had no authority on those subjects. But he cited these texts taking from the writings of late Tilak who had a recognized authority on the Sanskrit language and on the Hindu Shastras.

The second question raised by Gandhiji was that the contents of the Shastras should be interpreted not by the learned but the saints as because they could understand them. Gandhiji said that Caste and Untouchability had no Shastric affiliation.

In response to this second question, Ambedkar raised another question about how the common people would make any distinction between the genuine texts and the interpolated texts as they were too illiterate to know the contents of the Shastras. Naturally, they would believe what they would have been told and they had been told that the Shastras did enjoin as a religious duty the observance of Caste and Untouchability. He also said that the saints failed to influence the common people to destroy the Caste System due chiefly to two reasons;

Firstly, the saints were staunch believers of the Caste Institution. Most of the saints lived and died as members of the Castes which they respectively belonged. Naturally, the saints never came forward to attack the Caste System for its destruction. He cited the names of saint Jnyandeo and saint Eknath in this context. Saint Jnyandeo moved heaven and earth to obtain the status of a Brahmin by the recognized Brahmin fraternity after refusing by the Brahmins of Paithan. Even saint Eknath who was

known as 'Dharmatma' to the untouchables did not come forward to start a campaign against Caste and Untouchability. Not only that but also the saints did not preach the gospel of equality and liberty. They preached that all men were equal in the eyes of God. They were mainly concerned between man and God.

Secondly; it was taught to the common people that saint might break the norms of Caste but the common people could not. As a result a saint would never become an instance to be followed. They were honoured as pious men. Naturally, the common people had nothing but remain staunch believers in the Caste and Untouchability. It must be reckoned with the fact that the common people held different views regarding the Shastras. Ambedkar said that it could not be dealt with except by denouncing the authority of the Shastras which continued to govern their conduct. This was a question which the Mahatma had not considered. He must have accepted that the pious life led by one good Samaritan might be very elevating to himself but in India, with the attitude the common man had to saints and to Mahatma-to honour but not to follow-one could not make much out of it.

The third statement made by Gandhiji is in connection with religion. He said that a religion must be judged by its best merits not by its worst specimens. He cited the names of many saints like Chaitanya, Tukaram, Ramkrishna Paramahansa and others who preached and upheld gospel of the Hindu religion. According to Gandhiji, Hindu religion could not be meritless as was understood by him.

In reply to this third question, Ambedkar said that he agreed with every word of the statement made by Gandhiji. But he wanted to know about the context of the fact that what did the Mahatma desire to prove? He also raised another question relating to this matter. Why the worst number so many and the best so few? He answered to this question in his own way. He identified the worst by reason of some original perversity of theirs which were morally uneducable and were incapable of making the remotest approach to the religious ideal. He said that the religious ideal was completely a wrong ideal. It had given a wrong moral twist to the lives of the common people. The best had become best in spite of the wrong ideal, in fact by giving to the wrong twist a turn in the right direction. Ambedkar basically emphasized on his second explanation which was only logical and reasonable to

accept the proposition unless the Mahatma had a third alternative to prove why the worst were so many and the best so few.

The fourth assertion stated by Gandhiji was that Hinduism would be tolerable if only the people were to follow the example of saints like Chaitanya and others. The broadest and simplest form of the Hindu society could be made happy without changing its any fundamental structure if all the high caste Hindus could be persuaded to follow a high standard of morality in their dealings with the low caste Hindus.

In reply to this assertion of Gandhiji, Ambedkar straight way pointed out that he was totally opposed to this kind of ideology in spite of his best regards to the saints and high esteemed caste Hindus who emerged to maintain a high social ideal in their life. He said that the criteria for the improvement of personal character would not make the maker of arrangements a good man. He cited the example of a man who would sell shells that would not burst and gas that would not poison. You can not accept personal character to make a man loaded with the consciousness of Caste, a good man, i. e. a man who would treat his fellows as his friends and equals. He must deal with his fellows either as a superior or inferior according as the case may be; differently from his own caste fellows. He also pointed out that there could be a better or worse Hindu. But there could not be a better Hindu. To a slave his master might be better or worse. But a master of his slave could not be a good master. A good man could not be a master and a master could not be a good man. The same context might be applied to the relationship between his high caste and low caste. Naturally, a high caste man could not be a good man in so far as he might have a low caste man to distinguish him as high caste man. Ambedkar already noted the fact that a society based on Varna or Caste was a society that was based on a wrong relationship. In connection with the above noted facts, Ambedkar had a curiosity to know how far Gandhiji himself practices what he preaches. He said that Gandhiji was a Bania by birth. His forefathers had left trading in favour of ministership that was calling of the Brahmins. He chose the profession of law before becoming a Mahatma. In course of time he changed the profession of that of a lawyer and became a politician. His role as a half saint and half politician created numerous problems in the Indian caste politics. He never adopted his ancestral trading being a Vaishya. Even his youngest

son had married a Brahmin's daughter who had chosen to serve a newspaper magnate. But Gandhiji never condemned his son for not following his ancestral occupation. Ambedkar also raised a question against Gandhi's proposition for ancestral occupation in the following manner;

'If every one must purse his ancestral calling then it must follow that a man must continue to be pimp because his grandfather was a pimp and a woman must continue to be a prostitute because her grandmother was a prostitute. Is the Mahatma prepared to accept the logical conclusion of his doctrine?'[71]

5.5. Conclusion

The ideas and views of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste and Untouchability were completely opposite to each other. Gandhiji was a staunch follower of the Caste Institution whereas Ambedkar was completely anti-Caste. The social philosophy of Gandhiji was built up upon the norms of the Caste System, the Varnashram Dharma and the Hindu religion whereas Ambedkar made his social philosophy on the basis of the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. He said, that a Varna of a person should be determined not by his birth but by his merits whereas Gandhiji emphasized on birth criterion in this context. The occupation of a person was decided by the principle of hereditary professions of his forefathers. Gandhiji emphasized on the tradition of heredity in this contest. Ganghiji favored the concept of caste whereas Ambedkar was completely anti-Caste and build up an anti-Caste thesis and strongly demanded the eradication of the Caste Institution. But Gandhiji was completely unwilling to attack politically the Caste System. Ambedkar raised voice to annihilate this Institution. So he made up his mind to launch a direct anti-Caste movement. He encouraged the ill-fated caste-stricken poor peoples of India to fight to finish the Caste Institution. He believed in the norms of the social democracy and political democracy in this respect. But Gandhiji did not come forward to start a Satyagraha movement against the attitudes of the Caste Hindus who closed the doors of the Hindu temples for the Untouchables. That is why, Ambedkar played a vital role to establish the rights of worship for the Depressed Classes in the Hindu temples. Therefore, it can be pointed out that Gandhiji was a bearer of the Caste traditions whereas Ambedkar was an ardent follower of equality, liberty and

fraternity in this respect and played a vital role in establishing the concept of 'Social Justice' by protecting 'Human Rights' of the Depressed Classes in India.

References

1. Senart, Emile; Caste in India, ESS Publications, Delhi, 1930, p. 1.
2. Ketkar, S. V; History of Caste in India, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, Reprint, 1979, p. 12.
3. Dutta, N.K; Origin and Growth of Caste in India, Vol. I, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1968, p. 1.
4. Ketkar, S. V; History of Caste in India, op. cit., p. 14.
5. Dutta, N.K., Origin and Growth of Caste in India, Vol. I, op. cit., p. 2.
6. Ketkar, S. V; History of Caste in India, op. cit., p. 14.
7. Ibid, p. 15.
8. Jha, Ganganath (Translated); Manusmriti, Vol. 7, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Delhi, p. 249.
9. Ibid, p. 215.
10. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2005, p. 252.
11. Ibid.
12. Risley, H.H.; The People of India, W. Thacker & Co. London, 1915, p. 56.
13. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2005, pp. 254-255.
14. Risley, H.H.; The People of India, op. cit., p. 56.
15. Narmadeshwar Prasad; The Myth of the Caste System, Patna, 1956, p. 25.
16. Leach, E.R.; Aspects of Caste in South India, Ceylon and North-West Pakistan, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960, p. 5.
17. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, op. cit., p. 257.
18. Senart, Emile; Caste in India, op. cit., p. 26.
19. Nesfield; Brief View of the Caste System of the North Western Provinces and Oudh, 1885, p. 88.
20. Ibid, 171-172.
21. Majumdar, D.N.; Races and Cultures of India, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1952, p.292.

22. The Economic Weekly, 1961.
23. Ketkar, S.V.; History of Caste in India, Ithaca, New York, 1909, p. 18.
24. Ibid, p. 2.
25. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, op. cit., p. 264.
26. Ibid, p. 264.
27. Senart, Emile; Caste in India, ESS ESS Publications, Delhi, 1975, p., preface-xiv.
28. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, op. cit., p. 265.
29. Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, published by the Education Department, Government of Maharastra for Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication Committee, Bombay, 1987-1997, p. 107.
30. Ibid, p. 98.
31. Ibid, p. 256.
32. Ibid, pp. 250-251.
33. Ibid, P. v.
34. Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. I, op. cit., p. xv.
35. Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 9, op. cit, p. 276.
36. Ibid, p. 77.
37. Ibid, pp. 277-278.
38. Young India, 27th April 1921.
39. Hindustan Times, 15th April 1945.
40. Speech at Colombo, November 25, 1927; Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CW) Published by the Publications Divisions, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi (1958-1994), Vol. 35, p. 318.
41. Young India, June 4, 1931; C.W., Vol. 46, p. 302.
42. Letter to Suresh Chandra Banerjee, October 10, 1932; CW, Vol. 51, p. 219.
43. The Bombay Chronicle, April 17, 1945; CW, Vol. 79, p. 384.
44. Letter to Shyamlal, July 23, 1945; CW, Vol. 81, p. 25.
45. Young India, November 24, 1927; CW, Vol. 35, pp. 522-23.
46. Harijan, April 15, 1933; CW, Vol. 54, pp. 410-11.

47. ' Caste Has To Go', Harijan, November 16, 1935, CW, Vol. 62, p. 122.
48. Letter to Shyamlal, July 23, 1945; CW, Vol. 81, p. 25.
49. Harijan, April 14, 1946; CW, Vol. 83, p. 350.
50. Speech at Prayer Meeting, May 31, 1946; CW, Vol. 84, p. 247.
51. Economic and Political Weekly, May 13, 2006, Vol. XLI No. 19, p. 1837.
52. Ketkar, S.V.; History of Caste in India, op.cit. p. 4.
53. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.I, Published by the Education Department Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, 1990, p. 9.
54. Ibid, p. 19. Quoted in Laws of Imitation, Tr. by E.C.Parsons, 2nd edition, p.224.
55. Ketkar, S. V; History of Caste in India, op. cit., p. 82.
56. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. I, op. cit., p.39.
57. Times of India, January 4, 1928.
58. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. I, op. cit., p. 42.
59. Ibid, p. 43.
60. Ibid, p.71.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid, pp. 76-79.
63. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, Tenth Reprint 2002, p. 267.
64. Harijan, July 11, 1936.
65. Ibid, July 18, 1936.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid, August 15, 1936.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
70. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 1, Education Department, Government of Maharasra, 1991, p.86-87.
71. Ibid, p. 90.
72. Ibid, p. 95-96.

Chapter 6

Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the Question of Caste based Economic life

6.1. Introduction

Gandhiji is called the 'Father of the Indian Nation' and Ambedkar is defined as the 'Modern Man' in India. But their attitude towards the question of caste based economic life was totally opposite to each other. The difference of their attitudes relating to the question of caste based economic life was quite fundamental. Gandhiji profoundly believed in the caste based economic activities as he believed in the myth of the Caste Institution of the so-called Brahmanical Hindu society. So, it was quite natural and normal to him to stress on the thoughts and ideas of the Caste System. He stressed on the professions of forefathers in the directions of heredity from generation to generation. Naturally, he advised the people to follow up the professions based on heredity of their forefathers. He forbade the people to take any other occupation independently beyond the norms of the Caste System. He became ultimately a great upholder of the so-called Caste System of the Brahmanical Hindu traditions and Manu's (an ancient law maker) thought-provoking socio-religious, political, economical and administrative norms and principles, which were not based on humanitarian grounds. Gandhiji said that the object of the Varna system (caste system) was to prevent competition, class struggle and class war. He clearly noted the fact that he believed in the caste system because it fixed the duties and occupations of persons. Caste determined the occupation of a man before he is born. There is no liberty to choose his occupation of a person in the constitution of the Caste Institution. Even he profoundly believed in the hereditary birth profession of a person that was determined by their forefathers 'hereditary birth' occupation. Naturally, the occupation of a person was determined by heredity[1]. Therefore, it can be pointed out that Gandhiji was very much influenced by the ordinances of the Caste Institution. He also believed in the division of castes and caste based economic professions and activities of different varnas (castes). According to him, each caste (Varna) has its own occupations. According to the occupational tradition of the Caste System, Gandhiji believed in the superior occupational position of the Brahmans, Kshatriyas

and Vaishyas than the Sudras in the Hindu society. But he was not puzzled or astonished by the forcefully dictated inhuman occupational professions of the Sudras prescribed in the so-called Hindu Shastras. He ultimately changed his attitude radically towards the miseries, distress, and occupational questions of the ill-fated Sudras in course of time for political compulsions. He responded to the call of humanity to save the life of the inborn unprivileged sections of the society. He also came forward to uplift the condition of the Harijans in India in the later span of his life. The ideology of trusteeship of Gandhiji did not fulfill his cherish dream in the context of economic relation between the haves and haves not. His role was nothing but a repetition of the age-old Brahmanical Hindu traditions and the ordinances made by Manu in the Caste Institution in the spheres of caste based economic life of the fourfold varnas. Gandhiji played a very vital role to protect the forefather's hereditary qualification rather than educational qualification of a person in the spheres of caste based economic life. In fact, Gandhiji profoundly believed in the Caste System. He treated it as the part and parcel of the Hindu religion. He advocated the Caste System as a divine arrangement in respect of punishment and reward for their previous deeds and activities. To him, Caste is a kind of ethical stratification, which is a projection of ethical status of human beings based on their deeds done in their previous life. He explained that the divisions of Varna were based on birth[2]. Gandhiji believed in the Varnashrama Dharma and the Caste System. He had a living faith in God and the facts and events that were described in the Vedic literatures in the context of the caste based economic life. Even he was very much convinced by the Indian so called cultural, social and religious traditional heritage in the context of the caste based economic life. Therefore, the status and position of the Brahmins in the four-fold caste division in the Hindu society is unquestionable in matter of employment, education, occupation and all sorts of mastery over the other caste groups in the so-called Hindu society. The Brahmins are none but the intellectual groups in the Hindu society. They made themselves the most privileged class in the society in matter of socio-religious, political, economic and other spheres of life. Even they made themselves the real source of power behind the thrown by the Shastras of the Brahmanical Hindu religion. The occupations of the Brahmins were mainly confined to the reading and teaching of the Vedas, play the role of a priest to perform the sacrificial rites and duties in socio-religious perspective. Normally, they could not earn money or wealth to establish their economic position. However, they could earn

money only in time emergency to lead their livelihood. Gandhiji strongly emphasized the talent and capacity of the Brahmins that made them the architect and pioneer of the Caste Institution in the Brahmanical Hindu society. Only the Brahmins could change their professions or occupations in their distressed conditions. After all, they were the mastermind behind the caste based hereditary economic life. But Gandhiji did not try to alter the concept of the hereditary occupations or professions of different caste divisions rather he stressed on class-caste coordination of different economic divisions. He propagated the theory of caste coordination and discarded the theory of class struggle. In fact, Gandhiji liked to say that hereditary occupations of different caste groups should be followed up from generation to generation. That is why; he advocated the pre-defined permanent hereditary occupations of the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras in the context socio-economic activities to lead their livelihood. Actually, Gandhiji did not distract himself from the so-called pernicious concept of the Caste Institution. As a result of it, the Kshatriyas Vaishyas and Sudras were compelled to join their age-old traditional and hereditary professions to earn money or wealth to run their livelihood. The Kshatriyas adopted the professions of warriors to protect the country and its subjects. They played a vital role to rule the country. Their economic activities were mainly confined within the ruling and protecting scenario of the country. Therefore, Gandhiji did not hesitate to say that every caste group has its own functions or occupations that were based on birth-heredity since the beginning for the welfare of the country and the Kshtriyas even could not discard the ordinance of the Caste Institution. To Gandhiji, it was completely good for the benefit and welfare of the people. But the lawful hereditary economic professions of a Vaishya caste were cultivating, cattle breeding, trading and lending money at interest. Gandhiji pointed out that the Vaishyas played a vital role in cultivating the land assigned to them beyond their common hereditary trade and commerce. Their main economic activities were to produce or cultivate the land to fulfill the necessity of life. They also tilled the land and reared cattle. But everything should be done in connection the policy of trusteeship. Whereas the Sudras were forced to obtain his livelihood by serving the higher-castes and if necessary by practicing mechanical arts. They were advised to serve their superior three caste groups. Otherwise, they were severely given punishment by the so-called norms of the Caste Institution. They were forced to become the menial labours of the upper three castes, i. e., Brahmanas, Kshtriyas and Vaishyas. In fact, Gandhiji did not oppose the

caste line of Manu. He accepted it blindly due to implement the essence of it for the livelihood of different castes. He did not come forward to bring radical change in the context of the caste based economic activities of the four fold divisions of Varnas or castes. Gandhiji wrote an article on 'Varna Vayavastha' in Gujarati where he clearly mentioned '...What Varna system enjoins is that a Sudra will not make learning a way of earning a living. Nor will a Kshatriya adopt service as a way of earning a living. Similarly, a Brahmin may learn the art of war or trade. But he must not make them a way of earning his living. On the contrary a Vaishya may acquire learning or may cultivate the art of war. But he must not make them a way of earning his living'[3]. But Ambedkar vehemently opposed to the theory of forefather's hereditary birth occupational criteria for choosing any professions for any varnas. He clearly pointed out that a person should obtain a job if he would deserve according to the nature of that job. So he fought against the inhuman and unjustified hereditary birth criteria for obtaining a job. He identified various criteria like, educational qualification, efficiency in work and expertise knowledge etc. in the occupational fields for obtaining any kind of jobs. He raised his voice against the caste based economic professions or occupations. He vehemently opposed to the caste based occupational divisions of varnas. But he profoundly believed in the philosophy of liberal thoughts and ideas to open up the occupational sectors to all irrespective of their caste, class, sex, religion etc. He mainly believed in the slogan of 'career open to talent' in respect of the social, economic, cultural, religious, political activities, administrative works or any kind of professions[4]. That is why; Ambedkar expressed his opinions, views and grievances very seriously through his famous writings on "Annihilation of the Caste System" to annihilate permanently the so-called inhuman Caste Institution. He urged for social democracy before political democracy. He also believed in the parliamentary democracy. Even he welcomed the dynamic concept of industrialization to uplift the ill-fated economic conditions of the toiling masses in India. He played a vital role to protect the interest of the workers, peasants, women, untouchables and the Depressed Classes of India through the constitutional safeguards. His role for establishing the concept of 'Social Justice' and 'Human Rights' was completely based on humanitarian approach in the world history. But it was none other but Ambedkar who truly and solely fought against the evil-base of the Caste System. His attitude towards caste and its annihilation was based on the principle of humanity, equality, liberty, fraternity in the context of political, economic

and social democracy. He was in favour of modernization, industrialization and urbanization, which, he found, were indispensable for the overall growth of the nation[5]. Besides, as the first law minister in independent India he always tried to alleviate the lot of those sociologically and economically exploited. Therefore, the glowing effects of the Caste Institution can be seen in the face behind the mask of the Orthodox Hindus in the Indian society. Ambedkar indeed played a vital role in establishing the concept of 'Social Justice' and 'Human Rights' among the 'Depressed Classes'. Even the labour welfare measures and the concept of the empowerment of women introduced by Ambedkar in the true sense of the terms heralded an epoch-making event in the history of India.

6.2. Conceptual frame work of Gandhian Economic Philosophy

Gandhian economic philosophy was entirely based on the principles of trusteeship, idolization of Charka (the spinning wheel), manual work, opposition to machinery of the modern civilization etc. His economic philosophy was based on the principles of 'Trusteeship' and the ideology of 'Ramraj'. Gandhiji said that economics and ethics were not two separate entities. Economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation were immoral and therefore sinful[6]. Trusteeship was the only principle to maintain status-quo in the society between the landlords and peasants, capitalists and poor and haves and haves not. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhian theory of trusteeship was no makeshift, certainly no camouflage. It had the sanction of philosophy and religion behind it. In fact, the idea of trusteeship of Gandhiji was integrally related to the concept of non-possession. Non-possession and equality for him pre-supposed a change of heart, a change of attitude. Besides, he stressed on traditionalism, naturalism, manual work, handicraft, no big industry and trusteeship of wealth to achieve the ideal of Ramraj. Apart from these, he said that 'Truth is God'. He then coined the word 'Ramrajya' to describe the kingdom of God on the earth, i.e., 'the sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority'. He used the word 'Swaraj' to mean 'self-rule and self-restraint'. According to Gandhiji, 'Swaraj was synonymous with the concept of 'Ramraj'. He wanted that the perfect democracy in which inequalities based on possession and non-possession, colour, race or creed or sex would vanish from his Ramrajya. In it, the state had the obligation of realizing the greatest good of all rather than the greatest good of the greatest number. The real

administrative structure of the concept of Ramraj was Panchayat Raj. The vision of Gandhiji was to make decentralization of power to the local Panchayat of the villages. He did not approve of the proletarian dictatorship of the Communists and the parliamentary democracy. He was completely against modernization, urbanization and industrialization[7] and by the development and progress of which the 'Depressed Classes' could improve their lot at a large. Instead, Gandhiji advocated the call of nature, which ultimately compelled the toiling masses of India to remain in the same distressed condition. He urged for 'Sarvodaya'. But the state of 'Sarvodaya' was a state of moral anarchism. He said that the poor should not be jealous of the rich because this discrimination was mainly due to their own destiny. He said that the poor, workers and peasants would not to proceed for revolution against the ruling trustees but only compromise for reforms[8]. He considered the divine right of the trustees and rulers as permanent and it was the duty of the ruled not to hate the rulers. These types of socio-political and economic thoughts of Gandhiji practically complicated the emancipation process of the 'Depressed Classes' and the 'Harijans' in India.

The fundamental concept of Gandhian economic, social, political, and religious philosophy were based on different ideologies as like 'Ahimsa' (Non-Violence), 'Satyagraha' (Truthfulness), 'Varnashrama Dharma', 'Caste System', 'Trusteeship and Ramraj', 'Socialism', 'Metaphysical Idealism and Impersonal Truth', 'Idolization of Charka' and after all 'Sarvodaya'. But Gandhiji propagated the mechanism of the Caste System and Varnashrama Dharma of the Hindu society in context of the different Varna's economic activities. Even he believed in the theory of Manusmriti, Gita and different Vedic literatures relating to the issue of Caste based economic life of different Varnas or Castes. The principle of Ahimsa and Satyagraha was basically the core concept of the Gandhian economy on which trusteeship between the haves and haves not had been made in course of time. But his economic thoughts were completely based on ethics. He did not differentiate between economics and ethics. His main plan was to implement the ethical Indian cultural and spiritual heritage that was based on religion into his economic philosophy. He pointed out that his economic theory would only can help to imbibe good virtues of life of an individual who will preserve the mantle of the society. He also noted that the total well-being of man could never be wrought by bringing about a change in the material conditions of his

life alone. Only the universal love, trusteeship etc. formed the basis of the foundation of the Gandhian economic theory. His economic thought was all embracing. His economic thoughts cover all the problems that plague our social life. The teaching of the Vaishnava philosophers and other great saints of different religions had stirred the mind set up of Gandhiji. The work of Ruskin, viz. 'Unto This Last' left its deep impressive mark in Gandhi's mind on this issue. Therefore, Gandhiji clearly mentioned in his autobiography that he derived the following ideas from this book of Ruskin; "that the good of the individual is contained in the good of all; that a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's inasmuch as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work; that a life of labour, i. e. that life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth living."[9] Apart from these ideas of Ruskin, Gandhiji adopted Tolstoy's "theory of bread-labour". According to this theory, no man was free from the obligation of body-labour for the production of the elementary necessaries of life. This was a law, which should apply to intellectual workers as well. They too were not to be exempted from its operation[10]. Gandhiji pointed out about 'economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation are immoral and therefore, sinful. Thus the economics that permit one country to prey upon another are immoral'. Therefore, it can be said that the entire Gandhian economics was based on ethical or moral values. Even he implemented the political weapon of non-violence in the international field of economics. The introduction of non-violence in international trade and commerce means nothing less than the introduction of moral values as a factor to be considered in regulating international commerce. That is why, Gandhian economic philosophy was completely different from that of Marshall, Marx or Keynes. Gandhian economic philosophy highlighted class co-ordination whereas Marx stressed on class struggle. According to Marx, bloody revolution perhaps the only modus operandi of solving the problem of economic inequality. But Gandhiji expressed his views on this issue in a different way. He noted on this issue very clearly that the economics, which disregard moral and sentimental considerations, are like waxworks that being life-like still lack of the living flesh. Even these new fangled economic laws have broken down in practice at every critical movement. Therefore, nations or individuals who accept them as guiding maxims must perish. For 'that economics is untrue which ignores or disgraces moral values'[11]. Gandhiji did not deny the importance of material development in anyway. According to him, economic progress means material advancement without

limit and by real progress means moral progress. He said that "true economics stands for social justice and moral values"[12]. That is why; a society must follow a norm of life where mere material well-being is not the only motivating force. He did not like an economics that enables the strong to amass wealth at the expense of the weak and spell death, is a false and dismal science. But true economics works for social justice and promotes the good of all equally, including the weakest and is indispensable for decent life[13]. Gandhiji derived his ethico-economic philosophy of trusteeship and inheritance from the deep feeling of spirituality and divinity of man. According to his version, everything belonged to God and was from God. Therefore, God as a whole would assign everything for the people, not for a particular individual. Even the theory of trusteeship and thorough equality made by him to make fruitful his economic philosophy. Gandhiji pointed out that everybody must have equal opportunity in life. He always said about the equal distribution of national wealth. Not only that but also he pointed out that man is born equal. Therefore, he has a right to equal opportunity. However, men of more intellect generally earn more than the others as everybody do not possess the same capacity or talent. Gandhiji advised to expense the excess earnings of an intellect for the well-being of the state or its subjects, just as the income of all earnings of the father go to the common family fund. Therefore, the people of strong economic background should play a vital role for the welfare of the state only as trustees. To him, everybody should enjoy as per their acute demand to fulfill the necessities of life, otherwise excessive earnings of a people would create socio-economic problems in the society. In fact, Gandhiji wanted to say that nobody should enjoy more than his necessity and advised to become trustees for the betterment of the society. If a person has weak digestion and requires only a quarter of a pound of flour for his bread and another needs a pound, both should be in a position to satisfy their wants. The entire social order has to be reconstructed if this ideal practically came into being[14]. Therefore, this type of sincere approach identified Gandhiji as a true socialist as he believed in the universal ownership of the instruments of production. No one should suffer from want of food and clothing. Everyone should be able to get sufficient work to enable him to make the two ends meet and the common people would control the means of production of the elementary necessaries of life to establish the universal ideal of socialism. But they should not be treated as a vehicle of traffic for the exploitation of others[15]. Gandhiji advocated man's freedom of thought that ranks superior in the valuation

scale than his bread alone. He said, "My socialism means 'even unto this last'. His modified socialism based upon the unique philosophical ideas of trusteeship and Panchayat Raj. He established viable alternative to industrialization through the gradual progress of village agriculture and its industries. The motto of which is to establish the concept of Ram Rajya and try to make arrangement to provide a square meal a day to the masses without snatching the personal liberty of an individual. He also pointed out that one could not reach truth by untruthfulness. Only truthful conduct alone can reach truth[16]. Gandhiji said, "True economics never militates against the highest ethical standard, just as all true ethics to be worth its name must at the same time be also good economics. An economics that inculcates mammon-worship, and enable the strong amass wealth at the expense of the weak, is a false and dismal science. It spells death. True economics, on the other hand, stands for social justice, it promotes the good of all equality including the weakest, and it is indispensable for decent life"[17] Gandhiji said, "The political and economic organization of the state shall be based on principles of social justice and economic freedom. While this organization shall conduce to the satisfaction of the national requirements of every member of society, material satisfaction shall not be its sole objective. It shall aim at healthy living and the moral and intellectual development of the individual. To this end to secure social justice, the state shall endeavour to promote small scale production carried on by individual or cooperative effort for the equal benefit of all concerned. All large scale collective production shall be eventually brought under collective ownership and control, and in this behalf the state shall begin by nationalizing heavy transport, shipping, mining and the heavy industries. The textile industry shall be progressively decentralized"[18]. Gandhiji pointed out about the state industries that "In all state-owned and state-managed enterprises, the workers shall be represented in the management through their elected representatives and shall have an equal share in it with the representatives of the Government"[19]. Gandhiji said, "I am not an economist, but India may become a self-sustained country, growing all the produce she needs. This may be an utterly ridiculous proposition and perhaves the best proof that it cannot be true is that England is one of the largest importers in the world."[20] His economic programme was completely based upon the ideal of self-sufficiency. Man was the ultimate consideration according to his economic philosophy. Gandhiji did never compromise ethical principles with economic enlistment. He said that spiritual progress should be

done first and last and no economic progress can violate this principle. He even did not sharply differentiate between economics and ethics. But his Khadar economics was completely based upon ethics. Ethics directs one to discuss truth and falsity and to act without attachment in order to achieve good. It is the science of ideals. It formulates laws for both the society and the individual. It is universal. "Another feature of the moral law is that it is eternal and immutable."[21] "The highest morality is universal"[22] "No individual and no nation can ever violate the moral law with impunity."[23] "No action which is not voluntary can be called moral"[24]. Truth is the highest ideal in Gandhian social philosophy. Gandhiji said that "There should be truth in thought, truth in speech and truth in action."[25] Thus, truth should be practiced in all walks of life-social, economic, political and other fields.

But the theory of trusteeship was the most controversial economic philosophy of Gandhiji. He was deadly against the theory of capitalism. His target was to use their genius as managers of industries. However, he was very much softening toward the capitalist class. His non-violent means were all pervasive including the economic field. Therefore, Gandhiji pointed out that "In reality the toiler is the owner of what he produced. If the toilers intelligently combine, they will become an irresistible power. That is how I do not see the necessity of class conflict. If I thought it inevitable I shall not hesitate to preach it and teach it."[26] Even Gandhiji replied to a question raised at the Round Table Conference in England and explained the mechanism how to bring about in practice the concept of trusteeship. He said, "Not merely by verbal persuasion, I will concentrate on means. Some have called me the greatest revolutionary of my time. It may be false, but I believe myself to be a revolutionary – a non-violent revolutionary. My means are non-cooperation. No person can amass wealth without the cooperation, willing or forced, of the people concerned."[27] Everybody doubted and criticized the possibility of Gandhian trusteeship. Gandhiji did a fair trial on this matter in his lifetime. None but only Jamna Lal Bajaj came somewhere near to his ideal. He was against accumulation of wealth by violence but he was also against all mad races after wealth. He was very much alert about the dangers of state capitalism. That is why; he prescribed decentralization of industries. His ideal was equitable distribution if not equal distribution. To him, labour is the master of the means of production and never a slave of it. He said that capital is the servant of labour and not its master. He encouraged the labourers to be united for a

non-violent struggle. He liked a stateless society but this stage has to be achieved through non-violent revolution as anything secured through violence, according to Gandhiji, is bound to fail in the end. In fact, Gandhiji's proposals for the solutions of the problems of social, economic and political arenas were the same, those based upon the principles of cooperation, spiritual evolution, liberty, synthesis etc. and ultimately leading to God realization and the establishment of kingdom of God on earth. Carl Heath explained Gandhiji in his book, namely 'Apostle of Life and Truth Force' as ...the type of the civilized and humanized man. According to Pearelal-ji, Mahatma Gandhi summed up his trusteeship idea in the following formula:

Firstly; Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one, it gives no quarter to capitalism but gives the present owing class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.
Secondly; it does not recognize any right of private ownership of property except in as much as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.
Thirdly; it does not exclude legislative regulation of ownership and use of wealth.
Fourthly; thus under state-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold on disregard of the interest of society.
Fifthly; just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that could be allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum and maximum income should be reasonable, equitable, and variable from time to time, so much so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference.
Sixthly; under the Gandhian economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not personal whim or greed.

Even Gandhiji confessed straightway that Ruskin's book 'Unto This Last' greatly marked a turning point in his life. He made three decisions from this book, such as; the individual uplift was laid down in the welfare of all. Equal rights deemed necessary to lead the livelihood for all. The value of works either an advocate or a hair-cutters are same. The lives of the labourers are the ideal life as because labour is given the utmost importance in the world. Prof. J.C. Johari pointed out that 'Sarvodaya, literary meaning 'the uplift of all' is the most appropriate name of

Gandhian Socialism. It is a principle of a new philosophical, social, ethical, economic and political order whose aim, in the words of Gandhiji's spiritual disciple, Vinoba Bhave, is 'that all may be happy.' He also pointed out that 'Sarvodaya pleads for villagisation, decentralization and gifts as those of labour (Shramdan), of land (Bhoodan), of wealth (Sampathidan), and of big shares in village property (Gramdan).' Sampurananda pointed out in his book, 'Indian Socialism' that 'It (Sarvodaya) is the name chosen by Mahatmaji for what he considered to be the goal of all effort in the field of public work. It means the Udaya (upliftment) of all, udaya standing not only for material prosperity but for spiritual good.' Sarvodaya means the all round development of every individual. Its aim is the establishment of a society in which every individual, religion, language and literature is to get unhindered opportunity. Prof. V.P. Verma said, If the bhoodan and gramdan are technics of Egrarian revolution based on moral force, sampathidan is a significant path in the transformation of capitalism into the sarvodaya society. It (Sarvodaya) wants to replace party strife, jealousies and competition by sacred law of cooperative mutuality and dominant altruism. Gandhiji advocated to the decentralization of industries and that of all the economic functions including production, consumption and distribution. This ideal can be realized only if the means of production of the elementary necessaries of life remain in the control of the masses. Everybody should be able to get sufficient work to enable him to make the two ends meet[28]. The basic ideas of Gandhiji in economics lays stressed on minimizing the wants rather than maximizing them. His main approach was to oppose too many desires and advocate only the minimum desires. It was basically against the mode of much production. Indian philosophy established the norms of man's life for spiritual evolution and not for physical satisfaction. He developed an economic theory that was based on Indian spiritualism. In fact, Gandhiji did not want economic progress at the cost of spiritual values. He opposed to mechanization. But he realized the importance of small machines necessary for everyday life. According to him, the production of these machines should be in public sector. In fact; Gandhian ideas have been propagated, or put forward as specific, viz., Khadi, village industries, etc. He noted the causes of economic struggle as exploitation of labourers by capitalists, of the villages by the cities, of agriculture and handicrafts by the mechanized industries, and of man by machines. This economic explanation is very similar to that of Marx, but the solution offered by Gandhiji is diametrically opposite. He sought to resolve the conflict

through a process of harmonization of the interests of the exploited and exploiting class. So long as the owner of capital does not abuse his ownership rights to increase his own prosperity, and so long as the owner, acting as a trustee of the social interest, returns the fruits of social endeavour back to the society, the two classes can live in harmony, and work for each other's prosperity. This is the solution for bringing about economic justice by leveling the inequalities of income, raise and maintain the standard of living of the economically weak working force of the society, and create conditions for full employment[29].

Gandhiji said, "I work my own spinning wheel everyday as a religious exercise. But that does not mean that I disapprove of modern machines. The condition, which, I would make, however, is that industry should be distributed throughout country, and not concentrated in large industrial cities, which I regard as evil. A few such cities may be unavoidable evils, but we should do our best to decentralize industry."[30] But the core concepts of the Gandhian economic thought were based on self-regulation, trusteeship, mass participation and self-reliance. He pointed out that every individual should regulate and restrain the demands of his self-interest without seeking gains for the greater interest of the society as a whole. The concept of trusteeship can be expressed in the following words, so long as the owner of capital does not abuse his ownership rights to increase his own prosperity by exploiting other classes, and so long as the owner acting as a trustee of the social interest, returns the fruits of social endeavour back to the society, all classes can live in harmony, and work for each other's prosperity. According to Gandhiji, Trusteeship provides means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives the present owing-class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption. It does not recognize any right of private ownership of property except so far as is permitted by society for its own welfare. Not only that but also it is clearly mentioned in the Gandhian economic order that the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim, or greed. All the capitalists will have the opportunity of becoming statutory trustees ... They cannot accumulate wealth without the co-operation of the poor in society. If the poor realize it, they would become strong, and would learn how to free themselves by means of non-violence from the crushing inequalities, that have brought them to the verge of starvation. That is why; Trusteeship, therefore, was not a

mere stopgap arrangement, it had a perennial value and use. Mass participation in every activity is the basis of progress. Gandhi's concept of planning was creation of consciousness among the people to achieve pattern results. Only a self-regulated people can think of participating in the economic development of the country. Self-reliance is the key word of Gandhian approach to economics. It is the basis for maximum economic effort. His concepts dealing with economics are realistic and human. Economics, from the Gandhian point of view is a description of self-regulated mass activity of human beings who make an endeavopur to fulfill the needs of all sections of the society with a view to make it self-reliant.

But in the modern age of machinery and industrialization Gandhiji's ideas about these two are peculiar and anti-progressive. He opposes mechanization and industrialization as things destructive to human civilization. He rejects economic progress based on machine. He thinks modern machinery will create a havoc and bring about untold misery to man. To him mechanization spells calamity. Once Gandhiji said regarding the land reforms that land would be owned by the state. He presumes the reins of the Government will be in the hands of those who have faith in this ideal. A majority of Zaminders will give up their land willingly; those who do not do so will have to do so under legislation[31]. Not only that but also Gandhiji pointed out that "Our solution can come through farmer. Neither the lawyer, nor the doctors, nor the rich landlords are going to secure it"[32].

From the aforesaid discussions it can be pointed out that Gandhiji was himself the great believer, supporter, propagator and protector of the so-called Hindu Caste Institution in India. Therefore, he did not change his attitude towards issue of Caste and the provision of hereditary occupations for different Caste divisions. He believed that everything was pre-determined according to the caste rules before a man is born and it was highlighted the fact that a particular occupation is assigned to a person as he belonged to particular caste division. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji strongly believed in the division of the Varna system or the caste system. He advocated the division of castes made by Manu, an ancient lawmaker. According to him, the people of different castes have to perform their hereditary functions or occupations from one generation to another. Otherwise, they would fall in distressed conditions. But it has multi-dimensional positive sides. It creates full form maturity of

a particular work. The experience of a specific work would enable a people to become a master on that subject. He said that different castes are like different sections of military division. Each division is working for the good of the whole. Each community possesses unique power of organization. It helps to spread primary education. Each community can take the responsibility to improve their lot at a large. Each caste has its privilege to control their caste rules. In fact, the principle of hereditary occupation is the soul of the caste system. According to Gandhiji, hereditary principle of the caste system is the eternal principle. It is a natural order of the society. Its change may create disorder in the society. Each caste must follow the hereditary occupations of his ancestors. Gandhiji strongly pointed out that the motto of the caste division or Varna division is to prevent class struggle, class war and competition as the profession of a person of a particular caste is determined before he is born. That is why; Gandhiji played a vital role to highlight the caste based economic life of different communities according to their status and position in the so-called caste division in the Brahmanical Hindu society. Therefore, Gandhiji conceded all sorts of caste norms based on either heredity or divine origin. The sanctity of the so-called Brahmancal religion also played a vital role for the caste based economic life of different caste groups. He said that caste system is good. It would hasten the developmental process of the country. It would work for the welfare of the state and its subjects. Gandhiji did not raise his voice against the inhuman nature and character of the caste system that wrecked the civil rights and privileges of the lower strata in the Hindu society. According to him, everything is good in the context of caste. But it was the real fact at all in the rule of caste. The Sudra Varna or caste was practically the most exploited community in the so-called Hindu society rather than the other community in the world economy. However, Gandhiji did not mind in it at all. Therefore, it is completely beyond the comprehension of the scholars of different fields to imagine how Gandhiji accepted the theory of the caste system that wrecked the human rights and privileges of the toiling masses in India, as he was the pioneer of the concepts of Ahimsa, Satyagraha, Trusteeship, Ramraj, Socialism, Metaphysical Idealism and Impersonal Truth, and Sarvodaya. After all Gandhiji was a great believer in God. That is why; it can be said that Gandhiji got much propagation in India and abroad than he deserve in the context of the human rights protectionist movement. It is said that he was a great moral man in India. His economic thoughts and beliefs were based on ethics. The main motto of which was to the welfare of the

poor peoples in India. But some scholars opine that it is not correct to entitle a man like Gandhiji or others as a great humanist who believed in the caste system that based on inhuman hereditary birth circle. Even Gandhiji clearly pointed out that 'it will be a chaos if every day a Brahmin is to be changed into a Sudra and a Sudra is to be changed into a Brahmin'[33]. Therefore, it can be said that Gandhiji did not like to change a profession that has already pre-defined for a particular caste groups. He strongly advocated the hereditary occupations of the ancestors of each caste groups. Even he opposed to all those who were out to destroy the caste system. He was a strong defender of the caste system. He believed in this system because it had fixed the duties and professions or occupations of the peoples of different caste groups. That is why; the concepts of Ahimsa, Satyagraha, Trusteeship, Ramraj, Socialism, Metaphysical Idealism and Impersonal Truth, and Sarvodaya may be explained in order to understand the truth of the Gandhian economic thoughts and believes at a large. Gandhiji profoundly believed in the doctrine of Ahimsa (Non-Violence) and Satyagraha (practice of truth) as because only these moral forces could help others to arouse their inner soul-forces to do better for the common peoples and the welfare of the state. Only the above noted concepts that are absolute and universal would be able to establish the concept of humanity in the society. Ahimsa is not merely the negative act of refraining from doing offence, injury or harm to others, but really it represents the ancient law of positive self-sacrifice and constructive suffering. Practically, he considered truth and non-violence to be absolutely binding. Explaining the law of Varna in Indian social system Gandhiji said, "The law of Varna means that every one shall follow, as a matter of dharma-duty, the hereditary calling of his forefathers is so far as it is not inconsistent with fundamental ethics. He will earn his livelihood by following that good of the people."[34] According to Gandhiji, "Brahmin is not only a teacher, he is predominantly that. But a Brahmin who refuses to labour will be voted down as an idiot, because the rishis of the old who lived in forests cut and fetched wood, tended cattle and even fought, but their pursuit in life was predominantly search after truth. Similarly, a Rajput without learning was good for nothing no matter how well he wields the sword. And Vaishya without divine knowledge sufficient for his own growth will be a veritable monster eating into the vitals of society as many modern Vaishyas whether of the East or the West have become. They are, according to the Gita, incarnations of sin who live only for themselves."[35] Gandhiji said, "Varnas and Ashramas are institutions which have nothing to do with castes. The law

of Varna teaches us that we have each one of us to earn our bread by following the ancestral calling. It defines nor our rights but our duties. It necessarily has reference to callings that are conducive to the welfare of humanity and to no other. It also follows that there is no calling too low and none too high"[36]. Gandhiji said, 'People are the roots, the state is fruit. If the roots are sweet, the fruits are bound to be sweet.' Pyarelal said that Gandhiji was a firm believer in a classless, egalitarian society in which there would be no distinction of rich and poor, high and low.' Gandhiji pointed out that Ramrajya means the realization of universal peace and humanitarian ethics...The realization of the Kingdom of God would depend however, on a sincere faith in the supreme spirit by millions ... this Ramrajya will be more cohesive than the formal bonds of legal organization. He also remarked in the Young India that 'By Ramrajya I do not mean Hinduraj. I mean by Ramrajya divineraj, the kingdom of God... the ancient ideal of Ramrajya is one of true democracy'.

However, Gandhiji was criticized by some scholars in connection with his deep belief in the Caste System. They pointed out the fact that Gandhiji was perhaves wrongly convinced by the norms and tradition of the Caste Institution that was based on inhuman principles, irrational and unscientific social, religious customs and political and administrative affiliation. It created numerous hurdles and difficulties in the way of their day to day living of the toiling masses. But their hardship and distressed failed to change the mind set up of Gandhiji. As a result, he came forward to protect the content of the Caste Institution excluding the case of the Harijan in India. He struggled to establish the socio-economic rights and duties of the Harijans due to uplift their socio-economic conditions. But he did not come forward to accept the content of the Bhagvat Gita. According to the content of the Bhagvat Gita, the Varna system has at least two merits. It does not say that it is based on birth. It highlights the fact that man's Varna is fixed according to his innate qualities and the profession of a son shall not be that of the father. It completely depends upon the innate qualities of a father or a son. But Gandhiji had radically changed his outlook and pointed out that Varna is determined by birth and the profession of a Varna is determined by the principle of heredity so that Varna is merely another name for caste. Even Gandhiji said about the caste based economic life of the Sudras as follows:

"The Shudras who only serves (the higher caste) as a matter of religious duty, and who will never own any property, who indeed has not even the ambition to own anything, is deserving of thousand obeisance...The very Gods will shower down flowers on him" [37]. Gandhiji said that the main ideal of any economic programme must be human happiness combined with full mental and moral growth[38]. The wealth of a nation is its people who produce it. Therefore, if economic policty does not provide each according to his need, it is of no value. One of the economic imperatives, for Gandhi, was immediate engagement of the entire population in productive work of any kind. Gandhi advised complete de-centralisation of the productive process. This led to the evolution of constructive programme based on 'Swadeshi' and 'Khaddar'. Through the practice of Swadeshi and Khaddar, Gandhiji evolved a practical remedy for crushing poverty of the millions of village people who lived in India on the border line of starvation. His vows of Swadeshi and Khaddar went deep into his conception of human progress. Swadeshi would mean self-dependence and Khaddar, work for the millions of idle manpower of the country. In advocating the production and use of Khadi, Gandhiji had a humanitarian motive. In fact, manufacture and use of Khadi meant more and more self-dependence and use of leisure time for productive purposes. He basically dedicated to the cause of 'daridranarayan' the poor man, who represents God. But he identified machinery as anti-social for it was meant to replace human labour and thus increased unemployment. His supreme consideration was man. In the words of Yusuf Meherally, his protest against the machine was essentially a protest against the enslavement of humanity in the name of technological progress[39]. Even Gandhiji pointed out in 'Young India' that "I would favour the use of most elaborate machinery if thereby India's pauperism and resulting idleness be avoided"[40]. His utmost aim was to establish a classless society by changing the hearts of the people. Some scholars pointed out that humanism was the basic principle of his economic theory.

6.3. Ambedkar on the question of Caste based Economic Life

Ambedkar is called the 'Father of Indian Social Unrest'[41] and the leader of the suppressed humanity in India. He represented the poorest of India's poor who were half-fed, half-nude and dumb. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru pointed out that "Dr. Ambedkar was a symbol of revolt against all oppressive features of the Hindu

Society"[42]. He was not only a crusader against the caste system but also a valiant fighter for the cause of the downtrodden in India. His fighting zeal for human rights as emancipator of all those enslaved in the world gave him international recognition as a liberator of humanity from injustice, social and economic. But the economic thoughts of Ambedkar were based on the concept of mixed economy, socialism, industrialization, State ownership of industries, worker's right to strike etc. He fought against the caste based economic life to establish the idea of liberty and equality in the society. The main motto behind it was to create a liberal atmosphere in the field of economic life and activities with a vision to open up the flood gate of different occupations to all irrespective of their caste, class, creed, sex and religion. As an economic thinker, Ambedkar belonged to the group of liberal thinkers. By and large his orientation was that of a socialist but he did not agree with Karl Marx whose ideas and methods were of violent nature to him. He was very much anxious about the exploitative social and economic conditions of the toiling masses in India. He knew well that these people most of whom were Dalits were being severely exploited by land lords and capitalists. That is why Ambedkar struggled for mixed economy or State Socialism to prevent this endless social and economic exploitation. He had understood that the economic equality was very much essential along with political equality to empower the toiling masses in India. The problem of the toiling masses, landless labours relied exclusively on the agricultural problems and more than this on the Indian economy as a whole. These problems should be tackled in the wider spectrum of national economic development. That is why Ambedkar stressed on the nationalization of economy. He said that the production might reach the optimum level and the capitalist might not grab the entire benefits and the hard earned money should be distributed equally[43]. According to him, the capitalist economy can not in any way remove the economic crisis of the suffering people. In the capitalist economy there are more chances of unemployment, inhuman treatment of labour, long hours of working, vicious working conditions and numerous repressive measures. In fact, he was a great champion of socialism. According to him, "State Socialism is essential for India's industrialization, private economy cannot do so and it makes an attempt it would give way to economic disparities as it can be visualized in the case of Europe. It is a warning bell for India"[44]. He pointed out that industrial harmony can be established through labour welfare and congenial industrial relations by eradicating exploitation. He fought for economic and social freedom and equality. He clearly

noted the fact that political freedom and equality without economic and social equality is quite insufficient[45]. He advocated state socialism in the field of industry and also ownership in agriculture with a collectivized method of cultivation. He opined that the plight of millions of untouchables who were of landless labourers can not be ameliorated through consolidation of lands or by tenancy legislation, only collective farms can solve the problems of the landless labours; therefore, Ambedkar suggested the plan that has two special features. The first proposes state socialism in important fields of economic life and the second does not leave the establishment of state socialism to the will of the legislature; it establishes state socialism by the law of the constitution and thus, makes it by any act of the legislature and executive[46]. That is why Ambedkar demanded to include the provision of state ownership of agriculture in the fundamental rights as this provision was unalterable by any act of legislature and the executive. The purposal was to protect the liberty of the individual. Naturally, the connection between liberty and the shape and form of economic structure of society becomes real only when state socialism has been established through political democracy. He expressed his views to establish state socialism not through dictatorship but through political democracy. Besides, Ambedkar strongly believed in the fundamental cause of India's backward economy that was the delay in changing the land system. The remedy was democratic collectivism that entailed economic efficiency, productivity and overhauling the village economy. This, he said, would wipe out elements of economic exploitation and social injustice. He did not want landlords, tenants, or landless labour. His idea of economic realism sought both freedom and welfare. The essential feature of his approach to economic problems was the condemnation of such extreme views as laissez-faire and scientific socialism. Mixed economy was the cornerstone of his economic ideas. He advocated an end to the glaring social and economic inequalities produced by the capitalist system. His evidence before the "Hilton-Young Commission"[47] was an important contribution to the discussion of currency problems in India. He gave expression to his thoughts on such issues as small-holdings, collective farming, land revenue and abolition of landlordism. It covered nearly four important decades 1917 to 1956, and touched on all major political and economic events. He realized that the solution to the problem of the untouchable landless labourers depended upon the solution to Indian agricultural problems or, even more broadly, economic problems. He focused on the injustice based on the assessment of land revenue on income and advocated that land

revenue be brought under the income-tax. His work 'The Problem of the Rupee' was considered an instructive treatise. He wrote that closing of the Mints would prevent inflation and disturbances in the internal price level. He advocated that the standard of value should be gold and the elasticity of currency should come from this source. That great scholarship and hard work in this book is evidenced by the rave reviews Ambedkar received from the British Press. Admiral Vishnu Bhagwat highlighted the fact that Ambedkar descended on the Indian skies like a meteor, lighting up the freedom movement with a viable economic vision and road-map, charted a constitutional democracy which, as he often said, could take us to the revolutionary goal of equality, liberty and fraternity. This assessment is accepted by a large number of people. His economic ideology and mission have been buried in the sands of globalization , privatization and 'reforms' by the ruling elite and even his self-proclaimed followers, who have joined hands in erecting stone and granite statues of the 'Revolutionary' whose thoughts not only sprang from the soil of the country but also its political, economic, and social realities. Ambedkar, through his logic, reasoning and scientific rationale, backed by a deep and real understanding of theoretical and applied economics, charted a path for all Indians, especially for the Dalits who he defined as all those engaged in the 'Struggle' for emancipation from the bondage of the exploitative order, through centuries of feudal and capitalist domination. Ambedkar said that socialism does not only embrace economic equality but also social and political equality. The main features of his socialism are as follows:

i. "A condemnation of the existing social, political and economic order as unjust.
ii. An advocacy of a new order based on one man, one value and one vote.
iii. A belief that this ideal is realizable in state socialism and parliamentary democracy.
iv. The conviction that immorality of established order is traceable to the attitude of Hindus and to corrupt social institutions.
v. A programme of actions leading to the ideal to be achieved through constitutional means only and

vi. A revolutionary will for establishing social democracy to carry out the programme of social solidarity"[48]. The key industries shall be owned and run by the state.

vii. The basic industries which are not the key industries shall be run by the state or by corporation established by the state.

viii. Insurance shall be a monopoly of the state and that state shall compel every adult citizen to take out a life insurance policy commensurate with his wages as may be prescribed by the legislature.

ix. Agriculture shall be state industry.

x. The state shall acquire the subsisting rights in such industries, insurance and agricultural land held by private individuals whether as owners, tenants or mortgages and pay them compensation in the form of debenture equal to the value of his or her right in the land, provided that in reckoning the value of land, plant or security no account shall be taken or any rise therein due to emergencies or any potential or unearned value or a value for compulsory acquisition.

xi. The state shall determine how and when the debenture holder shall be entitled to claim cash payment.

xii. But the agricultural industry shall be organized on the following grounds:

a. The land shall be let out to villagers without distinction of caste or creed and in such manner that there will be no landlord, no tenant and no landless labourer.

b. It shall be the obligation of the state to finance the cultivation or the collective farms by the supply of water, draught, animals, implements, manure, seeds etc.

xiii. The scheme shall be brought into operation as early as possible but in no case shall the period extend beyond the tenth year from the date of the constitution coming into operation[49]. Ambedkar had added a very relevant point that highlighted the rationale of state socialism. The plan had two special features:

a. "One is that it proposes state socialism in important fields of economic life.

b. The second special features of the plan are that it does not leave the establishment of state socialism to the will of the constitution, and thus, makes it unalterable by the act of the legislature and the executive"[50].

"Angered by the inability and incompetence of the men in power to provide economic relieve to the weaker sections of the Indian people, he suggested a bonfire of the constitution of which he was the main architect"[51].

But Ambedkar was an economist. His career was characterized by two distinct phases: the first one up to 1921 as a professional economist contributing scholarly books and the second one as a political leader thereafter until his demise in 1956, during which he made path breaking contributions as a champion of human rights for the untouchables. He wrote three scholarly books on economics:

i. Administration and Finance of the East India Company,

ii. The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India, and

iii. The Problem of the Rupee: Its Origin and Its Solution

The first two represent his contribution to the field of public finance: the first one evaluating finances of the East India Company during the period, 1792 through 1858 and the second one analyzing the evolution of the Centre-State financial relations in British India during the period, 1833 through 1921. The third book, his *magnum opus* in economics, represents a seminal contribution to the field of monetary economics. Here Ambedkar examined the evolution of the Indian currency as a medium of exchange covering the period, 1800 to 1893 and discussed the problem of the choice of an appropriate currency system for India in the early 1920s. He did not write any book on economics *per se*, though several of his other contributions during that period carry a distinctive imprint of the economist in him. As a member of the Bombay Legislative Assembly (since 1926), Ambedkar gave effective expression to the grievances of the rural poor through his mass movements. His successful struggle against the prevailing land tenure system called Khoti[52] liberated a vast majority of the rural poor from an extreme form of economic exploitation. His successful agitation against Mahar Vatan[53] emancipated a large

section of the rural poor from virtual serfdom. He presented a bill in the State Assembly aimed at preventing the malpractices of money-lenders hurting the poor. On the industrial front Ambedkar founded in 1936, the Independent Labour Party. While the prevailing trade unions fought for the rights of workers, they were indifferent to the rights of untouchable workers as human beings. The new political party took up their cause. Subsequently, as the Labour Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council from 1942 to 1946, he was instrumental in bringing about several labour reforms including establishment of employment exchanges[54], generally laying the foundations of industrial relations in Independent India. His ministry also included irrigation, power and other public works. He played an important role in shaping the irrigation policy, especially the Damodar Valley Project[55]. A distinctive feature of his scholarly contribution is his Perceptive analysis of economic dimension of social maladies, such as, the caste system and untouchability. While Mahatma Gandhi had defended the caste system on the basis of division of labour, Ambedkar came out with a hard-hitting critique in his book 'Annihilation of Castes' (1936), pointing out that what was implicit in the caste system was not merely division of labour but also a division of labourers. Ambedkar's attack on the caste system was not merely aimed at challenging the hegemony of the upper castes but had broader connotation of economic growth and development. He argued that the caste system had reduced the mobility of labour and capital which in turn, impeded economic growth and development in India. In his memorandum submitted to the British Government titled 'States and Minorities' in 1947, Ambedkar laid down a strategy for India's economic development. The strategy placed an obligation on the State to plan the economic life of the people on lines which would lead to highest point of productivity without closing every avenue to private enterprise and also provide for the equitable distribution of wealth. After Independence, Ambedkar became the first Law Minister of India. Even while drafting the Indian Constitution (as the Chairman, Drafting Committee) in 1948-49, the economist in Ambedkar was very much alive. He strongly recommended democracy as the 'governing principle of human relationship' but emphasized that principles of equality, liberty and fraternity which are the cornerstones of democracy should not be interpreted narrowly in terms of the political rights alone. He emphasized the social and economic dimensions of democracy and warmed that political democracy cannot succeed when there is no social and economic democracy. He gave an expression to

the objective of economic democracy by corporating the Directive Principles of State Policy in the Indian Constitution. As the Law Minister, Ambedkar fought vigorously for the passage of the Hindu Code Bill[56] - the most significant reform for women's rights in respect of the abolition of the doctrine of the rights by birth, right over property to women, share to daughters from the parent's property, provisions for divorce, marriage and inheritance. He resigned in September 1951 when the Bill was not passed in the Parliament. There is a unified theme running through Ambedkar's multifaceted and diverse contributions. The economic philosophy underlying is best captured in his own phrase: Bahujan Hitaya Bahujan Sukhay (*i.e.*, Greatest Good to the largest number of people). Ambedkar's philosophy is couched in social, religious and moral considerations. The focal point of philosophy is the oppressed and the depressed. The philosophy aims at giving life to those who are disowned, at elevating those who are suppressed, and ennobling those who are downtrodden and granting liberty, equality and justice to all irrespective of their castes. Before his death in 1956, Ambedkar led nearly three quarter of a million untouchables to Buddhism.

Realizing the gravity of the ill-fated economic conditions, Ambedkar was very much shocked and astonished. He expressed grievances against the deplorable economic arrangements of the state. He highlighted the fact that Chanakya who led a revolt of the slaves and helped to install a Shudra dynasty, the Mauryas, which held sway over most of India until it was done out by a regrouping of the wealthy and the propertied, expropriating classes. The people who toiled in the fields to produce food, the bunkers who wove clothes and fabrics, the artisans who made tools with their hands, household items and the most exquisite articles with precious stones and alloy metals, the people who built homes, palaces and monuments, the leather workers who made shoes, saddles for the army cavalry and without whose services society would not exist and flourish, were all continuously being cheated, looted through expropriation of the surpluses that they created by their sweat, blood and sacrifices. So the oppression, suppression, tyranny and humiliation in respect of socio-religious customs, economic exploitation, educational and professional torture done by the so-called privileged classes in the society exposed the bare content of the Caste Institution that stirred the mental set up of Ambedkar and boosted up his mind to raise a strong voice to eradicate it. He was very much inspired by the

October Proletarian Revolution in Russia in 1917 that placed the power in the hands of the workers, peasants, toiling and hitherto exploited classes in the world history. Ambedkar had thus laid bare the huge colonial (looting) enterprise on which Britain's industrialization was founded.

Besides, R. C. Dutt and Dadabhai Naoroji exposed the bare economic intention of the British Government through their thought-provoking writings. Dadabhai Naoroji for whom Ambedkar had great respect also spoke and wrote on the rapacious transfer of surplus wealth and money from India to England that shook those little social clubs who were petitioning the British government for some concessions in entry to the British Indian Army through the Royal Military Academy, Sand Hurst and the ICS quota for Indians. Even Gandhi was very much acquainted with the racial discrimination and apartheid in South Africa that bound him to re-starting a new policy of transforming the Congress into a mass organization of peasants, workers and all the toiling masses within the limitations of the social set up in the country. But Ambedkar did not remain content with these monumental works. He came forward to complete his writings on 'Small Holdings in India and their Remedies in 1917'.The subjects of Ambedkar's Doctoral thesis were in the disciplines of economics only. It dealt with the problem of agricultural economy of the country. He chose the subject of the size of holdings only as it affects the productivity of agriculture. He noted that the holdings of land in India are not small but they are also scattered which Ambedkar identified as an industry. The problems of these holdings are two-fold: How to consolidate the holdings and after consolidation, how to perpetuate the said consolidation. The heirs of deceased in India desired to secure share from each survey number of the deceased rather than distributing complete holdings amongst themselves. This has resulted into rendering the farming most inefficient and causing several problems. Ambedkar suggested that the remedy lies in not enlarging the holding but in the matter of increasing capital and capital goods. He also pointed out that the evil of small holding is the product of maladjustment of the Indian social economy. A large number of populations of superfluous and idle labour exert high pressure on agriculture. He tried to discuss how to remedy the ills of agriculture and suggests that industrialization of India is the soundest remedy for the agricultural problems of India.

Even he was very much inspired by the concept of Mahatma Jyotiba Phule's 'Kisan Che Kode' that stoked his passion to try and expose, and later struggle, by throwing in his lot with those classes subjected to extreme social, political and economic exploitation. He also consolidated his grasp of Public Finance that was published in 1921. He worked on and published 'Provincial Decentralization of Imperial Finance in British India, the Problem of the Rupee (the issues of Silver and Gold Standards) in 1923, the Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India 1925. The nectar of Ambedkar's perceptions can be gauged by a better effort at understanding the essence of his writings and speeches, through his life and the stands he took, some necessarily with compromises, underpinned by his deep understanding of how the exploitative chain and the process of accumulation of surplus works and creates an overwhelming majority of serfs and slaves as an economic underclass leading a dehumanizing animal outside the boundaries of the proper village or baste and in slums and ghettoes in the cities and towns as outcastes, untouchables and sub- humans or 'unter-menschens'. Others, so called born into higher castes have also been forced into this large mass of labour, of unceasing toil, of carrying the load on their backs and pulling the 'thela', since then with the rise of modern capitalism.

Apart from these the Great Depression of 1929 –33 shook the whole world and its epicenter was in the United States and Europe, the foremost capitalist systems, where he had spent his period of study and observation. Capitalism's exploitative chain had broken down and was engulfed by a serious crisis; it was replaced by Fascism, i.e. the rule by private Corporations in partnership with the ruling elite controlling the State apparatus. Ambedkar was perceptive enough to grasp the significance of slave labour being used by the Corporations. While he had preoccupations with the Round Table Conference, the Poona Pact, the Government of India Act 1935, the provincial elections and Separate electorates; he was deeply distressed by the exploitation, impoverishment, daily humiliation and denial of human rights to the exploited classes and the Dalits in the social milieu of the backward, feudal, arch conservative society that had evolved in the country of his birth. This evolution was not an accident. Machiavellian state-craft in combination with parasitical economic production relations and a cruel, ritual order was used as a means to enslave the people who built India. But he was very much anxious about the tragic event in the world economic history, i. e., known as the 'Great Economic Depression (1929)'. It came with its

devastation, hunger and unemployment, which not only burnt the people in the United States but also in Europe. The Capitalist classes across the industrialized countries speedily funded Fascist groups, to further dispossess and divert the working classes. This was spread through fear and propaganda, promising them the mirage of nationalism, discipline, conquests and full employment, at the same time breaking their organizations, enslaving them in factories, mines and plants jointly owned by global 'finance capital' including by American corporations and British capitalists, through the 1930s, as now brought to light through the period of the Second World War, via a commonly owned and set up Banking system, while the soldiers were killed and maimed as cannon fodder on military fronts all over the world in Europe, the Soviet Union, North Africa and Asia. Naturally, its bad impacts felt upon the socio-economic set up in colonial India. Under this unavoidable circumstances, Ambedkar explicitly stated so in his revolutionary call in Manmad in 1938, that was the central idea of his declaration of the three principles at the Workers Conference to express his views, proposals, suggestions and advices to over come the unwanted situations. He violently opposed the British economic policies that were introduced in colonial India. He expressed his grievances regarding this economic policy and pointed out that the colonial government always tried to suck the wealth and money from the Indian sub-continent to foster the process of their industrialization and economic profit. Ambedkar highlighted the theory of 'drain of wealth' introduced by the colonial government through his different thought-provoking articles. His protestant movement against caste discrimination, economic deprivation, gender inequality and exploitation heralded an epoch making event in the history of India. Ambedkar drafted the constitution of India keeping in mind of these facts to foster the notion of human rights in respect of every sphere of individual as well as national life. He was the chief architect of the Indian constitution. His central mission is spelt out in his drafts to the Drafting Committee of the Indian Constitution. He was the Chairman of it from 1947-49. Ambedkar finally emerged as the main 'Architect' of this most vital document that lays down the framework of the Republic and its social, political and economic objectives, which is a manifesto of those who struggled for India's freedom against foreign capital, foreign rule and local dominant, economic and caste interests. He decided to carry out the struggle on two tracks, viz., to destroy the oppressive social order and to bring about an equitable, non-capitalist economic restructuring through mass awakening, reform and democratic movements, as he

believed that real economic democracy was a means to transform a nation to a just order. He pointed out that 'the struggle for economic justice was as important as the struggle for social justice'. His core ideas and philosophy based on the struggle for economic justice were very important to eradicate socio-economic, political and religious disparities and inequalities in Indian society. His prime motto was to establish social justice, economic justice, political justice, religious justice etc. keeping in mind the views of the Human Rights in Indian society. That is why; he played a vital role to incorporate the core ideas and thoughts of his life for the betterment of the Indian nation through the final drafting of the Indian Constitution. He made the Directive Principles as the soul of the Indian Constitution. The Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of State Policy were his special contribution. If the chapter on Fundamental Rights, particularly its cardinal articles on Equality before the Law, Equality of Opportunity and the Right to Life (and Livelihood) as interpreted by the Apex Court are indeed held sacred, then read with Articles 37, 38 and 39 of the Directive Principles they are the guiding spirit of the Constitution and immutable. The Directive Principles of State Policy were held to be legally unenforceable at the time the Constitution was adopted in the name of "We the People..." However Directive Principles of State Policy have a mandatory character, as the injunction to the State and, therefore, to the Judiciary, Legislative and the Executive is always "SHALL" and not a 'May'. The Directive Principles are mandatory for any Government in office to fulfill the motto of our constitution. Its target is to uplift the condition of the economically, socially and politically exploited classes, establish equality of opportunity in the context of education, right to work, and economic stability that have made the preamble of the Constitution a paper promise in the hands of the exploiting classes and to destroy the privileges and total monopoly of resources of the capitalist classes. Ambedkar came forward particularly to protect and defend the Dalit rights and privileges. He clearly realized it that Dalit emancipation could only be achieved through a broad united front of all the exploited classes. That is why; Ambedkar formed a Dalit united front to launch a ceaseless struggle for the democratic rights of the haves not. His struggle was, therefore, categorically inclusive of all individuals and groups who were naturally bonded, engaged in the common struggle, of the exploited classes.

In fact, Ambedkar played a vital role to liberate the untouchables from the age-old socio-economic exploitations. The untouchables were forced to be used as breed labourer, scavengers and sweepers as the untouchables could be compelled due to their state of complete destitute and helplessness to work on a mere pittance and sometimes on nothing at all. Even they could be kept to lower jobs and prevented them from entering into competition for higher jobs. Apart from these, they could be used as shock absorbers in slums and dead weights in booms. Their plight became worse than slaves. Ambedkar noted this fact as follows:

"In slavery the master at any rate had the responsibility to feed, cloth and house... But in the system of untouchability the Hindus takes no responsibility for the maintenance of the untouchable. As an economic system it permits exploitation without obligation...."[57]

That is why; Ambedkar raised voiced against these exploitations and encouraged the ill-fated peoples to be self-respected, self-dignified and self-honored to obtain their equal honourable status and position in the society irrespective of their caste, class, sex and religion. Every individual should have the right to enjoy as he deserves an open atmosphere of the society in connection with the concept of equality, liberty and fraternity. He encouraged the untouchables to fight to finish the socio-economic exploitation imposed upon them by the ancient law makers. He did not adopt Marxian methods of ending the exploitation of the untouchables. He admitted that economic factors play an important role in human relations but not to the extent to which Marx accepted. Marx stood for the abolition of private property and sided with those who were stricken by poverty, diseases and disalities. He also included the rights against exploitation of man by man in the constitution. He not only emancipated the untouchables from the fetters of slavery but also the women, the children and the helpless people from the scourge of evil systems such as devadasi, forced labour, employment of children below the age of 14 years and so on. Apart from these, Ambedkar pointed out that "The force which will sweep all obstacles from their path and really emancipate them from their age-old bondage can, I am sure, come only from within. It is a fact, because this new movement of the untouchables, i. e., a movement from within that I feel sure that help and encourage, it will be a success... It has become a truism that without raising the untouchables the country can not rise

and that in their salvation lies the salvation of the country"[58]. Therefore, the following points should be considered for a better understanding of the philosophical thoughts[59] of Ambedkar in respect of society, polity, eonomy and others:

i. social, economic and moral regeneration is more important than political;
ii. a movement, if comes only from within, surely leads to success;
iii. the emancipation of the untouchables, dalits and the weaker sections of society, means the country would become a great and strong nation;
iv. the political power is not an end but a means to cultural revolution; and
v. this way the movement of Ambedkar gained momentum among the people in distress, poverty, tyranny, oppression, illiteracy, ills and ailments, widely spread in the country.

In fact, Ambedkar fought for the rights and duties of women who were forced to work under several distressed conditions to lead their livelihood. They were compelled to follow some inhuman evil social customs to remain in the never-ending distressed conditions. His ceaseless efforts made them aware to be self-respected and dignified to obtain their right position in the male dominated society. He clearly highlighted the fact that the nation can not be built up without the economic, political and social empowerment of women. So Ambedkar championed the cause of women. He highlighted a number of problems of Indian women and sought for their solutions in Bombay legislative council, in Viceroy's Executive Council as a Labour Minister, in the Constituent Assembly as a Chairman of Drafting Committee and also in the Parliament as the first Law Minister of Independent India. His arguments on the maternity benefit bill and on birth control were quite relevant to recognize the dignity of women. He said that the employer should not be free from liability, it is absolutely reasonable to state that the employer gets certain special benefits by employing women instead of men. He pointed out that there could not be any progress without women. He accorded equal status to women and men in every sphere of their social, economic, political, and educational. Not only that but also Ambedkar demanded the abolition of the doctrine of rights by birth. He explained the importance of the right to property to women, right to share by daughters from parent's property, provisions for divorce in the Hindu Code Bill. The Hindu Code Bill was a right step towards the Civil Code. The main target of the Hindu Code Bill was to codify and modify certain

inhuman provisions of the Hindu law in connection with women status and dignity. His contribution in the field of women emancipation is unique. So he highlighted the following points to take into consideration for the economic, social and political empowerment of women.

i. To regard and respect the woman as a good companion to man in personal, social and economic life;

ii. To share and seek full participation of woman in ordering the family affairs;

iii. To accord and awaken the womenfolk about their social duties, economic position, legal obligations as well as human rights;

iv. To shun and shift away from inferiority complex and evils of harmful nature;

v. To get education and find graceful jobs for their emancipation and to support the children and husbands;

vi. To enjoy equal status and dignity without being shadowed and swaddled by the pressure of men in power;

vii. To fight and defeat the anti-social elements that force them tolead a disgraceful life like prostitution;

viii. To grow in good conduct and character in order to keep and lead a clean public life, remaining away from illegal relations with men;

ix. To believe in an 'independent judiciary' for protecting the rights of men and women;

x. To advocate and agitate for the inclusion of deserving females in the judiciary in order to safeguard womenfolk from indignity, injury and injustice; and

xi. To raise their voice for an honest functioning of independent judiciary as it was entrusted to safeguard the rights of individuals[60].

Ambedkar basically fought for human rights and priviledges especially for the Indian proletariats, labours, women and dalits. He was called the champion of the Indian Sudras. He played a vital role in the Indian society, polity and economy with a motto to establish the concept of equality, liberty and fraternity among the citizens of India irrespective of their caste, class, creed, sex and religion. His violent opposition against caste-based economic exploitation and oppression heralded a new chapter in the

history of human rights movement in India. He mentioned the name of Manu, an ancient law-maker who was the chief architect of the Caste Institution in ancient India that wrecked the essence of liberty, equality and fraternity and compelled the common masses to remain in distressed conditions ceaselessly. On realizing the hard reality of the Sudra-Proletariats, Ambedkar came forward to save their life. Ambedkar identified the Manu Smriti as a fraudulent, adharmic manufacture of diseased minds[61]. He said that the priestly class was empowered with unlimited power in respect of socio-economic and religious rights and privileges by this religious law book and it became a 'sanad' for the priviledged Brahmin class to act as a decision-making factor in the society without considering the needs and demands of the toiling masses in India. This cruel and despotic social order based on all that is ignoble, unjust and unequal, in direct opposition to the Dharma that many great minds, especially Gautam Buddha, and those who guided Indian society had laid down. But the fighting mind and challenging spirit of Ambedkar against all sorts of cruelties worked as a source of inspiration to the working classes in India. But Ambedkar played a vital role as a socialist for establishing an egalitarian society, with the help of Buddhism as the essence of Buddhism and its Dhamma greatly influenced his mind and thoughts. Some scholars pointed out that Ambedkar was perhaves the first person who imbibed and implemented the concept of the communist idea in his own way in India to bring the toiling masses or haves not under a common united front to fight for establishing the socio-economic and political justice in India. Apart from these, we have seen how the Sanghis , who are essentially adherents of the Manu Smriti order, infiltrated and subverted the Congress Party , pre and post Independence , camouflage the core issue of economic justice while rationalizing 'social justice' to fool the people, assassinated Gandhi for opposing the domination of British finance capital in India which devastated the Indian economy. This class opposed the mild dose of reform for the Hindu society, the Hindu Code Bill and engineering riots and pogrommes and spreading division and violence through their well-oiled Goebellsian propaganda machinery, all funded by the corporate class . Why is it that we too have deviated from the central threading that runs through the mission of Ambedkar's life? As we have seen Ambedkar through his logic, reasoning and scientific rationale, backed by a deep and real understanding of theoretical and applied economics, charted a path for all Indians, for the Dalits who he defined as all those engaged in the 'Struggle' for emancipation from the bondage of the exploitative order, through centuries of feudal

and capitalist domination. It is no surprise, therefore, that he set his precepts into practice by mobilizing and leading the march for temple entry at Mahad, to be shortly followed by his stirring address at the Independent Labour Party Conference at Manmad in 1938. This was a continuity of the calls of Tuka Ram, Shahuji Maharaj, Jyoitaba Phule, only set in the contemporary context and sharply focusing on the struggle for economic justice that lay ahead. These ideas he later introduced in his draft submissions for the Constitution and the final form of the Constitution, of which he was the principal architect. Manmad 1938, the GIP Railway Dalit Mazdoor Conference, (caste discrimination was practiced in the railways and the textile mills, with the lower and lesser paid jobs going to the Dalits; while clean and weaving jobs went to the 'other' workers), was a defining moment in Dalit struggle, an inflexion point, a turning point, that focuses both on the contemporary reality and a guiding star for the times ahead. Ambedkar places before all, this foundation of his beliefs, convictions and the path that leads to the future, that the Dalits in a common united front to be forged with all the exploited classes, to achieve the goal of social and economic justice[62] in an egalitarian society and real democracy thus:

i. The economic emancipation of the Dalits is as vital as the struggle for social justice. To make the Dalits aware of the definition of the Subjugated class so that Dalit awareness is raised to a level whereby our join hands and march shoulder to shoulder with all other subjugated classes, to wage the struggle against the Ruling Class.
ii. Brahmanism (or the forces that negate and deny equality, liberty and the feelings of brotherhood, 'bhai-chara') and Capitalism are the two biggest enemies of the workers or toiling classes.

iii. Karl Marx did not as a principle; say that there were only two classes, the owner and the worker, and that in India these two classes had evolved in their final form.

iv. The spread of poisonous and vicious religious hatred in a casteist order in Indian society has resulted in workers and employees sometimes turning against each other, as opponents and enemies.

v. Trade Union Leaders while exhorting and giving spirited speeches against the Capitalists adopt double standards and remain silent on the issue of Brahmanism.

vi. The Dalit wokers and labourers movement is not against the common workers movement. It also does not support the Capitalists. Their only request is that their independent identity be protected.

vii. The movement of the Working class has deviated, from its main goal, and is solely concerned with trade unionism per se.

viii. The General Strike is the weapon of last resort; it is not an end in itself to be used for attaining the end of competitive trade unionism - leadership.

ix. In the struggle against capitalist owners the working class cannot be successful by resorting only to trade unionism. The workers have to seize and take the reins of political power in their hands.

x. Mazdoor Sanghatans which are politically directionless become tools in the hands of political parties that support the capitalist class.

xi. Equality, liberty and fraternity must be the ideals of the working class.

xii. Even after the end of British Rule, it would be wholly legitimate for the workers to struggle against the spider's web of the Landlords, Capitalists and the Baniya – Sahukar combine who will very much survive even after British Rule.

xiii. To wage a struggle to oppose the Imperialists does not mean that the class struggle against the internal structure of society has to be kept away on the shelf.

xiv. The Dalit class conflict in the interest of the Dalits must conjoin with the mainstream Mazdoor Andolan.

xv. In normal situations Mazdoors will take the Constitutional path. However they should prepare and ready themselves to use other means, should the situation and circumstances so demand.

xvi. Dalit Mazdoor Sanghatan is in full co-operation and support of the All India

Mazdoor Andolan; and it sees 'reservation' as complimenting and supplementing the Andolan.

However, it is very interesting to note that no economist in India has produced such monumental, vital and relevant works as Ambedkar did between1916-25. Undoubtedly these studies gave him an incomparable advantage over his contemporaries. His contribution as the Law Minister after 1950 in the field of public finance was noteworthy. Ambedkar had emerged as an eminent economist on the sub-continent. His main mission was to free the toiling masses of India from the endless hardships, bondage and slavery by establishing economic democracy in the Indian society.

Ambedkar formed the Independent Labour Party on the basis of three principles[63] and these principles were as follows:

Firstly; all the wealth, property and assets in this world are the result of and have been created by the undying, hard labour of the workers and the kisans. Despite this, the worker and the kisans who toil with desperation in the field are naked and hungry. All these riches, property and the means of production have been arrogated by private property rights arbitrarily imposed by the profiteers, landlord class, capitalists and the rich class who have expropriated all this wealth by illegal loot, robbery and theft. This (parasitical) class has done nothing to earn this.

Secondly; Indian society is divided into the class 'The Ruled Over' and 'The Ruling' whose interests mutually clash as a class conflict between the 'Ruler-Exploiter' and the 'Ruled-Exploited', is fundamental, and this fact remains all encompassing.

Thirdly; the rights of workers and the toilers can be defended, (and will be secured) only when the reigns of 'Political power' will be in their own hands.

If the 1920s was the decade of learning and education in Ambedkar's life, the 1930s was that of struggle, agitation, deep sensitivity and commitment to the cause of the oppressed and the exploited classes and communities; the decade of the 1940s demonstrated his ability for creativity and innovation of national level institutions and

experimentation. Few equal his contribution in this decade which precedes and transgresses India's Independence or partition, the founding of the Republic and great hopes and aspirations to real democracy, however troubled they were in the predominant class structure in 1947. Even Ambedkar played a vital role to reduce the labour problems. He realized it very well that the Second World War transformed the economy that provided opportunities for an expansion of industries. While entrepreneurs and managers could hope for prosperity, labour was not given its due share. Ambedkar piloted and introduced measures for labour welfare. The spirit of his labour philosophy could be summed in his own words from the speech delivered on September 15, 1943 in the first session of the Plenary Labour Conference: "For a long time the conviction had gained ground that the industrial labour welfare problems could not be solved unless the three parties – government, employees and employer-developed a sense of responsibility towards one another, showed more respect for one another and agreed to work in a spirit of give and take, and that there was not much chance of such a sense of mutual respect and responsibility growing up. A plan to bring them together and to let them talk to each other across the table was felt to be necessary for the realization of this purpose"[64]. The progressive labour policies adopted in free India owe much to the measures introduced by Ambedkar in the forties. Labour in India has been largely exploited. The efforts of Ambedkar were directed towards bringing the workers under the protective umbrella of social security. His contributions to the discussions on Workmen's Compensation Act[65], Maternity Benefit Act[66], etc. are of lasting importance. His played a vital role to pass the Coalmines Labour Welfare Ordinance[67] in 1944. His non-conventional approach to the problems of flood-control, navigation, irrigation and drainage, soil conservation and power developments revealed the modern and scientific mind of Ambedkar. It was evident that the not so young Ambedkar was burning the candle at both ends, unmindful of his health, all fired up with hopes and dreams. As a Labour Member of the Viceroy's Council, 1942-45, he initiated programmes to help increase the productivity of workers, by providing them education and skills, health care and maternity leave provisions for women workers, for example. Ambedkar set up the Tripartite Labour Council in 1942, to safeguard social security measures to the workers, giving equal opportunity to the workers and employers to participate in formulating labour policy and strengthening the labour movement by introducing compulsory recognition of trade unions and worker organizations[68]. Labour was

placed in the Concurrent List. Chief and Labour Commissioners viz. were appointed, so was formed a Labour Investigation Committee. Minimum Wages Act[69] was his contribution. So were Employment Exchanges and importantly workers 'Right to Strike'. Productivity and job security went together, unlike the Reformers and Globalists of today, bent on contract labour and its in-formalization thru 'hire and fire' or 'Exit Policy'. Ambedkar's vision and economic philosophy is best illustrated by his thrust to improve human capital and human resources. He established the Central Water Commission, the Central Electricity Authority, the Central Irrigation and Waterways Commission in 1944 which became the Central Waterways, Irrigation, Navigation Commission on the approval of Babasaheb in 1945, and the Central Water, Power, Irrigation and Navigation Commission, the latter's integration to concurrently enhance employment opportunities, in 1948. The Central Water and Power Commission later bifurcated into the Central Electricity Authority and the Central Water Commission. Environment was a central concern. Downstream it gave birth to State Electricity Boards (now sought to be unbundled and privatized), the Regional and National Grids (and Corporations), the National Thermal Power Corporation a giant in the Power sector today, the Damodar Valley Corporation, work on both initiated in 1943-44. His initiative and contribution on the Multi-purpose Plan for Development of Orissa's rivers is noteworthy. Such was the energy and vision of a great 'Dalit' son of the soil. We now come to perhaps his greatest contribution to the Nation State, to the Republic and to his much dreamed concept of democracy. Appointed Chairman of the Drafting committee of a Constitution for India, Ambedkar found himself the only active member of the seven originally nominated. Extraordinary though, he was still subject to being over-ruled, especially in the interest of the dominant class as regards production and property relations. Ambedkar clearly saw that unless the means of production were nationally owned by the state and agricultural lands too were nationalized there would be no real democracy. The village commons were in earlier times, not under the ownership of individuals or families. They were only sanctified as private property, just over a hundred years ago by Wellesley's Permanent Settlement and the Zamindari system introduced to make it convenient to help collect revenues for the East India Company and later the Crown , which had destroyed the social and economic fabric of our villages, by an order of magnitude. The Dalits and the landless, of which the Dalits were a majority, had no hope in hell, so to say. For the call for 'Land to the tiller' did not cater for the interests

of the Dalits as they were not even tillers or 'hissedars' and 'bataidars'. While presenting the main memorandum on 'State and Minorities' Ambedkar clearly stated that 'The main purpose behind the clause is to put an obligation on the State to plan the economic life of the people on lines which would lead to the highest point of productivity without closing every avenue to private enterprise and also provide for the equitable distribution of wealth'. Ambedkar was against monopoly in every form because he knew monopoly leads to exploitation.....it extracts work at low wages and creates artificial scarcities.....monopoly of capitalists cannot give justice to the exploited, poor classes'. He wrote in 1956 in the RPI manifesto, 'that any scheme of production must in the view of the RPI remain subject to one overriding consideration that there should be no exploitation of the working class.' Ambedkar made it clear that economic reforms by equalization of property must have precedence over every other kind of reform, noting that man is not just an economic creature (the monster of caste also had to be killed). To recapitulate, Ambedkar's radical proposals for inclusion in the Constitution were as follows:

i. Consolidation of land holdings and tenancy legislation are worse than useless, as they cannot help the 60 million untouchables, who are just landless labourers ....only collective farms set out on the lines in the proposal can help them.

ii. State Socialism is vital for the rapid industrialization of India. Private enterprise cannot do it and if it did it would produce those inequalities of wealth which private capitalism has produced in Europe.

iii. Nationalization of Insurance serves a double objective. Apart from greater security to people, it also gives the State resources for financing its economic planning in the absence of which it would have to resort to borrowing from the money market at a high rate of interest. This plan, elaborated in clause 4, Article II of his Memorandum to the Constituent Assembly included recommendations that:

I. Agriculture be a State industry.
II. Key and basic industries would be owned by the State.
III. A life insurance policy would be compulsory for every citizen.
IV. The State shall acquire the subsisting (existing) rights in agriculture and private owners will be compensated for by transferable debentures.

(Nationalization of land would simultaneously abolish caste, in Ambedkar's view.)

V. The land acquired shall be divided into farms of standard size and let out equitably, and cultivated collectively. Finance or credit shall be provided by the State.

VI. All this was without closing every avenue for private enterprise[70].

That is why; Ambedkr's ardent desire was that the plan of State Socialism must become a part of the Constitution. He further cautioned that this essential condition for the success of a planned economy should not be liable to suspension, abrogation or abandonment by the Parliament or the Government (and how prophetic he has turned out to be today). Political democracy, he said rests on the principle that the State shall not delegate powers to private persons (entities) to govern others. He also went on to write, 'anyone who studies the working of the system of social economy based on private enterprise and pursuit of personal gain will realize how it undermines, if it does not actually violate, the last two premises on which democracy rests. How many have to relinquish their constitutional rights in order to gain their living? How many have to subject themselves to be governed by private employers? Ask those who are unemployed whether what are called Fundamental Rights are of any value to them. If a person who is unemployed is offered a choice between a job of some sort, with some sort of wages, with no fixed hours of labour and with an indirect restriction on joining a union and the exercise of his right to freedom of speech, association, religion etc can there be any doubt as to what his choice will be? How can it be otherwise? The fear of starvation, the fear of being compelled to take children away from school, the fear of having to bear the burden of public cost are factors too strong to permit a man to stand out for his fundamental rights. The unemployed are thus compelled to relinquish their fundamental rights for the sake of securing the privilege to work and to subsist...What about those who are employed? Constitutional lawyers assume that the enactment of Fundamental Rights is enough to safeguard their liberty, and that nothing more is called for. They argue that where the state refrains from intervention in private affairs, economic and social, the residue is liberty. What is necessary is to make the residue as large as possible and state intervention as small as possible. It is true that that where the state refrains from intervention what remains is liberty. But this does not dispose of the matter; one more

question remains to be answered. To whom and for whom is this liberty? Obviously, this liberty is liberty to the landlords to increase rents, to the capitalists to increase the hours of work and reduce the rate of wages. This must be so. It cannot be otherwise, for in an economic system employing armies of workers, producing goods in mass at regular intervals, someone must make rules, so that the workers will work and the wheels of industry run on. Liberty from the control of the state is another name for the dictatorship of the private employer'[71] The Advisory Committee did not accept his proposals. But Ambedkar pressed repeatedly with the Chairman of the Constituent Assembly to incorporate his proposals in the Chapter on Fundamental Rights of the Constitution and not disallow them on 'technical grounds'. He argued that it was a matter in which the labouring classes in general and the scheduled castes in particular, are vitally concerned. That is the precise reason why it was not permitted in the justifiable part of the Constitution...but relegated to the Directive Principles, now more honored in the breach than practice (that is why the PS Appu Committee observed in its report on Land Reforms in 1972, that the hiatus between precept and practice, between policy pronouncements and actual execution has been the greatest in the domain of land reforms.) The application of economic thoughts and ideas of Ambedkar can only be implemented in steps and phases when the mazdoors in both the formal and the informal sector, kisans, landless workers, rural and urban men and women without livelihoods and entitlements, adivasis, artisans, bundkars, students, teachers, educated unemployed, technicians and engineers, employed or unemployed, subscribe and dedicate themselves to a better future for all. That is why; ambedkar pointed out that Dalits only as a caste group are not sufficient in numbers to change the system, its core policies, priorities and its structure without joining with the other oppressed groups, communities and demonstrating an overwhelming democratic majority. So, he had given special attention again and again in all his writings and speeches to form a 'United Front' of all exploited sections. For this a United Front of all sections and elements who constitute the exploited majority must be forged as a federation with decentralization as its watchword. Then and only then will the Dalits advance forward to their goal of social and economic justice. Otherwise they must remain as they are confined to receiving a few crumbs from the top table, always at the mercy of the Capitalist class and their ideology of Brahmanvad as defined by Ambedkar. The programmes, policies and objectives will need the agreement of all. However there will be sufficient flexibility for local initiatives depending on the

material and human resources, and the stage of development which have been reached in different locales, in the uneven matrix of social and economic indicators that we are confronted with, as long as they conform to the direction and goals of the movement.

His great contribution was also the preparation of the Declaration of Fundamental Rights safeguarding the cultural, religious and economic rights of the Depressed Classes. He prepared a scheme of political safeguards for the protection of the Depressed Classes in the future Constitution of a self-governing India. Ambedkar got opportunity in policy-making as Law Minister in the Central Cabinet of Independent India during 1947-51 and earlier as a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council in Charge of the labour, irrigation and power portfolio. His ideas on fiscal policy, administration, provincial autonomy, poverty, unemployment, inequalities, stagnant agriculture and destroyed industrialization were outstanding. He gathered numerous research experiences on finance and highlighted the economic exploitation done by the colonial government. He completed his M. Sc. degree on the thesis of "The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India" and he was awarded D.Sc. for his thesis on "The Problem of Rupee". Besides, Ambedkar has dealt with the problems of landless labourers, small holdings, Khoti system, collective farming, land revenue and abolition of landlordism. He has expressed his views and opinions on nationalization of industries, food position, socialism and social equality. He was deadly opposed to the Gandhian economic philosophy that was completely based on the principles of trusteeship. He vehemently opposed the Varna based professions of Gandhiji. He struggled against caste based professions of the Hindus that were introduced in the time of Manu, an ancient Indian law maker. He encouraged people to discard the age-old traditional inhuman beliefs and professions due to empower themselves in the field of economy, polity, society, education, culture and so on. He boosted up the mind of the toiling masses to earn by learn not by tradition. He encouraged the Dalits to feel the importance of education as it is the master key of the entry point in different employment sectors. He taught the doctrine of labour-wealth relations to the common people in India. He highlighted the philosophical interpretation of the Marxian economy and pointed out that labour is the lord of wealth in the universe. So labour can change the world economy for the greater benefit of humankind. That is why Ambedkar was very much violent against the Indian caste based traditional professions or economy. He also tried to break the shackles of caste based

professional traditions of the Hindu society. He opposed to hereditary qualification in case of any work or occupation. He always fought for qualitative educational qualification deemed fit in respect of any kind of job irrespective of caste, class, creed, sex and religion. His tireless efforts for establishing the concept of equality, liberty and fraternity in respect of professional opportunities, social liabilities, political activities, economic earnings, educational facilities, religious worships and so on. His attitude towards the ill-fated peasants, exploited labours, women workers and half naked and half-hunger toiling masses was very much humane rather than Gandhiji-the Father of the Indian Nation. In the field of caste based economic life Gandhiji stands on false myth of Brahmanical socio-religious and economic tradition whereas Ambedkar stands on living myth of humanism in the world perspective. Some scholars pointed out that Gandhiji and Ambedkar, the two shining stars in the history of universe, worked for the benefit of humankind. But Gandhiji was completely convinced by the age-old Brahmanical traditions and beliefs that lopsided the benefit of the common people. Ambedkar came forward as a saviour to the unprivileged and exploited classes without any hesitation to establish the concept of human rights in the Indian society. The explanation of Gandhiji towards caste based economy was completely based on the traditional thoughts and beliefs. He did not implement the doctrine of Ahimsa (non-violence) and Satyagraha (truthfulness) to establish the concept of equality, liberty and fraternity in respect of economic activities, social mobility and political transparency for the benefit of the exploited sections of the Indian society. But Ambedkar launched ceaseless struggles to fight to finish the injustices prevailed in the Hindu society that was imposed upon the ignorant toiling masses in India. He never bends his head before the inhuman age-old traditional thoughts and beliefs relating to hereditary professions or works. His noble labour welfare measure heralded a new dimension in the history of Indian labour economy that brought a revolutionary change in the mind set up of the deprived sections of the society along with the attitude of the wealthy classes and the government. This is the first ever attempt made by Ambedkar to bring the three opposite directions under the common minimum programme for the benefit of the toiling persons along with the protection of the national interest of the country. Ambedkar came forward to save the life of the ill-fated labour women from their endless hardships, the problems of wages and maternity leaves. He also explained the ill-fated socio-economic conditions of the Hindu women and encouraged them to

fight to finish their woes and sorrows from the society that were imposed upon them since the implementation of the laws introduced by Manu. He boosted up the mind of the Hindu women to stand up their own feet by breaking the shackles of barriers made by the ancient law makers. In fact, Ambedkar fought for the establishment of socio-economic empowerment of women in the Indian society. But Gandhiji never came forward to accelerate the process of socio-economic empowerment of women in India. Apart from these Ambedkar struggled against the forces of capitalism, privatization, free marketing, disinvestment on the part of government and globalization, as these would ultimately ruin the country, and the most adversely affected lot of our society would be the people living below the poverty line; consequently, there would be an unbroken gap between the rich and the poor. It is actually happening at present. His life and work would remain as a source of inspiration to all men and women all over the world. Therefore, it is clearly found from the aforesaid discussions that the role and attitudes of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the question of Caste based economic life was completely opposite to each other. Gandhiji advocated caste based economic activities whereas Ambedkar vehemently opposed to it and identified the criteria of requisite qualification and expertise knowledge of a person to a particular work irrespective of their caste, class, creed, sex and religion. Gandhiji stressed on the criteria of hereditary professions of the ancestors for a person to a particular work. He said that caste is the basis of hereditary professions. But Ambedkar preached the gospel of liberty, equality and fraternity and pointed out that these ideological parametric principles should be the basis of socio-economic, political, cultural, religious and other affairs of life. He also pointed out that there is no conception of liberty, equality and fraternity in the caste based economic activities. In fact, the Caste System was the main source of the Gandhian caste based economic activities. That is why; Ambedkar gave a proposal to annihilate the Caste System as is completely against the human rights and privileges. The low born Hindus (Sudras, Untouchables and Harijans) were severely humiliated and victimized by this inhuman system. It is an irony of fate that Gandhiji, the father of the Indian nation was the ardent follower and believer of this inhuman Caste System that wrecked the life of the toiling masses in India. Even Gandhian Varna system was based on the norms of caste. To him, there was no distinction between the division of caste and the Varna division. His profound believe in the Varna system was quite different from the Varna system of the Bhagbat Gita. Ambedkar believed in

the three norms and principles of the Gita, i, e., qualitative qualifications, actions and virtuous deeds. These three principles would help to judge a person according his actions for a suitable work. It does not depend upon the heredity professions of the forefathers, It is completely based upon the norms and principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, socio-economic and political democracy. Realizing the hard reality of life Gandhiji changed his attitudes in his later activities relating to the caste based Varna issues to the doctrine of Varna propagated in the Gita. He came forward to uplift the socio-economic conditions of the Untouchables and the Harijans in India. But he could not over come the inhuman norms of the Caste Institution relating to the economic activities of the Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras in the true sense of the term. Some scholars pointed out that Gandhiji extended his helping hand to save the life of the Harijans only for the cause of political compulsions. But Ambedkar raised his voice against the inhuman role and activities of Gandhiji in respect of society, polity, economy, religion and so on. He played a vital role to establish the concept of Human Rights and Social Justice in the Indian society, polity and economy.

6.4. Conclusion

It can be pointed out from the above discussions that Gandhiji stressed on the professions of forefathers in the directions of heredity from generation to generation. He said that the object of the Varna system (caste system) was to prevent competition, class struggle and class war. To him, Caste determined the occupation of a man before he is born. There is no liberty to choose his occupation of a person in the constitution of the Caste Institution. The ideology of trusteeship of Gandhiji did not fulfill his cherish dream in the context of economic relation between the haves and haves not. Therefore, the status and position of the Brahmins in the four-fold caste division in the Hindu society is unquestionable in matter of employment, education, occupation and all sorts of mastery over the other caste groups in the so-called Hindu society. They were the mastermind behind the caste based hereditary economic life. But Ambedkar vehemently opposed to the theory of forefather's hereditary birth occupational criteria for choosing any professions for any varnas. He clearly pointed out that a person should obtain a job if he would deserve according to the nature of that job. So he fought against the inhuman and unjustified hereditary birth criteria for

obtaining a job. He identified various criteria like, educational qualification, efficiency in work and expertise knowledge etc. in the occupational fields for obtaining any kind of jobs. He raised his voice against the caste based economic professions or occupations. He vehemently opposed to the caste based occupational divisions of varnas. But he profoundly believed in the philosophy of liberal thoughts and ideas to open up the occupational sectors to all irrespective of their caste, class, sex, religion etc. He mainly believed in the slogan of 'career open to talent' in respect of the social, economic, cultural, religious, political activities and administrative works. He played a vital role to protect the interest of the workers, peasants, women, untouchables and the Depressed Classes of India through the constitutional safeguards. He was in favour of modernization, industrialization and urbanization, which, he found, were indispensable for the overall growth of the nation.

References

1. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 9, Education Department, Government of Maharasra, 1991, p. 278.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid, p-277.
4. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 1, Education Department, Government of Maharasra, 1989, p. 77.
5. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches,* Vol. 9, op.cit. , pp. 278-282.
6. Shukla, Ramakant; Gandhian Philosophy of Education, Sublime Publications, Jaipur, 2002, p.263.
7. Gandhi, M.K.; Modern V. Ancient Civilization, Hingorani T, Anand ed., Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1970, p. 14.
8. Gandhi, M. K.; Industrial and Agraian life and Relations, Kher V. D. ed., Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1984, p. 260.
9. Gandhi, M.K.; An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth; Desai, Mahadev, translated, Penguin Books, 1982, p.365.
10. Bose, Nirmal Kumar; Studies in Gandhism, India Associated Publishing Co., Calcutta, 1962, p.47.
11. Young India, December 26, 1924.

12. The Harijan, October 9, 1937.
13. Ibid.
14. The Harijan, August 25, 1940.
15. Young India, November 15, 1928.
16. The Harijan, July 13, 1947.
17. Ibid, October 9, 1937.
18. The Harijan, April 20, 1940.
19. Ibid.
20. An address delivered before the Missionary Conference, Madras on 14 February, 1939, on Economics of Khadi.
21. Gandhi, M. K., Ethical Religion, Trans. By Ayar, S. Ganesan Publisher, Madras (1922), p. 46.
22. Ibid, p.59.
23. Ibid p. 48.
24. Ibid, p. 39.
25. Young India, March, 9, 1922.
26. The Harijan, September 4, 1919, p.466.
27. Gandhi, M.K, National Voice, p.212.
28. Young India, November 1928, p. 381.
29. Mishra, D. K; Doshi, S. L.; Jain, C. M.; Gandhian Thought (Gandhi and Social Order), Published by Research Publications, Jaipur, New Delhi, 2008, p. 23-24.
30. Ibid.
31. The Harijan, 29.11.51
32. February 1916 – Convocation of the Hindu University.
33. Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol. 9, op. cit, p. 276. Quoted in Vol. II of the series called Gandhi Sikshan as No. 18.
34. The Harijan, September, 28, 1934, p. 560.
35. Vide Dr. Bhagwandas: Sanatan Vaidika Dharma (1928), p. 104.
36. The Harijan, July 18, 1936.
37. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 9, op. cit., p. 291; Quoted in Gandhi's Varna Vyavastha, p.51.
38. Mazumdar, H.T; Mahatma Gandhi- A Peaceful Revolutionary, Charles Scribner, 1952, p. 56.

39. Meherally, Yusuf; On Gandhi (Gandhi's 75th Birthday volume), 1944, p. 238.
40. Gandhi, M. K; Sarvodaya, Ahmedabad, NPH, 1954, p. 40.
41. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, Tenth Reprint 2002, p. 136.
42. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 9, op. cit., p. viii.
43. J.S. Narayan Rao and others, (ed.), B.R.Ambedkar-His Relevance Today, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 1994, p. 53.
44. Vidyasagar, I.S; Concept of Humanism of Dr. Ambedkar, ABD Publishers, Jaipur, India, 2005, p.72.
45. Jatava, D.R; Ambedkar Code of Conduct, ABD Publishers, Jaipur (Raj.), India, 2005, p.163.
46. Lokhade, G.S; Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar - A Study in Social Democracy, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi, 1982, pp. 33-34. / or ISV-P123
47. Jatava, D.R; Ambedkar Code of Conduct, op. cit., p. 162.
48. Lokhade, G.S; Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar-A Study in Social Democracy, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi, 1982, p. 35.
49. Ibid, pp.45-47.
50. Ibid, p. 47.
51. Deogirikar, T.R; Twelve Years in Parliament, Continental, Poona, 1964, p. 88.
52. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, Tenth Reprint 2002, p. 129.
53. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 298.
54. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 10, op. cit., p.78
55. Ibid, p. 220.
56. Vidyasagar, I.S; Concept of Humanism of Dr. Ambedkar, op. cit., p. 108-109.
57. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 9, op. cit., p. 197.
58. Quoted in Dalit Voice (Forty-nightly), Vol. 23, December1-15, Bungalore, India.
59. Jatava, D.R; Ambedkar Code of Conduct, op. cit., p.116.
60. Ibid, p.133.
61. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 106.

62. http://atrocitynews.wordpress.com/2007/02/02/dr-br-ambedkar-economic-program-vision-central-mission/
63. Ibid. See also Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., pp. 285-286
64. Moon, Vasant (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches*, Vol.10, op. cit., p. vii-viii.
65. Ibid, p. 320.
66. Mehra, Shashi; ed., Ambedkar's Perspective on State, Caste and Social Justice, Sanjay Prakashan, New Delhi, 2002, pp. 197-198.
67. Ibid, pp. 137-138.
68. Ibid, Vol. 10, pp. 188-200.
69. Ibid, pp. 211-219, 300-301.
70. Vidyasagar, I.S; Concept of Humanism of Dr. Ambedkar, op. cit., pp. 135-136.
71. Shabbir, Mohammad (ed.); Ambedkar on Law, Constitution and Social Justice, Rawat Publications, Jaipur and New Delhi, pp.341-342; Quoted in Appendix I (Explanatory Notes), Clause 4, Section II, Article II, States and Minorities..., 1947.

Chapter 7

Caste, Politics and the Activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar

7.1. Introduction

The role, ideas and activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste and its politics heralded a new dimension in the history of India. Their approaches relating to the issues of Caste, Untouchability and Harijans made them fundamentally opposite to each other. Gandhiji's role and activities relating to these issues were completely traditional in nature and peculiar in character. He could not do anything without the affiliation to the traditional beliefs and convictions. He never dared to break the norms of the caste-based traditions. His explanations in connection with these subjects were basically based on age-old traditions. In spite of his numerous limitations related to these factors, Gandhiji emerged as a saviour of the Harijans in India. He also became the champion of the ill-fated untouchables in India and founded the Harijan Sevak Sangha to uplift their socio-economic and educational status and position in the society. He earned name in the world history for the benevolence of the Harijans. He was influenced by the concept of liberal ideas relating to the social reforms of the Harijans in a different way that ushered an epoch-making event in the life of Gandhiji and also in the history of the freedom struggle in India. But the ideas, roles and activities of Ambedkar relating to these issues were much more attractive and encouraging. He fought for the abolition of the inhuman Caste Institution and Untouchability and tried to establish the concept of liberty, equality, fraternity, nationality, democracy, and socialism with a mission to build up India on the basis of liberalism, nationalism, humanism, justice in all aspects such as social, political, economic etc. His role for the progress of the Harijans as human being in India was very much reformative and energetic. However, Gandhiji and Ambedkar ultimately came forward to establish the concept of liberalism, social reforms, human rights and social justice in the Indian socio-political and economic arena. They worked for the betterment of the downtrodden, toiling masses of India in their own ways. They explained their views and opinions distinctively to uplift the ill-fated conditions of the Depressed Classes, Untouchables and Harijans. Both of them were completely

opposite to each other in the context of their thoughts and views relating to the issue of Caste, Untouchability and Harijans. However, Gandhian political philosophy was mainly based on the ideologies of Ahimsa (Non-Violence) and Satyagraha (Truthfulness) whereas the political ideology of Ambedkar was based on the principles of humanity, liberty, equality, fraternity, social democracy, political democracy, human rights, social justice, nationalism and so on. In fact, Gandhiji was so committed to these two cardinal ideas (Ahimsa and Satyagraha) that he even suspended political action in Chauri Chaura in 1921 when the situation became violent. For Gandhiji, non-violent action is the only test for truth. Satyagraha is a form of persuasion, which aimed not at the conquest of the opponent but at the removal of conflict through genuine agreement. Based on truth, non-violence and self-suffering, Satyagraha is a force that contained an element of coercion. According to him, "Satyagraha provides strong moral strength to the Satyagrahee who is himself willing to endure self-suffering"[1]. Ahimsa denotes not merely refusal to use violence; it also contains a positive psychological element seeking to eliminate ill-will. Love is an important constituent of ahimsa for, without love, ahimsa will remain a mere theoretical conceptualization. Ahimsa and truth, argued Gandhiji, "Are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. Nevertheless ahimsa is the means and truth the end"[2]. In politics, the use of ahimsa was based in Gandhi's view "upon the immutable maxim that government is possible only so long as the people consent, either consciously or unconsciously, to be governed"[3]. He developed a new form of political struggle based on the idea of Satyagraha or Non-violent protest. He ushered in a new era of nationalism in India by articulating the nationalist protest in the language of non-violence or ahimsa, which galvanized the masses into action. Gandhiji advised the masses to follow the essence of his two cardinal doctrines i. e. Ahimsa and Satyagraha to maintain tranquility in the field of society, polity and economy. Some scholars pointed out that the followers of Gandhiji almost failed to keep it up these two ideologies in mind whenever they moved to lead anti-British political movement in India. Even Gandhiji was forced to launch the 'quite India' movement against the colonial government to liberate the country from the foreign yoke through the historic callings of 'do or die' and 'fight to finish'. Naturally, the concept of Ahimsa and Satyagraha ultimately depended on the callings of 'himsa' (violence) in the true sense of the terms. Not only Gandhian political strategies failed to cope up the interest of the common masses but also it was to pursue non-violence

even facing the bayonet and bullet. It was a creed not to physically attack the law-makers but to sacrifice life in passive resistance. It was to non-co-operate with the government or to deny the rule through civil disobedience and not to force the government with arms. Gandhiji said, "When we do not like certain laws we do not break the heads of law-givers but we suffer and do not submit to the laws"[4]. He also said, "... Believe me that a man devoid of courage and man-hood can never be a passive resister" [5]. In Indian politics Gandhiji used the policy of non-violence non-co-operation in 1920 and the policy of civil disobedience in 1930 against the British Government. But he always maintained the creed of non-violence or passive resistance was not a weapon of the weak. He advised all to live a life leading to the realization of truth. He made no difference between the personal and political life in this regard. He advocated the concept of Ramrajya that was an ideal state of 'Swaraj'. He disapproved of proletarian dictatorship of the communists and also of Parliamentary democracy. Even he said that democracy do not serve any good in India. To him, "Parliaments are really emblems of slavery"[6]. In the last stage of his life, Gandhi proposed for the disbanding of the Congress Party after the attainment of freedom and turned it into a social organization[7]. In fact, he was not a rationalist or a follower of reason, but he claimed that his life was after inner-voice of the truth within. He stressed on 'Love-Force' instead of 'brute-force'. Practically speaking, Gandhiji tried to introduce the doctrines of Ahimsa and Non-violence in the field of political arena to liberate the country from the foreign suzerainty and bondage. But he did not come forward to implement these ideologies in the field of caste-politics to liberate the toiling masses from age-old traditional thoughts and believes of the Caste Institution. The Institution of Caste practically wrecked all sorts' of rights, privileges and liberty of the low-born peoples. But Ambedkar was the chief architect of several Hindu temple entry movements in India. His main motto was to establish the rights and privileges of the untouchables in the Hindu temples. But the Harijan Sevak Sangh of Gandhiji refused to incorporate abolition of Caste System in its programmes. Gandhiji used Satyagraha against Britishers but did not favour it for untouchables against the caste Hindus. He wanted to abolish untouchability but not at the cost of offending caste Hindus. Thus he had his own reservations on the issue of rights of the Depressed Classes. But Ambedkar wanted reorganization of the Hindu society with complete abolition of the Caste System and untouchability on the principle of liberty, equality and justice. He demanded the recognition of the Depressed Classes as a

separate community as the Muslims with separate political rights. His main mission was to annihilate caste, untouchability, socio-political, religious and age-old evil traditions and hypocrisy and to build up the country on the basis of the ideologies of liberty, equality, fraternity, nationality, democracy, socialism and so on. The other prime object of Ambedkar was to liberate the low-born people from the yoke of age-old evil Brahmanical traditions and believes to lead a free life in the society. However, Gandhiji and Ambedkar worked for the benefit of the downtrodden masses in India completely in opposite in directions to each others. Therefore, the role and activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste and its Politics was very much interesting and investigating to expose their real mentality publicly and historically in the true sense of the terms. To make a true picture relating to the questions of Caste and Untouchability before the emergence of Gandhiji was very much important in these connection to understand the real truth. Naturally, the discussions relating to these issues can be done under the following heads:

7.1 Caste Politics of the Congress Leaders and Politicians before the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the Political Arena.

7.2. Caste Politics after the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the Political arena.

7.3. Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar in connection with the 'Communal Award' and the Historic 'Poona Pact' of 1932.

7.4. Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar relating to the Question of the Harijan Temple Entry Movement.

7.2. Caste Politics of the Congress Leaders and Politicians before the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the Political Arena

Before the emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar as national leaders in Indian political arena, the moderate politicians of the Indian National Congress tried to address the problems and issues of the Depressed Classes and Untouchables in India. Their dealings with the questions of age-old traditional, inhuman and superstitious social evils and social wrongs such as Caste system, Untouchability etc. were not fruitful at all. They failed to bring radical change in the sphere of socio-economic, politico-cultural, dictated socio-religious norms and customs of the so-called Hindu

society. Naturally, the Depressed Classes and the Untouchables of India remained in the same distressed conditions as before. Some scholars pointed out that the attitude of the political leaders of the Indian National Congress towards the problems of the Depressed Classes and Untouchables were just like a public show. Their main motto was to deceive them in all spheres of their individual as well as their national life. But W. C .Bannerjee, Dadabhai Nairobi, Budruddin Tyabji, Surendra Nath Banerjee and other eminent politicians of the Indian National Congress distinctively expressed their views on the incurable social issues like the Caste System, superstitions, Untouchability and others. Most of them worked on the line of their predecessors and always tried to protect their class interest intact. None of them came forward to launch a direct reform movement to eradicate numerous social evils from the Hindu society except few exceptions. Most of the moderate and extremist politicians of the Indian National Congress gave emphasis on political reform rather than social reforms. They did not like to give priority to social reform. As a result, there arose a great controversy relating to the question of social reform between the two groups of the Indian National Congress. The social reform group vehemently opposed to the role and activities of the political reform group. They pointed out that social reform was inevitable before political reform. Otherwise, the concept of Indian nation, nationalism, unity in diversity would not be possible at all. In fact, their fighting for independence against the mighty British imperialism was based on the damp of sand. The political reform group ultimately failed to realize the untold and priceless importance of the social reforms. Naturally, they lost a great opportunity to hasten the national movements with strong holds. Therefore, it can be said that the lot of the toiling masses of India was not improved up to the mark under the leadership of the pre-Gandhian politicians and leaders of the Indian National Congress. Although some politicians profoundly felt the necessity of a national movement against the mighty British Government since the inception of the Indian National Congress. They said that national movement should not be organized exclusively on political line only. It should consider the political questions along with the factors that affecting the Indian social economy. Therefore, they realized it very well that they should adopt best measures for vitalizing Hindu Society by removing all social evils.

That is why; we should examine the role, activities and attitudes of some Congress leaders and politicians in this perspective. The name of W. C .Banerjee - the first

President of the Indian National Congress may be mentioned first in this connection to realize the motive and intention of him relating to the issues of Caste and Untouchability. He clearly mentioned the following aims and objectives of the Indian National Congress in his Presidential address to make the national movements with strong holds.

i. The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst the countrymen;
ii. Eradication of all possible prejudices relating to race, creed, or provinces;
iii. Consolidation of sentiments of national unity;
iv. Recording of the opinions of educated classes on the pressing problems of the day; and
v. Laying down of lines of future course of action in the public interest etc.

Therefore, it can be pointed out that Mr. Banerjee did not include a provision for direct anti-caste and anti-untouchability campaign against the orthodox Hindus to bring solidarity and unity among the multi-racial, multi-lingual and multi-religious people of colonial India. Mr. Banerjee expressed his views once again on the subject of Social Reform in the Presidential address in the Eighth Session of the Indian National Congress in 1892. He pointed out that some of their critics had been busy in advising them that they ought not to meddle with political matters, but leave politics aside and devote themselves to social subjects in order to improve the social system of their country. They even demanded that they knew their affairs better than those. However, Mr. Banerjee was one who had very little faith in such public discussions. According to him; this matter ought to be left to the individuals of a community who belong to the same social organization to do what they could do for its improvement[8]. He also noted the fact that they knew it very well that how people became excited when social subjects were discussed in public. He cited the example of the Age of Consent Bill in this regard that was introduced into the Viceregal Legislative Council. Even Mr. Banerjee did not propose to say one word as to the merits of the controversy that arose over these subjects. He alluded to it to illustrate how apt the public mind was to get agitated over these social matters if they were discussed in a hostile and unfriendly spirit in public. He pointed out that they did not understand what was meant by social reformation. Even some of them were very anxious and pointed out that their daughters should have the same education as theirs sons, that they should go

to Universities, that they should adopt learned professions; others who were more timid would be content with finding that their children were not married when they were very young, and that widows should not remain widows all through the rest of their lives. He always expected Congress to remain as a pure political organization devoting its energies only to political matters. Mr. Banerjee was very much afraid about the critics who always tried to find out their faults for not making social subjects a part of their work. And it was very much surprising to him when the critics uphold the proposition that the Congress platform was suitable only to discuss social problems and to find out its solutions. Mr. Banerjee was very much worried against those who held that they were not fit for political reform. He clearly pointed out that there was no connection between social and political reform. He cited the instances to prove this notion. He pointed out that they had been suggesting year after year on different matters, like the separation of judicial from executive functions in the same officer. So there was no urgency to give top priority to social reforms before the completion of the political reforms. In the same way, they took Permanent Settlement which they had been advocating, the amendment of the law relating to forests and other such measures. Mr. Banerjee also asked what these had to do with social reform.

But some emergent nationalists expressed their views in favour of social reform in the first session of the Indian National Congress held in Bombay in 1885. The name of Dewan Bahadur R. Raghunath Rao, Justice M. G. Renade (the then Rao Bahadur) and others may be mentioned in this connection who critically highlighted the necessity and utmost urgency of the eradication and removal of all age-old traditional inhuman and unscientific socio-religious, and poisonous evil dogmas from Hindu Society. Practically speaking, nothing was done in this regard in 1886. As a result, there arose a great controversy among the moderates, extremist leaders, politicians and other educated Indian intelligentsia in connection with the question of social reform and political reform. Naturally, they were divided into two opposite camps. But the conservative groups of the Indian National Congress asserted their proposition in favour of political reform rather than social reform. They proposed for the establishment of a separate organization to address the issues of caste and untouchability. They raised numerous questions in connection with the utility of social reforms. They said that Congress should set up a separate body for the discussion of social questions. It was not the right way of social discussion in the

Congress platform. In fact, it was completely intolerable to them. They did not like the Social Reform group. To them, Congress should not take any initiative to eradicate social evils under the umbrella of the Indian National Congress. Under these unavoidable circumstances, a separate organization called the 'Indian National Social Conference' was formed for the consideration of different subjects relating to the questions of social reforms, social economy, socio-religious digamous and other burning issues.

But Dadabhai Nairoji was one from the leaders who presided over the Second Session of the Indian National Congress held in Calcutta in 1886. He expressed his opinions relating to the issues of social reforms with utmost antipathy. He cheerfully mentioned that Congress ought to take up the questions of social reforms relating to caste, untouchability, superstitions and others. But Congress failed to do these social reforms. Naturally, the failure of the Congress had been identified as a reproach against them. He said that no other member of the Congress had realized the necessity of social reforms more than him. He said that there was proper time, proper circumstance, proper party and proper place for everything. All of them were assembled together in the Congress platform as a political body to represent their political aspirations to their rulers, not to discuss social reforms. None should blame them for ignoring the social reforms of the Hindu society. The Hindus were categorically divided into numerous castes and each caste group had its own customs and social arrangements that were distinctively different from each other's in the same province side. Even the Mohammedans, Christians of various denominations, Parsis, Sikhs, Brahmos and others lived in India. How could this gathering of all classes discuss the social reforms needed in each individual class? Only the members of that class could effectively address to the reforms one needed. That is why; the Congress must confine itself to these questions in which the entire nation had a direct participation and it must leave the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions to Class Congress[9]. Under these circumstances late Rajah Sir T. Madhav Rao (K.C.S.I.) presided over the First Indian Social Conference held at Madras in 1887. Many supporters attended the meeting. They realized the necessity of holding such conferences in different parts of India. They expressed their valuable opinion on the subject of social reforms. They proposed a plan to adopt the required measures for the improvement of the conditions of the Depressed Classes in the Indian society.

Even some of them came forward to deal with different subjects relating to the disabilities attendant on distant sea-voyages, the ruinous expenses of marriage, the limitations of the age below which marriage should not take place, the re-marriages of youthful widows, the evils of the remarriages of old men with young girls, the forms and evidences of marriages and inter-marriages between sub-divisions of the same caste, caste problems, untouchability and so on. Their main motive was to establish a society based on the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity in India that would hasten the process of democratic movement against the British Government. As a result, they proposed to form different sub-committees to deal with these social questions. The Sub-Committees advocated certain fundamental principles and penalties for breaking its norms. Therefore, the members of the Social Reform Party should enforce these norms, otherwise they might have to be bound by the prescribed penalties by the Sub- Committees themselves, or through their spiritual heads whenever it was possible to do so, or through Civil Courts. And failing all by application to Government for enabling the Committees to enforce the rules in respect of their own pledged members.

Budruddin Tyabji, a reputed Congress leader who presided over the Third Annual Session of the Congress held at Madras in 1887 delivered a speech on the subject of Social Reform in that meeting. But the attitude of Mr. Tyabji towards the issues of caste and untouchability and other social evils can be found out from his lectures given there on social reforms. He clearly pointed out that an objection was raised against the Congress for not addressing the social questions relating to age-old acute social evils. However, this objection seemed to him not only strange but also irrelevant because Congress was consisted of the representatives, not of any one class or community, not of one part of India, but all the different parts, and of all the different classes, and of all the different communities of India. But any question of Social Reform must be related only to a particular caste or community not the whole class of colonial India. Apart from these, the arguments against the thesis of social reforms, Mr. Tyabji asked the people of different castes, classes and communities to solve their social problems in their own way. He said that Mussalmans had their own social problems to solve, just as the Hindu and Parsi friends had theirs. The leaders of the particular communities to which they belonged could deal with these questions best. He also pointed out that that the only wise and possible way that could be

adopted was to confine their discussions only to such questions that affected the whole of India at large. However, Surendra Nath Banerjee who presided over the meeting of the Congress Session held in Poona in 1895 mentioned the following subjects on 'Social Reform' in his presidential speech. This was the last occasion when a Congress President expressed his personal views on this matter.

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, the-then President of the Indian National Congress pointed out that they could not afford to have a schism in their camp because already they had told them that it was a Hindu Congress, although the presence of their Mohammedan friends completely contradicted the statement. This was the Congress of one social party rather than that of another. The Congress consisted of the Hindus, the Mahomedans, the Christians, the Parsis and the Sikhs, of those who would reform their social customs and those who would not and Congress was the pillar of united India. Mr. S.N. Banerjee also pointed out that they had all agreed to bury their social and religious differences and recognized the one common fact under the common platform of the Indian National Congress that being the subjects of the same sovereign and living under the same Government and the same political institutions, they had common rights and common grievances and they had called forth this Congress into existence with a view to safeguard and extend their rights and redress their grievances. What should they say of a Faculty of Doctors who fell out, because though in perfect accord as to the principles of their science, they could not agree as to the age at which they should marry their daughters, or whether they should remarry their widowed daughters or not. He clearly mentioned that it was a political and not a social movement. Therefore, it was not an urgent matter to complaint relating to this issue against them. He said that they were not a social organization any more than it could be urged against any of their lawyer friends that they were not doctors. Even in regard to the question of political matters, such was their respect for the opinions of minorities, that so far back as 1887, he thought it was at the instance of Mr. Badruddin Tyabji, who once was their President and whose elevation to the Bench of the Bombay High Court was a matter of national congratulation, a resolution was passed to the effect that where there was practical unanimity among a class, though in a minority in the Congress, that a question should not be discussed, it should forthwith be abandoned. There was special danger to which an organization such as theirs, was exposed and which must be guarded against them, the danger of there being

developed from within the seeds of dissension and dispute[10]. Under these unavoidable circumstances, the 'Social Reform Party' had already established a separate organization of its own called the 'Indian National Social Conference' in 1887 to address different types of social evils that festered Hindu society at a large. But the members of this Conference were not satisfied with the activities of Congress as Congress was completely dissociating itself from questions of social reform. Many leaders of the Indian National Congress expressed their views that Social Reform should not precede Political Reform and pressed for a decision. Auckland Colvin, a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council vividly stated that Indians ought to turn their attention to Social Reform in preference to endeavours they were making "to teach the British what their duties were in regard to the Government of India"[11]. But Mr. S.N. Banerjee was the last Congress President who highlighted the Congress motive towards the issue of social reforms in 1895. None of the Congress President considered social reforms as on urgent basis to eradicate all sorts of the social evils existed in the Hindu society, like caste, untouchability etc. As a result, there arose a great controversy between the two groups of the Congress camp on the issue of social reform versus political reform. Dadabhai Naoraji, Budruddin Tyabji and Surendranath Banerjee belonged to a particular school. They individually realized the importance of social reform. But W. C .Bannerjee and others who belonged to other school demanded social reform as on urgent basis under the umbrella of the Indian National Congress. They vividly pointed out that there could not be build up political reform with out the completion of the social reform. Both these schools within the Congress camp were fundamentally opposed to each other and did not develop a spirit of antagonism and intolerance towards each other up to 1895. As a result, the INC and the Social Conference functioned as two distinctive parallel organizations. They already tried to fulfill their particular aims and objectives. In spite of their differences, the relation between the two schools in the Congress camp was good and co-operative up to 1895. For instance, it can be noted here that the programmes of the Indian National Congress and the Social Conference were held in the same pandel and majority of the Congressmen attended the Social Conference who had come to attend the Congress session. But the relation between the two groups became worse due to the Anti-Social Reform Section of the Congress after 1895. Therefore, the Social Conference became an eyesore to them. They even did not like to use the Congress pandal for holding the session of the Social Conference. When the Congress met in

Poona in 1895, they rebelled and threatened to burn the Congress pandel if the Congress would allow for using that pandal for the purpose of the Social Conference. Tilak played a vital role among the other leaders of the Political Reform group against the Social Reform Section group in this context. Although he said, 'Swaraj is my birth right'. In the context of Untouchability, once he stated, "If a God were to tolerate Untouchability, I would not recognize him as God at all."[12]. Yet he deadly opposed to use the Congress pandel by the Social Conference. Therefore, he, along with the other leaders of the Indian National Congress threatened to burn the Congress pandal if they would allow the Social Reform group to use the pandel of the Congress. The rebellious group succeeded because the Pro-Social Reform Party in the Congress was not prepared to fight its opponents. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the Pro-Social Reform Party in the Congress did not like to take up the challenge was evident from the letter which Mr. Surrendranath Bannerjee wrote to Mr. Ranade over the question raised by Mr.Tilak's Party regarding the use of the Congress pandel by the Social Conference in which he said, "The raison d'etre for excluding social question from our deliberations is that were we to take up such questions it might lead to serious difference ultimately culminating in a schism, and it is a matter of the first importance that we should prevent a split. The request of the other side is very unreasonable; but we have sometimes to submit to unreasonable demands to avert greater evils"[13]. Consequently, Congress did not want to consider this matter under the pressure of the Anti-Social Reform group. But some of the leading Social Reformers welcomed this rebellion by the opponent of the Social Reform Party in the Congress against the Conference. Dewan Bahadur R. Raghunath Rao wrote to Mr. Ranade that he "was glad that the pandel was not allowed to be used by the Social Conference, for the deception that used to be practiced by the Congress upon the English people that it worked in conjunction with the Social Conference was unveiled and the English people would now clearly understand that the Congress really did not mean to work with the social conference"[14].

That is why, no Congress President after 1895 raised the question of social reforms in their Presidential address. In fact, the Congress had become purely a political body after 1895 and it had completely discarded the principle of social reform from their agenda to remove the social evils of the Hindu society. Congress had done nothing since the beginning up to 1916 on those issues in the Hindu society. Under such

unavoidable circumstances, the Depressed Classes passed the following resolutions in the year of 1917 at two separate meetings held in the city Bombay under two different Presidents. The first meeting was called under the chairmanship of Sir Chandavarkar on 11th November, 1917 and passed the following resolutions[15].

First of all, it was resolved to remain loyal to the British Government and prayed for victory of the Allies.

Secondly, it was resolved unanimously to approve the scheme of reform in the administration of India Muslim League.

Thirdly, it was unanimously resolved in this meeting to improve the lot of the untouchables, Depressed Classes considering their degraded conditions in the Hindu society, economy, polity, education etc. through the scheme of reform and reconstitution of the Legislative Councils which Government might be pleased to adopt necessary measures to pay due attention to protect the interests of those classes. It was further noted in this meeting that the British Government was so gracious to grant these classes the right to elect their own representatives to the said Councils in proportion to their numbers.

Fourthly, it was unanimously appealed to the British Government for the introduction of a compulsory and free system of education to improve the social elevation of any community which completely depended upon the universal spread of education among its members and it would be much help to uplift the ill-fated conditions of the Depressed Classes by removing their the age-old illiteracy and ignorance

Fifthly, it was unanimously authorized the Chairman of this public meeting to appeal the I.N.C. to pass at its forthcoming session a distinct and independent resolution in favour of the Depressed Classes so that they could remove all the disabilities imposed by religion and custom upon them that were prohibiting them from admission into public schools, hospitals, courts of justice and public offices, and the use of public wells, etc. These disabilities social in origin, amount in law and practice to political disabilities and as such fall legitimately within the political mission and propaganda of the Indian National Congress.

Sixthly; it was further resolved to appeal especially the higher castes, who demanded political rights and treated it as the only way out for the purpose of removing the blot of degradation from the Depressed Classes, which had subjected those classes to the worst of treatment in their own country.

The second meeting under the Chairmanship of one Bapuji Namdeo Bagade, a leader of the Non-Brahmin party was also summoned in November, 1917 and unanimously adopted the following resolutions[16]:

Firstly, it was resolved to remain loyal to the British throne.

Secondly, it was resolved not to give its support to the Congress-League Scheme.

Thirdly, it was resolved that Colonial India should remain under the control of the British administration till the improvement of all classes and specially the Depressed Classes to participate in the administration of the country

Fourthly, it was further resolved that the British Government must had to provide special grant to the untouchables relating to their own representatives in the various legislative bodies to ensure their civil and political rights.

Fifthly, it was approved the objectives of the Depressed India Association (Bahiskrit Bharat Samaj) and supported the deputation to be sent on its behalf to Mr. Montagu.

Sixthly, there was an appeal to the British Government that they should take special measures to fulfill the needs of the Depressed Classes, make their primary education both free and compulsory and to give special facilities by way of scholarship to the students of the Depressed Classes.

Seventhly, it was further resolved unanimously to authorize the President of this meeting to forward the above resolution to the Viceroy and the Government of Bombay.

Under these circumstances, the Indian National Congress, under the Presidentship of Mrs. Annie Besant, passed a resolution in the Annual Session held in Calcutta in 1917. The Indian National Congress appealed to the people of India for understanding the necessity and righteousness of removing all disabilities upon the Depressed Classes imposed by custom, the disabilities being of a most vexatious and oppressive character, subjecting those classes to considerable hardship and inconvenience.

The representative from Madras, G.A. Natesan also highlighted this resolution at that meeting and pointed out that the question of justice and righteousness of removing all disabilities. The Subjects Committee realized the necessity and unique character of this Congress after obtaining self-government in colonial India. The first duty of the Congress was to remove all inequalities and injustice. He also pointed out that without injuring their religious feelings, without giving up all that was best in their religious tradition; the Congress had a right to ask of them and others elsewhere that such absurd restrictions as the non-admission of these people to schools should be removed. These people were refused even the use of common well. Naturally, these restrictions should be disappeared. When Responsible Self-Government was to be given to them they should be in a position to say that Indians of all classes, of all creeds, had the fullest rights, to all institutions so that Indian manhood may develop in all its truest, best the noblest traditions[17].

Ambedkar critically discussed the activities and intention of Mrs. Annie Besant in this regard. According to him, she had a strong dislike for the Untouchables. Ambedkar pointed out about an article on 'The Uplift of the Depressed Classes' had written by Mrs. Annie Besant which was published in the Indian Review, February, 1909. Mrs. Annie Besant expressed her views on the matter of social reforms relating to the uplift of the Depressed Classes. She said that a large section of the people who were ignorant, degraded, unclean in language, habits and others remained as the social pyramid in every nation of the world. But they performed many tasks which were necessary for society. In spite of that, they were neglected by the very society to whose needs they fulfilled. In England, she treated this class as 'submerged tenth'. It was formed by the one-tenth of the total population of England. They suffered severely from starvation, malnutrition, weak nervous system and their children had to die premature due to ill-nourishment, rickety, and often malformation and other

causes. They chiefly consisted of unskilled labourers and were compelled to perform the roughest work like that of the scavengers, sweepers, navies' casual dock-labourers, costermongers. It was forming its worse type; drift all the wastrels of society, the drunkards, the loafers, the coarsely dissolute, the tramps, the vagabons, he clumsily criminal, the ruffians. In India, this class was formed by one sixth of the total population. They were called by the generic name of the 'Depressed Classes'. They emerged from the aboriginal inhabitants of the country, conquered and enslaved by the Aryan invaders. They were drunken and utterly indifferent to cleanliness whether of food, person or dwelling etc. But Criminal communities, such as hereditary thieves, lived apart and did not mingle with the scavengers, sweepers, husbandmen and the followers of other simple crafts who made up the huge bulk of the depressed. They were gentle, docile, as a rule industrious, pathetically submissive, merry enough when not in actual want, with a bright though generally very limited intelligence; of truth and the civic virtues they were for the most part utterly devoid how should they be anything else? But they were affectionate, grateful for the slightest kindness, and with much 'natural religion'. In fact, they offered good material for simple and useful though humble civic life. She said that only through education their condition would be developed. But a difficulty arose at the outset, for one class of the community, moved by a noble feeling of compassion and benevolence, but not adding thereto a careful and detailed consideration of the conditions, demands, for the children of the pariah community admission to the schools frequented by the sons of the higher classes, and charges with lack of brotherhood those who were not in favour of this policy. Naturally, they could not develop themselves up to the mark due to the lack of brotherhood of the caste Hindus, educational facilities and other required privileges in the then caste-ridden society. Their demands were fulfilled to lead their livelihood. She also pointed out that they should forfeit the hardly won fruits of the education of generations, in order to create an artificial equality, as disastrous to the progress of the future as it would be useless for the improvement of the present. The children of the Depressed Classes needed, first of all, to be taught cleanliness, outside decency of behaviour, and the earliest rudiments of education, religion and morality. Their bodies, at present were ill-odorous and foul with the liquor and strong-smelling food out of which for generations they had been built up. Naturally, it would be needed for them some generations of purer food and living to make their bodies fit to sit in the close neighbourhood of a school-room with children who had received bodies from an

ancestry trained in habits of exquisite personal cleanliness and fed on pure food-stuffs. That is why; the novel mission would have to raise the Depressed Classes to a similar level of physical purity, not to drag down the clean to the dirty. This should be done for close association. Realizing the hard reality, she pointed out that they were not blaming these children, or their parents for being what they were. This was stating a mere palpable fact. The first daily lesson in a school for these children should be a bath and the putting on of a clean cloth. The second should be a meal of clean wholesome food. The primary needs could not be supplied in a school for children who took their daily bath in the early morning and who came to school well-fed. She also highlighted the fact that another difficulty that the teachers had to face of these children was the contagious diseases that were bred from first. She cited eye-disease as for example that was occurred wholly due to neglects. It was one of the most common and 'catching' complaints among them. In the Panchama schools in Madras, the teachers were ever on the alert to detect and check this, and the children's eyes were daily washed and disease was thus prevented. But was it to be expected that fathers and mothers, whose daily care would protect their children from such dirty disease should deliberately expose them at school to this infection? Naturally, the manners and habits of these children were not in a position to be imitated by gently-nurtured children. Children learnt manners chiefly by imitation from well-bred parents and teachers. They should be trained in continual and rigid self-control for the comfort and convenience of themselves as the cultured children. If, at the school, they were to be made to associate with children not thus trained, they would quickly fall into the ways which they would see around them. So they should be rendered good habits until fixed by long practice. It was far easier to be slipshod than accurate and to be careless than careful. That is why; the children of good families in which good manners and courtesy were hereditary had a vital importance in this respect. Gentle speech, well-modulated voice, pleasant ways, these were the valuable results of long culture, and to let them be swamped out was no true brotherhood. In England, it had never been regarded as desirable to educate boys or girls of all classes side by side, and such grotesque equalizing of the unequal would be scouted. Eton and Harrow were admittedly the schools for the higher classes; Rubgy were Winchester were also schools for gentlemen's sons, though somewhat less aristocratic. Then come a number of schools, frequented chiefly by sons of the provincial middle class. Then the Board schools, where the sons of artisans and the general manual labour classes were taught;

and below all these for the waifs and strays, were the ragged schools, the name of which indicates the type of their scholars, and the numerous charitable institutions. A man in England who proposed that ragged school-children should be admitted to Eton and Harrow would not be argued with, but laughed at. Here, when a similar proposition was made in the name of brotherhood, people seem ashamed to point out frankly its absurdity, and they did not realize that the proposal is merely a violent reaction against the cruel wrongs which had been inflicted on the Depressed Classes, the outcry of an awakened conscience, which had not yet had time to call right reason to guide its emotions. It was sometimes said that Government schools paid no attention to social differences; therein they show that they were essentially 'foreign' in their spirit. They would not deal so with the sons of their own people, though they may be careless of the sons of Indians, and lump them all together, clean and dirty alike. It was very easy to see the differences of 'tone' in the youths when only the sons of the cultured classes were admitted to a school, and it was to the interest of the Indians that they should send their sons where they were guarded from coarse influences as Englishmen guard their own sons in England[18].

As a Bombay representative, Bhulabhai Desai expressed his views in support of this resolution and pointed out that their brethren suffered much under numerous social evils and disabilities that blew to the equality, goodwill and unity of man. How did they approach the British Democracy or any other power to uplift their own brethren? They could do it only by self-help. It was needless to approach any other power for these reasons. The Congress had taken a bold decision to allow this resolution for the benefit of the Depressed Classes. The existence of the social evils and disabilities was the great bane that was an insult to the name of Hinduism. Therefore, both on the ground of necessity and on the ground of justice, as well as on the ground of righteousness, for the truth that they cherished , how could they deny them what this resolution demands, when the justice lies in their own hands ? In addition, if you failed to do that, with what justice, with what face, would they demand Self-Government? [19].

Rama Iyer of Malabar expressed his views on the social reform issues and pointed out that this resolution urged for social freedom by which they would break the shackles that bind the lower classes that were the foot of the nation. If anyone would like to

climb the hill of Home Rule, they must have to break first the shackles on their feet and then only would Home Rule come to them. He also noted the fact that none could not be political democrats and at the same times social autocrats. A social slave could not be politically a free man. Their motto was to make united India, not only politically united but also united all along the line. He urged the Brahmins, who belonged to the higher castes and appealed to them to go to their villages and shatter the shackles of the low castes people who were struggling against their own men - the social bureaucrats of their own land[20].

Asaf Ali of Delhi supported that resolution and delivered his observations on social reforms. Mr. Ali said that the Depressed Classes were severely suffered from numerous social problems. They were crying upon the autocratic actions of the bureaucratic bunglers. They were victimized for many misfortunes. They were forced to do their degraded trades in utter muteness for thousands of years. They never got opportunity to emerge from the abyss of degradation into which the cruel and utterly unjustified customs of the country had hurled on them who were vociferously clamouring for the attainment or preservation of human rights for themselves. However, it was not fair to leave a large section of humanity into a damp of sufferings and evil social wrongs. Others were shedding their blood in the battlefield for their redress. The 'untouchables', were forced to subject themselves as the sub-human beings and children of the soil, in whose veins coursed the self-same 'red-blood' as in the veins of those who arrogated superiority to themselves. The Depressed Classes demanded special privileges for their betterment in worldly circumstances. They could not be debarred from the birth right of man. It was a standing reproach to the Indians that they had any Depressed Classes at all, and it was for the extinction of this reproach that they prayed.[21]

7.3. Caste Politics after the Emergence of Gandhiji and Ambedkar in the Political Arena

Gandhian charisma spellbound the common people in Indian politics. Under his leadership, Indian freedom movement got a new dimension and impetus. His supremacy and position in the congress was absolute and unchallenging. The Indian freedom movement was centered on the versatile personality and genius of Gandhiji

during the year of 1919–20 to 1947. He was the only person among the Indian leaders who was successful in organizing the vast mass movement under the umbrella of the Indian National Congress against the British imperialism. In fact, he applied the blue-print of the South African experiences in Indian politics which ushered an epoch-making event in Indian Independence movement. Rothermund, a German historian, entitled Gandhiji as a creative politician. According to him, "Gandhiji had to create almost everything; a political organization, the means of communication, the ways and means of articulating political protest and the solidarity of the people whom he was supposed to lead. This was a challenge..."[22]. Louis Fischer stated about Gandhiji that "No ism held him (Gandhi) rigid in its grip. No theory guided his thoughts or actions. He strove to keep his mind open. He reserved the right to differ with himself....Gandhi was independent, unfettered, unpredictable, hence exciting and difficult."[23] Rajoni Palm Dutta pointed out that "Gandhiji was the chosen representative and ablest leader of bourgeois nationalism."[24] Judith Brown said that "Gandhiji was the enigmatic national leader as well as the erratic leader."[25] Gandhiji himself opined that "Do I contradict myself? Consistency is a hobgoblin."[26] That is the question. In fact, Gandhiji became a national leader in Indian politics in 1919 immediately after the beginning of the Rowlatt Satyagraha movement against the British Government. The blue-print of his South African experiences during the period of 1893 to 1914 played a vital role in this context. He gathered experiences beyond direct political involvement in India as per the instruction of his political guru, Gopalkrishna Gokhle. He got an opportunity to take part in the regional movement of Ahmedabad, Champaran and Kheda (Kaira) which hastened the process of confidence building among the common people about his strategy of fighting against the British imperialism. Besides, a large number of influential leaders of the Congress were either already passed away or became politically less important at this juncture. Under this turmoil conditions, Gandhiji became a popular leader in Indian political scenario. Therefore, his political activities in India were based on the principle of Ahimsa (non-violence), Satyagraha (truthfulness) etc. Gandhiji derived the idea of non-violence (Ahimsa) from Buddhism and Jainism. He gathered knowledge by reading 'The light of Asia' of Edwin Arnold, 'The song celestial', 'New and old Testament', 'Heroes and Hero-worship' of Carlyle etc. which stirred the mind of Gandhiji at a large. To him, "Truth is the law of our being."[27] "The truth was absolute and not dynamic and consequently changeless."[28] On the way of living a truthful life he derived deductively

"non-violence" as a creed and 'satyagraha' (practice of truth) as a changeless behaviour. Gandhiji applied this non-violence creed to politics against the British for the freedom of India. Faith in non-violence was his first and the last article.[29] According to him, only moral force or soul force of 'Ahimsa' or non-violence or the practice of truth could help others in arousing the inner soul-force or the call of the truth. That is why; he used the creed of non-violence as a moral force to change the minds of the evil doers. As he stated that, no man is basically an evil doer. In fact, Gandhiji was perhaps the first man to politicize the concept of non-violence and eternal truth in order to change society and the state. He evinced and renewed the philosophy of mercy and non-violence of Buddhism [30] and Jainism[31] and the idea of love as inlaid in the Bible[32]. According to Gandhiji, "Three moderns have left a deep impression on my life and captivated me: Raichand Bhai by his living contact, Tolstoy by his book, 'The kingdom of God is within you' and Ruskin by his Unto the Last." He also derived the idea of Satyagraha and Civil disobedience from Henry David Thoreau's book of 'Civil disobedience'. That is why, it can be said that Gandhiji derived the idea of non-violence (Ahimsa) from Buddhism and Jainism. For the application of this idea in politics and for the development of the idea of Civil disobedience; he was profoundly impressed by three eminent western thinkers' viz., Ruskin Bond[33], David Thoreau[34] and Leo Tolstoy[35]. Bond's idea of good work and sacrifice, Thoreau's view on Civil Disobedience and passive resistance and Tolstoy's ideas of non-violence and the "Kingdom of heaven'' influenced Gandhiji to be more convinced in his already cherished ideas of non-violence and civil disobedience. Judith Brown pointed out that "South-Africa taught him the techniques with which he was to combat the might of British imperialism in India...There he gained the experience which was critical for his later career in India and the explosive effect he was to have in Indian politics."[36] But Mridula Mukherjee said that "South Africa built up his faith in the capacity of the Indian masses to participate in and sacrifice for a cause that moved them."[37] In the meantime, Gandhiji gathered bitter experiences about the inhuman, untouchable behaviour during his South-African journey. So it can be said that Gandhiji was treated then as like the Indian untouchable by them. Therefore, he realized the actual status and position of untouchables. In spite of it, his attitude towards the Indian untouchables was very much surprising and astonishing. He was a traditional bearer of the Brahmanical Hindu Caste System. He profoundly believed in the norms and principles of the Caste System. Naturally, he never came

forward to launch a direct or indirect political movement against the Caste System. He kept himself almost silent relating to these issues. After becoming an undisputed leader in the Indian National Congress Gandhiji followed the principles and traditions of his predecessors to deal with these issues. He never proposed to annihilate the Caste System. He even never took necessary measures to promote the 'constructive programmes' of the historic 'Bordali resolution' adopted by the Congress relating to the ill-fated conditions of the Depressed Classes. The prime objective of the Congress behind this historic resolution was to set up schools, construct ponds, wells, roads and to make arrangements for other requirements for the development of the Depressed Classes. In fact, this was the first ever historic attempt on the part of the Indian National Congress to solve the caste-ridden and poverty stricken problems of the lower caste people of India. Practically speaking, this historic resolution remained in paper and not in practice. The role of Gandhiji was very discouraging and astonishing here. He vehemently opposed to the concessions given to the Depressed Classes through the 'Communal Award' declared by the then British Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald and launched hunger strike until death against this privileges. Ambedkar responded to the call of humanity to save his life by signing the historic Poona Pact of 1932. However, Gandhiji failed to keep his promises in the near future given at the time of the Poona Pact due to his helplessness position in the Indian National Congress. But some scholars have pointed out that Gandhiji was ultimately forced to start anti-untouchability movement for the sake of national interest and national unity under some political compulsion. He earned name and fame to deal with the issue of the Harijans. In the last phase of his political activities, Gandhiji emerged as a saviour of the Harijans in India. He left politics after prolonged political struggles against the British Government and ultimately decided to sacrifice more and more time to uplift the ill-fated conditions of the Harijans. He came forward to serve the Harijans at the call of humanity. Even numerous programmes were introduced by him to develop the socio-religious, political and economic condition, position and status in the society. He also proposed a scheme for separate education for the Harijans. He chalked out the learning of cleanliness, applied hygiene, sanitation and needle-work. They would also be taught through conversation lessons as simple knowledge of history, geography and arithmetic[38]. But he never came forward directly or indirectly to launch temple Satyagraha movement against the caste-Hindus to open the Hindu temples to the untouchables. He did not take initiative to establish the rights and privileges of the

untouchables in the caste-Hindu temples. Even he did not support the Kalaram and Nasik temple entry movements of the untouchables. However, it can be said that in spite of numerous limitations, Gandhiji played a vital role to ameliorate the ill-fated conditions of the Harijans. Gandhiji first took up the issue of the Harijans very seriously and ultimately decided to devote his life for establishing the rights and privileges of the Harijans. Some scholars pointed out that Gandhiji was very much active in social service leaving the political activities in the later part of his life with a vision and mission of establishing the concept of social justice among the Harijans in the society. He was identified as the savoiur of the Harijans in India. The name and fame of Gandhiji as the 'Saviour of the Harijans' and the 'Father of the Indian Nation' was not confined only in the history of Indian Sub-continent but also in the history of the world. He was the main guardian of the Indian Independence movement. So he had to reorganize the Indian National Congress to bring the common masses under a united platform irrespective caste, class, creed, sex and religion to fight to finish the entity of the colonial government in India.

But on the contrary to the above Ambedkar was influenced chiefly by Marx in connection with the theory of class-struggle. He highlighted the differences between class and caste. He observed that the downtrodden people in India were the last to be hired and the first to be fired. However he differed from Marx on one point that the suffering is not only due to economic exploitation but also due to social exploitation. He was also inspired by Dewey's method of inquiry and activist epistemology. He fully endorsed Dewey's emphasis on education as a means to change the world. That is why, he established The People's Education Society in Bombay in 1946 for the Depressed Classes. Dewey's ideas provided the basis for a systematic analysis of problems relating to politics, economics, society, religion and history. He was very much encouraged by the political philosophy of Ranade who gave precedence to social, economic and religious reforms over political reform. He was also influenced by the doctrines (Annicca and Annatta) of Lord Buddha. He was influenced by Mill, like Mill he was also convinced that unless men are free to form and maintain their own opinions, they can not develop that mental well-being on which everybody depends.

Ambedkar was unquestionably the great Untouchable leader in India. None of his followers comes to him in terms of prestige. But his political career began from zero. He had to fight for existence in the caste-ridden Hindu society since the childhood. Keeping in mind the hard reality of the Caste System and Untouchability in the Hindu society, Ambedkar firmly decided to fight to finish all sorts of caste-ridden inhuman treatments from the society. He always fought for justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. But after the completion of his education, Ambedkar resolved to start ceaseless struggle against the tyranny, oppression, exploitation, humiliation and suppression of the caste Hindus. His only aim was to eradicate the Caste Institution and Untouchability from the Hindu society. He had done an extensive research work on 'Annihilation of Caste' in this respect to open up the real truth in the world. None dared to disprove his scientific explanation and logical analysis relating to the abolition of the Caste System except illusionary Gandhi through his childish talking and illusionary spiritual thinking that was published in the Harijan. However, Ambedkar started writing a manuscript with the help of the Maharaja of Kolhapur on January 31, 1920, under the title of Mook Nayak (Leader of the Dumb) with a novel vision and grater mission to organize the untouchables to raise their voice for restoring their lost dignity, status, position, self-respect, self-confidence, liberty, equality, fraternity from the Brahmanical Hindu society. It was his mouthpiece although Ambedkar was not its official editor. In order to save the Depressed Classes from perpetual slavery, poverty and ignorance some Herculean efforts had to be made. Ambedkar asserted, to awaken them to their disabilities. It was further highlighted that it was not enough for India to be an independent country. She must rise as a good state guaranteeing equal status in matters of religious, social, economic and political, to all classes, offering every man an opportunity to rise in the scale of life and creating conditions favourable to his advancement. It was noted that if the protections of the colonial government were withdrawn without providing them fundamental and civic rights their condition would remain in the same as before under the Brahmanical rule. In another article, Ambedkar pointed out that the Swaraj wherein there were no fundamental rights guaranteed for the Depressed Classes, would not be a Swaraj to them. It would be a new slavery for them[39]. Ambedkar was not satisfied with the role of Lokmanya Tilak and other caste-Hindu reformers who raised voice for the upliftment of the untouchables as he realized very well that such sympathy of them within the framework of the existing social structure of Hindu

society could not bring about any radical change in the situation. That is why; he demanded separate electorates and reservations of seats for Depressed Classes in proportion to their population when the Montford Reforms of 1919 were going to be formulated. He also emphasized on the need of social equality before the demand of Home Rule and pointed out that it was the duty of the advanced classes to put the Lower and Depressed Classes on social equality who belonged to the same religion, followed the same customs, lived within the same borders, with the same aspirations for Liberty and Home Rule. So it was the first duty of them was to educate, enlighten and elevate the low caste ill-fated ignorant poor people. Unless and until such an attitude was adopted, the day on which India would gain Home Rule would remain in far distant[40]. Under his constant fighting the colonial Government ultimately recognized the existence of the Depressed Classes in India by the Act of 1919. But Gandhiji and Savarkar started their work in April 1924 for the consolidation of the Hindu society and invariably for the upliftmnt of the Depressed Classes. Ambedkar also prepared himself in March 1924 to launch his social movement for the upliftment of the Untouchables. That is why; Ambedkar took initiative to establish an organization known as 'Bahishkrit Hitakarini Sabha' and he was made the chairman of this organization. It was an association for the welfare of the ostracized that was continued up to 1928. The main motto and objective[41] of this organization are given below:

To promote the spread of education among the Depressed Classes by opening Hostels or by employing such other means as may seem necessary or desirable.

i. To promote the spread of culture among the Depressed Classes by opening libraries, social centres and classes or study circles.
ii. To advance and improve the economic condition of the Depressed Classes by starting Industrial and Agricultural schools.
iii. To represent the grievances of the Depressed Classes.

The organization therefore focused on two key demands to help integrate Untouchables into the Hindu world; firstly for entrance into temples and secondly, to find access to wells, ponds, schools etc. which they were often denied[42].

A conference was held at Mahad in March 1927 organized by Ambedkar and supported by some non-Dalit leaders. His address delivered at Mahad was in step with the principles of Sanskritisation: "No lasting progress can be achieved unless we put ourselves through a three-fold process of purification. We must improve the general tone of our demeanour, re-tone our pronunciations and revitalize our thoughts. I, therefore, ask you now to take a vow from this moment to renounce eating carrion"[43]. However, under the direction of the Sabha the students conducted a monthly magazine named Saraswati Vilas for the Depressed Classes students. Ambedkar inspired the people to fight for their liberty, human rights and civic rights against the existing Hindu social structure. He encouraged them to send their children to school. He remarked that primary education should be compulsory and mandatory for all children. He took numerous steps to reform the ill-fated poor conditions of the untouchables. He spread the gospel of liberty, equality and fraternity among the toiling masses so that they could rise themselves in a dignified position in the society. He moved all over India to arouse the caste-ridden sleeping people from all sorts of yoke of the Brahmanical rule and their age-old traditions. Apart from these, Ambedkar always opposed to the illusionary programmes of Gandhiji relating to the ameliorating scheme of the untouchables. He presided over a conference of the Untouchables at Mangaon in the Kolhapur state where Shri Shahu Maharaj was personally present. Maharaj delivered a speech in that conference and said, "You have found your saviour in Ambedkar. I am confident that he will break your shackles...a time will come when Ambedkar will shine as a front-rank leader of all-India fame appeal"[44]. He also raised his voice in the Nagpur Conference which gave him an opportunity of turning the eyes of the Untouchables from Depressed Classes Mission. It was the First All-India Conference convened by the Untouchables. At the end of the meeting inter-caste dinner was held to violate the Hindu norms. Therefore the movement against the established social order and for the rights of untouchables started in two phases, the first in the form of petitions and protests, and the second, in the form of direct action to use wells, schools, buses, railway etc. In the first conference of untouchables in March 1927, at Bombay he asked them to fight for their rights, give up dirty habits and rise to manhood. Ambedkar was a man of versatile genius. Among the twentieth century leaders of India, Ambedkar held a prominent position. After comprehensive study on different subjects like history, culture, religion, society, economy etc. Ambedkar understood very early in his career

that distortion of religion and misinterpretation of history and culture did more harm to Indian social life than foreign invasions and domination for centuries. A society internally divided and suffering from innumerable contradictions could not grow into a strong nation. With this understanding Ambedkar adopted numerous task of fighting for religious, social and economic equality in the Indian society. Millions of people living in extreme poverty, social discrimination and injustice saw a hope of new life in the personality and work of this great humanist. According to him, democracy was the only form of government which ensured liberty and equality in the society. That is why; Ambedkar expresses his opinions in the First Session of the Round Table Conference in 1930 as follows: "The bureaucratic form of government in India should be replaced by a government which will be the government of the people by the people and for the people"[45]. Being conscious that without self-government a country can not make any progress, Ambedkar pointed out that "We must have a government in which the men in power will give their undivided allegiance to the best interest of the country. We must have a government in which men in power, knowing where obedience will end and resistance will begin, will not be afraid to amend the social and economic code of life which the dictates of justice and expediency so urgently call for"[46]. According to him, "No share of political power can come to us so long as the British Government remains as it is. It is only in a Swaraj Constitution that we stand any chance of getting the political power in our own hands without which we can not bring salvation to our people"[47]. He said, "Hindu society as such does not exist. It is a collection of castes, each caste is conscious of its existence. It is not even a federation"[48]. According to him, "There can not be a more degrading system of social organization than Chaturvarnya. It is a system which deadens paralyses and cripples the people from help activity"[49]. The Hindu religion ceased to be a missionary religion due to the growth and development of the Caste System. He also pointed out that Hinduism is a very liberal religion in all matters, yet it gave sanction to complete segregation of a class known as untouchables. According to him it amounted to declaring that untouchables were not human beings and not fit for social association[50]. Hinduism has not only been based on merely principle of inequality but principle of graded inequality. Ambedkar differed with Mahatma Gandhi who opposed untouchability without opposing Chaturvarnya. He said, "Hindu law declared that the untouchable was not a person, Hinduism refused to regard him as a human being fit for comradeship"[51]. There was untouchability because there was Caste

System and without destroying the Caste System untouchability could not be reviewed. He fought for the political, social, educational and economic rights and privileges of the Depressed Classes... According to Ambedkar, "Democracy is more than a government. It is a form of the organization of society. There are two essential conditions which characterize a democratically constituted society: Absence of stratification of society into classes; a social habit on the part of individuals and groups which are ready for continuous readjustment or recognition of reciprocity of interests"[52]. He also said, "If the mental disposition of the individuals is not democratic then a democratic form of government may easily become a dangerous form of government"[53]. Even a democratic government would not be able to do anything if our society remained divided into classes and sub-classes. In such society each individual with class consciousness would place class interest above everything. In that condition there would not be justice and fair play in the functioning of the government. That is why, the democratic attitude of mind is very essential, and for this proper socialization is needed a democratic society. Ambedkar pointed out that "Democracy is more than a social system. It is an attitude of mind, a philosophy of life"[54]. Ambedkar was very much influenced by the impact of the French Revolution and pointed out that in democracy, equality and liberty ensured by the Constitution could not be considered sufficient without the existence of fraternity. Without fraternity, equality destroys liberty and liberty destroys equality. According to him, fraternity implies true religious spirit which is the basis of any democratic system. That is why; the people must recognize the importance of fraternity with equality and liberty. So we must not only preach democracy but it must be made obligatory for all. He delivered a speech on democracy in the Constituent Assembly at New Delhi on December 17, 1946 and remarked that they must seek mandate to rule after every five years those who are in place of authority in democracy. Secondly, strong opposition is urgently required to protect democracy. Thirdly, the essence of equality must be ensured for all in the eyes of law and administration. Fourthly, formation of a democratic government is needed. Ambedkar said, "In my judgement for the successful working of democracy an important condition is observance of constitutional morality"[55]. The party in power must resist temptations in the larger interest of society and country. Again, "in the name of democracy there must be no tyranny of the majority over the minority". He profoundly believed in the Parliamentary system of government due to three inherent traits; viz., negation of

hereditary rule, laws applicable to public life has public approval and rulers can not stay in power without the confidence of the people. According to him, "In Parliamentary democracy there is the legislature to express the voice of the people; there is the executive who is subordinate to the legislature and bound to obey the legislature. Over and above the legislature and executive there is the judiciary to control both and keep them both within prescribed bounds. Parliament democracy has all the marks of a popular government"[56]. But he pointed out that in spite of constitutional assurance of equality and liberty the Parliamentary system is bound to fail if it takes no note of economic inequalities in the society. Even political democracy can not succeed with social and economic democracy. According to Ambedkar, "Democracy is another name of equality. It never made even a nodding acquaintance with equality. It failed to realize the significance of equality and did not even endeavour to strike a balance between liberty and equality; with the result that liberty swallowed equality"[57]. As an architect of Indian Constitution Ambedkar did whatever was possible to ensure political and economic rights of the Depressed Classes. Apart from these, he stressed on true concept of nationalism. According to him, 'Nationalism is a fact which can neither be eluded nor denied...it is a potent force which has a dynamic power to disrupt empires. Whether nationalism is the cause or the threat to nationalism is the cause, is a difference of emphasis only'[58]. He regards nationalism as a real force in human life. National unity was the fundamental aim of his political thought. The spirit of his nationalism started with the humanistic cause of the poorest of poor in the world. He wanted equality and civil rights for those who were deprived for centuries past. He emerged as the champion of the downtrodden people. He wanted not only freedom from foreign domination, but also internal freedom for the people to whom it was denied. Nationalism does not mean communalism to him. It means the spirit of oneness in the people. His spirit of nationalism took a definite shape through the struggle against the British rule. The struggle against foreign domination and love for the community in which he was born, brought in his mind the real implications of nationalism. He stressed on the freedom of a country together with the freedom of the people living in that country. According to him, nationalism becomes a means of internal slavery, forced labour and organized tyranny for the poor and servile classes without the freedom of people. He stressed on spiritual unity of the people. According to Ambedkar, "Nationalism is not a matter of political nexus or cash nexus, for the simple reason that union can not be

the result of calculation of mere externals. Where two communities live a life which is exclusive and self-enclosed for five years, they will not be one, because, they are made to come together on one day in five years for the purposes of voting in an election"[59]. He lays a stress on the need of fighting against separatism, provincialism, linguism, casteism and communalism. Casteism is against the spirit of nationalism. It has weakened India socially and nationally. He said that 'Caste has killed public spirit. It has destroyed the sense of public charity. It has made public opinion impossible. Virtue has become caste-ridden and morality has become caste-bound. There is no sympathy to the deserving. There is no appreciation of the meritorious. There is no charity to the needy...There is charity but it begins with the caste and ends with the caste. There is sympathy but not for men of other caste'[60]. To him, nationalism means the negation of caste-spirit and caste-spirit is nothing but a deep-rooted communalism.

Therefore, the Caste, Politics and activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar may be discussed under the following heads. Ambedkar marked the Bardoli Resolution of the Indian National Congress of 1917 as 'a strange event' and raised the following questions to justify the attitude of the Indian National Congress towards the Untouchables:

1. ***"Why did the Congress think it necessary to pass such a resolution in the year 1917?"***
2. ***"What made it take cognizance of the Untouchables?"***
3. ***"What did it want to gain?"***
4. ***"Whom did it want to deceive?"***
5. ***"Was it because of a change in its angle of vision or was it because of some ulterior motive?"***

But at the same time the 'Depressed' classes were very much politically conscious about the pros and cons of the resolution of 1917. Ultimately, they became Anti-Congress. Their Anti-Congress movement was rapidly increasing due to the inactive role of the Congress leaders regarding the violent attitude of Tilak and his followers against the Social Reform group for using the pandel of the Congress as the platform of the Social Reform Conference in 1895. But their undefined unrest and agitation had

been increasing day by day regarding in extreme point. Naturally, the Social Reform group organized a demonstration against the Congress and burned its effigy. Ambedkar remarked on this issue that "This antipathy to the Congress has continued ever since. The resolutions passed by both the meetings of the Depressed Classes held in Bombay in 1917 give ample testimony to the existence of this antipathy in the minds of the Depressed Classes towards the Congress"[61]. In the meantime Montague, the then Secretary of State for India declared on August 20, 1917 that "in the House of Commons the new policy of his Majesty's Government towards India, namely, the policy of gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire"[62]. Under these circumstances, different types of schemes such as "the Congress-League schemes (Lucknow Pact, 1916" etc.) were made by the Indian National Congress. The main objective behind it was to provide the Congress-League scheme the status and character of a 'National Demand'. It would come true only if the scheme would get support and assistance from all communities in India. So the utmost necessity of the Indian National Congress was to get unanimous support of the Depressed Classes in this regard. Besides, the Congress was very much interested in seeing that its own scheme would be accepted by His Majesty's Government. So Congress was bound to make a contract with the Depressed Classes. This contract was practically negotiated between the two through Sir Narayan Chandavarkar who was the President of the Depressed Classes Mission Society and the Ex-President of the Congress. He exercised considerable influence over the Depressed Classes in this matter. But they agreed to support the Congress on that issue on a condition that the Congress would pass a resolution for the removal of the social disabilities of the Untouchables. As a result, the Congress passed the resolution of 1917 in connection with the demand of the Depressed Classes. So, it can be noted that there was an ulterior motive of the Congress behind the passing of the resolution of 1917. Their motive was quite political and not a spiritual one at all. Hence, Ambedkar clearly stated that the Depressed Classes in their resolutions had called upon the "higher castes, who claim political rights to take steps for the purpose of removing the blot of degradation from the Depressed Classes, which has subjected these classes to the worst of treatment in their own country"[63]. In fact, under the undergoing impact Congress was bound to organize a drive against Untouchability. But Congress had done nothing in this perspective willingly. Ambedkar traced out the problem and said

that "It was a formal fulfillment of a condition which the Depressed Classes had made for giving their support to the Congress-League scheme. Congressional representatives did not appear to be charged with any qualms of conscience or with any sense of righteous indignation against man's inhumanity to man, which is what untouchability is. They forgot the Resolution the very day on which it was passed. The Resolution was a dead letter. Nothing came out from it."[64]

In the meantime Gandhiji returned to India from South Africa in January, 1915. In his book Hind Swarajaya, written in 1909, he interpreted Swaraj (self-rule) in a much broader sense. His constructive work began with the foundation of the Sabarmati Ashram at Ahmedabad in May 1915. It was through involvement in two agrarian disputes; Champaran (in North Bihar) and Kaira (in Gujarat) and the labour dispute in Ahmedabad in 1917-18, that Gandhi emerged as an influential political leader. At all the three places Gandhiji used his technique of Satyagraha or passive resistance. During the last two years of the First World War (1917-18), he maintained close contact with the Congress and the Home Rule League and with the Muslims leaders. But it was the repressive policy of the British Government which dragged him away from the shell of political isolation and made him launch the anti-Rowlatt Bills Satyagraha. He criticized the so-called Rowlatt Acts as "unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and destructive of elementary rights of the individual". A Satyagraha Sabha was established, with Gandhiji as its President, to organize the campaign. In the first stage of the anti-Rowlatt Satagraha, volunteers courted arrest through formal defiance of the law. The second stage was to launch a countrywide 'hartal' or strike on April 6, 1919. This was followed by mass protest and mob violence in Bombay, Ahmedabad and several other places. But after the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre on April 13, 1919, the anti-Rowlatt movement 'Satyagraha' lost momentum. It transformed the Congress into a national body, with a new ideology and a new strategy under a new leader who was none other than Gandhiji. To protest against the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy Rabindranath Tagore surrendered the knighthood conferred on him by the British Government, and Sir Sankaran Nair, one of the former presidents of the Indian National Congress, resigned his membership of the Viceroy's Executive Council. So the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy introduced a dramatic change in the Indian political situation, which became further surcharged with the initiation of the Khilafat Movement. The Amritsar Session of the Indian

National Congress, held in December 1919, reflected the new aggressive mood of the people. In fact, Judith Brown stated that "Tension between Gandhi's ideal of Satyagraha and the Khilafat leaders' adoption of it as a political technique remained a constant feature of the Khilafat Movement as long as the Muslims needed Gandhi as a guarantee of Hindu support"[65]. "After the Rowlatt Satyagraha Gandhi's standing in Congress had risen considerably, but the leadership of Khilafat agitation gave him real power among Hindu and Muslim politicians, enabling him to exert leverage on both because he was the guarantor of the hopes and fears of both"[66]. According to Judith Brown, "The mechanism by which Gandhi had gathered widespread Muslim support was also a political boomerang"[67]. In addition to that Gandhi stated that "In my humble opinion, the attainment of Swaraj is the quickest method of righting the Khilafat wrong. Hence, it is that for me the solution of the Khilafat question is the attainment of Swaraj and vice versa."[68] On realizing the importance of the situation, Gandhiji made a statement on 9th July, 1920, in the Young India that "If the acts of the Punjab government be an insufferable wrong ...it is clear that we must refuse to submit to this official violence. If we are worthy to call ourselves a nation, we must refuse to uphold the Government by withdrawing co-operation from it"[69]. As a result, Non Co-operation Movement was started under the guidance and leadership of Gandhiji. In fact, he became an undisputed leader by that time. Most of the established leaders, such as, Gokhale, Mehata, Tilak, Annie Besant, Surendranath Banerjee etc., of the Indian National Congress either passed away or their position rapidly deteriorated at that very moment. At this juncture, Nehru and Chitaranjan Das came out as a leader of the Indian National Congress without any national importance and recognition. Under this unavoidable political environment, Gandhiji established himself as a national leader in Indian politics. In fact, the Nagpur Annual Session of the Congress was a historic session which, apart from ratifying the Non co-operation resolution, also undertook two important amendments to the constitution of the Congress. First, the goal of the Congress, which in the existing constitution was "self-government within the British Empire", was replaced with the word Swaraj. Secondly, revolutionary changes were brought about in the Congress organization and a constructive programme was chalked out. These included:

1. Opening of Congress membership to all adults;
2. The formation of an All-India Congress Committee (AICC) of 300 members;

3. Creating a hierarchy of district, taluka and village Congress Committees;
4. Reorganization of the provincial Congress committees on a linguistic basis;
5. Promotion of Swadeshi, particularly hand-spinning and weaving;
6. Removal of untouchability among the Hindus; and
7. Promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity and use of Hindi as far as possible. In other ways too, the organizational structure was both streamlined and democratized.

Therefore, the Non Co-operation Movement, which was the first mass movement launched under the leadership of Gandhiji, started to emphasize three main demands:

1. The Khilafat issue;
2. The redressal of the Punjab wrongs; and
3. The attainment of Swaraj.

But Gandhiji's ambition to achieve Swaraj within a year of launching the movement was not fulfilled. The 'Chauri Chaura' incident convinced Gandhiji that the country was not yet ready for the mass civil disobedience. For this reason, he prevailed upon the Congress Working Committee, which met at Bardoli on February, 12 to call the movement off. But the communal situation became far worse during the years 1921-27 than it had been before. In fact, the historical importance was laying in the fact that the Congress Working Committee adopted a 'Constructive Programme' of social amelioration at its meeting in Bardoli held in February, 1922. This constructive programme of social amelioration was also known as the historic 'Bardoli Programme'. Gandhiji made the Congress a mass organization by opening its membership to all, irrespective of their caste, class, creed, sex, and religion. His main target was to secure active support and co-operation of the common people for strengthening the political movement in India. That is why; Gandhiji took initiative to make the Congress a country-wide organization. To finance the Bardoli Programme, Congress made a fund, i.e., the 'Tilak Swaraj Fund' of Rs. 1 Crore. Congress, by this time, made up its mind to execute and complete the constructive programme of social amelioration of the untouchables.The members of the Working Committee took up the untouchable case and discussed the matters in detail in February, 1922 at Bardoli and unanimously adopted and passed a historic resolution in this context to fulfill the necessity of the Bardoli Programme. Therefore, the Working Committee advised all Congress Organizations to be engaged in the following activities:

1. To enlist at least one crore members of the Congress.
2. To popularize the spinning wheel and to organize the manufacture of hand-spun and hand woven khaddar.
3. To organize national schools.
4. To organize the Depressed Classes for a better life, to improve their social mental and moral condition, to induce them to send their children to national schools and to provide for them the ordinary facilities which the other citizens enjoy.
5. To organize the temperance campaign amongst the people addicted to the drink habit by house to house visits and to rely more upon appeal to the drinker in his home than upon picketing.
6. To organize village and town Panchayats for the private settlement of all disputes, reliance being placed solely upon force of public opinion and the truthfulness of panchayat decisions to ensure obedience to them.
7. In order to promote and emphasize unity among all classes and races the establishment of which is the aim of the movement of non-co-operation, to organize a social service department that will render help to all, irrespective of differences in times of illness or accident.
8. To continue the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund collections and upon every Congress Man or Congress sympathizer to pay at least one-hundredth part of his annual income for 1921. Every province to send every month twenty-five percent of its income from the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund to the All- India Congress Committee.

That is why; the All India Congress Committee confirmed the Bardoli Resolution at its meeting held in Delhi on 20th February, 1922 and the matter of the 'Depressed Classes' was remitted to the Working Committee for action and the Working Committee took up the matter of the Bardoli programme which related to the uplift of the Untouchables at its meeting held in Lucknow in June 1922 and passed a resolution relating to this issue. It was unanimously passed in this resolution to form a Committee and Swami Shradhanandji, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and Messrs. I.K. Yajnik and G.B.Deshpande were appointed its members to formulate a scheme for practical measures for bettering the condition of the so-called Untouchables throughout the country. Their proposal should be placed before the next meeting of this Committee

for its consideration and the amount to be raised for their scheme only Rs.2 lakhs at present. The All India Congress Committee accepted the scheme of its Sub-Committee relating to the development of the Depressed Classes all over India and the amount was raised for the scheme of Rs. 5 lakhs only for the present instead of 2 lakhs mentioned in the previous resolution of the Working Committee. As a result, Swami Shradhanandji had shown keen interest to take part in this noble service. So he applied for advance of Rs. 10000/ to fulfil the mission of the Depressed Classes' beneficial works. But he was denied the advance. That is why; he resigned from the post of Convener of that Sub-Committee dated 8th June 1922 and Mr.Gangadhar Rao B. Deshpande was appointed convener of that Sub-Committee for the same purpose and he was requested to convene a meeting at an early. As a result the Committee convened a meeting in Bombay in July 1922 and passed a resolution that the General Secretary be asked to request Swami Shradhanand to reconsider his resignation and withdraw it and a sum of Rs.500 be remitted to the Convener, Syt. G. B. Despande, for the contingent expenses of the Depressed Classes Sub-Committee. In fact, nothing was done in the year 1922 for ameliorating the condition of the Untouchables except the same vague resolution. The Congress Working Committee took up the issue of the Untouchables for discussion at its meeting held at Gaya in January 1923 and the passed a resolution in reference to Swami Sradhananda's resignation that the remaining members of the Depressed Classes Sub-Committee would form the Committee and Mr. Yajnik be the convener. The All-India Congress Committee once again convened a meeting held in Bombay in May 1923 on the question of the Untouchables which was the end of the Second Stage in the history of resolution remitting the question of the Untouchables to a Special Committee and passed a resolution in connection with the question of the condition of the Untouchables and it was decided to refer to the working for necessary action. That is why; the Committee of India National Congress ultimately passed the following resolution that was the third stage in its history for taking resolution on this burning issue of ameliorating the ill-fated conditions of the Depressed Classes in India at its meeting held in Bombay in may, 1923:

"Resolved that while some improvement has been effective in the treatment of the so-called Untouchables in response of the policy of the Congress, this Committee is conscious that much worked remained yet to be done in this respect and in as much as

this question of untouchability concerns the Hindu Community particularly, it requests the All-India Hindu Mahasabha also to take up this matter and to make strenuous efforts to remove this evil from amidst the Hindu Community."[70]

Ambedkar criticized the role and activities of the Indian National Congress and Gandhiji for the implementation of the Bardoli resolution as it were directly related to the question of upliftment of the 'Depressed Classes' in India. That is why; Ambedkar raised the following questions to prove the actual intention of the Indian National Congress and the attitude of Gandhiji relating to the question of improvement of the Untouchables through the historic Bardouli resolution:

I. ***Why did the congress abandon the work of social amelioration of the untouchables of which it had made so much show?***
II. ***Did the Congress abandon the programme because it was revolutionary?***
III. ***Did the Congress abandon the programme because it had no funds?***
IV. ***How much money did the Congress collect?***
V. ***How was this huge amount spent by the Congress?***
VI. ***Was this expenditure regulated by any principle?***
VII. ***Was it distributed according to the needs of the provinces?***
VIII. ***Was it distributed on the basis of cultural units and their relative size?***
IX. ***How much of the grant was actually appropriated for the salvage of the Untouchables?***
X. ***Where is the desire of the Congress to undertake the uplift of the Untouchables?***
XI. ***Would it be wrong to say that the Bardoli resolution was a fraud in so far it related to the Untouchables?***
XII. ***Where was Mr. Gandhi when all this was happening to the cause of the untouchables in the Congress camp?***

Ambedkar pointed out that the Hindu Mahasabha was the most unsuitable body to take up the work of the upliftment of the Untouchables. It was quite unfit for addressing itself to the problem of the untouchables as it was completely an orthodox as well as conservative Hindu organization. It was a militant Hindu organization. Its aim was to conserve in every way everything that was Hindu, religious or cultural. It was not a social reform association. It was a purely political organization, whose main objects and aims were to combat the influence of the Muslims in Indian politics. It was completely a communal body of the caste Hindus. Its main motto was just to preserve its political strength, social solidarity and Hindu traditions and religion that

were based on caste, untouchability and several age-old religious dogmas and pernicious norms and others. That is why; it was completely not suitable to deal with the problems of caste and untouchability and its eradication. So it can be said that Congress somehow wanted to get relief while handing over the responsibility of the ameliorating schemes for the ill-fated Depressed Classes to the Hindu Mahasabha. The resolution adopted by the Congress was nothing but a cheating to the toiling masses of India. Practically, the Indian National Congress wanted somehow to get rid of an inconvenient problem and washed its hands without taking any responsibility for the betterment of the Depressed Classes. . The Hindu Mahasabha of course did not come forward to undertake the work for it had no urge for it and also because the Congress had merely passed a pious resolution recommending the work to them without making any promise for financial provision. So the project came to an inglorious and an ignominious end. In fact, the intention of the Congress was clear from the above noted facts relating to the improvement programme for Depressed Classes. The leaders of the Congress wanted to show that it was a modest scheme to adopt a pious resolution for the amelioration of the untouchables not costing more than two or five lakhs rupees. But they ultimately felt that they had made a great mistake in including Swami Sradhananda in the Committee and rather than allow the Swami to confront them with a huge scheme which the Congress could neither accept nor reject. That is why; the leaders of the Congress thought it better in the first instance to refuse to make him the convener and subsequently to dissolve the Committee and hand over the work to the Hindu Mahasabha. But Ambedkar criticized the Congress and its leaders not to help Swami Sradhananda for the reformative works of the untouchables. They did not like to leave matters in the hands of Swami Sradhanand as he had honestly come forward to complete this noble mission. They selected Mr. Despande who was an Orthodox Brahmin. He was also not advocating the essence of social reforms for the benevolence of the Depressed Classes. This selection by the Congress made it clear that they did not want anything to be done relating to the untouchables for the simple reason that Mr. Deshpande was an Orthodox Brahmin who had taken no interest in the welfare of the Untouchables. In fact, Swami Sradhananda was the greatest and the most sincere champion of the Untouchables. Naturally, it was beyond doubt that if he would get opportunity to work on the Committee he would have produced a very big scheme. So the Congress tactfully adopted a policy of non-co-operation with him and made an arrangement to

drop his name as the Convener from that Sub-Committee. Besides, the leaders of the caste Hindu leaders of the Congress were very much afraid regarding his big demand from the Congress funds for the cause of the Untouchables. This assertion would clearly be proved from the correspondence held between Swami Sradhananda and Pandit Motilal Nehru, the then General Secretary of the Congress. Swami Shradhanand wrote a letter[71] to Pandit Motlilal Nehru, General Secretary of the Congress with a great pain regarding the acknowledgement of receipt of his letters Nos.331 and 332. He reminded him that these letters were embodying resolutions of the Working Committee and of the All-India Congress Committee about Untouchability. But he observed with great disappointment that the noble mission of those resolutions adopted by the All India Congress Committee was in a very discouraging position and it remained only in papers not in the practical field due to non-co-operative, non-reformative as well as conservative role and attitudes of the caste Hindu Congress leaders and politicians. He simply cited the facts of a letter sent to Mr. Vithalbhai Patel (the then) General Secretary on 23rd May 1922, on the issue of the untouchables to realize a true picture of this disappointing situation relating to the reforms of the Depressed Classes. Besides, he cited the example of Gandhiji who put the question of Unthouchability in the forefront of the Congress programme. But it seemed to him that the question of uplifting the Depressed Classes had been relegated to an obscure corner and a liberal sum had been sanctioned for Khadi works. Even a strong Sub-Committee had been appointed to look after national education and a special appeal for funds to be made for the same. But the question of the removal of Untouchability had been shelved by making small grants in Ahmedabed, Ahmednagar and Madras. He said that the Khadi scheme could not succeed completely. The Members of the Working Committee perhaps did not know about the suppressed brethren who were leaving off khadi and taking to buy cheap foreign clothes. He also highlighted the fact that a Sub-Committee consisting of three members of the All-India Congress Committee be appointed to give effect to the resolution about the so-called Depressed Classes and a sum of five lakhs of rupees be placed at their disposal for propaganda work and that in future all applications for grants be referred to the said Sub-Committee for disposal. But Mr. Patel asked him to accept the Working Committee's proposed resolution in toto in connection with the question of untouchables. But he denied and noted the fact that in the very first sitting of the All-India Congress Committee substituted 5 lakhs for 2 lakhs with the condition that one

lakh of the same be allotted by the All-India Congress Committee out of the funds in its hands , in cash and an appeal be made for the balance. But Mr. Rajagopalchariar, on behalf of the Working Committee proposed not to fix up the amount that would be given out of the Congress funds. After accepting the scheme by the Working Committee fund should have to allot as much cash as it could then spare for this purpose. But there arose a demand from all sides that the cash balance in the hands of the All-India Congress Committee ought to be announced. As a result the President called him aside and told him in confidence that the Congress possessed very little cash balance. It would harm for the movement if the Congress fund was opened up publicly. So it was not possible practically as outsiders and even C.I.D. people were also present there. So he was impressed by Mr. Rajagopalachariar in spite of protests from his seconder and supporters. But he was very much surprised in practice when he found the resolution in the dailies, as reported by the Associated Press shorn of Mr. Rajagopalachariar's amendment. On the issue of selecting convener of that Sub-Committee, Mr.Vithalbhai patel (the then General Secretary) got up and said: As Swami Shradhanand's name occurs first, naturally he will be the convener and therefore there was no need of moving any fresh resolution at all. He also pointed out that members from all parts of the country began to give him information about Untouchability in their Provinces and asked him to visit their parts. On this occasion he made some promises. So he realized it very well that without some cash for preliminary expenses, no enquiries on the spot could be made and hence no proper scheme could be formulated. He also came to know that Rs. 25,000 had been voted by the Working Committee for 'the Independence' of Allahabad and that an application for grant of Rs. 10,000 to the Urdu daily. That is why; he wrote a letter addressed to the President, asking him to give the Untouchability Sub-Committee an advance of Rs. 10,000 for preliminary expenses. But he was very much surprised when he read the resolution adopted by the Working Committee forwarded by his letter No. 331. After all the following resolution of the Working committee forwarded by him in letter no. 331 presents a very interesting reading:

"Read letter from Swami Shradhanand dated 8th June 1922 for an advance for drawing up a scheme for Depressed Class work. Resolved that Mr. Gangadharrao B.Deshpande be appoionted convener of the sub-committee appointed for the purpose

and he be requested to convene a meeting at an early date, and that Swami Shradhanand's letter be referred to the Sub-Committee."[72]

Despite the honest and noble intentions to better the lot of the Depressed Classes Swami Sradhananda failed to reach to his desired goal and here he was basically discouraged and belittled by some noted Congress leaders among whom Gandhiji stands most prominent. This humiliation all the more encouraged him and all by himself he traveled throughout the country almost and tried to ameliorate the condition of the untouchables.

Therefore, the above noted correspondence that was held between Swami Sradhananda and Pandit Motilal Nehru, the then General Secretary of the Congress relating to the issue of the Depressed Classes that the leaders of the Indian National Congress did not favour the abolition of Untouchability. It accepted the policy of separate schools and separate wells for the untouchables. This was clear from the following note which the working committee had appended to the resolution and which the All India Congress committee had approved so the Bardoli programme was no sense revolutionary:

"Whilst therefore in places, where the prejudice against the Untouchables is still strong separate schools and separate wells must be maintained out of Congress funds, every effort should be made to draw such children to national schools and to persuade the people to allow the Untouchables to use the common wells."[73]

Keeping in mind the above noted facts it can be pointed out that the Congress formed the 'Tilak Swaraj Fund' in 1921 to carry out Congress propaganda and to finance the 'Constructive Programmes' of the Congress as drafted by the Working Committee at Bardoli. In fact, the Congress made an arrangement for funding the 'Constructive Programmes' of the historic Bardoli resolution with a novel mission of reformatting the Depressed Classes. But the ill-intension of the leaders of the Congress behind the fund management was very irritating and discouraging in connection with the upliftment programmes of the untouchables. The following tables[74] will give a clear cut idea about the public contribution to the 'Tilak Swaraj Fund' and its misappropriation by the leaders of the Indian National Congress.

Table 20: TILAK SWARAJ FUND RECEIPTS

	1921	1922	1923	Total
	Rs..... a p.	Rs..... a. p.	Rs..... a. p.	Rs..... a. p.
General Collections Annexture No-1	64,31,779 15 10	3,92,430 2 6½	2,64,288 9 1	70,88,498 11 5½
Specific (ear-marked) Donations or Grants Annexxure No.II	37,32,230 2 10½	9,45,552 1 4½	7,10,801 10 3	53,88,583 14 6
	1,01,64,010 2 8½	13,37,982 3 11	9,75,090 3 4	1,24,77,082 9 11½
Add-Miscellaneous Receipts, Interest, otherFunds,Famine, Flood, Provincial membership, Delegation Affiliation, etc.				5,42,332 5 7½
For 1921-23....				1,30,19,415 15 7

Source: The Indian Annual Register – 1923, (p-112)

Table 21: Amount grated from Tilak Swaraj Fund to different provinces.

Provinces	Amount Granted (Rs.)	Population†	Percentage Grant due on the basis of Population ratio to total Population	Percentage of Grant actually paid
General – All India*	4,94,000			
Bombay	26,90,381	227,238,000	-	10
Madras	5,05,000	16,012,623	8	54.3
Bihar and Orissa	5,65,000	42,319,000	18	10.1
...	3,11,200	33,820,000	15	11.3
U.P.	1,13,000	45,376,000	20	6.26
Sind	51,080	3,279,337	-	2.2
Assam	50,000	6,735,000	3	1.1
Bengal	47,000	46,241,000	20	1.0
C.P.	45,000	12,780,000	5	.95
Punjab	40,000	20,675,000	9	.9
Hyderabad	25,000	-	-	.81
Ajmer	14,000	-	-	.5
Foreign		-	-	.28
Total ...	49,50,661			

* Excluding Burma and Native States.

†These figures are taken from the Simon Commission Report, Vol. I and refer to the year 1921.

Table 22: Total grant allotted to different provinces

Linguistic Areas	Total Grant (Rs.)	Amount of Grant (Rs.)	Percentage of the Total Grant to the Province	Percentage of the Population of the Area to the Population of the Province
Bombay	26,90,381	26,22,381	97.4	
Presidency...	... -	43,000	1.6	100
Gujarath ...	... -	25,000	0.93	18
...	... -	10,000	-	69
Maharashtra	... 47,000	37,000	21.2	13
...	... -	1,03,000	78.7	100
Karnatak...	... -	3,02,000	-	45
...	... 5,05,000	1,00,000	20.4	55
Central Provinces	... -	-	60.0	100
...	... -	5,15,000	19.6	38
Marathi Districs	... -	50,000	-	52
Hindustani Districts	... 5,65,000		91.0	10
Madras Presidency	... -		0.9	100
Tamil Nad	... -			73
Addhra ...				27

It is clearly found from the above noted tables that the role played by the leaders of the Indian National Congress was very much discouraging regarding distribution of funds for different programmes. They kept themselves silent to grant the fund for the 'Constructive Programmes of the Bordauli resolution relating to the question of bettering the ill-fated conditions of the untouchables except few exceptions. The shameful favouritism in the distribution of the Tilak Swaraj Fund exposed the real intension of different Congress leaders and politicians relating to developmental programmes of the untouchables all over India in connection with the historic Bordouli resolution adopted by the Congress in 1917. The following tables will give some idea regarding some cases about the reckless plundering committed by the predatory leaders of the Congress of public money for nursing their own constituencies without any qualms of conscience. There was no cheek, no control, no initiative of knowing for what purposes money was voted and to whom it was granted.

Table 23: Misutilization of Tilak Swaraj Fund

Moneys allotted but kept at the Disposal of Individuals without Appropriating		Moneys allotted without Appropriation to any purpose without naming the guarantee	
Moulvi Badrul Hassan.....	40,000	To Gujrath	3,00,000
T.Prakasam	7,000	To Gujrath	18,00,000
C. Rajagopalachariar ...	1,000	To Gujrath	3,00,000
Barajaj	20,000		
Mr. Gandhi	1,00,000		

All these plundering of the Tilak Swaraj Fund happened in the presence of Gandhiji who was then one of the vital leaders of the Indian National Congress. He was basically then very much busy in collecting fund for his cherished plan and programmes without considering the needs and demands of the ill-fated untouchables in India. That is why; the leaders of the Congress got opportunity to shift from their policy of improving the lot of the toiling masses to foster their other agenda adopted then by them. They proposed to establish a separate fund relating to the issue of the untouchables and by which the amelioration of the Untouchables would be done. The All India Congress Committee fixed up the amount of separate fund at five lakhs whereas the Working Committee reduced it's among up to Rs. 2 lakhs. Therefore it can be said that the allotment of Rs. 2 lakhs for the amelioration of the Untouchables by the Congress Working Committee for sixty millions Untouchables was a very low in comparison to the total population of the untouchables. However, the following amount was actually appropriated for the salvage of the Untouchables out of the grand sum of Rs. 2 lakhs.

Table 24: Amount Sanctioned for Depressed Classes Welfare Scheme

Purpose	Amount Sanctioned (Rs.)
Rajamuhendry Depressed Class Mission	1,000
Antyaj Karyalaya, Ahmedabad	5,000
Antyaj Karyalaya, Ahmedabad	17,381
Depressed Classes Work in Andhra	7,000
National Social Conference for Depressed Classes Work ...	3,000
Tamil District P.C.C. for Depressed Classes Work	10,000
Total. Rs	43,381

That is why; Ambedkar raised the question against the partiality done by the leaders of the Indian National Congress in connection with the distribution of the 'Tilak

Swaraj Fund'. He said that the fund was not distributed on the basis of cultural units and their relative size. The above mentioned Table[75] (No-2) shows that a province like Bombay with a population of 16012623 got as much as Rs.2690381 while U.P. and Madras with a population of 45376000 and 42319000 respectively got Rs.311200 and 505000 not more than that. Not only that but also the Bombay Presidency included three cultural units Maharashtra, Gujrath and Karnatak and it was highlighting the following features (table no.3). Out of the total grant of Rs.2690381 given to the Bombay Presidency, Gujrath with only 18% of the population of the Province got as much as Rs. 2622381 i.e. 97.4% and Maharashtra with a population of 69% got only Rs.43000 or 1.6% and Karnataka with a population of 13% Rs. 25000 or .93% of the grant. But in the case of C.P. out of a total grant of Rs. 47000 the Hindustani districts having 55%of the population got Rs. 37000 or 78.7%while the Marathi speaking districts having 45%of the population got only Rs. 10000 i.e. 21.2%. In Bihar and Orissa out of the total grant of 565000 Bihar got Rs 515000 or 91%with a population of 73%and Orissa got only 50000 or 0.9%while its population was a much as 27%. Even the same principle was noticeable in the distribution of grants in the three areas of the Madras Presidency. From the above noted discussions it can be pointed out that there was shameful favouritism was done in the distribution of the Tilak Swaraj Fund. While Mr. Gandhi's Province (Gujrath) got of Rs. 2622381/- , the rest of India got 23 lakhs. That is why, it can be highlighted the fact that a population of Gujrata numbering 29½ lakhs got 26¼ lakhs while the rest of India numbering about 23 crores got 23 lakhs and Gandhiji was completely inactive to play a vital role for increasing fund allocation relating to the issue of the untouchasbles. That is why , Ambedkar pointed out that "it is unnecessary to pursue the story of the organized and systematic loot by the Congressmen of the balance of 1 crore and 30 lakhs which was spent in subsequent years. It is enough to say that never was there held such an organized loot of public money. However, it is clearly found from the above noted tables that the scrutiny of this list of grants failed to show the ameliorations of the Untouchables, which had been one of the purposes for which money had been advanced from the Swaraj Fund. Ambedkar pointed out that without considering the needs and demands for ameliorating the ill-fated socio-religious, educational and economic conditions of the untouchables thousands of rupees were spent on feeding briefless lawyers who were alleged to have given up practice in the cause of the nation without even an inquiry whether they had any, when thousands of rupees were spent to feed toddy

drawers who had given up their profession for living on alms from public fund and many other wild cat schemes carrying the marks of dishonesty on their faces. But it did nothing of the kind. But Gandhiji was very much attentive to manage financial help for layers those who had lost their professions to take part in the nationalist activities against the British. Naturally, necessary resolution was passed under the influence of Gandhiji by the Working Committee at its meeting held in the Calcutta on January 31st and February 1st, 2nd and 3rd 1921 with vision to support those lawyers. So it was resolved that 'Rs.100000 was to remain at the disposal of Mahatma Gandhi for the support of lawyers who gave up their practice and stood in need of support (iv)'[76]. However, it can not be denied that the Congress could find only Rs.43381 out of Rs.49½ lakhs which it spent for carrying out the constructive otherwise known as the Bardoli Proggrame in which the uplift of the Untouchables was given so much prominence. But it is very much interesting to note the fact that Gandhiji expressed his positive views in the Young India on 3rd November, 1921 as follows brushing aside his earlier attitude towards the ill-fated conditions of the untouchables:

"Untouchability can not give a secondary place on the programme. Without the removal of the taint, Swaraj is a meaningless term. Workers should welcome social boycott and even public execration in the prosecution of their work. I consider the removal of untouchability as a most powerful factor in the process of attainment of Swaraj."[77]

Gandhiji addressed the Untouchables in the following terms[78]. He said about the untouchables that there were three options open to these down-trodden members of the nation. Firstly, they might take help from the slave-owning Government for their impatience and they would get it, but they would fall from the frying pan into the fire. They were slaves of slaves at present. They would be used for suppressing their kith and kin if they would take Government aid. So they would make themselves the sinners if they took the Government assistance. The Musalmans tried it and failed. Their condition became worse than before. The Sikhs did it unwittingly and failed. So there was no more discontented community in India than the Sikhs at present. That is why; Gandhiji noted the fact that the Government assistance was not a matter for its solution.

Secondly, Gandhiji said about the rejection of Hinduism and wholesale conversion to Islam or Christianity. He advised without hesitation that a change of religion be accepted if it could be justified for worldly betterment. He also said that no physical inconvenience can warrant abandonment of one's own religion as religion is completely a matter of self choice. Therefore, the inhuman treatment of the Panchamas in connection with Hinduism might be abandoned straightway by both of us. He would not make a fetish even of religion and condoned every evil in its sacred name. But he believed that untouchability is no part of Hinduism which was rather its excrescence to be removed by every effort. And there was quite an army of Hindu reformers who had set their heart upon ridding Hinduism of this blot. Conversion therefore, Gandhiji hold, was not remedy whatsoever.

Thirdly, Gandhiji said that there must have to remain self-help and self-dependence with such assistance as the non-Panchama Hindus would render of their own motion, not as a matter of duty but they should come forward to use the Non-co-operation strategy. Therefore, by way of protest against Hinduism, the Panchamas might certainly stop all contact and connection with the other Hindus so long as the special grievances were maintained. But this means organized intelligent effort. And so far as he could notice that there was no leader among the Panchamas who could able to lead them to victory through Non-co-operation. That is why; Gandhiji pointed out that it was perhaves the better way for the Panchamas heartily to join the great national movement. It was right way for throwing off the slavery of the present Government. So the Panchama friends should give an option to join the Non-co-operation movement against this evil Government and it seemed to him that pre-supposes co-operation between the different sections would be made for forming the Indian nation. In the same article, Gandhiji said the Hindus as follows:

"The Hindus must realize that, if they wish to offer successful Non-co-operation against the Government they must make common cause with the Panchamas, even as they have made common cause with the Musalmans."[79]

Gandhiji repeatedly appealed to the people of India through the Young India as follows:

"Non-co-operation against the Government means co-operator among the governed, and if Hindus do not remove the sin of untouchability, there will be no Swaraj whether in one year or in one hundred years.... Swaraj is an unattainable without the removal of the sins of untouchability as it is without Hindu Muslim unity."[80]

But Ambedkar criticized the role and activities of Gandhiji on the question of ameliorating the condition of the Untouchables in India relating to the resolution adopted by the Congress in the Bardoli. It seemed to him that he was very much interested to fruitful the historic Bardoli programmes. But in practice, Gandhiji did not take the slightest interest in the programme for the amelioration of the downtrodden people in Indian at that very moment. Although it was expected from all corners of the Depressed Classes that Gandhiji would come forward to give utterance to pious platitude. But he did not do anything for the betterment of the untouchables at that very juncture. As an undisputed leader, he had greater opportunity to work for the amelioration of the untouchables. That is why; it can be pointed out that if he was so minded, he could have appointed another Committee. If he was so minded, he could have saved a large part of the Tilak Swaraj Fund from the organized loot that was being carried on by Congressmen and reserved it for the benefit of the Untouchables. But Gandhi tried to justify his indifference to the cause of the Untouchables by the following strange arguments published in the Young India:

"Should not we the Hindus wash our bloodstained hands before we ask the English to wash theirs? This is proper question reasonably put. And if a member of a slave, nation could deliver the suppressed classes from their slavery, without freeing myself from my own I would do so today. But it is an impossible task. A slave has not the freedom even to do the right thing."[81] Gandhiji concluded by saying the following:

"That process has commenced and whether the Panchamas deliberately take part in it or not, the rest of the Hindus dare not neglect them without hampering their own progress. Hence though the Panchama problem is as dear to me as life itself, I rest satisfied with the exclusive attention to national non-co-operation. I feel sure that the greater includes the less."[82]

But Ambedkar played a vital role to criticize the role, attitude and activities of Gandhiji and other prominent leaders of the Indian National Congress relating to the burning problems of the untouchables. He said that Gandhiji always created illusions due to use the untouchables through his illusionary arguments and advised the untouchables that they must not act against the Hindus as because the Hindus were their kith and kin. Once again Gandhiji was creating an illusion by saying that the Hindus regarded the untouchables as their kith and kin. But Ambedkar said that the Hindus never came forward spontaneously to remove untouchability from the Hindu society. In fact, there was a band of Hindu Reformers keenly interested to do nothing but remove untouchability was to conjure an illusion to fool the untouchables and to fool the world at a large. Ambedkar then pointed out that he had an interview with Gandhiji in Bombay before going to the First Session of the Round Table Conference, in which Gandhiji had told him that he was not in favour of regarding the Untouchables as a separate entity for political purposes.[83]

7.4. Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar in connection with the 'Communal Award' and the Historic 'Poona Pact' of 1932

The politics of Caste relating to the Institution of Caste, Untouchability, and Hindu temple entry movement for the Harijans etc. worsened the situation of the socio-political environment of India. Gandhiji and Ambedkar – the two shining pillars of Indian political arena in the colonial India tried to address these problems in their own ways. However; Gandhiji stressed on freedom movement rather than social integration of the caste-ridden Hindu society. Realizing the hard reality of social disintegration among the Hindu society, he came forward to deal with the problems of untouchability, ill-fated socio-religious, educational and economic conditions of Harijans and other Depressed Classes. But all these he had done on the line of his traditional convictions relating to the issue of Caste. But he had a grave tension because Ambedkar had already launched social reform movements for the amelioration of the Depressed Classes in connection with the same factors. Ambedkar preached the gospel of liberty, equality and fraternity among these ill-fated poor untouchable and Depressed Class Hindus and encouraged them to fight against the evil socio-religious system that was imposed upon them from generation after

generation by the caste-Hindus in the name of God. He always inspired them to restore their self-respect and self-dignity in the caste-ridden Hindu society. His main aim was to unite them under one united front so that they could liberate themselves from the age-old bondage, slavery and yoke of the Brahmanical Hindu society on the one hand and foreign rule on the other hand. At that very moment, Ambedkar prayed to the colonial Government to address the problems of their people in the caste-ridden Hindu society and recognize them as a separate community. They could not take water from wells, ponds, use Hindu temples for worship, use roads to move from one place to another and their children had no chance in the schools etc. But the British Government was watching these ill-treatments and inhuman acts imposed upon the untouchables by the caste-Hindus on the hand and the programmes of Hindu-Muslim unity (Lucknow Pact, 1916) and role of Gandhiji on the other hand. Realizing the aspirations of the nationalists, extremists and Gandhiji against the colonial rule, the Government of Britain adopted some measures to satisfy the discontentment of the Indian leaders. As the Minto-Morley reforms of 1909 (Indian councils Act) failed to satisfy the Indians, the moderates were greatly disappointed with the reform. The growing discontent of the people resulted in the revolutionary activities. The introduction of communal electorates for Muslims under the Act of 1909 greatly shocked the mind of the Indian Nationalists. Congress demanded for self-government. Coupland said that the concessions made by the Congress were for more substantial than the Muslims had been given by the Morley and Minto to secure acquiescence in the Reforms of 1909. But the Indians supported the British Government during the war with a hope of gaining self government for India after the war. But the British Government was not willing to give any such sovereignty. As a result leaders like Tilak, Anne Besant etc. insisted on the demand for Home Rule for India immediately. All these developments convinced the British Government of the need of further constitutional reforms without any further delay. That is why, the recommendations of Montague, the secretary of State for India, formed the basis of the government of India Act 1919 (Montague Chemsford reforms of 1919). The Act clearly defined its objectives in the preamble which was attached to it. The Preamble read, 'Whereas it is the declared policy of the Parliament to provide for the increasing association of Indians in every branch of Indian administration and for gradual development of self governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the Empire'. But it can be noted that

the Communal or separate electorate, injected into the body politic of India under the Morley Minto reforms of 1909, was further extended to the Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Christians in provinces where the influence of these communities could be weighty. Despite its various limitations it cannot be denied that it was the first milestone on the highway leading to the acquisition of self Government. It marked the beginning of a new era of responsible government. Thompson and Garrat pointed out that the reforms were far from being complete failure. Useful work was done in the provinces by the Indian ministers, and there was no break down during the first three years. The process of Indianisation within the Government was proceeding quickly if unostentatiously. Besides, there was a provision in the Act of 1919 which had imposed an obligation and responsibility on His Majesty's Government to appoint at the end of ten years a Royal Commission to enquire into the working of the Constitution and it gave an instruction to make report upon such changes as may be found necessary. As a result, a Royal Commission was appointed in 1928 under the chairmanship of Sir John Simon Birkenhead, the secretary of State for India opposed to the inclusion of Indians in the Royal Commission. That is why; Gandhiji, alongwith other liberal leaders of the Indian National Congress treated this event as an insult and boycotted this Commission with strong agitation. In fact, officially the objective of the appointment of Simon Commission was described as inquiry into the working of system of government, the growth of education and development of representative institutions in British India and matters connected therewith, and to report as to whether and to what extent it was desirable to establish the principle of responsible government or to extend, modify , or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing therein, including the question whether the establishment of second chambers of the local legislatures, was or was not desirable. Under this situation, Ambedkar submitted a memorandum to the Simon Commission on 29 May, 1928 relating to the issue of safeguards for the protection of the Depressed Classes as a minority in the Bombay Presidency. Regarding the representation for the Depressed Classes, Ambedkar stated that the Bahishkrit Hitkarni Sabha was opposed to the principle of nomination. Ambedkar demanded the protection through the following guarantees[84] as given below:

i. That the education of the Depressed Classes shall be recognized as the first change on the revenue of the province and that an equitable and just proportion

of the total grant for education should be earmarked for the benefit of the Depressed Classes.

ii. That the right of the Depressed Classes to unrestricted recruitment in the army, navy and the police shall be recognized without any limitations as to cost.

iii. That for a period of 30 years the right of the Depressed Classes for priority in the matter of recruitment to all posts, gazetted as well as non-gazetted in all civil services shall be recognized.

iv. That the right of the Depressed Classes to the appointment of a special inspector of police from amongst themselves for every District shall be recognized.

v. That the right of the Depressed Classes to effective representation on the local Bodies shall be recognized by the Provincial Governments.

vi. That the right of the Depressed Classes to appeal to the Government of India in case of violation of these rights by the Provincial Governments shall be recognized and the Government of India shall be given the powers to compel the Provincial Governments to confirm to the law in the matter.

Realizing the gravity of the discontentment, the Simon Commission proceeded with its works and report was issued on 7th June, 1930. Its chief recommendations were as follows:

1. Federal constitution for India.
2. Full autonomy in the Provinces subject to the overriding powers vested in the Governor.
3. Enlargement of the Provincial legislative councils.
4. The Lower House of the Central legislature to be enlarged and elected by the provincial councils but no responsible government in the centre.
5. Separation of Burma from India.

But the Report of Simon Commission was bitterly criticized and condemned by the Indian politicians. The British Government did not respond favourably and branded Nehru Report, 1928 as too progressive. Jinnah who was opposed to the constitutional scheme proposed by Nehru Committee suggested 14th points to safeguard the interests of the Muslims. Though his plan could hardly offer a solution of the communal problem, it found its way in Mac Donald's Award practically speaking; the labour Government under Ramsay Mac Donald in 1929 raised high hopes in the minds of Indians, because while in the opposition the labour party had also sympathized with the Indian aspirations and supported their cause. The policy of Labour Government towards India was expressed by Lord Irwin in his statement of October 1929. He said

that in view of the doubts which had been expressed both in Great Britain and India regarding the interpretation to be placed on the intentions of the British Government in enacting the statute of 1919, he was authorized on behalf of His Majesty's Government to state clearly that in their judgment, it was implicit in the Declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress as there contemplated was the attainment of the Dominion Status. He also announced that His Majesty's Government had accepted the suggestion of Simon Commission that a conference should be convened in which his Majesty's Government most the representatives both of British India and of the States for the purpose of seeking the greatest possible measures of agreement for the final proposals which it would later be the duty of his Majesty's Government to submit to Parliament. Therefore, in accordance with the Viceroy's declaration of 31 October, 1929 there was a conference of the representatives of his Majesty's government and those of India. It was the First Round Table Conference that was inaugurated by His Majesty the King Emperor (George V) in London on 12 November, 1930. The session continued till 19th January, 1931 under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. The conference was attended by 89 members, 16 from the British parties, 16 from the Indian states and 57 from British India. As most of the Congress leaders were in jail, the government nominated 'safe' men of other parties, communities and services to represent India. Some representatives of the Indian states were also invited to take part in the deliberations. After prolonged discussions the conference accepted three basic principles viz. (1) the form of new government in India should be All-India federation, (2) the federal government with certain reservations should be responsible to the federal legislature; and (3) the provinces must enjoy autonomy. At the end of the conference Ramsay Mac Donald announced that the view of His Majesty's government was that responsibility for the government of India should be placed upon legislature Central and provincial with such provisions as may be considered necessary to guarantee during the period of transition, the observance of certain obligation and to meet other special circumstances and also with such guarantees as were required by minorities to protect their political liberties and rights. In such statutory safeguards as may be made for meeting the needs of the transitional period, it will be a primary concern of His Majesty's Government to see that the reserved powers were so framed and exercised as not to prejudice the advance of India through the new constitution to full responsibility for her own government. Pledge after

pledge had been given to India that British Raj was there not for domination. He hoped, and he trusted, and he prayed that by their labours together India would come to possess the only thing which she now lacked to give her the status of a Dominion amongst the British Commonwealth of Nations. What she now lacked for that-the responsibilities and the cares, the burdens and difficulties, but pride and the honour of responsible self government. In fact; from the point of view of Indians, the First Round Table Conference played a vital role in the context of recognition by His Majesty's government of the right of Indians to be consulted in the matter of framing a constitution for India. So a new complication was added with the demand of B.R. Ambedkar that for electoral purposes the Depressed Classes should be treated as a separate community. That is why, the Muslim delegation as a whole before the conference was closed, made a formal statement to the effect that no advance was possible or practicable, whether in the Provinces or in the Central Government, without adequate safeguard for the Muslims of India, and no constitution would be acceptable. As the Governor General must be responsible for the observance of the constitutional rights of Minorities, he must be granted the necessary powers for these purposes. As a result, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and Dewan Bahadur R.Srinivasan were for the first time allowed to represent separately the Untouchables in the First Round Table Conference for the protection of their rights and privileges which was treated as a landmark in the history of the Untouchables. Under this situation, the work of the First Round Table Conference was distributed among nine Committees. Among these Committees the Minorities Committee was the most important Committee. Ramsay Mac Donald, the then Prime Minister himself assumed its chairmanship. The main task of the Minorities Committees was to find out a solution of the Communal question. In this context it can be noted that the Act of 1919 had recognized them as statutory minorities and provisions to their safety and security were embodied in it. But the Montague Chelmsford Report mentioned that provision must be made in the Constitution for their protection. In fact the Government of India Found it difficult to devise any protective measures and provisions for the protection of the Depressed Classes except to give them (to ken) representation in the legislatures by nomination. But Ambedkar raised his voice against this policy and demanded to formulate the safeguards deemed necessary by is why; B.R the Untouchables for their protection against the tyranny and oppression of the Hindus. He formulated a scheme of constitutional safeguards for the protection of the Depressed Classes in the Future

Constitution of a self-governing India. He submitted a Memorandum to the Minorities Committee of the First Round Table Conference. The following are the headings of the terms and conditions[85] of the Memorandum on which the Depressed Classes will consent to place themselves under a majority rule in a self governing India:

Condition No. i: EQUAL CITIZENSHIP

Condition No. II: FREE ENJOYMENT OF EQUAL RIGHTS.

Condition No. III: PROTECTION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION.

Condition No. IV: ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION IN THE LEGISLATURES.

Condition No. V: ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION IN THE SERVICES.

Condition No. VI: REDRESS AGAINST PREJUDICIAL ACTION OR NEGLECT OF INTERESTS

Condition No. VII: SPECIAL DEPARTMENT CARE.

Condition No. VIII: DEPRESSED CLASSES AND THE CABINET.

However, the members of the Minorities Committee met themselves to discuss above noted demands of the Untouchables. They came forward to submit a report on these burning issues to the First Round Table Conference. Some points[86] are noted below as a ready reference to understand the real condition:

i. A demand was raised by different committees for communal representation and for fixed proportions of seats in connection with the number of population of different minority communities through the process of nomination, electorates and separate electorates. - (Extract No. 5).

ii. Nomination was unanimously deprecated – (Extract No. 6).

iii. Joint electorates were proposed by the Minorities Committee with the proviso that a proportion of seats should be reserved to the communities. The election of minority representatives was held by the majority communities. - (Extract No. 7).

iv. It was evident from the discussion of the Minorities Committee that the demand which remained as the only one which would be generally acceptable was separate electorates. But the problem was that what should be the proportion of communal representation in the various provinces and in the Centre if practically the whole of the seats in a legislature were to be assigned to communities. Practically speaking, that there would be no room for the growth of independent political opinion or of true political parties, and this problem would naturally receive a serious complication by the demands of the Depressed Classes. That is why; there was only one way either they should have to be deducted from the Hindu population for electoral purposes or identified themselves as a separate community. (Extract No. 8)

v. Only a proportion should be assigned (say 80 per cent. or 90 per cent) in connection with the objection of the ear-marking of seats to communities and that the rest should be filled by open election. However, this was not accepted by some of the communities as giving them the guarantees they required. (Extract No.9)

vi. A scheme was proposed by Maulana Muhammad Ali, a member of the Sub-Committee, that no communal candidate should be elected unless he secured at least 40 per cent according to arrangement of the votes of the other community as far as possible was also considered. It was so open to objections similar to those urged against separate electorates. (Extract No. 10)

vii. It was unanimously resolved by the Minorities Committee that no claim for separate electorate or for the reservation of seats in joint electorates was made on behalf of women. They would take in election as male. It was further noted the fact that 5 per cent. of the seats in the first three Councils should be reserved for women and it was suggested that they should be filled by co-option by the elected members voting by proportional representation. (Extract No. 11)

viii. It was unanimously resolved that the representation on the Provincial Executive of important minority communities was a matter of the greatest practical importance for the successful working of the new constitution in connection with the recommendation of Sub-Committee No II (Provincial Constitution). On the same grounds, Muhammadans should be represented on the Federal Executive. A claim was put forward on behalf of the smaller minorities for their representation, either individually or collectively, on the Provincial and Federal Executives or that, if this should be found impossible, in each Cabinet there should be a Minister specially charged with the duty of protecting minority interests. (Extract No. 12)

ix. It was noted that the recruitment to both Provincial and Central Services should be entrusted to Public Service Commissions in field of administration, with instructions to reconcile the claims of the various communities to fair and adequate representation in the Public Services to maintain proper standard of efficiency. (Extract No. 13)

x. It was further noted that failing to reach a unanimous agreement on the part of the British Government, separate electorates, with all their drawbacks and difficulties, would have to be retained as the basis of the electoral arrangements under the new constitution. Naturally, the claims of Depressed Classes would have to be considered adequately. (Extract No. 16)

xi. The Minorities Committee unanimously reached to decision that the Minorities and Depressed Classes were definite in their assertion that they could not consent to any self-governing constitution for India unless their demands were met in a reasonable manner. (Extract No. 18)

Now the First Round Table Conference appointed another Committee known as the Federal Structure Committee to discuss the form and functions of the Central Government had also to consider the question of the Untouchables in connection with the composition of the Federal Legislatures. In the report it made clear to the conference as follows:

"Opinion was unanimous in the sub-committee that, subject to any report of the Minorities Sub-Committee, provision should be made for the representation, possibly in both Chambers and certainly in the Lower Chamber of certain special interests, namely, the Depressed Classes, Indian Christians, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Landlords, Commerce (European and Indian) and Labour."[87]

Naturally, the reports of both the Committees were placed before the first session of the Round Table Conference was completed. After thorough discussions of that reports it was unanimously accepted that the Untouchables were entitled for recognition as a separate entity for political and constitutional purposes. But the

attitude of the Indian National Congress was not known relating to this decision adopted by the house of the First Round Table Conference. The Congress was the only party which was not present at the time of taking such a vital decision in the First Round Table Conference. It happened because the Congress had taken a decision for boycotting the First Round Table Conference and the Congress was busy to carry on the Civil Disobedience Movement against the British Government. So the First Round Table Conference failed to accomplish anything because of the absence of Congress. According to Dr. Ishwari Prasad, 'After nine weeks of vague and varied talks, the First Round Table Conference concluded its labours after having achieved nothing except the intentional advertisement of India's communal differences'. In March 1931 at the instance of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and M.R. Jayakar, the famous Gandhi-Irwin pact was concluded. As a result of this Pact, all the political prisoners were released and Gandhiji called off his Civil Disobedience Movement. It was accepted by the Government that any reservation of safe guard in the transfer of power should be in the interest of India. The Congress on its part agreed to take part in the Second Round Table Conference. The Second Round Table Conference was convened in September, 1931. But there was a change of Government in England before the Second Round Table Conference could take place. The Labour Government of Mac Donald fell and was replaced by a National Government containing representatives of the liberal and conservative parties under Mac Donald. At this conference Gandhiji represented Congress as the sole representative, while Jinnah was the representative of the Muslim League. But the attitude of Mahatma Gandhi to the demands of the Untouchables at the Second Round Table Conference was clearly stated in the very first speech which he made in the Federal Structure Committee on 15th September 1931 as follows:

"The Congress has, from its very commencement, taken up the cause of the so-called 'Untouchables.' There was a time when the Congress had at every annual session as it adjunct the Social Conference, to which the late Ranade dedicated his energies, among his many other activities. Headed by him you will find in the programme of the Social Conference, reform in connection with the 'Untouchables' taking a prominent place. But, in 1920, the Congress took a large step and brought in the question of the removal of untouchability as a plank on the political platform, making it an important item of the political programme. Just as the Congress considered the

Hindu-Muslim unity-thereby meaning unity amongst all the classes –to be indispensable for the attainment of Swaraj, so also did the Congress consider the removal of the curse of untouchability as an indispensable condition for the attainment of full freedom. The position the Congress took up in 1920 remains the same today; and so you will see the Congress has attempted from its very beginning to be what it described itself to be, namely, national in every sense of the term."[88]

But Ambedkar vehemently criticized the above noted statement made by Gandhiji relating to the ameliorating measures of the Untouchables adopted by his predecessors and some leaders of the Indian National Congress. Ambedkar had already proved this assumption in the earlier phase of this chapter to disapprove this above statement of Gandhiji and showed how the Congress leaders, politicians and Gandhiji himself were aloof in making the pious as well as historic Bardoli resolution a successful mission to uplift the ill-fated low caste peoples. Not only that but also the Indian National Congress failed to carryout the Bardoli programme of 1922 to the uplift the Untouchables and ultimately it was resolved by the Congress to hand over this charge to the Hindu Mahasabha for improving the conditions of the untouchables. So the above mentioned facts are very urgent in approving or disapproving the above mentioned statement of Gandhiji. Under these unavoidable circumstances, a Supplementary Memorandum[89] in connection with the above noted memorandums on the claims of the Depressed Classes for Special Representation was submitted to the Round Table Conference by Dr. B.R.Ambedkar and Rao Bahadur R.Srinivasan relating to the establishment of their political safeguards for protection in a constitution for a self-governing India under the following points:

POLITICAL SAFEGUARDS FOR DEPRESSED CLASSES

1. Extent of Special Representation:
A. Special Representation in Provincial Legislatures.
B. Special Representation in the Federal Legislature.
2. Method of Representation:
3. Necessity of Defining the Depressed Classes:
4. Nomenclature:

After leaving the responsibility of the amelioration programmes to the Hindu Mahasabha, relating to the untouchables, the caste Hindu leaders of the Indian National Congress washed their hands in this perspective. But Gandhiji knew it very

well that Hindu Mahasabha was nothing but an organization of the orthodox as well as conservative Hindus. So Gandhiji and his Congress left this responsibility of uplifting the untouchables without considering the needs and demands of the ill-fated poor untouchables. Even he vehemently opposed to the demand of their identity as a separate community and separate electoral process. However, Gandhiji's role in the meeting of the Federal Structure Committee on 17th September, 1931 on the subject of election of members of the Federal Legislatures was very much interesting as follows:

"I come to sub-head (v) – representation by special constituencies of special interest. I here speak for the Congress. The Congress has reconciled itself to special treatment of the Hindu-Muslim-Sikh tangle. There are sound historical reasons for it but the Congress will not extend that doctrine in any shape or form. I listened to the list of special interests. So far as the Untouchables are concerned, I have not yet quite grasped what Dr. Ambedkar has to say: but of course the Congress will share the honour with Dr. Ambedkar of representing the interests of the Untouchables. They are as clear to the Congress as the interests of any other body or of any other individual through out the length and breadth of India. Therefore I would most strongly resist any further special representation"[90]

According to Ambedkar, Gandhiji and his Congress made a declaration of war against the demand of the Untouchables for special representation. In any case it may be resulted in a war between the two. Realizing the importance of this situation, Gandhiji made a plan to bypass the demands of the Untouchables. His main motto was to close the chapter of the Communal problems by bringing about a settlement between the there parties; the Hindus, the Muslims the Sikhs. So he was earnestly trying to get support of the Muslims on this issue. So he took initiative to make a negotiation privately with the Muslims before the Minorities Committee's meeting. But ultimately he failed. The Minorities Committee met on 28th September, 1931 and Sri Ali Imam deliberated a speech on behalf of the Nationalist Muslim point of view on this issue. But Aga Khan said in the house that Mahatma Gandhi was trying to make a possible negotiation with their Muslim Delegation so far as the question of special representation of the Untouchables was concerned. But Ambedkar raised his voice and pointed out that they had already reached a negotiation with the members of the minority communities so far as the questions of the Depressed Classes were

concerned and they had presented in the meantime their case to the Minorities Sub-Committee. He also pointed out that he had only thing with him to place before this Committee that was a short statement suggesting the quantum of representation which we wanted in the different Legislatures. But he was very much anxious at the very outset that he had heard with great pleasure that further negotiations was going to take place for the settlement of the communal issue, but he would like to make their position clear at the very beginning. But he said that those who were negotiating ought to understand that they were not plenipotentiaries appointed by the Committee to negotiate a settlement; that whatever would be the representative character of Gandhiji or of the other parties with whom he wished to negotiate, they certainly were not in a position to bind them certainly not. That is why; Ambedkar strongly opposed to any settlement which would take place between one minority on the one hand and the Congress or any other party for the matter of that on the other hand, without taking into consideration the claims which had been put forward by other minorities, could have no binding force as far as he was concerned. Not only that but also Ambedkar pointed out that he had no quarrel with the question whether any particular community should get weightage or not, but he would like to say most emphatically that whoever claims weightage and whoever was willing to give that weightage he might not give it - he could not give it - out of his share. That is why; he liked to make that absolutely plain. Apart from these, Ambedkar had made his position absolutely clear on this burning question. But Gandhiji completely failed to make a negotiation on that burning question with the members of the Minority Committees during the adjournment of the meeting. As a result of it, the Minorities Committee met once again on 1st October, 1931. Ambedkar said that he did not wish to create any difficulty in their making every possible attempt to arrive at some solution of the problem with which this Committee had to deal, and if a solution could be arrived at by the means suggested by Mahatma Gandhi, he, for one, would have no objection to that proposal if the question of the Depressed Classes be considered. So Gandhiji told them on the first day that he spoke in the Federal Structure Committee that as a representative of the Indian National Congress he was not prepared to give political recognition to any community other than the Muhammadans and the Sikhs. Even Gandhiji was not prepared to recognize the Anglo Indians, the Depressed Classes, and the Indian Christians. Not only that but also Gandhiji said in plain terms that the attitude that he had taken in the Federal Structure Committee was a firm and well

considered attitude. What he would like to say was that unless at the outset he knew that the Depressed Classes were going to be recognized as a community entitled to political recognition in the future Constitution of India. He did not know whether it would serve any purpose for him to join the committee that was proposed by Mahatma Gandhi to be constituted to go into this matter. Unless, therefore, he have an assurance that this Committee would start with the assumption that all those communities which the Minorities Sub-Committee last year recommended as fit for recognition in the future constitution of India would be included. After utter failure in reaching a peaceful solution at that informal meeting held during the adjournment, Gandhiji dissolved that meeting. As a result of it, the Minorities Committee again met on 8th October, 1931 and the Prime Minister asked Gandhiji to deliver his speech first. That is why, Gandhiji delivered his speech as follows:

"Prime Minister and friends, it is with deep sorrow and deeper humiliation that I have to announce utter failure on my part to secure an agreed solution of the communal question through informal conversations among and with the representatives of different groups. I apologise to you, Mr. Prime Minister, and the other colleagues for the waste of a precious week. My only consolation lies in the fact that when I accepted the burden of carrying on these talks I knew that there was much hope of success and still more in the fact that I am not aware of having spared any effort to reach a solution.

"But to say that the conversations have to our utter shame failed is not say the whole truth. Causes of failure were inherent in the composition of the Indian Delegation. We are almost all not elected representatives of the parties or groups whom we are presumed to represent; we are here by nomination of the Government. Nor are those whose presence was absolutely necessary for an agreed solution to be found here. Further, you will allow me to say that this was hardly the time to summon the Minorities Committee. It lacks the sense of reality in that we do not know what it is that we are going to get. If we knew in a definite manner that we going to get the thing we want, we should hesitate fifty times before we threw it away in a sinful wrangle as it would be if we are told that the getting of it would depend upon the ability of the present Delegation to produce an agreed solution of the communal tangle. The solution can be the crown of the Swaraj constitution, not its foundation-if

only because our differences have hardened, if they have not arisen by reason of the foreign domination. Differences will melt under the warmth of the sun of freedom.

"I propose to use the failure as a stepping-stone to success, and I invite you all to do likewise; but, should all effort at agreement fail, even when the Round Table Conference reaches the end of its labours, I would suggest the addition of a clause to the expected constitution appointing a judicial tribunal that would examine all claims and give its final decision on all the points that may be left unsettled."[91]

Gandhiji made it clear that the delegates of the Round Table Conference were nominated by the colonial Government who were not the real representatives of the people. Even they did not represent the views their respective communities for whom they stood. But Ambedkar said that instead of confining himself to his proposition, namely, that the Minorities Committee Gandhiji started casting certain reflections upon the representatives of the different communities who were sitting round this table. Ambedkar claimed that he fully represent the claims of his community whereas Gandhiji had demanded that the Congress always stood for the Depressed Classes, and that the Congress only represented the Depressed Classes. To Ambedkar, the claim of Gandhiji was not true at all relating to the representation of the Untouchables. So he cited resolution adopted by the Depressed Classes Union, Kumaun, and Almora, which he believed was in the United Provinces, and which contained the following resolution:

"This Meeting declares its non-confidence in the Congress movement which has been carried on in and outside the country, and condemns the methods adopted by the Congress workers."[92]

Realizing complexity of Gandhiji, Ambedkar said that the Minorities Committee either should solve the problem or the British Government should undertake the solution of the problem relating to the question and special demands of the Depressed Classes. He was completely unwilling for arbitration by the third parties relating to the question of Untouchables. Even he had no confidence to others except the sense of responsibility of the British Government in this respect. He also noted the fact that the position of the Depressed Classes were not clamouring for transfer of political power.

Their position was to put it plainly that they were not anxious for the transfer of power; but if the British Government would unable to resist the forces that had been set up in the country which would do clamour for transference of political power and they knew the Depressed Classes in their present circumstances were not in a position to resist that. So they asked the British Government that if the Government would make that transfer, that transfer would be accompanied by such conditions and by such provisions that power should not fall into the hands of a clique, into the hands of an oligarchy, or into the hands of a group of people, whether Muhammandans or Hindus; but that that solution should be such that the power should be shared by all communities in their respective proportions. After a long deliberations relating to the issues of the Depressed Classes and others, the Prime Minister of Britain said that British Government would take its action if the delegates could not find out the solution because they were determined to make such improvements in the Government of India that would make the Government of India consistent with their own ideas, as would make the Government of India something that was capable of greater and greater expansion towards liberty. That is why; the Prime Minister of England appealed to the Delegates for representing all communities. On the basis of the Prime Minister's suggestion, the Minorities Committee met and met a settlement which was submitted to the Prime Minister in the evening before next meeting of the Minorities Committee which took place on thirteenth November, 1931 and the Prime Minister opined that the work of this Committee, therefore, was from the very beginning of supreme importance, and he was sorry to say that the delegates were unable to present the British Government to an agreed plan. Even he received a deputation representing the Mohammedans, the Depressed Classes, at any rate a section of the Indian Christians, the Anglo-Indians and the British Community and they met him with a document which embodied an agreement that they had come to amongst themselves which covered something in the region of 46 per cent. of the population of British India. His Highness The Aga Khan got up and read that document in the house and said that they had been arrived at between them with regard to the intercommunal problem with which the Round Table Conference in general and the Minorities Committee in particular were concerned. They said that this agreement had been arrived at after careful and anxious consideration of this difficult and complicated problem and might be taken as a whole. All parts of the agreement were interdependent and agreements stood or fall as a whole. This

agreement was known as 'Minorities Pact' and the Provisions of which was put forward jointly by Muslims, Depressed Classes, Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians and Europeans to the British Prime Minister. It was nothing but a Settlement of the Communal Problem agreed and signed by the HIS HIGHNESS THE AGA KHAN (Muslims Delegate), DR. AMBEDKAR (Depressed Classes representative), RAO BAHADUR PANNIR SELVAM (Indian Christians leader), SIR HENRY GIDNEY (Anglo-Indians representative) and SIR HUBERT CARR (Europeans delegate). The main claims[93] of the Minorities Communities were as follows:

i. No person should be prejudiced by reason of his origin, religion, caste or creed in the field of employment, education, civic rights and the exercise of any trade or professions.
ii. Statutory safeguards should be incorporated in the constitution with a view to protect against enactments of the Legislature of discriminatory laws affecting any community.
iii. Right to Liberty should be guaranteed to all communities in the sphere of religion, worship, observances, propaganda, associations, education, social institutions, schools etc.
iv. Right to Constitution guarantee should be implemented in the field of adequate safeguards for the protection of religion, culture and personal law, and the promotion of education and for their due share in grants-in-aid given by the State and by the self-government bodies.
v. Right to the enjoyment of Civic Rights by all citizens should be guaranteed by making any act.
vi. Right to adequate representation of the Mussalman community and other minorities by convention in the formation of Cabinets in the Central Government and Provincial Government.
vii. Right to protect minority communities and to promote their welfare by the establishing the Statutory Department under the Central and Provincial Governments.
vii. No change to joint electorates and reserved seats should be made until after 20 years' experience of separate electorates and until direct adult suffrage for the community had been established with regard to the Depressed Classes.

10. In every Province a Public Service Commission shall be appointed, and the recruitment to the Public Services in such a way as to secure a fair representation to the various communities consistently with the considerations of efficiency and the possession of the necessary qualifications.

11. If a Bill is passed which, in the opinion of two-thirds of the members of any Legislature representing a particular community, affects their religion or social practice based on religion, or in the case of fundamental rights of the subjects in one-third of the members object, it shall be open to such members to ledge their objection thereto, within a period of one month of the Bill being passed by the House.

SPECIAL CLAIMS OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES

A. ------ The constitution shall declare invalid custom or usage by which any penalty or disadvantage or disability is imposed upon or any discrimination is made against any subject of the State in regard to the enjoyment of the civic rights on account of Untouchability.

B. ------ Generous treatment in the matter of recruitment to Public Service and the opening of enlistment in the Police and Military Service

C. ------ The Depressed Classes in the Punjab shall have the benefit of the Punjab Land Alienation Act extended to them.

D. ------ Right of Appeal shall lie to the Governor or Governor General for redress of prejudicial action or neglect of interest by any Executive Authority.

E. ------ The Depressed Classes shall have representation not less than set forth in the Annexure.

But Gandhiji attacked everybody who had taken part is producing the Minorities Pact. He was particularly furious against the special recognition given to the Untouchables as a separate political entity. He said that the Congress would not accept the demands for special electorates of the Untouchables. Even Gandhiji told that he would not sell the vital interests of the Untouchables for the sake of winning the freedom of India. He repeatedly claimed himself in his own person to represent the vast mass of the Untouchables. He also noted that he spoke not merely on behalf of the Congress, but on his own too. Besides, he said that he would work from one end of India to the other to tell the Untouchables that separate electorates and separate reservation was not the way to remove this bar-sinister, which was the shame, not of them, but of orthodox Hinduism. Therefore, with all his regard for Ambedkar, and for his desire to see the Untouchables up lifted, with all his regard for his ability, Gandhiji said that here the

great wrong under which Ambedkar had laboured and perhaps the bitter experience that he had undergone had for the moment warped his judgment. It hurts him to have said this, but he would be untrue to the cause of the Untouchables. He was speaking with a due sense of responsibility, and he told that it was not a proper claim which was registered by Dr. Ambedkar when sought to speak for the whole of the Untouchables of India. According to him it would create a division in Hinduism which he could not possibly look forward to with any satisfaction whatsoever. He did not mind Untouchables, if they so desire, being converted to Islam or Christianity. The Chairman of the Round Table Conference made a suggestion to the delegates that he had asked several sections-at least, individuals-from time to time for that, and he had never got it. He also said in opening of this meeting-that the Government would not allow community differences to prevent it from carrying out its pledges and producing a constitution. Therefore they were asked not to make the community difference more important than it was. Although it was noted further that Gandhiji was ready to give recognition to the demands of the Muslims and the Sikhs except the demands of the Untouchables. That is why; Ambedkar said that whenever they asked for an explanation. Gandhi did nothing except to get angry. Gandhiji himself could not give a logical and consistent defence of his opposition to the Untouchables. Inside the Round Table Conference his defence was that the Hindus had seriously taken up the cause of the Untouchables and that therefore there was no reason to give them political safeguards. Outside the Round Table Conference he gave totally different reasons. Further Gandhiji told in a speech in defence of his position as follows:

"Muslims and Sikhs are all well organized. The Untouchables are not. There is very little political consciousness among them and they are so horribly treated that I want to save them against themselves. If they had separate electorates their lives would be miserable in villages which are the strongholds of Hindu orthodoxy. It is the superior class of Hindus who have to do penance for having neglected the 'Untouchables' for ages. That penance can be done by active social reform and by making the lot of the 'Untouchables' more bearable by acts of service, but not by asking for separate electorates for them. By giving them separate electorates you will throw the apple of discord between the 'Untouchables' and the orthodox. You must understand I can tolerate the proposal for special representation of the Musalmans and the Sikhs only as a necessary evil. It would be a positive danger for the 'Untouchables.' I am certain

that the question of separate electorates for the 'Untouchables' is a modern manufacture of Government. The only thing needed is to put them on the voters list, and provide for fundamental rights for them in the constitution. In cases they are unjustly treated and their representative is deliberately excluded they would give them complete protection. It should be open to these tribunals to order the unseating of an elected candidate and the election of the excluded men.

"Separate electorates to the 'Untouchables' will ensure them bondage in perpetuity. The Musalmans will never cease to be Musalmans by having separate electorates. Do you want the 'Untouchables' to remain 'Untouchables' for ever? Well, the separate electorates would perpetuate the stigma. What is needed is destruction of untouchability, and when you have done it, the bar-sinister which had been imposed by an insolent 'superior' class upon an 'inferior' class will be destroyed. When you have destroyed the bar-sinister, to whom will you give the separate electorates? Look at the history of Europe. Have you got separate electorates for the working classes or women? With adult franchise, you give the 'Untouchables' complete security. Even the orthodox would have to approach them for votes.

"Now then you ask, does Dr. Ambedkar, their representative, insist on separate electorates for them? I have the highest regard for Dr. Ambedkar. He had every right to be bitter. That he does not break our heads is an act of self-restraint on his part. He is today so much saturated with suspicion that he cannot see anything else. He sees in every Hindu a determined opponent of the 'Untouchables' and it is quite natural. The same thing happened to me in my early days in South Africa, where I was hounded out by Europeans wherever I went. It is quite natural for him to vent his wrath. But the separate electorates that he seeks will not give him social reform. He may himself mount to power and position but nothing good will accrue to the 'Untouchables.' I can say all this with authority, having lived with the 'Untouchables' and having shared their joys and sorrows all these Years."[94]

Ambedkar said that Gandhiji felt considerably disturbed when he heard that at the suggestion of the Prime Minister, the minorities were about to produce a settlement. That is why; Gandhiji devised a scheme to isolate the Untouchables from other Minorities, especially the Muslims. For this reason, he decided to buy out the

Mussalmans at any cost. Ultimately Gandhiji agreed to their 14th points on condition that the Mussalmans might withdraw their support from the Untouchables and a secret agreement was signed between Gandhi and Mussalmans representatives. This agreement was known as the 'DRAFT OF GANDHI-MUSLIM PACT'. The main issue of discussion was centered on the question of the withdrawal of the Mussalmans support from the demands of the Untouchables at any cost. That is why; the proposals made by the Muslim for safeguarding their rights and privileges and the proposals made by Gandhiji regarding the Congress policy to isolate the Untouchables from obtaining Mussalmans support by hook and cook. Ambedkar said that Gandhiji did not hesitate to approach the Musalmans and turn against the Untouchables by accepting their 14th points which the Congress, the Hindu Maha Saba and even Simon Commission had rejected. Under these circumstances, the Second Round Table Conference was dissolved and the Minorities Committee accepted the proposal of the Prime Minister to put in a signed requisition authorizing him to arbitrate and gibe his decision on the 'Communal' issue. Many delegates did it including Gandhiji of the Untouchables were so reasonable that no arbitration was necessary. That is why, the Prime Minister appointed a Committee with the late Lord Lothian as its Chairman. Its main object was to devise a system of franchise and his instructions the Chairman was as follows:

"The legislatures to which responsibility is to be entrusted should be representative of the general mass of the population, and that no important section of the community may lack the means of expressing its needs and its opinions."[95]

For doing its work the Committee took the help of the Provincial Governments and of the Provincial Franchise Committees. But the Lothian Committee had close relation with the political demands of the Untouchables.

That is why; the duty and responsibility of the Committee was to find out the exact population of the Untouchables in British India. But it was irony of fate that witness after witness came forward to say that the exact populations of the Untouchables in his Province were very small. Some witness said that there was no Untouchables al all. Even Hindu witnesses were denying the existence of the Untouchables or reducing their number to a negligible figure. Not only the members of the Provincial

Franchise Committee were a party to this plan but also some of the Hindu members of the Lothian Committee were in the game. The total populations of the Untouchables before the Round Table Conference were 70 to 80 millions as per the census figures. But Ambedkar opined that "In the United Provinces, the Census Commissioner in 1931 had estimated the total population Government at 6.8 millions but the Provincial Franchise Committee at .6 millions only!! In Bengal, the Census gave the figures of 10.3 millions; Provincial Government fixed it as 11.2 millions but the Provincial Franchise Committee at .07 millions only!"[96] That is why; Ambedkar raised the following question: "Why did then the Hindus start suddenly to challenge this figure when the question was taken up by the Lothian Committee?"

As an explanation he said that the population of the Untouchables had no value before the formation of the Lothian Committee. After the Round Table Conference, the Hindus had come to know that the Untouchables were demanding separate allotment of their share of representation that such share must come out of the lump which the Hindus had been enjoying in the past and that the measure of the share must depend upon the population of their interest. That is why; Gandhiji and Congress did not mind sacrificing truth and decency and decided to adopt the safest course, namely, to deny that there were any Untouchables in India at all, and thereby knocked out the bottom of the political demands of the Untouchables and left no room for argument. After returning India with empty hand from the Round Table Conference, Gandhiji threatened to revive his campaign of Civil Disobedience Movement in India. But he was ultimately arrested. Without getting no way of obtaining their position and decision relating to the burning issue of the Untouchables, Gandhiji addressed from the jail on 11th March,1932 in a letter to Sir Samuel Hoare, the then Secretary of State for India and reminding him regarding his opposition to the claim of the Untouchables. Gandhiji told Sir Samuel that he would perhaps recollect that at the end of his speech at the Round Table Conference when the Minorities' claim was presented, he said that he should resist with his life the grant of separate electorates to the Depressed Classes. So far as Hinduism was concerned, separate electorates would simply vivisect and disrupt it. So the question of these classes was predominantly moral and religious. But he pointed out that no penance that the Hindus would do can in any way compensate for the calculated degradation to which they had consigned the Depressed Classes for centuries. So it seemed to him that separate electorate was

neither penance nor any remedy for the crushing degradation they had groaned under. That is why; Gandhiji, therefore, respectfully inform His Majesty's Government that in the event of their decision creating separate electorate for the Depressed Classes, he must/ might fast unto death. He also was hoping, however, all his fears were wholly unjustified and the British Government had no intention whatever of creating separate electorate for the Depressed Classes. As a result of it, the Secretary of state for India sent the following reply to Gandhiji. He said that he realized fully the strength of his feeling upon the question of separate electorates for the Depressed Classes. But he could only say that their intension was to give any decision that would be necessary solely and only upon the merits of the case. He said that Lord Lothian's Committee had not yet completed its tour and it must be some weeks before they could receive any conclusions at which it might have arrived. However, the main motto of Gandhiji was to paralyze the British Government and prevent them from accepting the claim of the Untouchables for special representation. As the Indian leader had failed to come to an agreement; British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald announced his 'Communal Award' on 17th August, 1932. While announcing his award, he also declared that "If the Government were satisfied that communities concerned were mutually agreed upon an alternative scheme, they would be prepared to recommend to Parliament that the alternative should be substituted for the provisions outlined in the Communal Award". The main provisions[97] of the Award were given below:

Communal Decision by His Majesty's Government, 1932
Main Provisions:

"1. In the statement by the Prime Minister on 1st December last on behalf of his Majesty's Government at the close of the second of the Round Table Conference, which was immediately afterwards endorsed by both Houses of Parliament, it was made plain that if the communities in India were unable to reach a settlement acceptable to all parties on the communal question which the Conference had failed to solve, His Majesty's Government were determined that India's constitutional advance should not on that account be frustrated, and that they would remove this obstacle by devising and applying themselves a provisional scheme.

2. On the 19th March last His Majesty's Government having been informed that the continued failure of the communities to reach agreement was blocking the progress of

the plans for the framing of a new Constitution, stated that they were engaged upon a careful re-examination of the difficult and controversial questions which arise. They are now satisfied that without a decision of at least some aspects of the problems connected with the position of minorities under the new Constitution, no further progress can be made with the framing of the Constitution.

3. His Majesty's Government has accordingly decided that they will include provisions to give effect to the scheme set out below in the proposals relating to the Indian Constitution to be laid in due course before Parliament. The scope of this scheme is purposely confined to the arrangements to be made for the representation of the British Indian communities in the Provincial Legislatures, consideration of representation in the Legislature at the Centre being deferred for the reason given in paragraph 20 below. The decision to limit the scope of the scheme implies no failure to realize that the framing of the Constitution will necessitate the decision of a number of other problems of great importance to minorities, but has been made upon the basic questions of method and proportions of representation the communities themselves may find it possible to arrive at modus vivendi on other communal problems, which have not received the examination they require.

4. His Majesty's Government wishes it to be most clearly understood that they themselves can be no parties to any negotiations which may be initiated view to the revision of their decision, and will not be prepared to give consideration to any representation aimed at securing the modification of it which is not supported by all the parties affected. But they are mot desirous to close no door to an agreed settlement should such happily be forthcoming. If, therefore, before a new Government of India Act has passed into law, they are satisfied that the communities who are concerned are mutually agreed of any one or more of the Governors' Provinces or in respect of the whole of the British India, they will be prepared to recommend to Parliament that that alternative should be substituted for the provisions now outlined.

5. * * * *

6. * * * *

7. * * * *

8. * * * *

9. Members of the "depressed classes" qualified to vote will vote in general constituency. In view of the fact that for a considerable period these classes would be unlikely, by this means alone, to secure any adequate representation in the Legislature, a number of special seats will be assigned to them as shown in the table. These seats will be filled by election from special constituencies in which only members of the "depressed classes" electorally qualified will be entitled to vote. Any person voting in such a special constituency will, as stated above, be also entitled to vote in a general constituency. It is intended that these constituencies should be formed in selected areas where the depressed classes are most numerous, and that, except in Madras, they should not cover the whole area of the Province.

In Bengal it seems possible that in some general constituencies a majority of the voters will belong to the Depressed Classes. Accordingly, pending further investigation, no number has been fixed for the members to be returned from the special Depressed Class constituencies in that Province. It is intended to secure that the Depressed Classes should obtain not less than 10 seats in the Bengal Legislature.

The precise definition in each Province of those who (if electorally qualified) will be entitled to vote in the special Depressed Class Constituencies has not yet been finally determined. It will be based as a rule on the general principles advocated in the Franchise Committee's Report. Modification may, however, be found necessary in some Provinces in Northern India where the application of the general criteria a untouchability might result in a definition unsuitable in some respects to the special condition of the Province.

His Majesty's Government does not consider that these special Depressed Classes constituencies will be required for more than limited time. They intend that the Constitution shall provide that they shall come to an end after 20 years if they have not previously been abolished under the general powers of electoral revision referred to in paragraph 6."

Realizing the content relating to the terms and conditions of the 'Communal Award' of 1932, Gandhiji became furious against the colonial Government. That is why; he sent a protesting letter to the Prime Minister on August 18, 1932 from the Yeravda

Central Prison and highlighted that in pursuance of his letter Sir Samuel Hoare and his declaration at the meeting of the Minorities Committee of the Round Table Conference on 13th November, 1931 at St; James' Palace, he had to resist their decision with his life. The only way he could do so was by declaring a perpetual fast unto death. This would cease only if during its progress the British Government revise their decision and withdraw their scheme of communal electorates for the Depressed Classes, whose representatives should be elected by the general electorate under the common franchise, no matter how wide it was. He strongly pointed out that the proposed fast would come into operation in the ordinary course from the noon of 20th September next, unless the said decision was meanwhile revised in the manner suggested above. In response to the reactions of Gandhiji, the Prime Minister of England expressed his views on September 8th, 1932 and said that Gandhiji had written this letter to him under a misunderstanding as to what the decision of His Majesty's Government as regards the Depressed Classes really implied in connection with the permanent segregation of the Depressed Classes from the Hindu community. He noted the fact that Gandhiji made his position very clear on the Minorities Committee of the Round Table Conference and expressed it once again. Under this unavoidable circumstance, he replied to Gandhiji that they would take it into most careful account when they were considering the question of representation of the Depressed Classes. Keeping in mind of the numerous appeals they had received from Depressed Class Organizations and the generally admitted social disabilities under which they laboured and which they had often recognized, they felt that it was their duty to safeguard what they believed to be the right of the Depressed Classes. But under the Government scheme the Depressed Classes would remain part of the Hindu community and will vote with the Hindu electorate on an equal footing but for the first twenty years they would receive a limited number of special constituencies. Thus, in every way was the unity of Hindu society preserved. Under this unavoidable condition, the special advantage initially given under the scheme for the Depressed Classes was wholly different in conception and be effective in the same method as that of the representation adopted for a minority such as the Moslems by means of separate communal electorates. However, he said that Gandhiji opposed to the demands of the untouchables very interestingly who would adopt the extreme course of starving yourself to death not in order to secure that the Depressed Classes should have joint electorate with Hindus, because this right was already recognized. In

response to this general request the Indians, after they had failed to produce a settlement the Govt. undertook to give a decision on the minorities' question. They had now given this priviledge, and they could not alter it. It seemed to him unfair if his present internment were to deprive his of opportunity of explaining to the public the reason why you intend to fast. However, once again he urged Gandhiji to consider the actual details of Government's decision and ask himself seriously the question whether it would really justify him in taking the action he had already declared[98].

Realizing the attitude of the British Government towards the question of the Untouchables, Gandhiji wrote a letter to the P.M. of Britain on September 9th, 1932. that the mere fact of the Depressed Classes having double votes did not protect them or Hindu society in general from being disrupted. In the establishment of separate electorate all was calculated to destroy Hinduism and did no good whatever to the Depressed Classes. He should not be against even over-representation of the Depressed Classes. What he disliked was their statutory Separation even in a limited form, from the Hindu fold, so long as they choose to belong to it. He asked that if his decision stood and the constitution would come into being, he would arrest the marvellous growth of the work of Hindu reformers, who have dedicated themselves to the uplift their suppressed brethren in every walk of life. That is why; Gandhiji said that he had been compelled reluctantly to adhere to the decision conveyed to him. Under this unavoidable circumstance, Gandhiji commenced his 'Epic Fast' unto death on 20th September, 1932 as a protest against the grant of separate electorates to the Untouchables.

Ambedkar made the statement on Gandhiji's attitude at the Round Table Conference to the Untouchables and their demand for Constitutional Safeguards on 19th September 1932. It was possible for Ambedkar to read the correspondence held between Gandhiji, Sir Samuel Hoare and the Prime Minister, which was published recently in the Newspaper, in which Gandhiji had expressed his determination to starve himself unto death till the British Government of its own accord or under pressure of public opinion revise their opinion and withdraw their scheme of communal representation for the Depressed Classes. But a question stirred into Ambedkar's mind; why would Gandhi stake his life on an issue arising out of the communal question which he, at the Round Table Conference, said was one of a

comparatively small importance. So it was very painful and surprising to him that Gandhi should single out special representation for the Depressed Classes in the Communal Award as an excuse for his self-immolation. It was well known to all that separate electorates were granted not only to the Depressed Classes, but to the Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians, Europeans, as well as to the Mohammedans and the Sikhs. It was also noted that separate electorates were granted to landlords, labourers and traders. But Gandhiji had declared his opposition to the special representation of every other class and creed except the Mahomedans and the Sikhs. All the same, Gandhiji chose to let everybody else except the Depressed Classes retain the special electorates given to them. Gandhiji expressed his grievances against the consequences of the arrangements for the representations of the Depressed Classes. Ambedkar also said that it was nothing but purely an imaginary opinion of Gandhiji. If the nation was not going to be split up by separate electorates to the Mahomedans and the Sikhs, the Hindu society could not be said to be split up if the Depressed Classes were given separate electorates. His conscience would not be aroused if the nation was split by the arrangements of special Electorates for classes and communities other than the Depressed Classes. Some scholars and politicians felt that if there was any class which deserved to be given special political rights in order to protect itself against the tyranny of the majority under the Swaraj constitution, it was the Depressed Classes which was undoubtedly not in a position to sustain itself in the struggle for existence. Further the religion, to which they were tied up, instead of providing for them an honorable place, brands them as lepers. This class was entirely dependent economically upon the high-caste Hindus. The only path for a community so handicapped to succeed in the struggle for life against organized tyranny, some share of political power in order that it might protect itself was a paramount necessity. So Ambedkar fought as a well-wisher of the Depressed Classes for securing as much political power as might be possible in the new Constitution while Gandhiji strangely opposed to his noble mission. Therefore, he endeavoured to augment the scanty political power which the Depressed Classes had got under the Communal Award. The opposition from Gandhiji seemed to Ambedkar that he completely dished the Depressed Classes out of political existence. He even tried to enter into an agreement with the Muslims and the Congress by offering the Muslims all the 14 claims which they had put forth on their behalf, and in return asked them to join with him in resisting the claims for social representation made by him on behalf of the Depressed

Classes. So the credit should be given to the Muslim delegates as they refused to be a part to such a black act. But Gandhiji said that the Communal Award had separated the Depressed Classes from the Hindu Community. Dr. Moonje, a much stronger protagonist of the caste Hindus had been insisting on the fact that the Communal Award did not create any separation between the Depressed Class and the Hindus. But it was very much interesting to note that Dr. Moonje was surprised about Gandhiji that he was a nationalist and not known to be a communalist should read the Communal Award, in so far as it relates to the Depressed Class, in a manner quite contrary to that of communalists like Dr. Moonje. According to Ambedkar, the Communal Award should not only satisfy the Hindus, but also those among the Depressed Classes such as Rao Bahadur Rajah, Mr. Baloo or Mr. Govai, who were in favour of Joint Electorates. But it was very much interesting to say that although Gandhiji was opposed to the system of separate electorates, he was not opposed to the system of Joint Electorates and Reserved Seats. Once again it can be said that he was totally opposed to any system of Special representation for the Depressed Classes whether by joint Electorates or by Separate Electorates in the Round Table Conference. Beyond the right to vote in a general electorate based upon Adult Suffrage, Gandhiji was not prepared to concede anything to the Depressed Classes by way of securing their representation in the legislatures. Gandhiji proposed a scheme which was purely conventional without any constitutional sanction behind it and without any single seat being reserved for the Depressed Classes in the electoral law. But the scheme was mentioned as follows:

"Depressed Class candidates might stand in the general electorate as against other high caste Hindu candidates. If any Depressed Class Candidate was defeated in the election, he should file an election petition and obtain the verdict that he was defeated because he was an Untouchable. If such a decision was obtained, the Mahatma and he would undertake to induce some Hindu members to resign and thus create a vacancy. There would be then another election in which the defeated Depressed Class candidate or any other Depressed Class candidate might again try his luck as against the Hindu candidates. Should he be defeated again, he should get similar verdict that he was defeated because he was an Untouchable and so on ad infinitum. I am disclosing these facts as some people are even now under the impression that the joint

Electorates and Reserved States would satisfy that there is no use discussing the question until the actual proposals of the Mahatma are put forth."[99]

But Ambedkar was not satisfied about the assurances of the Mahatma relating to question of the Untouchables that he and his Congress would come forward to do the needful. So Ambedkar did agree to leave the most important question as the protection of his people to conventions and understandings. Instead of that he highlighted the fact that there had been many Mahatmas in India whose sole object was to remove Untouchability and to elevate and absorb the Depressed Classes, but every one of them had failed in this mission. This is why; Ambedkar was bound to insist on a statutory guarantee for the protection of his people. Ambedkar also concluded his statement regarding the 'Epic Fast'of Gandhiji by assuring the public that although he was entitled to say that he regarded the matter as closed, he was ready to consider the proposals of Gandhiji. However, Ambedkar believed that Mahatma Gandhi would not drive him to the necessity of making a choice between his life and the rights of his people. That is why; he could never consent to deliver his people bound hand and foot to the Caste Hindus for generations to come. But the Prime Minister of England had made it quite clear that the British Cabinet would not withdraw the 'Communal Award' on alter it of its own, but that they were ready to substitute for it a formula that may be agreed upon by the Caste Hindus and the Untouchables. Under these unavoidable circumstances, Ambedkar had to face two types of problems such as the political rights for the Untouchables which the Prime Minister had given them and to save the life of Gandhiji from sure death. Ambedkar ultimately responded to the call of humanity and save the life of Gandhiji through an agreement i.e. known as the 'Poona Pact' of 1932. As a result of it; a public meeting of the Hindus was called on 25th September, 1932 in Bombay to accord to it their support and the following resolution[100] was passed in this meeting:

"This Conference confirms the Poona agreement arrived at between the leaders of the Caste Hindus and Depressed Classes on September 24, 1932, and trusts that the British Government will withdraw its decision creating separate electorates within the Hindu community and accept the agreement in full. The Conference urges that immediate action be taken by Government so as to enable Mahatma Gandhi to break his fast within the terms of his vow and before it is too late. The Conference appeals

to the leaders of the communities concerned to realize the implications of the agreement and of this resolution and to make earnest endeavour to fulfill them.

This Conference resolves that henceforth, amongst Hindus, no one shall be regarded as an Untouchable by reason of his birth, and that those who have been so regarded hitherto will have the same right as other Hindus in regard to the use of public wells, public schools, public roads, and all other public institutions. This right shall have statutory recognition at the first opportunity and shall be one of the earliest Acts of the Swaraj Parliament, if it shall not have received such recognition before that time.

It is further agreed that it shall be the duty of all Hindu leaders to secure, by every legitimate and peaceful means, an early removal of all social disabilities now imposed by custom upon the so-called Untouchable Classes, including the bar in respect of admission to temples."[101]

However, the historic Poona Pact was signed between Gandhiji and Ambedkar on 25th September 1932. The following relevant texts[102] of the Poona Pact are given below:

(1) "The shall be seats reserved for the Depressed Classes out of the general electorate seats in the Provincial Legislatures as follows:

Madras 30; Bombay with Sind 15; Punjab 8; Bihar and Orissa 18; Central Provinces 20; Assam7; Bengal 30; United Provinces 20; Total 148. These figures are based on the total strength of the Provincial Councils, announced in the Prime Minister's decision.

(2) Election to these seats shall be by joint electorates subject, however, to the following procedure; all the members of the Depressed Classes, registered in the general electoral roll in a constituency, will form an electoral college, which will elect a panel of four candidates belonging to the Depressed Classes for each of such reserved seats, by the method of the single vote; the four persons getting the highest number of votes in such primary election, shall be candidates for election by the general electorate.

(3) Representation of the Depressed Classes in the Central Legislature shall likewise be on the principle of joint electorates and reserved seats by the method of primary election in the manner provided for in Clause 2 above, for their representation in the Provincial Legislatures.

(4) In the Central Legislature, eighteen per cent of the seats allotted to the general electorate for British India in the said legislature shall be reserved for the Depressed Classes.

(5) The system representation of the Depressed Classes by reserved seats in the Provincial and Central Legislature as herein before mentioned, shall come to an end after the first ten years, unless terminated sooner by mutual agreement under the provision of Clause 6 below.

(6) The system of representation of the Depressed Classes by reserved seats in the Provincial and Central Legislature as provided for in Clauses 1 and 4 shall continue until determined by mutual agreement between the communities concerned in the settlement.

(7) Franchise for the Central and Provincial Legislature for a Depressed Classes shall be as indicated in the Lothian Committee Report.

(8) There shall be no disabilities attaching to any one on the ground of his being a member of the Depressed Classes in regard in any elections to local bodies or appointment to the Public Services. Every endeavour shall be made to secure fair representation of the Depressed Classes in these respects, subject to such educational qualifications as may be laid down for appointment to the Public Services.

(9) In every province out of an educational grant, an adequate sum shall be earmarked for providing for providing educational facilities to the Members of the Depressed Classes."

Therefore it can be highlighted the fact that the Poona Pact gave the Untouchables 148 seats, while the Award had only given them 78 seats. The Communal Award gave the Untouchables only two benefits[103] viz.

I. A fixed quota of seats to be elected by separate electorate of Untouchables and to be filled by persons belonging to the Untouchables.

II. Double vote, one to be used through separate electorates and the other to be used in the general electorates. If the Poona Pact increased the fixed quota of seats it also took away the right to the double vote. This increase in seats can never be deemed to be a compensation for the loss of the double vote. The second vote given by the Communal Award was a priceless privilege. Its value as a political weapon was beyond reckoning. The voting strength of the Untouchables in each constituency is one to ten. With this voting strength free to be used in the election of caste Hindu candidates, the Untouchables would have been in a position to determine, if not to dictate, the issue of the General Election. No caste Hindu candidate could have dared to neglect the Untouchables in his constituency or be hostile to their interest if he was made dependent upon the votes of the Untouchables. Not only that but also if the Communal Award with its system of double voting had remained the Untouchables would have had a few seats less but every other member would have been a member for the Untouchables. The increase in the number of seats for the Untouchables is no increase at all and was no recompense for the loss of separate electorate and the double vote...Disliked by the Hindus and disfavoured by the Untouchables; the Poona Pact was given recognition by parties and was embodied in the Government of India Act.

However, the Poona Pact was concluded in a hurry that it left many things undefined. The most important things that were left undefined were two namely:

i. Did the 'panel of four' to be elected at the primary election imply four as a maximum or a minimum?
ii. What was intended to be the method of voting in the final election?

The Hindus wanted that the distributive system of voting should be made compulsory so that a caste Hindu voter whether he wants it or not can have no option but to vote

for the Untouchable candidate who may be the nominee of the Hindus, and thus make his election sure and certain.

That is why; Ambedkar had been pressing in the discussion in the Round Table Conference that the Untouchables might not only have the right to be represented in the legislature, they might also have the right to be represented in the Cabinet. So it was to introduce a clause in the Instrument of Instructions to the Government imposing an obligation upon them to see that in the formation of the Cabinet representatives of the Minorities were included. The clause ran as follows:

"In making appointments to his Council of Minister our Governor shall use his best endeavours to select his Ministers in the following manner, that is to say, to appoint in consultation with the person who in his judgment is most likely to command a stable majority in the Legislature those persons (including so far as practicable members of important minority communities) who will best be in a position collectively to command the confidence of the Legislature. In so acting, he shall bear constantly in mind the need for fostering a sense of joint responsibility among his Ministers."[104]

That is why; the Congress could not use it to defend its conduct in excluding the Untouchables from the Cabinet for the following two reasons:

Firstly; the Congress was bound by the terms of the Poona Pact to give representation to the Untouchables in the Cabinet.

Secondly; the Congress could not say that there were no Untouchables in the Legislatures who were not members of the Congress Party. On the contrary, there were as many as 78 Untouchables returned on the Congress ticket and pledged to the Congress policy. So Ambedkar raised a question, why then did the Congress not include them in the Cabinet? It seemed to him that the only answer was that it was a part of the Congress policy not to admit the right of the Untouchables to be represented in the Cabinet and this policy had the support of Mr. Gandhi. Ambedkar cited the instance that was imbedded in the story of the expulsion of the Hon'ble Dr. Khare from the Congress Ministry who was the Prime Minister in the Congress Ministry in the Central Provinces. However, Dr. Khare was bound to form a Cabinet

under the unavoidable circumstances. But Dr. Khare's new Cabinet was different from the old one as it included Mr. Agnibhoj, an Untouchble, who was a member of the Central Provinces, who belonged to the Congress Party and who by his education well qualified to be a Minister.

On the 26th July 1938, the Congress Working Committee met in Wardha and passed a resolution condemning Dr. Khare on the ground that in tendering the resignation of his colleagues in the old ministry he was guilty of a grave error of judgment and that in forming a new Ministry he was guilty of indiscipline. In explaning what was behind this charge of indiscipline in forming a new ministry, Dr. Khare openly said that Gandhiji told him that it was wrong on his part to have raised such aspirations and ambitions in the Untouchables and it was such an act of bad judgment that he would never forgive him. This statement was repeatedly made by Dr. Khare from platforms. But Gandhiji never came forward to contradict it[105]. It was nothing but more direct evidence on this point. In 1942 there was held All-India Conference of the Untouchables. In that Conference resolutions setting out the political demands of the Untouchables were passed. An Untouchable of the Congress Party who attended the Conference went to Gandhiji to ascertain what Gandhiji had to say about these demands and put him the following five questions:

"1. What will be the position of the Harijans in the future constitution to be framed?

"2. Will you advise the Government and the Congress to agree to fix the five seats from a Panchayat Board upwards to the State Council on population basis?

"3. Will you advise the Congress and the leaders of the various majority parties in the legislatures in the provinces to nominate the Cabinet members from among the Scheduled Caste legislators who enjoy the confidence of the majority of Scheduled Caste members?

"4. In view of the backwardness of the Harijans, will you advise the Government to make a provision in the Act that Executive posts in the Local Boards and Municipal Councils be held on communal rotation? So as to enable the Harijans to become Presidents and Chairman?

"5. Why do you not fix some percentage of seats for Harijans from District Congress Committee upwards to the Working Committee of the Congress?

But Gandhiji answered of these questions as follows:

"1. The constitution, which I could influence, would contain a provision making the observance of untouchability in any shape or form an offence. The so-called 'untouchables' would have seats reserved for them in all elected bodies according to their population within the elected area concerned.

"2. You will see that the answer is covered by the foregoing.

"3. I cannot. The principle is dangerous. Protection of its neglected classes should not be carried to an extent which will harm them and harm the country. A cabinet minister should be a topmost man commanding universal confidence. A person after he had secured a seat in an elected body should depend upon his intrinsic merit and popularity to secure coveted positions.

"4. In the first place, I am not interested in the present Act which is as good as dead. But I am opposed to your proposal on the ground already mentioned.

"5. I am opposed for the reason mentioned. But I should like to compel large elective Congress organizations to ensure the election of Harijan members in proportion to their numbers on the Congress register. If Harijans are not interested enough in the Congress to become 4 anna members, they may not expect to find their names in elective bodies. But I would strongly advise Congress workers to see that they approach Harijans and induce them to become members of the Congress."[106]

It was beyond doubt that Gandhiji and the Congress were determined on principle not to recognize the right of the Untouchables to be represented in the Cabinet. As to the question of qualifications, there would have been some sense if Gandhiji had that limiting condition applicable to all minorities. Nobody had claimed that an unqualified Untouchable should be made a Minister. It only confirmed the inner

feeling of opposition that lies locked in the heart of Gandhi. But it was very much disgusting to mention that the series of acts which the Congress perpetrated to nullify the Poona Pact. First, it was related to the policy adopted by Congress Parliamentary Board in selecting candidates' for election. This question had not yet been studied as deeply as it importance demanded. Practically, speaking, communal principle played a very great part in it. In a constituency where there were two candidates to choose from, the Congress did not feel it necessary to choose the one more worthy. It chose the one who belonged to a caste which was more numerous. Considerations of wealth also played their part. But there were other principles followed reveal a deep-seated plot. Different class of qualifications was set down for different classes of candidates. From candidates who came from high caste Hindus as Brahmins and the communities those with the highest qualifications were selected. In the case of the Non-Brahmins those with low qualifications were preferred to those with higher qualifications. And in the case of the Untouchables those with little or no qualifications were selected in preference to those who had. There seems to be a deep laid game behind it. Any one who studies it carefully will find that it is designed to allow none but the Brahmins and the allied castes to form the main part of the ministry and to secure for them the support of a docile unintelligent crowd of non-Brahmins and Untouchables who by their intellectual attainments could never dream of becoming rivals of the minister-folk but would be content to follow the lead for no other consideration except that of having been raised to the status of members of the Legislatures. If the present system of election continues the Congress could always prevent educated Indians from becoming members of the Legislature which was the stepping-stone for becoming a member of the Cabinet. It was a very grave prospect and some steps would have to be taken to retrieve the position. In the meantime, it is enough to say that the scheme of selecting candidates adopted by the Congress dealt the Untouchables a severe blow by depriving them of Executive power under the cover of there being no qualified men to hold it which it created for itself by such clandestine and subterranean means. The second of the Congress was to subject the Untouchable Congressmen to the rigours of party discipline. They were completely under the control of the Congress Party Executive. They could not ask a question which it did not like. They could not move a resolution which it did not permit. They could not bring in legislation to which it objected. They could not vote as they chose and could not speak what they felt. They were there as dumb driven cattle. One of the objects of obtaining representation in the

Legislature for the Untouchables is to enable them to ventilate their grievances and to obtain redress for their wrongs. The Congress successfully and effectively prevented this from happening. To end his long and sad story, the Congress sucked the juice out of the Poona Pact and threw the rind in the face of the Untouchables[107].

7.5. Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar relating to the Question of Harijans and their Temple Entry Movement

The Caste Politics between Gandhiji and Ambedkar relating to the questions of Harijan emancipation heralded an epoch-making event in the history of Harijan Human Rights Movement in India. Both of them played a vital role to liberate the Harijans from age-old traditional customs, manners, believes, numerous religious dogmas and evils of the so-called Hindu society. All these obnonimus matters gauged the life of Harijans in all sphere of their individual as well as national life. Realizing the hopeless position of its political mission, Gandhiji hurriedly came forward to reform the Harijan community with a motto to uplift their socio-economic, cultural, educational, religious and political conditions within the periphery of the Hindu religion as well as Hindu society. All these reformative and parametric measures were adopted by Gandhiji to abolish the stain of Untouchability from the Hindu society. He had done much more rather than his predecessors for improving the lot of the Harijans. But he did not believe in eradicating the Institution of Caste which was much more necessary before proceeding to the abolition of Untouchability. However, it was well known to all the liberal scholars and thinkers of science and humanities in the contemporary world that the abolition of the Caste System was of the source of automatic abolition of the Untouchability from the so-called Hindu society. But Ambedkar, the leader of the millions of dumb in India dedicated much more time to emancipate the Sudras, Depressed Classes, Untouchables and Harijans from the age-old traditional and hereditary slavery, yoke and curse of the Brahmins and their society and religion. He strongly voiced to annihilate the inhuman Institution of Caste and Untouchability from the so-called Brahmanical Hindu religion and society with a novel mission to emancipate the ill-fated poor, ignorant, weak toiling masses who were named by Sudras, Untouchables, Depressed Classes, Harijans etc. in different ages. That is why; Ambedkar stressed on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity to stir their mentality so that they could raise themselves in a position of

self-dignity, self-respect in the so-called Brahmanical Hindu society. Since the inception of his childhood, Ambedkar struggled against all sorts of injustice, inequality, tyranny, oppression, suppression and humiliation imposed upon the low caste Hindus from generation to generation hereditarily in the form of socio-religious norms, customs, manners of the Brahmanical Hindu religion and society. He fought for establishing the basic civic rights of these classes. Ambedkar also impressed the British Government by his scientific explanation and logical analysis to abolish the Caste System and Untouchability. His human rights movement for protect the interest of the Untouchables, Depressed Classes, Harijans ushered a new hope in their life to live in the society with honour. But he opposed to the scheme of Gandhiji in connection with Harijan Movement as he profoundly believed in the Caste System which is the core concept of emerging the Untouchability in the Brahmanical Hindu society.

As a consequence of the 'Communal Award' of Sir Ramsay Macdonald, the then Prime Minister of England, Gandhiji ultimately launched his 'Epic Fast' until death to resist Depressed Classes separate and double electoral rights and privileges given in the 'Communal Award' i. e. completely distinct from the caste Hindus electoral rights. Realizing the hard reality of the situation; Ambedkar, the leader of the Depressed Classes, had to sacrifice the priceless value of double electoral privileges of the Depressed Classes only to save the life of Gandhiji. As a result, the historic Poona Pact was signed between Gandhiji–Ambedkar in 1932 which heralded an epoch making event in the British Indian history. In response to keep his word in connection with the essence and provisions of the Poona Pact, Gandhiji came forward to uplift the ill-fated conditions of the Harijans through numerous social works and social services. In course of time Gandhiji left politics and started numerous plans and programmes in connection with the reforms of the Harijan society within the Hindu fold. He was the first leader of the Indian National Congress Camp as well as caste Hindu leaders of India who ultimately launched direct developmental schemes and programmes for the emancipation of the Untouchables in India. That is why; his contribution in the field of Harijans was praised globally. Practically speaking; Gandhiji started 'Harijan Movement' in response to the call of humanity. The main motto of his Harijan project was to uplift the Untouchables in the sphere of their individual as well as national life. In spite of it; it can not be denied that the Harijan

Movement was really the out come of the 'Poona Pact' (1932). As a result of it, a public meeting of the Hindus was called on 25th September 1932 in Bombay to accord to it their support and the following resolution[108] was passed in this meeting:

"This Conference confirms the Poona agreement arrived at between the leaders of the Caste Hindus and Depressed Classes on September 24, 1932, and trusts that the British Government will withdraw its decision creating separate electorates within the Hindu community and accept the agreement in full. The Conference urges that immediate action be taken by Government so as to enable Mahatma Gandhi to break his fast within the terms of his vow and before it is too late. The Conference appeals to the leaders of the communities concerned to realize the implications of the agreement and of this resolution and to make earnest endeavour to fulfill them.

"This Conference resolves that henceforth, amongst Hindus, no one shall be regarded as an Untouchable by reason of his birth, and that those who have been so regarded hitherto will have the same right as other Hindus in regard to the use of public wells, public schools, public roads, and all other public institutions. This right shall have statutory recognition at the first opportunity and shall be one of the earliest Acts of the Swaraj Parliament, if it shall not have received such recognition before that time.

"It is further agreed that it shall be the duty of all Hindu leaders to secure, by every legitimate and peaceful means, an early removal of all social disabilities now imposed by custom upon the so-called Untouchable Classes, including the bar in respect of admission to temples."

After getting acquitted from jail at that very moment, Gandhi propagated against Untouchability in different regions of India. But his project of 'Harijan Movement' was ultimately started through the establishment of 'All-India Anti–Untouchability League' under the Presidentship of Pandit Malaviya on 30th September 1932 in the Cowasjee Jahangir Hall in Bombay. Therefore, the 'All India Anti- Untouchability League' was established with branches in different provincial centres. It was also decided that the headquarters of it were to be in Delhi and G.D.Birla was to be the President and Amritlal V. Thakkar, General Secretary. Frankly speaking that the All-India Anti- Untouchability League was the direct outcome of the Poona Pact of 1932

Movement was really the out come of the 'Poona Pact' (1932). As a result of it, a public meeting of the Hindus was called on 25th September 1932 in Bombay to accord to it their support and the following resolution[108] was passed in this meeting:

"This Conference confirms the Poona agreement arrived at between the leaders of the Caste Hindus and Depressed Classes on September 24, 1932, and trusts that the British Government will withdraw its decision creating separate electorates within the Hindu community and accept the agreement in full. The Conference urges that immediate action be taken by Government so as to enable Mahatma Gandhi to break his fast within the terms of his vow and before it is too late. The Conference appeals to the leaders of the communities concerned to realize the implications of the agreement and of this resolution and to make earnest endeavour to fulfill them.

"This Conference resolves that henceforth, amongst Hindus, no one shall be regarded as an Untouchable by reason of his birth, and that those who have been so regarded hitherto will have the same right as other Hindus in regard to the use of public wells, public schools, public roads, and all other public institutions. This right shall have statutory recognition at the first opportunity and shall be one of the earliest Acts of the Swaraj Parliament, if it shall not have received such recognition before that time.

"It is further agreed that it shall be the duty of all Hindu leaders to secure, by every legitimate and peaceful means, an early removal of all social disabilities now imposed by custom upon the so-called Untouchable Classes, including the bar in respect of admission to temples."

After getting acquitted from jail at that very moment, Gandhi propagated against Untouchability in different regions of India. But his project of 'Harijan Movement' was ultimately started through the establishment of 'All-India Anti–Untouchability League' under the Presidentship of Pandit Malaviya on 30th September 1932 in the Cowasjee Jahangir Hall in Bombay. Therefore, the 'All India Anti- Untouchability League' was established with branches in different provincial centres. It was also decided that the headquarters of it were to be in Delhi and G.D.Birla was to be the President and Amritlal V. Thakkar, General Secretary. Frankly speaking that the All-India Anti- Untouchability League was the direct outcome of the Poona Pact of 1932

and it was also a long cherished project of Gandhiji. Therefore, he always encouraged and inspired for the establishment of such an organization. But Gandhi changed the name of it and expressed his views in a press report on 9th December, 1932 and stated that this League would henceforth be known as 'Servants of the Untouchables Society'. Ultimately he also changed this name and entitled it as the 'Harijan Sevak Sangh' which meant a society of those engaged in service to the Untouchables. In fact, Gandhi was really accused of sectarian partiality in choosing the name Harijan. But it would be noted here that the term 'Harijan came from the words 'Hari' and 'Har'. "Hari is one of the hundred names of Vishnu, while Har is one of the hundred names of Shiva"[109].

After signing the Poona Pact, it was not known that if it had any impact on Gandhi's mind or not. He chose a word 'Harijan. After then he started a publication of a Journal called 'Harijan'. But Gandhi explained it in maintaining his own style. That is why, it can be noted here the facts of God Basudeva in this matter, who himself was the originator of 'Chaturvarna' i.e., Brahmana, Kshtriya, Vaisha and Sudra according to the version of the Bhagvata Gita. Not only that, Basudeva was entitled as the incarnation of Krishna. In the same way, Gandhi himself was the creator and propagator of the 'Harijan', the fifth Varna[110] of the Hindu society in this dynamic Koli Yuga. So his followers entitled Gandhiji as the incarnation and saviour of the Harjan. Therefore, this fact was not based on imaginary ideas because Ray Bahadur Meher Chand Khanna, the follower of Gandhiji, propagated the incarnation theory in respect of Harijan since long days. So it seemed to Ambedkar that this type of interpretation of the word Harijan was innocent and irresponsible matter. He said that the motive of it was diplomatic. Ambedkar said that the Untouchables were killing by mercy and sympathy in every sphere of their individual as well as national life. They had no self respect, no status and position according to the orthodox version. They would have to live by the will, sympathy and mercy of others.

Therefore, Ambedkar pointed out that Gandhiji had given the name Harijan to the Untouchables to blaster up Vaishnavism. But Gandhiji replied in this connection that the term Harijan was used to mean God and not Vishnu and that Harijan simply meant 'Children of God'. That is why; Ambedkar mentioned the following grounds of objection against the name Harijan instead of Untouchables:

"In the first place it has not bettered their position. It has not bettered their position. It has not elevated them in the eyes of the Hindus. The new name has become completely identified with the subject matter of the old. Every body knows that Hirajans are simply no other than the old Untouchables. The new name provides no escape to the Untouchables from the curse of untouchability. With the new name they are damned as much as they were with the old. Secondly the Untouchables say that they prefer to be called Untouchables. They argue that it is better that the wrong should be called by its known name. It is better for the patient to know what he is suffering from. It is better for the wrong doer that the wrong is there still to be redressed. Any concealment is fraud upon the Untouchables and a false absolution to the Hindus. Thirdly there is also the feeling that the name Harijan is indicative of pity. If the name meant 'chosen people of God' as the Jews claimed themselves to be it would have been a different matter. But to call them 'children of God' is to invite pity from their tyrants by pointing out their helplessness and their dependent condition. The more manly among the Untouchables resent the degrading implications of this new name. How great the resentment of the Untouchables against this new name is can be seen from the fact that whole body of the representatives of the Untouchables in the Bombay Legislative Assembly walked out of the House in protest when the Congress Government introduced a measure giving to the name Harijan the sanction of law."[111]

Aims and Objective of the Harijan Sevak Sangh:

The following aims and objectives were adopted in framing the constitution of the 'Harijan Sevak Sangha' in the meeting held in Cowasjee Jehangir Hall in Bombay on the 30th September 1932 which were all contradicted the proposals given by Ambedkar in this context for accomplishing the task of the Sangh:

"Carrying propaganda against Untouchability and taking immediate steps to secure as early as practicable that all public wells, dharmashalas, roads, schools, crematoriums burning ghats and all public temples be declared open to the Depressed Classes, provided that no compulsion or force shall be used and that only peaceful persuasion shall be adopted towards this end."[112] A.V. Thakkar and G.D.Birla made an

announced on 3rd November 1932 to the Press about the programme of the Harijan Sevak Sangha and the set up of the machinery to carry out the following programmes:

"The League believes that reasonable persons among the Sanatanists are not much against the removal of Untouchability as such, as they are against inter-caste dinners and marriages. Since it is not the ambition of the League to undertake reforms beyond its own scope, it is desirable to make it clear that while the League will work by persuasion among the caste Hindus to remove every vestige of Untouchability, the main line of work will be constructive, such as the uplift of Depressed Classes educationally, economically and socially, which itself will go a great way to remove untouchability. With such a work even a staunch Sanatanist can have nothing but sympathy. And it is for such work mainly that the League had been established. Social reforms like the abolition of the caste system and inter-dinning are kept outside the scope of the League."[113]

In fact, the above mentioned aims and objectives were described in one of the Annual Reports of the Sangh. It stated as follows:

"According to its constitution the aim and object of the Society is the abolition of untouchability by reason of birth and the acquisition of equal rights of access of public temples, wells schools and other public institutions for Harijans as enjoyed by other Hindus. The achievement of this object has led the Society to undertake work of a two-fold kind. First, the Society has to bring about such a radical change in the sentiments and opinions of Caste Hindus that they may willingly, as a matter of course, allow the enjoyment of all civic rights to Harijans. Secondly, the society has to put forth its efforts and devote its funds for the educational, economic and social uplift of Harijan."[114]

Therefore, we have to mention first of all the proposals sent by Ambedkar to Mr. A. V. Thakkar, the Secretary of the 'Harijan Sevak Sangh' on the 14th November 1932 on Board the Ship M.V. "Victoria" through a letter after expressing his views regarding the policy and programme which the Sangha should adopt for accomplishing this task. So Ambedkar wrote a letter accordingly from the steamer but this letter was not even acknowledged by the Secretary of the Sangha. But his

suggestion was not accepted at all in framing the aims, objectives and constitution of the Sangha. Even Gandhiji did not consider it. That is why; Ambedkar released a letter to the Press so that the general public might know his views due to consider the said proposals. The brief content of this letter is given below to understand the real truth.

Ambedkar proposed to lead the programmes jointly of the Anti-Untouchability League. That is why; he said that there were two distinct methods that could be adopted for uplifting the Depressed Classes. School of social workers concentrated all its efforts and its resources on fostering personal virtue by adopting a programme which included items such as temperance, gymnasium, co-operation, libraries, schools, etc., which were adopted to make the individual a better and virtuous individual. He also noted that the fate of the individual being was governed by his environment and the circumstances he was obliged to live under, and if an individual was suffering from want and misery it was because his environment was not propitious. His view of the aim of the Anti-Untouchability League was that it had come into existence not for helping a few individuals at random or a few selected boys belonging to the Depressed Classes but for raising the whole class to a higher level. So he would not like the League to dissipate its energies on a programme calculated to foster private virtue. He would like the Board to concentrate all its energies on a programme that would effect a change in the social environment of the Depressed Classes. That is why; Ambedkar asked the vital members of the Anti-Untouchability League to reform the Harijan society after considering the following facts and conditions[115].

i. A CAMPAIGN TO SECURE CIVIL RIGHTS.
ii. EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY.
iii. SOCIAL INTERCOURSE.
iv. AGENCY TO BE EMPLOYED.

A CAMPAIGN TO SECURE CIVIL RIGHTS:

That is why; Ambedkar proposed that the League should undertake a campaign all over India to secure to the Depressed Classes civic rights such as taking water from the village wells, entry in village schools, admission to village chawdi, use of public conveyance, etc. Such a programme, if carried into villages would bring about the necessary social revolution in the Hindu Society, without which it would never be

possible for the Depressed Classes to get equal social status in the society. So the League might have to gather experiences before going to start a campaign to establish civic rights of the Harijans. Ambedkar also said that he knew it very well that the Depressed Classes Institute and the social equality League had to face numerous obstacles before launching such a plan in the Kolba and the Nasik district of the Bombay Presidency. It would create riots between the Depressed Classes and the caste Hindus. In this struggle, the Depressed Classes would suffer badly

Secondly, the villages would proclaim a complete boycott of the Depressed Classes, the moment they saw the latter were trying to reach a status of equality along with them. Ambedkar mentioned that only two of the many obstacles which the League would have to overcome, if this campaign of civic rights was to be successful and the League would have to have an army of workers in the rural parts, who would encourage the Depressed Classes to fight for their rights and who would help them in any legal proceedings arising therefrom to a successful issue. But he did not think that it could be avoided. All the caste Hindu liked all human beings would follow his customary conduct in observing untouchability towards the Depressed Classes. Naturally, it can be pointed out that ordinarily people did not give up their customary mode of behaviour because somebody was preaching against it. The salvation of the Depressed Classes would come only when the Caste Hindu was made to think and was forced to feel that he must alter his ways. The direct action in respect of Chawdar Tank in Mahad, the Kalaram Temple in Nasik and the Gurwayur Temple in Malabar had done in a few days what million days of preaching by reformers would never have done. He therefore strongly recommended this campaign of direct action for securing civic rights of the Depressed Classes for adoption by the Anti-Untouchability League.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY:

Ambedkar would like the Anti-Untouchability League to work for bringing about equality of opportunity for the Depressed Classes. The absence of equal opportunity accelerated the ill-fated poverty-stricken miserable conditions of the Depressed Classes ultimately led to the position of untouchability. He said that the Depressed Classes in villages and even in towns could not sell vegetables, milk or butter ways of earning a living which were open to all and sundry. A caste Hindu would have far

more scope to buy these things from a non-Hindu, but he was not ready to buy them from the Depressed Classes. In the matter of enjoyment, his condition was the worst. In Government Departments the bar-sinister operated and he was denied the place of a constable or even a messenger. In industries he fared no better. Like the Negro in America he was the last to be employed in days of prosperity and the first to be fired in days of adversity. In the Cotton Mills in Bombay and Ahmedabad he was confined to the lowest paid department where he could earn only Rs.25 per month. More paying departments like the weaving department were permanently closed to him. Even in the low paid departments he could not rise to the highest rung of the ladder. The place of the boss was reserved for the caste Hindu while the Depressed Classes worker might slave as his underdog, no matter how senior or how efficient. In departments where the earning depends on piece work, he had failed to earn as well as Caste Hindu employees because of social discrimination.

He had given only a few of the instances of the gross inequality of opportunity from which the Depressed Classes were suffering mainly at the hands of the Hindus. He thought that it would be fit and proper, if the Anti-Untouchability League were to take up this question by creating public opinion in condemnation of it and establishing bureaus to deal with urgent cases of inequality.

SOCIAL INTERCOURSE :

He said that the League should attempt to dissolve that nausea, which the Touchables felt towards the Untouchables and which was the reason why the two sections had remained so much apart as to constitute separate and distinct entities. He proposed to establish closer contact between the two in this connection. Only common cycle participation could help people to overcome the strangeness of feeling which one had, when brought into contact with the other. The admission of the Depressed Classes to the houses of the caste Hindus as guests or servants was very much horrible. The role of many caste Hindus who had shown themselves responsive were not prepared for this. He told that the League that the Depressed Classes would never be satisfied of the bondfides of these caste Hindu sympathizers until it was proved that they were prepared to go to the same length of fighting against their own kith and kin in actual warfare if it came to that for the sake of the Depressed Classes as the Whites of the

North did against their own kith and kin , namely, the Whites of the South for the sake of the emancipation of the Negro. That is why; the League should endeavour to inculcate upon the mind of Hindu public the necessity of establishing contact and social intercourse between the touchables and the untouchables in the different way.

AGENCY TO BE EMPLOYED:

He said that the League might have to employ a very large army of workers to carry out its programme. But the social workers might have human values to take part in this mission. As Tolstoy said; "Only those who love can serve." This mission might be fulfilled if the workers of its organization were drawn from the Depressed Classes. So the League should give importance in deciding upon the selection whom to appoint and whom not to appoint. In spite of several limitations, a worker drawn from the Depressed Classes might regard the work as love's labour-a thing which was so essential to the success of the League.

Secondly, there were many agencies which were already engaged in some sort of social service without any confined as to class or purpose and might be prepared to supplement their activity by taking up the work of Anti-Untouchability League in consideration of a grant-in-aid. Ambedkar said that this hire purchase system of work could produce no lasting good for the League. An agency was required which was a single-minded devotion to one task and one task only. The work it was to be assigned must be assigned to those who might undertake to devote themselves exclusively to the work of the Depressed Classes. He said that what could hold the British Empire together was love and not law. It should be applied equally to the Hindu society. The touchables and the untouchables could not live together by law certainly not by any electoral law substituting joint electorates for separate electorates. The only thing that could hold them together was love. Only justice and fair play would open the possibility of love, and it should be the duty of the Anti-Untouchability League to implement this novel notion.

Apart from these, a budget was made to lead the amelioration programmes of the Untouchables in India. However, a rough idea of the minimum total amount which

would have to be spent for the whole of India was settled down from public collection. So the scheme was of course modest enough in view of the gigantic nature of the work and it should not be difficult for the public to raise the required fund. Every pie contributed to the fund would make a valuable contribution and therefore an appeal to be made to the public to make some sacrifices for the cause. The number of units proposed for each province was only a tentative proposal. The final decision, of course would have to be taken by the Provincial Boards themselves. This amount would have to be made up both from the Central Fund as well as from funds raised by provinces and districts. It is found that a sum of six lakhs of rupees was intended to be collected and spent per year in the whole country for the removal of Untouchability and ameliorative work of Harijans. This programme particularly if the ameliorative work was to be effective should continue at least for 5 years. When spread out over 22 Provinces, including States and 4 crores or 400 lakhs of Harijans in the country, this budget had its much importance to uplift the Harijans[116].

In order to success the mission, Gandhiji started an All-India tour on 7th November, 1933 and completed it on 29th July, 1934 to collect money for the fund of the Sangha's work. The motto behind it was to inspire the Hindus for the cause of the Untouchables. As per the report of the 'Harijan Patrika' on 3rd August1934, Gandhiji ultimately collected Rs.8 lakhs from different corners of India to begin its work. He came forward to spend the fund for the amelioration programmes of the Untouchables. Even the Secretary of the Sangh invited many Americans to highlight the 'unrivalled piece of social work that is being done by Mr. Gandhi for the welfare of the Untouchables'[117]. Therefore, the role of Gandhiji to emancipate the Untouchables was very much important in this connection.

But Ambedkar criticized the works done by Gandhiji and his Sangha. He said that if any one who would go through the 'Annual Reports of the 'Harijan Sevak Sangh' the following features can be seen:

"First of all it can be said that the Sangha encouraged higher education among the Untouchables by instituting scholarships for the Arts, technical and professional courses in the field of education. It made numerous measures to provide scholarships to high school students. It also established hostels for Untouchable students attending colleges and high schools. It took necessary steps maintain separate schools for

primary stage children where there were no common school in the vicinity or where common schools were closed to them.

Secondly, the Sangha made numerous arrangements for the welfare activities of the Untouchables. Even the medical aid which the Sangh had given to the Untouchables falls under this head. This was done by intenerant workers of the Sangha who go in Harijan quarters to give medical aid to the sick and ailing among the Untouchables. The Sangh also maintains a few dispensaries for the use of the untouchables. However, this was a very small activity of the Sangha. The more important part of the welfare activity of the Sangh was related to water supply. The Sangh did this by (1) sinking new wells or installing tube wells and pumps for the use of the untouchables, (2) repairing old ones and (3) persuading local Government and bodies to sink and repair wells for the Untouchables. The third line activity undertaken by the Sangha was economic. The Sangha seemed to run a few industrial schools and it was claimed that the industrial schools run by Sangha produced a number of trained artisans who had taken to independent living. But according to the report, more successful and substantial work was done by way of organizing and supervising cooperative societies among the Untouchables."[118]

In fact, it would be noted here as per the record of the work done by the Sangh that the work of it was largely directed by the Caste Hindus and not by the Untouchables. It would be noted here from the above discussion that the Sangh had completely changed its views in the context of removal of Untouchability. Even it took up the constructive works as the main part of its programme. But this was not done without the knowledge and consent of Gandhiji. Therefore, removal of Untouchability as a programme of action of the Sangh was a good intention but it was bound Gandhiji very unpopular with the Hindus. He preferred the programme of the Constructive work instead of it as it had all advantage and no disadvantage. Therefore, it can be said that it was a complete departure on the part of Gandhiji as he did not mind to take positive steps to execute the provisions of the 'Poona Pact,' 1932. Therefore, Gandhiji stressed on the work of the Constructive programme which had the possibility of being converted into 'a plan to kill Untouchables by kindness'. Not only that, but also the Sangh did not bother and tolerate any movement of the Untouchables against the Caste-Hindus and the Congress. Even he did not like to appoint other Untouchables

into the management of the Sangh after the retirement of the first batch of the Untouchables. Instead of it, he encouraged the policy of exclusion the Untouchables from management and higher direction of the Sangh. As a result of it, a deputation was submitted to Gandhiji by the Untouchables for appointing their members to the managing body of the Sangh. So Gandhiji propounded a new doctrine to console the deputations. According to him, "The Welfare work for the Untouchables is a penance which the Hindus have to do for the sin of Untouchability. The money that has been collected has been contributed by the Hindus. From both points of view the Hindus alone must run the Hindus. From both points of view he Hindus alone must run the Sangh. Neither ethics nor right would justify Untouchables in claiming a seat on the Board of the Sangha."[119] Therefore, it was pertinent to ask: "Why at one time he was anxious to have Untouchables on the governing Body of the Sangh and why he is determined now to exclude them?" But the Hindus and Untouchables both worked together in perfect harmony towards furthering the work of the 'Depressed Classes Mission Society' and Mission had always included a certain number of Untouchables of its Managing Committee. Therefore, it can be said that the Mission had no political objectives behind its works but the Sangh had. Although the real intention was to keep the Sangh scrupulously aloof from politics that was mentioned in the statement issued on 3rd November, 1932 as follows:

The League may be able to carry on its work on a nonparty basis; it has decided not to associate itself with politics or religious propaganda of any kind. The heads of Provincial as well as Central Executive will, therefore, have to be very careful in the selection of their active worker. With this object in view it is necessary that all whole time paid workers of the League should not take part in politics or in any sectional or religious propaganda"[120]

Therefore, Ambedkar highlighted the following instances to trace out the real intention and attitude of the Congress and Sangh towards the Untouchables as follows:-

"The Bombay Branch of the Harijan Sevak Sangh had followed the policy of black listing some of the Untouchable communities residing in Bombay on account of is Anti-Congress attitude. Students from communities which were black listed were

refused scholarships and other educational aids. The Mahar Community, which forms the spearhead of the political movement of the Untouchables and has all along fought with the Congress, was black listed and Mahar students were generally subjected to discrimination unless the student proved that he did not share the Anti-Congress sentiments of the Community."[121]

Ambedkar also mentioned another instance regarding the mentality and attitude of their in this context. Mr.A.V.Thakkar, the General Secretary of the Harijan Sevak Sangh and a member of the 'Backward Classes Board' of the Bombay Government which was formed in 1929. The main motto of it was to advise the Government on matters affecting the Untouchables and other Backward Classes. But Mr.Thakkar in this case "brought a resolution in the meeting of the Board recommending to Government that scholarships set apart by Government for Untouchable boys should not be given to the Mahar boys alleging that the Mahar Community had become very much advanced in education and was appropriating- or according to him misappropriating – the share of Government funds which ought to be reserved for other Untouchable Communities. The resolution was sent down for investigation of the facts on which it was found. The inquiry showed that the facts were wrong and that Mahars instead of being forward were really backward in education as compared with other Untouchable Communities. The resolution was nothing but a political manoeuvre by no less a person than the General Secretary of the Harijan Sevak Sangh to punish the Mahars for their Anti-Congress politics."[122]

In fact, the Harijan Sevak Sangh was treated a charitable organization in name. Ambedkar said that the main target of it was to ensnare the Untouchables and to make them the camp-followers of the Hindus and the Congress. Frankly speaking, the aim and object of the Sangh and the Congress was just like a public show as it did not free the Untouchables from the age old socio-religious, politico-economic bondage and supremacy of the Hindus. Therefore, Ambedkar also highlighted the fact that 'the object of the Sangh was to kill the Untouchables by kindness'. Apart from the above mentioned facts in connection with the role, activities and attitude of Gandhiji, Congress and the Harijan Sevak Sangh towards the Untouchables, can not be denied that the labours of the Harijan Sevak Sangh "must be so planned that out of it, will come the destruction of Untouchability." The Sangh was openly supporting the

establishment of separate schools, hostels, dispensaries and wells for them without abashment. Therefore, Ambedkar pointed out that that was the surest way of perpetuating Untouchability. Even Gandhiji himself sanctioned a line of activity which perpetuated this segregation. Therefore, Gandhiji and the Sangh paid little attention to them. They wanted the rights for the admission to common schools, common dispensaries on equal terms, draw water from a common well etc. In fact, Gandhiji and his Sangh ultimately were not mentally ready to accept the demands of them on equal terms except the line of the Orthodox Hindus. As a result the Sangh had neither sought to remove untouchability nor had it help to alleviate the sufferings of them. According to Ambedkar, "The Sangh has failed because of its wrong politics." But Gandhiji had always resented such an allegation and repudiated it as being false. The General Secretary of the Sangh had stated in view of the fact that "The Sangh, though a sequel of a Political Pact, has no politics." But Ambedkar clearly expressed his views in this context as follows: "I insist that not only the Sangh has a definite line of politics and that that line of politics is wrong because it is prejudicial to the cause of the Untouchables."[123] That is why, Ambedkar mentioned the following clause of the Sangh's constitution as a piece of evidence in support of his contention. This clause adopted by Sangh for removing Untouchability and for securing equal rights to the Untouchables along with the Caste Hindus: "That no compulsion is to be used for securing rights, but that peaceful persuasion is to be adopted as the only means"[124]. But it would be noted here that this clause was adopted by the Sangh only to pretend for the removal of untouchability and securing equal rights to the untouchables along with the Caste Hindus.

Therefore, Ambedkar raised the following questions in connection with above mentioned works done by the Sangha, Congress and Gandhiji towards the Untouchables:

1) "Why has the Sangh limited itself to peaceful persuation of the caste Hindus as the one and only means of removing Untouchability?"
2) "Why do they not resist the injustice of the Caste Hindus by direct action?"
3) "Why does not Mr. Gandhi ask the Sangh to launch Satyagraha by the Untouchables against the Caste Hindus for the abolition of the injustice against the Untouchables?"
4) "Why is the answer of Mr.Gandhi to this question?"

In response to these questions raised by him Ambedkar said, "The only answer I can see is that it comes in the way of his politics. Mr. Gandhi must remain at the head of the nation. I wonder if life would be worthwhile to him if for some reason he ceased to be at the head of the nation. He is, I think, the most ambitious politician. I know he regards as his rivals those whom he calls as friends. To be at the head of the nation means that he must preserve the integrity of the Congress. The Congress is ninety nine per cent composed of Hindus. How can Gandhi succeed in maintaining the integrity of the Congress if he were to direct the Sangh to carry on Satyagraha against the Hindus for the sake of the Untouchables. The Hindus would leave the Congress and the Congress would disrupt. This is detrimental to the interests of Mr. Gandhi. This is the explanation why Mr. Gandhi and the Sangh have adopted peaceful persuation as the only means of removing untouchability. It is a means which is least likely to hurt the Hindus and the Congress. Not only in big matters but even in small matters the Sangh is careful to see that the Hindus are not hurt or annoyed. I am told that in distributing scholarships for instance the Sangh makes inquiries into the political affiliations of the applicant and if it is found that the applicant belongs to a community which is against the Congress or the Hindus, he gets no aid from the funds of the Sangh"[125]

Practically speaking Gandhiji was at best merely a sympathizer and nothing more. His sympathy for the Untouchables was limited by considerations such as social aims and politics. Therefore Ambedkar mentioned the following two instances in this regard. As an instance of the first, Ambedkar referred to the Khare episode. The Prime Minister Dr. Khare demanded the resignation of other ministers in the Central Provinces and forces them to do that and ultimately he formed another Congress Cabinet and filled the ministerial offices with men office his choice. He included an untouchable as a minister in the new Cabinet without consulting the Congress Parliamentary Board. So the Congress Working Committee took drastic action against him and he was ultimately deposed from his Primiership. Gandhiji too was very much offended to him owing to include and Untouchables in his new ministry. The following was the full text about this fact said by Gandhiji to Dr. Khare:

"Mahatmaji took me to task for including a Harijan in my second cabinet. I retorted by saying that it was a Congress programme of uplift of Harijans for which

Mahatmaji fasted unto death and that I did what I could in furtherance of that programme when opportunity offered itself and I think I have done nothing wrong in doing so. Thereupon Mahatmaji charged me of doing this for my selfish ambition. I repudiated this charge saying that any selfish motive is disproved by my resignation. Then Mahatmaji said that by my action I have thrown an apple of discord among the members of that simple community and have rendered disservice to the Congress cause by throwing this temptation in their way."[126] This statement was repeated by Dr. Khare at a meeting held in Servants of India society's Hall in Bombay in support of his cause. In fact, the untouchable who was chosen by Dr. Khare for ministership in the Central Provinces was a graduate, was a Congressman and was a strong party man. Yet Gandhiji did not like it. Therefore it can be said that if Gandhiji was genuine in his professions regarding this untouchable ministership case, he would had instructed all Congress Prime Ministers to include at least one Untouchable in their Cabinets. Although he was in favour of making coalitions with other non-Congress parties in provinces where it was not in a majority in order to secure offices. Even he did not care and bother about the qualifications and political faith in this context. That is why, a crowd of Untouchables moved to Shegaon to Gandhiji for an explanation on that untouchable's issue. Anticipating this he had remained speak to not one this issue and kept himself silence, so that no explanation could be given. At that juncture, the Untouchables launched Satyagraha against Gandhiji for not including an untouchable in the Central Provinces Congress Cabinet. At that very movement Gandhiji left Shegaon due to start a tour to the North Western Frontier Provinces for teaching non-violence to the Pathans. That is why? Ambedkar said, "I am sure Gandhi's silence on this occasion was not commune with God. It was taken on as a convenient excuse for not being driven under the fire of cross examination to disclose his inner most thoughts about the Untouchables. In any case we have no answer to this question from Mr. Gandhi. To my mind there can be only one answer and that even if Gandhi had opened his mouth he could give no better. That answer is that Mr. Gandhi's ideal for the untouchable is a very low ideal and that all that he cares for is that the untouchable should be touched and that if he is touched without anybody taking a bath nothing further needs to be done about them. If Gandhi had tried and failed he would have been excused. But how can he be excused for entertaining so low an aim? Not failure but low aim is a crime."[127]

Secondly, Ambedkar highlighted the fact that actually happened with an untouchable girl namely, Bachuma. Bachuma, a small girl, 12 years old and belonged to an untouchable family which was living in Wordha. One evening she was decoyed into the house of a Mahomedan who was the Sub-Inspector of Police. She was kept in his house and during the night this small child was raped by three Mahomedans, one was the Superintendent of Police himself, second a Sub-Inspector of Education and third a Layer. The three Mahomedans were tried in a Court of Law and two of them were sentenced to two years rigorous imprisonment and the lawyer was acquitted as the girl was not able to identify him. The two who were convinced appealed to the High Court but the High Court rejected their appeals and confirmed their convictions and sentences. From jail they sent a petition to the Governor-in-Council for mercy. But they were also rejected. This happened before the Congress came into office. After the Congress came into office they submitted fresh applications for mercy to the Minister-in-charge. The Minister-in-charge, who was also a Mahomedan thought that there was nothing wrong in a Mahomedan committing rape on an untouchable girl and decided to set the culprits free. He granted the application of one–that of the Inspector of Education who is now a free man and is employed on a big job in the Education Department of a Mahomadan State. He released the other culprit also but in the meantime the agitation against him was so great that he had to resign his office. Every body expressed his resentment against the shameless act of the Minister but Mr. Gandhi[128] has kept mum. So far he has not uttered a word of condemnation against this Minister. On the country he is even now engaged in the confabulations that are going on over the question of the reinstatement of this dismissed minister in his office which is still kept vacant. One likes to ask if Gandhi would have remained so silent and so unmoved if the little girl Bachuma who was raped by he three Mahamodans instead of being the daughter of an Untouchable had been Mr. Gandhi's own daughter. Why is Gandhi not able to make Bachuma's case his daughter's case? There are two answers. One is that Mr. Gandhi is not an untouchable. One must be born to it. Secondly Mr. Gandhi feels that by condemning the Muslim Minister for the sake of Bachuma he might destroy Hindu-Moslem Unity the maintenance of which is a fundamental creed of Congress politics. Does this now show that Mr. Gandhi's sympathies for the Untouchables are limited by his politics? What good is a man who is not even free sympathizes according to his conscience?

Temple Entry Movement

Apart from these, Gandhiji encouraged the people to come forward to uplift the conditions of the Untouchables. In consequence of the Poona Pact of 1932, Gandhiji established the 'Harijan Sevak Sangh' on 1932 to complete his mission. He made an arrangement of a public meeting relating to the question of Untouchables. This meeting was held in Bombay on 25th Sept. 1932. It was very clearly and unanimously resolved in the meeting that henceforth, amongst Hindus, no one should be regarded as an Untouchable by reason of his birth and other reasons. Even those people who had been so regarded hitherto as untouchables would have the same right as the caste Hindus in all aspects of life. Not only that but also they had given every rights in regard to the use of public wells, public school, public roads and all other public institutions and the caste Hindus were asked to co-operate the Untouchables in these context. However, it was further noted that this right should have statutory recognition at the first opportunity and should be one of the earliest Acts of the Swaraj Parliament, if it should not have received such recognition before that time. It was further unanimously resolved in the meeting that the prime duty of all the Hindu leaders to secure by every legitimate and peaceful means, an early removal of all social disabilities that was now imposed by custom upon the ill-fated poor and ignorant Untouchable classes. They were also asked to co-operate the Untouchables in the context of admission to the Hindu temples[129].

As a result, numerous measures were adopted by Gandhiji and his Sangh to propagate the content of this historic resolution adopted in the above noted meeting. The Hindus initially declared to throw open Temples to the Untouchables in consequence of the meeting. But in practice this policy was not unanimously followed and executed on equal terms in the case of the admission of the Untouchables into the Temples. Realizing the hard reality, Gandhiji started a weekly paper namely 'Harijan' and asked the caste Hindus to come forward to build up temples, throw open wells, opened school, started educational facilities etc. In response to his appeal, the following temples were either constructed or opened to the untouchables, wells were made, numerous welfare activities were done, and schools[130] were built up etc.

Practically speaking, Gandhiji was then very busy to build up temples in different parts of India. He also mentioned the names of those places where temples were built up. Among them one was in North Calcutta, one in village Bhapur, district Ganjam, Madras and one Thakurdwar temple at Naurania, in Jullundar, Punjab etc. One Municipal well was made at Guriapur in Jaipur town, district Cuttack, Orissa, two wells in Wazirpura and Nikigali, Agra, U.P. and in Trichinopoly (Madras) an orthodox Brahmin had offered expenses necessary for digging three wells for the common use of Harijans and caste Hindus etc. Apart from these, different schools were established for untouchable students such as a free school in Bachrota district Meerut, U.P.; one school at Metah district in Rajputana; three schools a Fatehpur, district Farukhabad, U.P.; three night schools in Mutta night schools in Sjt. V.R.Shinde; President, All-India Anti-Untouchability League and Founder-Trustee of the Depressed Mission Society of India played a vital role in these connection and Gandhiji was the pioneer behind this mission. Apart from these, Poona had addressed an open letter to the members of the Legislative Assembly on Sjt. Rangalyer's Untouchability Bills, strongly urging them to support the two measures. In Taikalwadi in 'G' Ward of Bombay, there was an outbreak of fire recently which caused very serious damage to the huts and belongings of 48 Mahar families. It was further noted that educational arrangements were made easier by establishing three reading rooms for Harijans in the North Arcot District by the S.U.S.; in the Madura District S.U.S. workers got Harijan children admitted into the Viraganur taluq board school; Banians, towels, slates etc. were distributed free to the children of the Melacheri School established by the Madura S.U.S.; two Harijan students of Ramjas college, Delhi had been allowed free scholarship and free lodging and one free scholarship by Princhpal Thadani of the College. One night school for adult Harijans was opened. Decision was taken to start a hostel for harijan students in Uravakonda. Some provisions were made and money had already been collected to start the hostel with 20 students. Owing to the unremitting efforts of the district Harijan Seva Sangham, Guntur, Harijan boys had been allowed into the Savarna schools. Gorakhpur Town U.P.One night school in Hata Tehsil district Gorakhpur, U.P, one night school at Sakhonia. Besides, it was found that wells were made in different parts of India, such as three wells in Coimbatore district which were in a bad condition, were cleaned and made available for use. The District Board President, South Arcot, had promised to dig four wells in cherries selected by the S.U.S. During the fortnight ending 31-5-33 no less

than 125 wells in all were opened to Harijans and 5 new ones constructed in Andhradesh. To meet the purpose of general requirements a shop had been opened in a bustee near Hogg market (Calcutta) where Doms live, for supplying them with articles of food at cheap rates. Rs.60 has been paid by the S.U.S. Bengal for paying up the debts. Of a Harijan family at Bibi Bagan bustee (Calcutta). The Amrita Samaj (Calcutta) had given service to some Harijans, 450 Harijans of Bolpur (Birbhum) etc. Apart from these, the Palitana State (Kathiawar) assembly has passed a resolution relating to the facilities to be given to he Harijans. A standing committee has been appointed by the Government of Sandhur State, Madras, to concert measures calculated to ameliorate the condition of the Harijans in the state. The Harijans in various villages near kashia in Gorakhpur district have given up carrion eating. On the occasion of the Basantpanchami' festival 'Basantotsava' was celebrated at Muzaffarpur (Bihar) under the auspices of the Harijan Seva Sangh in the temple of Sri Chaturbhujnathji in which all castes of Hindus took part. A.V. Thakkar, General Secretary, of Untouchables society sanctioned Rs. 500 for giving relief to these families, and the relief was organized by a sub-Committee of the 'G' Ward Committee of the Society. A sum of Rs.402-8 was distributed as an urgent measure of help to the 48 families, containing in all 163 persons. The Bombay Government had issued orders that requested from local bodies for assignment of Government lands for wells, tanks, dharamshalas, etc. on condition that all castes alike will have equal use of such wells tanks, etc.

But the owners or trustees of different temples were not prepared to throw open their temples to the Untouchables. So the Hindus took the Policy of Satyagraha against them and tried to convince them for opening their temples to the Untouchables. But most of them did not do that. Therefore, Mr. Kelappan started Satyagraha against them for securing entry in the temple at Guruvayur for the Untouchables. Although many Hindu legislators came forward, tumbling over one another with Bills requesting the trustees to throw open temples to the Untouchables. But they could not compel them to accept their temple entry proposal as most of the Hindu worshippers voted in favour of the Congress. Even Gandhiji was against the favour to allow Untouchables to enter Hindu Temples before 1932. Gandhiji said in his own words on this issue in the book 'Gandhi Shikshan' (vol-II, p-132) as follows:

"How is it possible that the Antyajas (Untouchables) should have the right to enter all the existing temples? As long as the law of caste and ashram has the chief place in Hindu Religion, to say that every Hindu can enter every temple is a thing that is not possible today."[131] But Dr.Subbaroyan raised a Temple Entry Bill in the Madras Legislative Council. In connection with this fact; the four Temple Entry Bills were introduced in the Central Assembly, one by Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer, two by Mr. Harabilas Sarda, third by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai and the fourth one by Mr. M.R. Jayakar. Under these unavoidable circumstances, Gandhiji surprisingly joined to the Temple Entry Movement at that very moment. Ambedkar clearly stated that the target of Gandhiji in joining the Temple Entry Movement was to destroy the basis of the claim of the Untouchables for political rights by destroying the barriers between them and the Hindus which made them separate from the Hindus. In the temple entry movement, he got a great chance to add his name a frame. Gandhiji asked Ambedkar at that moment about the attitude of the Untouchables for the Temple Entry Movement and requested him to support to the movement for temple entry. But Ambedkar denied to do so and issued a statement[132]on that subject to the press as follows:

Ambedkar's Statement on Temple Entry Bill on 14th February, 1933

The question of Temple Entry in respect to the Untouchables was confined to the Sanatanists, Mahatma Gandhi, and the Depressed Classes. They played a vital role in this respect. But their distinctive attitude towards this issue should be discussed. First of all, it can be said that the Depressed Classes could not possiblly give support to the draft relating to the Temple-Entry Bill of Mr. Ranga Iyer. As it was clearly noted in the draft that if a majority of Municipal and Local Board voters in the vicinity of any particular temple on a referendum decided by a majority that the Depressed Classes should be allowed to enter the temple, the Trustees or the Manager of that temple should give effect to that decision. It was further mentioned in the Bill that the principle was an ordinary principle of Majority rule. So there was nothing radical or revolutionary about the Bill, and if the Sanatanists were a wise lot, they would accept it without demur. That is why the Depressed Classes did not give support to this Bill. However, there were two more reasons behind it.

Firstly; this Bill could not work for opening up the temples for the Depressed Classes. The Minority would not have the right to obtain an injunction against the Trustee, or the Manager who threw open the temple to the Depressed Classes in accordance with the decision of the majority under this Bill. However, one might first of all felt assured that when the question was put to the vote, there would be a majority in favour of Temple Entry. Once the majority was definitely opposed and was conceded by the author of the Bill himself through his correspondence with the Shankracharya. But Ambedkar reminded the results of the referendum with regard to the Guruvayur Temple in this context.

Secondly, this Bill did not regard Untouchability in temples as a sinful custom. It highlighted Untouchability merely as a social evil not necessarily worse than social evils of other sorts. But it did not declare Untouchability as such to be illegal. It was completely dependent on the decision of majority. In the view of the Depressed Classes untouchability might be eliminated without any hesitation even if it was acceptable to the majority. This was the way in which all customs were dealt with by Courts of Law, if they would find them to be immoral and against public policy. According to Ambedkar, the author of the Bill did not take more serious view of the evil custom of untouchability. He did the temperance reformer of the habit of drinking. His method was advocated by temperance reformers to eradicate the evil habit of drinking, namely, by local option. He reminded Mr. Ranga Iyer that if he had not forgotten that only a few months ago Mahatma Gandhi had prepared himself to fast unto death if Untouchability was not removed, he would have taken a more serious view of this curse and proposed a most through going reform to ensue its removal lock, stock and barrel. However, the Depressed Classes could expect was for the Bill to recognize the principle that Untouchability was a sin. Even Gandhiji who had been insisting that Untouchability was a sin could not satisfy the Depressed Classes. It seemed to Ambedkar that the Depressed Classes might be elevated through higher education, higher employment and better ways of earning a living. He even said that once they were well placed in the scale of social life, they were respectable and once they were respectable the religious outlook of the orthodox towards them was sure to undergo change, and even if this did not happen, it could do no injury to their material interest. So they had no time to spend their resources on such an empty

thing as Temple Entry. There was also another reason why they did not care to fight for it. That argument was the argument of self-respect. This was the reason of the Depressed Classes people who were interested in his material welfare. He was prepared to say to the Hindus as follows:

"... to open or not to open your temples is a question for you to consider and not for me to agitate. If you think, it is bad manners not to respect the sacredness of human personality, open your temples and be a gentleman. If you rather be a Hindu than be gentleman, then shut the doors and damu yourself for I don't care to come."[133]

Secondly Ambedkar raised the following spiritual questions:

Is temple entry to be the final goal of the advancement in the social status of the Depressed Classes in the Hindu fold? Or is it only the first step and if it is the first step, what is the ultimate goal? In fact, the Temple Entry Bill as a final goal, the Depressed Classes could never support. They would not only reject it, but they would then regard themselves as rejected by Hindu Society and free to find their own destiny elsewhere. On the other hand, if it was only to be a first step in the direction they be may be inclined to support it. The position would then be analogous to what was happening in the politics of India to-day. All Indians had claimed Dominion Status for India. The actual constitution would fall short of Dominion Status and many Indians would accept it as because if the British had not accepted the goal of Dominion Status, no one would have accepted the partial reforms which many were now prepared to accept. In the same way, if Mahatma Gandhi and the reformers were to proclaim what the goal which they had set before themselves was for the advancement of the Social Status of the Depressed Classes in the Hindu fold, it would be easier for the Depressed Classes to define their attitude towards Temple Entry. The goal of the Depressed Classes might as well be stated here for the information and consideration of all concerned. The Depressed Classes liked a religion, which would give them equality of social status. The Depressed Classes might not be able to overthrow inequities to which they were being subjected. But they had made up their mind not to tolerate a religion that would lend its support to the continuance of these inequities. If the Hindu religion was to be their religion, then it must become a religion of Social Equality. The mere amendment of Hindu religion code by the mere

inclusion in it of a provision to permit temple entry for all; could not make it a religion of equality of social status.They would thereby reach a position where they would be free and equal, without being above or below any one else, for the simple reason that the Hindu religion did not recognize the principle of equality of social status; on the other hand it fostered inequality by insisting upon grading people as Brahnins, Kshatrias, Vaishyas and Shudras, which now stand towards one another in an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of contempt. If the Hindu religion was to be religion of social equality then an amendment of its code to merely provide temple entry was not enough. What was required was to purge it of the doctrine of Chaturvarna. That was the root cause of all inequality and also the parent of the caste system and Untouchability. Unless it was done not only would the Depressed Classes reject Temple Entry, they would also reject the Hindu faith. Chaturvarna and the Caste system were incompatible with the self-respect of the Depressed Classes. So long as they stand to be its cardinal doctrine the Depressed Classes must continue to be looked upon as low. The Depressed Classes can say that they were Hindus only when the theory of Chaturvarna and caste system was abandoned and expunged from the Hindu Shastras. Did the Mahatma and the Hindu reformers accept this as their goal and would they show the courage to work for it? But whether Mahatma Gandhi and the Hindus were prepared for this or not, let it be known once for all that nothing short of this will satisfy the Depressed Classes and make them accept Temple Entry. To accept temple entry and be content with it was to temporize with evil and barter away the sacredness of human personality that dwells in them[134]. In connection with these facts it can be said that even Dewan Bahadur R.Srinivasan did not support the movement for Temple entry. Although, he represented the Untouchables along with Ambedkar at the Round Table Conference. Instead of it, he made an announcement to the press regarding the temple entry matter of the Untouchables as follows:

"When a Depressed Classes member is permitted to enter into the caste Hindu temples he would not be taken into any one of the four castes, but treated as a man of fifth or the last or the lower caste, a stigma worse than the one to be called an Untouchable. At the same time he would be subjected to so many caste restrictions and humiliations. The Depressed Classes shun the one who enters like that and exclude him as caste man. The crores of Depressed Classes would not submit to caste restrictions. They would be divided into sections if they would do. It was further

noted that 'Temple entry could not be forced by law. The village caste men openly or indirectly defy the law. To the village Depressed Class man it would be like a scrap of paper on which the "sugar" was written and placed in hands for him to taste, the above facts are placed before the public in time to save confusion and disturbance in the country."[135]

In response to the above noted statements made by Ambedkar and Dewan Bahadur R. Srinivasn respectively, Gandhiji gave a straight reply that although he was against untouchability but he was not against casteism. So he clearly stated that it was impossible on his part to carry out social reform beyond removing untouchability. This was enough for all to understand about Gandhiji's attitude towards the caste problem and untouchability. Dewan Bahadur Rajah could not do anything on this issue with the Congress neither inside nor outside the Assembly. He was the only nominated member from the Untouchable community of the Central Assembly for 1927. In fact, he was in favour of separate electorates for the Untouchables. But the Congress was deadly against it. In spite of it, he suddenly changed his decision and supported the Congress in the crisis of 1932 and ultimately became the spearhead of the Congress movement for joint electorate and temple entry. The motive behind it was quite personal. The Government did not nominate him as a delegate to the Round Table Conference to represent the Untouchables as he was a "member of the Central Legislative Committee. Instead of it, Dewan Bahadur R. Srinivasan was nominated for the same by the Government. But ultimately he made out the situation and thought about these wrong decisions when the Congress Ministry took office in Madras and Poona Pact was practically being trampled upon in different concerned issues. Yet he took care not to fall out in the race for legislation against Untouchability. But he played a vital role and sponsored two Bills such as the removal of Untouchability Bill and the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill. But Gandhiji did not mind the objection and opposition which came from the Orthodox Hindus and the Untouchables. Instead, he remained indifferent and kept himself quite silent towards these issues. Ambedkar highlighted the fact that the Hindu heart was very rapidly stricken with palsy. He also noted that a large part of the news that was published in the "week to week" "was fake and was nothing but a lying propaganda engineered by Congressmen to deceive the World that the Hindus were determined to fight untouchability. As a result, most of the temples that were opened to the Untouchables were "dilapidated and deserted

temples which were used by name except dogs and donkeys."[136] So the Guruvayur Temple Satyagraha and the legislation for securing Temple Entry for the Untouchables ultimately discarded by Gandhiji and Congressmen which really revealed their true mentality towards the Untouchables. A temple of Krishna was situated at Guruvayur in the Ponnani taluk in Malabar. Mr. Kelappan, a Hindu, started a movement to acquire the rights of Temple Entry for the Untauchable. He fought for the cause of Untouchables of Malabar in that case. But the Zamorin of Calicut, the trustee of that temple denied to throw open the temple to the Untouchables. He also mentioned the action cited in Section 40 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. This Act clearly stated that no trustee could do anything against the custom and usage of the temples entrusted to him. Under this situation, Mr. Kelappan started a fast in protest against the Zamorin in front of the temple. In spite of it, he did not throw open the temple to them. He appealed to Gandhiji to make an arrangement to withdraw Mr. Kelappan's fast in respect to it. Thus under the influence and request of Gandhiji he suspended the fast on 1st October 1932 for three months. Gandhiji made an arrangement to issue the following statement to the Press:

"There is another fast which is a near possibility and that in connection with the opening of the Guruvayur temple in Kerala. It was at my urgent request that Mr. Kelappan suspended his fast for three months, a fast that had well nigh brought him to death's door. I would be in honour bound to fast with him if on or before 1st January 1933 that temple is not opened to the Untouchables precisely on the same terms as to the Touchables, and if it becomes necessary for Mr. Kelappan to resume his fast."[137]

But the Zamorin denied to throw open the temple for the Untouchables and a counter statement on this issue was given to the press as follows:

"The various appeals that are being made for throwing open the temples to Avarnas proceed upon an inadequate appreciation of such difficulties. In these circumstances, there is hardly any justification for thinking that it is in my power to throw open the Guruvayur temple to the Avarnas as desired by the supporters of the temple-entry campaign"[138]

Under this unavoidable situation, Gandhiji changed his policy and stated that he would refrain from fasting if a referendum was taken from that area and if the referendum would prove that the majority of that Ponnani taluk in which temple was situated was against the throwing open of the Temple to the Untouchables. But the rights of voting was confined to those who were actual temple goers and others who were not allowed to enter the temple were excluded from this privilege and ultimately their names were omitted from the Voter's list. As a result of it 73% of eligible voters got opportunity to cast their votes. But the result of the poll was very important in this context as it was 56% who were in favour of temple entry, 9% were against, 8% were neutral and 27% refrained from casting their votes. So Gandhiji was bound to resume the fast. Even the Viceroy gave permission to the moving of the Temple Entry Bills in the legislature. But Gandhiji did not agree. Instead, he made a statement to the press on 29th December 1932 in this regard:

"In view of the official announcement that the Viceregal decision as to sanction for the introduction, in the Madras Legislative Council, of Dr. Subbaroyan's permissive Bill with reference to the temple-entry could not possibly be announced before the 15th January, the fast contemplated to take place on the second day of the New Year will be indefinitely postponed and in any case up to the date of the announcement of the Viceregal decision. Mr. Kelappan concurs in this postponement."[139]

Gandhiji also expressed his views on this issue as follows:

"If the report is an intelligent anticipation of the forthcoming Viceregal decision, I can only say that it will be a tragedy... I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that there is any political objective behind these measures. If court decisions had not hardened a doubtful custom into law, no legislation would be required. I would myself regard State interference in religious matters as an intolerable nuisance. But here legislation becomes an imperative necessity in order to remove the legal obstruction and based as it will be on popular will, as far as I can see, there can be no question of clash between parties representing rival opinions."[140]

But Lord Willingdon did not promote Dr. Subbaroyan's Temple Entry Bill in the Madras Council, but His Excellency allowed the introduction in the Legislative

Assemble of Mr. Ranga Iyer's Untouchability Abolition Bill. Now realizing the importance of this fact, the Governor-General and the Government of India stated that it was deemed necessary to find out a way out after ascertainment of Hindu opinion before the Government could decide what attitude to adopt through the examination in all their aspects. But Gandhiji was not satisfied with their activities and pointed out:

"I must try to trace the hand of God in it. He wants to try me through and trough. The sanction given to the All India Bill was an unintentional challenge to Hinduism and the reformer. Hinduism will take care of itself if the reformer will be true to him. Thus considered the Government of India's decision must be regarded as God-send. It clears the issue. It makes it for India and the world to understand the tremendous importance of the moral struggle now going on in India. But whatever the Sanatanists may decide the movement for Temple-Entry now broadens from Guruvayur in the extreme south to Hardwar in the north and my fast, though it remains further postponed, depends not now upon Guruvayur only but extends automatically to temples in general"[141]

Mr. Ranga Iyer formally introduced the Bill in the Assembly on 24th March, 1933. He also took initiative so that the Temple Entry Bill be circulated to elicit public opinion by the 30th July, 1933. But the objection came from Raja Bahadur Krishnamachari, Mr. Gunjal and others and ultimately this Bill was postponed.

But the Government of India suddenly declared to dissolve the Assembly and ordered new election. As a resulted, there was a sudden change in the attitude of the Congress members in the Central Legislature towards Mr. Ranga Iyer's Temple Entry Bill and they ultimately refused to give any further support to the Bill at this Juncture.To solve this problem the great Mahatma wanted to tour the country but the Congress, betrayed him first and had further betrayed him with the assistance of his own samandhi, Rajagopalachariar. They said that they were not going to proceed with the Untouchability question and the Temple Entry Bill without a mandate from the people. But Gandhiji's strong reaction was issued on 4th November, 1932 in a statement that read as follows:

"Untouchables in the villages should be made to feel that their shackles have been broken, that they are in no way inferior to their fellow villagers, that they are worshippers of the same God as the other villagers and entitled to the same rights and privileges that the latter enjoy.

"But if these vital conditions of the Pact are not carried out by caste-Hindus, could I possibly live to face God and man? I ventured even to tell Dr. Ambedkar, Rao Bahadur M.C. Raja and other friends belonging to the suppressed group that they should regard me as a hostage for the due fulfillment by caste-Hindus of the conditions of the Pact. The fast, if it is to come, will not be for coercion of those who are opponents of reform, but it will be intended to sting into action those who have been my comrades or who have taken pledges for the removal of Untouchability. If they believe their pledges or if they never meant to abide by them and their Hinduism was a mere camouflage, I should have no interest left in life."[142]

But it was an irony of fate that Gandhiji did not blame RajaGopalachari on the issue of Temple Entry Bill. He blamed Ranga Iyer for his violent denunciation of the Congress Party for withdrawing its support to the Bill. Therefore, he made a statement in this context as follows:

"The ill fated Temple Entry Bill deserved a more decent burial, if it deserved it at all, than it received at the hands of the mover of the bill. It was not a bill promoted by, and on behalf of, the reformers. The mover should, therefore, have consulted reformers and acted under instructions from them. So far as I am aware, there was hardly any occasion for the anger into which he allowed himself to be betrayed or the displeasure which he expressed towards Congressmen. On the face of it, it was, and was designed to be, a measure pertaining to religion, framed in pursuance of the solemn declaration publicly made in Bombay at a meeting of representative Hindus, who met under the chairmanship of Pandit Malaviyaji on 25th September, 1932. The curious may read the declaration printed almost every week on the front page of Harijan. Therefore, every Hindu, caste or Harijan, was interested in the measure. It was not a measure in which Congress Hindus were more interested than the other Hindus. To have, therefore, dragged the Congress name into the discussion was unfortunate. The Bill deserved a gentler handling."[143]

In view of the above mentioned role and activities of Gandhiji towards the Temple Entry Movement it can be pointed out that he played a strange game of political acrobatics. He took part in it as an opponent. But he changed his position and became an active supporter of the Temple Entry Movement under the pressure of the-then political situation as the Untouchables were demanding for political rights at that time. However, Gandhiji once again changed his position to defeat the Congress in the election. Under this unavailable situation, Gandhiji made up his mind and cleared his position and ultimately gave up the Temple Entry Movement due to preserve political power in the hands of the Congress. That is why; Ambedkar raised the following questions in this regard: Is this sincerity? Does this show conviction? Was the 'agony of soul' which Mr. Gandhi spoke of more than a phrase?

7.6. Conclusion

The role, ideas and activities of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste were completely opposite to each other. Gandhiji could not do anything without the affiliation to the traditional beliefs and convictions. He never dared to break the norms of the caste-based traditions. But Ambedkar fought for the destruction of the Caste Institution and Untouchability. Both of them came forward to each other to uplift the ill-fated conditions of the Untouchables. Gandhiji was treated as an untouchable in South Africa. But he launched a direct purification movement for the betterment of the Indian untouchables in the later part of his life. Some scholars pointed out that Gandhiji would not come forward to uplift the untouchables if there was no political compulsion. He was first caste-Hindu leader of the Indian National Congress who ultimately took initiative in the later part of his life to launch a direct anti-untouchability movement for bettering the condition of the ill-fated people in India. He made arrangements to set up tube wells, digging of ponds, establishment of schools, and construction of roads etc. for the Harijans. All sorts of beneficial measures were taken by him to uplift the socio-economic, educational and cultural conditions of the Harijans. His liberal and reformative zeal for temple entry movement could not be denied.That is why; the role and activities of Gandhiji towards the emancipation of the untouchables was very much important. He played a vital role to establish the concept of social justice among the Harijans. In spite of

numerous limitations, the greatness of Gandhiji towards the upliftment of the Harijans heralded a new dimension in the history of India. Naturally, he became the champion of the Harijan movement in India. But it can not denied that the colonial government determined to render the concept of Social Justice among the Depressed Classes, Minorities and others by declaring the 'Communal Award' of 1932. Ramsay MacDonald, the-then Prime Minister of England played a vital role in this respect. Gandhiji was furious against the special recognition given to the Untouchables as a separate political entity. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the active participation of Gandhiji in the Second Round Table Conference made his position clear relating to the issue of Caste and Untouchability. He never expressed his woes regarding the ill-fated conditions of the Untouchables at that very moment. Instead of that he vehemently opposed the concessions and special privileges given to the Untouchables by the 'Communal Award'. However, Gandhiji founded the Harijan Sevak Sangha to uplift their socio-economic and educational status and position of the Harijans. But the ideas, roles and activities of Ambedkar relating to these issues were much more attractive and encouraging. He fought for the abolition of the inhuman Caste Institution and Untouchability and tried to establish the concept of liberty, equality, fraternity, nationality, democracy, and socialism with a mission to build up the India Nation on the basis of liberalism, nationalism, humanism, justice in all aspects such as social, political, economic etc. His role for the progress of the Harijans as human being in India was very much reformative and energetic. However, Gandhiji and Ambedkar ultimately came forward to establish the concept of liberalism, social reforms, human rights and social justice in the Indian socio-political and economic arena. They worked for the betterment of the downtrodden, toiling masses of India in their own ways. Gandhian political philosophy was mainly based on the ideologies of Ahimsa (Non-Violence) and Satyagraha (Truthfulness) whereas the political ideology of Ambedkar was based on the principles of humanity, liberty, equality, fraternity, social democracy, political democracy, human rights, social justice, and nationalism.He disapproved of proletarian dictatorship of the Communists and also of Parliamentary Democracy. Practically speaking, Gandhiji tried to introduce the doctrines of Ahimsa and Non-violence in the field of political arena to liberate the country from the foreign suzerainty and bondage. But he did not come forward to implement these ideologies in the field of caste-politics to liberate the toiling masses from age-old traditional thoughts and believes of the Caste Institution. The Institution

of Caste practically wrecked all sorts' of rights, privileges and liberty of the low-born peoples. But Ambedkar was the chief architect of several Hindu temple entry movements in India. His main motto was to establish the rights and privileges of the untouchables in the Hindu temples. But the Harijan Sevak Sangh of Gandhiji refused to incorporate abolition of Caste System in its programmes. Gandhiji used Satyagraha against Britishers but did not favour it for untouchables against the caste Hindus. He wanted to abolish untouchability but not at the cost of offending caste Hindus. Thus he had his own reservations on the issue of rights of the Depressed Classes. But Ambedkar wanted reorganization of the Hindu society with complete abolition of the Caste System and untouchability on the principle of liberty, equality and justice. The prime object of Ambedkar was to liberate the low-born people from the yoke of age-old evil Brahmanical traditions and believes to lead a free life in the society.

References

1. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CW), Original or Standard edition, Vols. 55, published by the Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1958-1994; p. 427.
2. Ibid, p. 426.
3. Iyer, Raghavan N; The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1973, p. 184.
4. Eriksson, Erik H; Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of militant Non-Violence, Norton, New York, 1966, p. 217. Quoted in CWMG, Vol. 10, pp. 42-4.
5. Ibid.
6. Gandhi, M.K; Hind Swaraj, Nabajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, Reprint, 1984, p. 37.
7. Gandhi, M.K; Harajin, February, 1948, Non-Violence, p. 11, p. 393.
8. Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, published by the Education Department, Government of Maharastra for Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication Committee, Bombay, 1991, pp.8-9.
9. Ibid, pp.7-8.
10. Ibid, p.10.
11. Ibid, pp.12.

12. Pradhan, G.P. Bhagwat, A.K; Lokanayak Tilak, p. 306.
13. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., pp. 13.
14. Ibid, p.14.
15. Addresses presented to the Viceroy in India and the Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State for India (1918).Parliamentary Paper Cd.9178 pages 74-75.
16. Moon, Vasant. (ed.);*Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., pp. 15-16.
17. Ibid, p. 1
18. Indian Review, February 1909.
19. Moon, Vasant. (ed.);*Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., p. 2.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid, pp. 2-3.
22. Rothermund, D; "Gandhi as a creative Politician" in his "The Phases of Indian Nationalism and Other Essays", p. 105.
23. Fischer, Louis; Life of Mahatma Gandhi, Harper and Row, New York, 1981, p. 149.
24. Dutta, Rajoni Palm; India Today, Manisha Granthalaya (p) Ltd., Calcutta, 1997, p. 629.
25. Brown, Judith; Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915-1922, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972, pp. 352-353.
26. Fischer, Louis; Life of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., p. 141.
27. Andrews C. F; Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas, Macmillan and Co., New York, 1930, p. 141.
28. Roy, Binoy Gopal; Gandhian Ethics, Ahmedabad, 1950, p. 21.
29. Char Narsimha, K. T; A Day Book of Thought from Mahatma Gandhi, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1951, p. 8.
30. Gandhi, M. K; An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth, Translated from the original Gujarati by Desai, Mahadev, Penguin Books, 1982, p.157.
31. Ibid, pp. 91-93.
32. Ibid, 136.

33. Gandhi, M. K; An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth, op. cit., pp. 273-275.
34. The Indian Opinion, Gujrati Section, November 23, 1907.
35. Ibid, June 12, 1909.
36. Brown, Judith; Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915-1922, op. cit., p.1-2.
37. Mukherjee, Mridula in Chandra Bipan and others; India's Struggle for Independence, K. P. Bagchi and Co., Calcutta, 1994, p. 176.
38. Gandhi, M. K; My Views on Education, Hingorani T. Anand (ed.), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1970, pp. 84-85.
39. Keer Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 2002, p. 42.
40. The Times of India, 16 January, 1919.
41. Keer Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., pp. 54-55. Quoted in Bahishkrit Hitakarini Sabha, Rules of Constitution, p. 1.
42. Jaffrelt, Christophe; Dr. Ambedkar and Untouchability, Published by Permanent Black, New Delhi, 2006, p.46.
43. Ibid, p. 47.
44. Shivtarkar, S.N; The Janata Special Number, April 1933.
45. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 2*, op. cit., pp. 503-4.
46. Ibid, p. 505.
47. Ibid, p. 28.
48. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 1*, op. cit., p. 50.
49. Ibid, p. 63.
50. Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 5*, published by the Education Department, Government of Maharastra for Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication Committee, Bombay, 1989, p. 92.
51. Ibid, p. 92.
52 Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 4*, op. cit., P. 28.
53. Ibid, pp. 282-83.

54. Ibid, pp. 282-83.
55. Bali, D. R; Modern Indian Thought (From Rammohan to Jayaprakash Narayan); Sterling Publishers Private Limited, 1993, p. 282.
56. Ibid.
57. Speech delivered at the All India Trade Union Workers Camp at Delhi on September 17, 1943.
58. Ibid.
59. Ambedkar, BR; Pakistan or the Partition of India, Thacker & Co. Ltd. Bombay, 1946, p. 207.
60. Ibid, p. 259.
61. Ambedkar, B. R; Annihilation of Caste, Katra Jaman Sangh, Amritsar, 1944, p. 37.
62. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., p. 17.
63. Ibid, p.16.
64. Ibid, p.18.
65. Ibid.
66. Brown, Judith; Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915-1922, op. cit., pp. 210.
67. Ibid. p. 229.
68. Sen, Sachin; Birth of Pakistan, Book Traders, Lahore, 1978, p. 71.
69. New India, 9.6.1920.
70. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., p. 20.
71. A letter sent to Motilal Nehru, General Secretary, and AICC by Shradhanand Sanyasi from Delhi, Jan. 30.
72. Ibid.
73. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., p. 24.
74. Ibid, 25.
75. Ibid, pp. 32-33.
76. Ibid, pp. 34-35.
77. Young India, 3rd November 1921.
78. Ibid, 20th October 1920.

79. Ibid.
80. Ibid, 29th December 1920.
81. Ibid, 20th October 1920.
82. Ibid.
83. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9*, op. cit., p. 56.
84. Keer Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 55.
85. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit.,* pp. 42-52.
86. Ibid, pp. 52-54.
87. Ibid, 54.
88. Ibid, p. 56.
89. Ibid, pp. 304-306.
90. Memorandum, Ambedkar Papers, Available in Bombay University Library, Bombay. C.W., Vol. 47, pp. 303-310, 314-325. Indian Round Table Conference (Second Session): Proceedings of Federal Structure Committee and Minorities Committies, Vol. 1, pp. 387- 9, 425-9.
91. C.W.M.G; Vol. 46, pp. 320-326.
92. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit.,* pp. 64-65.
93. C.W.M.G; Vol. 46, pp. 293-298.
94. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit.,* pp. 70-71.
95. The Bombay Chronicle, 13.09.1932.
96. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit.,* p. 76.
97. Parliamentary Paper (Command 4147) of 1932. Officially it is spoken of as Communal Decision. Quoted in Moon, Vasant.(ed.); Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9; op. cit., pp. 455-460.
98. A letter sent by Gandhi to Ramsay Macdonald on August 18, 1932. See also Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p. 167 and The Bombay Chronicle, 13. 09. 1932. C.W.M.G; Vol. 53, pp. 383-384.

99. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit., pp.* 83-86 and The Hindustan Times, 16.11.1931 and 18.11.1931.

100. Ibid, pp. 311-317; The Bombay Chronicle, 31.12.1932; The Hindu, 31.12.1932 and See also C. W.M.G; Vol. 51, p. 307.

101. Ibid, p. 103; Ibid and Ibid. See also Harijan, 3.8.1934.

102 Ibid, Vol. 8, pp. 464-465.

103. Chentharrassery, TPH; Ambedkar on Indian History, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, India, 2000, p. 159.

104. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit., p.* 96.

105. Ibid, p. 98.

106. The Harijan on 2nd August 1942.

107. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols.9, op. cit., pp.90-102.*

108. Ibid, p.103; The Bombay Chronicle, 31.12.1932 and The Hindu, 31.12.1932

109. Ibid, p.126.

110. Ibid, Vol. 5, pp. 363 – 364.

111. Ibid, Harijan, 29. 6. 1934. See also The Bombay Chronicle, 15.6.1934

112. Ibid, Ibid and Ibid.

113. Ibid, pp.372-373. See also Report of the Harijan Sevak Sangh for 1932-33, p.1.

114. A letter sent by Ambedkar to Mr. A. V. Thakkar, the Secretary of the Sangh on November 14, 1932.

115. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit., pp.* 126-127.

116. Ibid, pp. 127-129.

117. Ibid, Vol. 5, p. 366.

118. Ibid, Vol:9, p. 142.

119. Ibid. See also Mahadevbhaini Diary, Vol. II, pp. 340-2 (From Gujarati).

120. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit., pp. p. 143.*

121. Ibid, 144.

122. Ibid, p.145.

123. Ibid.

124. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.5, op. cit.,* p. 374.
125. Ibid.
126. Ibid.
127. Ibid, p. 375.
128. Ibid, p. 376.
129. Ibid, p. 377.
130. Harijan, 18th February 1933.
131. Ibid.
132. Ibid, 15th July 1933.
133. Ibid, 18th February 1933. See also The Bombay Chronicle, 13.02.1933
134. Moon, Vasant. (ed.); *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 9, op. cit., p.* 107. Quoted in 'Gandhi Shikshan', Vol. II, p. 132.
135. Ibid, p. 113.
136. Ibid, p. 115.
137. Ibid. p. 116. See also The Times of India, 28.11.1932 and The Hindustan Times, 7.12.1932.
138. Ibid. See also The Bombay Chronicle, 15.12.1932, 31-12-1932 and The Hindu, 16.12.1932 and 31-12-1932.
139. Ibid, p. 117; See also The Bombay Chronicle, 31-12-1932 and The Hindu, 31-12- 1932 and 3.1.1933.
140. Ibid, pp. 117-118.
141. Ibid.p. 118.
142. Ibid, p. 124.
143. Harijan, 31st August, 1934.

Chapter 8

Concluding observations

The foregoing discussions made it clear that the myth of Caste gradually transformed into an institution of Caste. The Brahmins, the so-called intellectual or privileged class of the ancient Indian society played a vital role in this connection. They destroyed the process of social engineering to keep up peace, tranquillity, unity, fraternity, social equanimity and justice. It created multi-dimensional problems in the Brahmanical Hindu society. Even today India failed to develop as a 'Nation State' in the global world. Caste Institution was nothing but a mechanical device of exploitation to the downtrodden section of the society. The unprivileged classes of the Hindu society were severely victimized by the divine ordinances of the Caste system made by the law-makers of ancient India. But the attitudes of Gandhiji and Ambedkar–the two shinning stars of India were completely opposite to each other relating to the issue of Caste and Untouchability. Gandhiji believed everything about Caste. His explanation was completely based on orthodox traditions. He was a staunch follower of the Caste System. He treated it as the part and parcel of the Hindu religion. He explained that the divisions of Varna were based on birth. He believed in the Varnashrama Dharma and the Caste System. He had a living faith in God and the facts and events that were described in the Vedic literatures in the context of Caste. His belief in the Varna system fostered the concept of the Caste System. He was in fact a bearer of the Caste tradition. That is why he did not come forward to address the numerous inhuman problems arising out of the existence of the Caste System in the society. But on the contrary Ambedkar clearly identified and criticized the inhuman content of the Caste System. His explanation for the abolition of the Caste System was completely based on logical and scientific analysis. It was completely against human rights, social justice and women empowerment. Ambedkar solely fought against the evil-base of the Caste System. He vehemently opposed the 'Aryan Race theory' in the context of the Rig Vedic Society and founded the 'Sudra-Aryan' theory. He demanded abolition of the Caste Institution and Untouchability from the so-called Brahmanical Hindu society. Even he scientifically explained the origin of

the Sudras and pointed out that they belonged to the Kshatriya Varna and there was not a single reference of the fourth Varna in the Rig Veda. The man-made Sudras could enjoy the rights and privileges of the upanayana[1]. They could worship the God and Goddess. They could become priest. Even some of the verses of the Rig Veda were composed by them. Naturally, there was no Caste distinction in the Rig Vedic society. The so-called Hindu society was categorically divided into numerous classes rather than Castes in the Rig Vedic society. But the probable interpolation of the Purusha Sukta in the Rig Veda gave birth to the concept of Caste in the Brahmanical Hindu society. Manu, an ancient law-maker, perhaves institutionalized the concept of Caste brushing aside the doctrine of Karma and virtuous deeds. Naturally, the concept of Class of the Rig Vedic period was transformed into the concept of Caste and it was spread gradually through the Vedic literatures in different ages. It was completely inhuman in nature and peculiar in character. The status and position of a person was determined by his forefather's position in the Caste System. As a result Brahmin became the privileged class and enjoyed all sorts of powers and positions in the society. But the toiling masses were forced to remain in a very distressed condition only to serve the privileged classes. Naturally, the concept of Caste created numerous problems in the Indian society.

But the very foundation of the Institution of Caste was stirred by the rise of Buddhism in India and the 6th century Religious Protestant Movement greatly influenced the reign of Chandragupta Maurya, Asoke, Harsha and Pala rulers in this context. But it was survived all positive treatments under the patronage of the Gupta, the Rajput and the Sena rulers of Bengal. Even the low-born Hindus converted themselves into Muslims during the medieval period. But they did not get opportunity to change their destiny. They were forced to remain in a very distressed condition all through the ages. But the emergence of the anti-Caste movement heralded an epoch making event in the history of the Human Rights Protection Movement in India. The name of Jyotibe Phule, Sri Narayan Guru and others may be mentioned in this connection who dedicated their life to fight against the inhuman nature and character of the Caste Institution. Ambedkar was very much inspired by their role and activities to annihilate the Caste System. But the high Caste Social Reformers of 19th century India did not come forward directly to annihilate the Caste System. As a result, the 19th century Renaissance and Reformation Movement failed to eradicate the problems of the Caste

System and Untouchability. Even most of the Congress leaders did not like to discuss the problems of Caste in their camp. They stressed on political revolution rather than social revolution. The so-called intellectuals of the 19th century did not come forward directly to deal with the issue of Caste and Untouchability. They continued the traditions of the Congress in this context. Practically speaking, they did nothing but ideal talking. Even they differed in their respective approach to the issue of Caste and Untouchability. The name of Raja Rammohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Swami Vivekananda and others may be mentioned in order to understand the real truth. Even Gandhiji was the follower of the Congress Camp in this respect. Most of the 19th century Social Reformers of India were very much class conscious. So they did not try to launch any direct movement against the Institution of Caste.

Therefore, it can be pointed out that the Social Reformers in different periods of history tried to address the issue of Caste and Untouchability but the problems survived all positive treatments. However, the very foundation of the Caste Institution was stirred by the impact of the Industrialization in colonial India. But the colonial Government did not interfere directly to this problem. They made an arrangement to utilize this problem as a weapon against the Nationalist Movement. They primarily came forward to undertake a policy of neutrality to deal with this problem. Even they prevented from taking any particular side that might create social unrest in India. But they ultimately decided to suppress numerous social evils and prevailing superstitions of the Hindu society. So they introduced some legal acts in this connection. But the emergent Indian intellectuals played a vital role to influence the Colonial Government during the 19th Century in this regard.

However, the emergence of Gandhiji as a national leader was an important fact in the Indian political arena. The socio-religious, educational, cultural and sound economic family background of Gandhiji accelerated his career building process in the Indian society. He was practically reared up since the beginning with adequate facilities that helped him very much to fulfil his cherished dream. He was a model of moral virtues in India. Everything was examined by him on the principles of truth, non-violence etc. He believed in the Caste System that created by the so-called intellectuals of the Later Vedic period to deny the human rights and privileges of the lower strata of the Hindu

society. Gandhiji always tried to advocate the class interest of the wealthy class. He never came forward spontaneously to save the civics rights of the downtrodden section in the Hindu society except in the case of the Harijans. Naturally, Gandhiji could not come forward to start a direct movement against this inhuman caste institution. But Ambedkar emerged as a leader of the Dalit India from zero socio-politico status and position of his family atmosphere. His position was poor of the poorest. However, his strong mental confidence and tireless efforts helped him to build up his academic as well as political career at a large. Every moment of his life was full of woes and sorrows since his childhood. None but the King of Boroda[2] came forward to help Ambedkar to complete his studies in abroad. The versatile personality of Ambedkar brought him in the lime light of Indian politics. He was solely not a politician in the true sense of the term. But the-then socio-political factors bound him to raise voice against the socio-religious and political tyranny that doomed the daily life of the Depressed Classes and Untouchables in every sphere of their individual as well national life. He was a great emancipator of the toiling masses and women in India in the true sense of the terms. His poor family background, helpless conditions in every walk of life made his iron backbone to build up him as a great champion of social justice in India. He was tortured and harassed by the so-called upper Caste people in every moment of life. The abolition of Caste and Untouchability, promotion of social justice, welfare measures of the labourers, women emancipation etc. were the prime motto of his socio-political movement in India. He did not compromise with anything except the life-saving Pact of Poona with Gandhiji. He responded only to save the life of Gandhiji by signing this treaty at the call of great humanity. The issue of Caste in Colonial India created turmoil condition in the Indian freedom movement. It gave birth to numerous psycho-politico obstacles in establishing a unanimous mass movement in India against the Imperialist British Government. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar fought for establishing the concept of Social Justice among the people in India. But their approach was quite different from each other especially in respect of Caste and Untouchability. Gandhian Caste thesis was very much discouraging. But Ambedkar's anti-Caste thesis was completely based on humanitarian approach. Gandhiji could not overcome the obstacles of his age in the sphere of Caste System and Untouchability whereas Ambedkar straightway struggled for the abolition of these. Gandhiji stressed on the concept of Truth, Satyagraha, Non-violence and others that depends upon moral force. Ambedkar believed in the concept of social

democracy, political democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity, protection of human rights and its privileges, emancipation of women, slaves, so-called Sudras made by the Aryans and others. Gandhiji did not believe in the liberty, equality and social liberty of the haves not, Indian Sudras and women of different Varnas. Most of his idealistic approaches were not based on materialistic point of view. Therefore, it could not work for the immediate benefit of the common people. His thoughts were based on moral forces that differed from man to man and it could not implement as a matter of compulsory deed for each persons. His philosophical ideas and spiritual thoughts could not bring any radical change into the mind set up of his followers. Naturally, the strategy of the national movement under the leadership of Gandhiji could not succeed at a large. But Ambedkar solely fought to establish the rights and privileges of the downtrodden masses of India. He raised the socio-religious and cultural obstacles before the British Government relating to the daily life of the toiling masses in the context of the caste and untouchability and forced the British Government as well the Indian National Congress to consider their ill-fated conditions in the light of human rights protection movement. He strongly proved that Caste System is itself a self-explanatory mechanical device to exploit the toiling masses of India in the name of divine origin and God as the creator of the universe. Therefore, it can be said that both Gandhiji and Ambedkar worked to fulfil the needs and demands of their class interests. Both of them dedicated their lifetime for the betterment of the Indian society as a whole. Gandhiji was treated as an untouchable in South Africa. But he launched a direct purification movement for the betterment of the Indian untouchables in the later part of his life. Some scholars pointed out that Gandhiji would not come forward to uplift the untouchables if there was no political compulsion. He discouraged them to launch direct Satyagraha movement against the caste Hindus in case of Chowdar Tank Satyagraha movement in Mahad and Kalaram Temple Satyagraha movement in Nasik. But the role of Gandhiji towards the upliftment of the Harijans could not be ignored. He was first caste-Hindu leader of the Indian National Congress who ultimately took initiative in the later part of his life to launch a direct anti-untouchability movement for bettering the condition of the ill-fated people in India. He made arrangements to set up tube wells, digging of ponds, establishment of schools, and construction of roads etc. for the Harijans. All sorts of beneficial measures were taken by him to uplift the socio-economic, educational and cultural conditions of the Harijans. His liberal and reformative zeal for temple entry

movement could not be denied. That is why; the role and activities of Gandhiji towards the emancipation of the untouchables was very much important. He played a vital role to establish the concept of social justice among the Harijans. In spite of numerous limitations, the greatness of Gandhiji towards the upliftment of the Harijans heralded a new dimension in the history of India. Naturally, he became the champion of the Harijan movement in India.

But the Colonial Government determined to render the concept of Social Justice among the Depressed Classes, Minorities and others by declaring the 'Communal Award' of 1932. Ramsay MacDonald, the-then Prime Minister of England played a vital role in this respect. Ambedkar was called in the First Round Table Conference to represent the Depressed Classes. Gandhiji did not attend that meeting. Realizing the hard reality of this environment Gandhiji went to London to represent the Congress in the Second Round Table Conference and claimed there that none but he solely represent the Depressed Classes in India. The 'Minorities Pact' was signed jointly by the Aga Khan (Muslim delegate), Ambedkar (Depressed Classes representative), Rao Bahadur Pannir Selvam (leader of the Indian Christians), Sir Henry Gidney (Anglo-Indian representative) and Sir Hubert Carr (European delegate). It was nothing but a settlement of the Indian communal problems. But Gandhiji was very much angry with them. He was furious against the special recognition given to the Untouchables as a separate political entity. He convinced the Untouchables that separate electorate and separate reservation was not the way to remove this bar-sinister which was the shame, not of them, but of orthodox Hinduism. Even Gandhi was ready to render immediate recognition to the demands of the Muslims and the Sikhs excluding the demands of the Untouchables. He said that if they were given separate electorate their lives would be miserable in villages which were the strongholds of Hindu orthodoxy. So he planned to isolate them from other Minorities but failed. Even he was ready to get Muslim support at any cost. Therefore, it can be pointed out that the active participation of Gandhiji in the Second Round Table Conference made his position clear relating to the issue of Caste and Untouchability. He never expressed his woes regarding the ill-fated conditions of the Untouchables at that very moment. Instead of that he vehemently opposed the concessions and special privileges given to the Untouchables by the 'Communal Award'. In this way, Gandhiji[3] himself was responsible for the promotion of Casteism at different phases during the freedom

struggle viz. Communal Award and his active participation in the Second Round Table Conference, Poona Pact, Harijan Movement and the Temple Entry Movement. Gandhiji had vehemently opposed the concessions and special privileges given to the Depressed Classes for their uplift by the Communal Award. He even started a hunger strike till death in order to oppose the separation of the Depressed Classes from the mainstream of the Hindu society. In such a critical situation Ambedkar came forward to save the life of Gandhiji and was literally compelled to sign the Poona Pact in 1932. In fact the Harijan movement and the Temple Entry Movement was a direct outcome of the Poona Pact. After this historic event, Gandhiji came forward for the first time to address the problems of the Harijans and became renowned world-wide as a champion of the Untouchables. Ambedkar had very rightly fought for the equalization of the Depressed Classes in all spheres. He himself took leading role and arranged various protest movements to achieve his goal i.e. social justice for the Depressed Classes. He launched Chower Tank Satyagraha movement, Nasik and Kalaram Temple Entry movement to establish the civil rights and privileges of the low born peoples. His fighting zeal inspired the common masses of India. His struggle was further strengthen by the declaration of the 'Communal Award' by Ramsay Macdonald, the then Prime Minister of England. He attended the Round Table Conferences as a sole representative of the Depresses Classes in India. His scientific and logical explanation for the benefit of the Depressed Classes created an amicable settlement among the 'Minority Communities' to implement the provisions of the 'Communal Award' in spite of the opposition of Gandhiji. As Gandhiji demanded himself as the sole representative of the Indian Untouchables.

Gandhiji said that the main ideal of any economic programme must be human happiness combined with full mental and moral growth. The wealth of a nation is its people who produce it. Therefore, if economic policy does not provide each according to his need, it is of no value. One of the economic imperatives, for Gandhi, was immediate engagement of the entire population in productive work of any kind. Gandhi advised complete de-centralisation of the productive process. This led to the evolution of constructive programme based on 'Swadeshi' and 'Khaddar'. Through the practice of Swadeshi and Khaddar, Gandhiji evolved a practical remedy for crushing poverty of the millions of village people who lived in India on the border line of starvation. His vows of Swadeshi and Khaddar went deep into his conception

of human progress. Swadeshi would mean self-dependence and Khaddar, work for the millions of idle manpower of the country. In advocating the production and use of Khadi, Gandhi had a humanitarian motive[4]. In fact, manufacture and use of Khadi meant more and more self-dependence and use of leisure time for productive purposes. He basically dedicated to the cause of 'daridranarayan' the poor man, who represents God. But he identified machinery as anti-social for it was meant to replace human labour and thus increased unemployment. His supreme consideration was man. Gandhiji pointed out in 'Young India' that 'I would favour the use of most elaborate machinery if thereby India's pauperism and resulting idleness be avoided'[5]. His utmost aim was to establish a classless society by changing the hearts of the people. Some scholars pointed out that humanism was the basic principle of his economic theory. But it was very difficult to do in the real sense of the term.

But the fighting zeal of Ambedkar for human rights gave him international recognition as a liberator of humanity from social and economic injustice. But the economic thoughts of Ambedkar were based on the concept of mixed economy, socialism, industrialization, state ownership of industries, worker's right to strike[6] etc. He fought against the caste based economic life to establish the idea of liberty and equality in the society. The main motto behind it was to create a liberal atmosphere in the field of economic life and activities with a vision to open up the flood gate of different occupations to all irrespective of their caste, class, creed, sex and religion. As an economic thinker, Ambedkar belonged to the group of liberal thinkers. By and large his orientation was that of a socialist but he did not agree with Karl Marx whose ideas and methods were of violent nature to him. He was very much anxious about the exploitative social and economic conditions of the toiling masses in India. He knew well that these people most of whom were Dalits were being severely exploited by land lords and capitalists. That is why; Ambedkar struggled for mixed economy or State Socialism to prevent this endless social and economic exploitation. He had understood that the economic equality was very much essential along with political equality to empower the toiling masses in India. The problem of the toiling masses, landless labours relied exclusively on the agricultural problems and more than this on the Indian economy as a whole. These problems should be tackled in the wider spectrum of national economic development. That is why; Ambedkar stressed on the nationalization of economy. He said that the production might reach the optimum

level and the capitalist might not grab the entire benefits and the hard earned money should be distributed equally. According to him, the capitalist economy can not in any way remove the economic crisis of the suffering people. In the capitalist economy there are more chances of unemployment, inhuman treatment of labour, long hours of working, vicious working conditions and numerous repressive measures. In fact, he was a great champion of socialism. According to him, 'State Socialism is essential for India's industrialization, private economy cannot do so and it makes an attempt it would give way to economic disparities as it can be visualized in the case of Europe. It is a warning bell for India'. He pointed out that industrial harmony can be established through labour welfare and congenial industrial relations by eradicating exploitation. He fought for economic and social freedom and equality. He clearly noted the fact that political freedom and equality without economic and social equality is quite insufficient. He advocated state socialism in the field of industry and also ownership in agriculture with a collectivized method of cultivation[7]. He opined that the plight of millions of untouchables who were of landless labourers can not be ameliorated through consolidation of lands or by tenancy legislation, only collective farms can solve the problems of the landless labours; therefore, Ambedkar suggested the plan that has two special features. The first proposes state socialism in important fields of economic life and the second does not leave the establishment of state socialism to the will of the legislature; it establishes state socialism by the law of the constitution and thus, makes it by any act of the legislature and executive. That is why Ambedkar demanded to include the provision of state ownership of agriculture in the fundamental rights as this provision was unalterable by any act of legislature and the executive. The purpose was to protect the liberty of the individual. Naturally, the connection between liberty and the shape and form of economic structure of society becomes real only when state socialism has been established through political democracy. He expressed his views to establish state socialism not through dictatorship but through political democracy. He realized that the solution to the problem of the untouchable landless labourers depended upon the solution to Indian agricultural problems or, even more broadly, economic problems. Ambedkar said that socialism does not only embrace economic equality but also social and political equality. But Ambedkar was in favour of modernization, industrialization and urbanization which, he found, were indispensable for the overall growth of the nation. Besides, as the first law minister in independent India he always tried to alleviate the

lot of those sociologically and economically exploited. He proposed for the implementation and enactment of the Hindu Code Bill the importance of which was only felt at a pretty later stage.

The foregoing discussions made it clear that the Institution of Caste created numerous problems, such as inter-caste exclusiveness, hatred, discrimination, disunity and others, in the Hindu society and it snawtched away the civil rights and privileges of the toiling masses in India. In spite of that the inhuman features of the Caste System and Untouchability were traditionally maintained in different ages. Even the colonial Government was very much alert to take any action owing to the fear of social unrest. But Gandhiji ultimately changed his attitudes towards these problematic issues and launched Harijan Movement to uplift the Harijans. However, Gandhiji and Ambedkar came forward to address the issues of Caste and Untouchability in terms of reforms, liberalism, humanism and progress to bring about a lease of life in the Indian society. But the Government of Independent India and different political parties of our country did not come forward even today to eradicate the Institution of Caste from the Hindu society. Instead of that, they traditionally maintained it probably to capture low caste vote banks for obtaining power. As a result caste politics increased day by day. Naturally, India could not develop as a 'Nation State' in the global world till date in the true sense of the term.

References

1. Moon Vasant ed. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharastra, 1990, Vol. 7, p. 169. Quoted in the History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature (1860), p. 207.
2. Keer, Dhananjay; Dr. Ambedkar-Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 2002, p. 26
3. Moon Vasant ed. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vol.9, op. cit., pp. 60 -125.
4. The Harijan, January 18, 1942.
5. Gandhi, M.K.; Sarvodaya, Ahmedabad, N.P.H., 1954, p. 40.
6. Vidyasagar, I. S.; Concept of Humanism of Dr. Ambedkar, ABD Publishers, Jaipur, India, 2005, pp. 135-138.
7. Lokhade, G.S., Ambedkar, Bhimrao Ramji; A Study in Social Democracy, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi, 1982, p.47.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. ARCHIVAL SOURCE

(i) Relevant Secret Files, Government of India, Home Department (political), National Archives of India, New Delhi.

1. Home Department, Political, File No. 33/XI & K.Ws, 1931; Courtesy: National Archives of India.
2. Home Department, Political, File No. 33/6, 1931, p.18; Courtesy: National Archives of India.
3. Bombay Secret Abstract, Home Department, Special Branch, File No. 800 (40), Pt.I.
4. Government of Bombay, Home Department, I.G.P., File No. 9.
5. Home Department Political File No. 31/108-Poll, p. 22, 1932. Courtesy: National Archives of India.
6. Home Department Political File No. 31/108-Poll, p. 30, 1932. Courtesy: National Archives of India.
7. Home Department Political File No. 31/108-Poll, pp. 40-2, 1932. Courtesy: National Archives of India. Also G.N. 3872.
8. Home Department Political File No. 31/108-Poll, p. 21, 1932. Courtesy: National Archives of India. Also Bombay Secret Abstract, Home Department, Special Branch, File No. 800 (40)(6), p. 121.
9. Government of Bombay, Home Department, I.G.P. File No. 10.

(ii). A.I.C.C. Papers, Relevant Files; Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Teen Murti House, New Delhi.

1. A.I.C.C. File No. 2/1931. Courtesy: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
2. A.I.C.C. File No. 4/1931 Part – I. Courtesy: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
3. A.I.C.C. File No. 16-B, 1931. Courtesy: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
4. A.I.C.C. File No. 329, 1931. Courtesy. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
5. Gandhi-Nehru Papers, 1933. Courtesy: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

6. A.I.C.C. File No. 199, 1931. Courtesy: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

(iii). 1. The Statesmen, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1938-1946 and 1947-1956. Courtesy: National Library, Kolkata (Periodical Section).

2. The Amritabazar, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1938-1946 and 1947-1956. Courtesy: National Library, Kolkata (Periodical Section).

B. Books authored by Ambedkar

Ambedkar, B.R; What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables? Thacker and Co. Ltd., Bombay, 1945.

Ambedkar, B.R; Who were the Shudras? How they came to be the fourth Varna in the Indo-Aryan Society? Thacker and Co. Ltd. Bombay, 1946

Ambedkar, B.R; States and Minorities, Thacker and Co. Ltd., Bombay, 1947.

Ambedkar, B.R; The Untouchables, Who are they and why they became Untouchables? Amrit Book Co., New Delhi, 1948.

Ambedkar, B.R; The Buddha and His Dhamma, Peoples Education Society, Bombay, 1957.

Ambedkar, B.R; The Rise and Fall of the Hindu Women, Dr. Ambedkar Publication's Society, Hyderabad, 1965.

Ambedkar, B.R; Gandhi and Gandhism, Bhim Patrika Publications, Jullunder. 1970.

Ambedkar, B.R; Annihilation of Caste, 2nd ed., B.R. Kaderekar, 1937.

Ambedkar, B.R; Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah, Thacker and Co. Ltd., Bombay 1943.

Ambedkar, B.R; Pakistan or Partition of India, Thacker and Co. Ltd., Bombay, 3rd ed., 1948.

Ambedkar, B.R; Federation versus Freedom, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jullunder,1970.

Ambedkar, B.R; Communal Deadlock and A Way to Solve It, F & 0 Printing Press, Delhi, 1945.

Ambedkar, B.R; Cabinet Mission and Untouchable, Bombay, Privately printed, No date.

Ambedkar, B.R; The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India, P.S. King, London, 1923.

Ambedkar, B.R; What Congress and Gandhi done to the untouchables, Thacker & Co., Bombay, 1945

Books authored by Gandhiji

Gandhi, M.K; Arya Samaj, Punjab, Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, 1910

Gandhi, M.K; Non-violence in Peace and War, Vol. I and Vol. II, Ahmedabad, Navjivan Publishing House, 1948.

Gandhi, M.K; *Hind Swaraj*: Indian Home Rule, Ahmedabad, N.P.R, 1938.

Gandhi, M.K; *My Non-violence*, Ahmedabad, N.P.H., 1960.

Gandhi, M.K; *Sarvodaya*, Ahmedabad, N.P.H., 1954.

Gandhi, M.K; *Gokhale; My Political Guru*, Ahmedabad, 1953.

Gandhi. M.K; Hindu Dharma. Reprinted 1993, Orient Paperbacks, Delhi.

Gandhi, M.K; *The Bleeding Wound!* Compiled and edited by Shri Ramanath Suman.Introduction by C.Y. Chintamani, Foreword by G. D. Birla. Beneras; Shyam Lal, 1932.

Gandhi, M.K; *Untouchability*. Lahore: Gandhi Publications' League, 1944.

Gandhi M. K; Gandhi's Autobiography: *The Story of my Experiments with Truth.* Translated from the Gujrati by Mahadev Desai, Washington Public Affairs Press, 1948.

Gandhi M. K; *My Varnashrama Dharma.* Edited by Anand T. Hingorani. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1965.

Gandhi M. K; *Hind Swaraj*, Nabajivan publishing House, Ahmedabad, Reprint, 1984.

Gandhi. M.K; *Hindu Dharma,* Reprinted 1993, Orient Paperbacks, Delhi.

Gandhi M. K; *Industrial and Agrarian life and Relations*, Kher, V.D; ed. Nabajivan publishing House, Ahmedabad, Reprint, 1984.

Gandhi M. K; *Modern V. Ancient Civilization*, Hingorani T., Anand. ed. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan,1970.

Gandhi, M.K; *My Souls Agony*. Being Gandhiji's statements from Yeravada prison on removal of untouchability among Hindus. Ahmedabad; Navajivan, 1932.

C. UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

1. B. R. Ambedkar private papers; Nehru Memorial and Museum Library, New Delhi (section of microfilms)
2. E.Zelliot, 'Dr Ambedkar and the Mahar Movement' unpubl. PhD thesis,

University of Pennsylvania, 1969.

3. H. S. Verma and N. Verma, 'Dr Ambedkar and the Constitution', paper presented to the colloquium 'Contribution of Dr B. R. Ambedkar to Law and constitution of India' Lucknow, April 15, 1997.

4. R. I. 'Duncan, "'Levels": the Communication of Programmes and Sectional Strategies in Indian Politics, with reference to the Bharatiya Kranti Dal and the Republican Party of India in Uttar Pradesh State and Aligarh district (UP)', unpubl. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Sussex. 1979.

D. News Papers, Journals, Special Numbers, Magazines, Periodicals and Articles :

A. C. Pranjpi, 'The "Becoming" of Dr Ambedkar: A Socio-psychological Study', in M. L. Ranga (ed.), B. R. Ambedkar: Life, Work and Relevance, Delhi: Manohar, 2000.

Anupama Rao,'Arguing against Inclusion', EPW. Feb.22.1997.

Bilgrani, Akeel, 'Gandhi, the philosopher;, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 38 (39), 2003

Bombay Chronicle, 4th July, 1939; and 7th November, 1946.

Bagheli, Dr. B.S., Why they need of BAMCEF, SU & BSP, a paper, Anil Printers, D -702, Kamal Nagar, Agra, No date.

Chatterjee, Partha, 'Gandhi please stands up?Illustrated Weekly of India, 15-21 January, 1984.

Career and Competition Times, Magazine, July, 1986.

Dalit Bandhu, special number, 15th April, 1943.

Dr. Ambedkar College, Mahad, magazine,1962.

Frank, Andre Gunder; 'Gandhi, the philosopher', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 38 Employment News Republic Day Number, 26th January, 1990.

Employment News.1-7 March, 1997. Series of Essay on Vedic age appeared in the Employment News from time to time. The essays are written by O.P. Kajriwal in three installments.

Gordon, L., 'Mahatma Gandhi's dialogue with Americans', Enonomic and Political, Weekly, Vol. 37 (4), 2002.

G. M. Tartakov, 'Ambedkar Statues', Dalit International Newsletter, vol. 3, no. 2, June 1998.

G. Omvedt, 'Development of the Maharashtrian Class structures, 1818 to 1931' EPW, Special Number, Aug. 1973.

Henningham, S; "The social setting of the Champaran satyagraha: the challenge of an alien rule, Indian economic and social history review, vol. 13 (1), 1976.

Hindu, September 26th, 1932.

Jha, Sadan, 'Charkha, "dear forgotten friend", of widows: reading the erasures of symbols' Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 39 (28), 2004

Janata, Bombay, June 14th 1941.

J.V. Deshpande, 'Behind Daht Anger', Economic and Political Weekly, Aug. 16, 1997.

Janata, Bombay, June 14th, 1941.

Kaushik, P. Datt: Gandhiji and Congress vis-à-vis Untouchables. *AICC Economic Review*, XV (October 1): 27-30, 1963.

Lokrajya Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, special number, 16th April, 1981.

Mother India, :Patrika, October, 1973.

Maya, Magazine, 30th September, 1990.

Morris-Jones, W.H. 'Mahatma Gandhi – political philosopher?', Political Studies, Vol. VIII (1), February, 1960.

M. Yasin, "Hindu Code Bill and Dr Ambedkar', Towards Secular India, 2 (1), Jan-March 1996.

M. G. Bhagat, 'The Untouchable classes of Maharashtra',Journal of the University of Bombay, 4 (1) ,July 1935.

Navabharat Times, 7th January, 1990.

Nauriya, Anil: 'Gandhi's Little-Known Critique of Varna'; Economic and Political Weekly, May 13-19, Vol. XLI No19, 2006.

O. Herrenschmidt, "L' inegalite graduee" ou la Pire des inegalites. L' analyse de la societe hindoue par Ambedkar', Archives europeennes de sociologie, 37 (1997).

Paschimbangh, Gandhi Sankha, (Bengali), Tattha o Sanskriti Bibhag, Paschimbangh Sarkar, 1995.

P. Kumar, 'Dalits and the BSP in Uttar Pradesh-issues and challenges', Economic and Political Weekly, April 3, 1999.

P. Constable, 'Early Dalit Literature and Culture in late nineteenth-and early

twentieth-century Western India', Modern Asian Studies, 31 (2), 1997.

R. Tucker, 'The Early Setting of the non-Brahmin movement in Maharashtra', Indian Historical Review July. 1980-Jan. 1981, 1981, vol. 2, nos. 1-2

R. J. Miller, "They will not die Hindus": the Buddhist conversion of Mahar ex-untouchables', Asian Survey, 2 (9), Sept. 1967.

S. Palshikar, 'Gandhi-Ambedkar Interface.. When shall the Twain Meet? EPW, 3 August 1996.

------'Gandhi and Ambedkar', EPW, July 26, 1997.

Sukumar Muralidharan,'New writings on Ambedkar', Seminar, 425, Jan. 1995.

S. M. Gaikwad,'Ambedkar and Indian nationalism', Economic and Political Weekly, March 7, 1998.

S. Bandyopadhyay, 'Transfer of power and the crisis of Dalit politics in India, 1945-47', Modern Asian Studies, 34 (4),2000.

S. Cohen, 'The Untouchable Soldier: Caste, Politics and the Indian Army', journal of Asian Studies, 28 (3), 1969.

The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies, Published by the Institute of Historical Studies, Kolkata. pp 28-40, Vol.XLIII, Oct. 2003 to March 2004, Nos. 3 and 4.

The Times of India, 14th February, 1938; 30th November, 1935; 16th January, 1919; 19th December, 1939; 15th November, 1956; 11th June, 1936; 22nd July, 1946; 25th April, 1948; and 21st January, 1956.

The Harijan, weekly, 11th July, 1936; 18th July 1936; and 20th February, 1933.

The Untouchables letter to the Sapru Committee, published by Jai Bheem Publishing House, Vepary, Madas, 14th April, 1945.

The Hindustan Times. New Delhi Edition, October 16, 1996. Indian Express. New Delhi Edition, May 19, 1994. August 10, 1994 and October 13, 1996.

The Tribune. Chandigarh, Saturday plus, August 5, 1995. Madhu Spres Nightmare.

The Week dated January 22, 1995; Article on: Savage Swamis, They Eat Human Flesh, pp. 36-42.

The Week dated January 21, 1996. Article on Salvation Through Sex, pp. 12-15.

The Week dated December 27, 1992. Article by Kamala Das. India Today June 15, 1994. Article on Sex: Playing Mixed Doubles.

The Week April 16, 1995. p. 16, The Kunal Discoveries, Published by Grom Manorama Building, Panampally Nagar, Kochi.

The Illustrated Weekly of India, November 5, 1989. Sarita (Hindi fortnightly), Delhi Press Group of Magazines, New Delhi.

Vidhu Verma, 'Colonialism and Liberation: Ambedkar's Quest for Distributive Justice', EPW Sept. 25, 1999.

V. Rodrigues, 'Making_a Tradition Critical: Ambedkar's Reading of Buddhism' in P. Robb (ed.), Dalit Movements and the Meanings of Labour in India, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Women's Era (English) April 1997 Issue and Women's Era February 1998 (Second).

Yasin, Dr. (Mrs.) Madhavi: 'Hindu Code Bill and B.R.Ambedkar', The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies, Published by the Institute of Historical Studies, Kolkata. pp 28-40, Vol.XLIII, Oct. 2003 to March 2004, Nos. 3 and 4.

Young India, 20th October, 1920.

E. Proceedings, Debates and Governmental Publications

5th Despatch of Govt. of India, dated 23rd April, 1919 on the report of South Borough Committee on Franchise.

Proceedings of the Indian Round Table Conference (First and Second sessions), 1930-1931, 1931-1932.

Indian Round Table Conference (Second Session): Proceedings of Federal Structure Committee and Minorities Committee, Vol. I, pp. 543-4.

Indian Round Table Conference (Second Session): Proceedings of Federal Structure Committee and Minorities Committee, Vol. I, pp. 387-9.

Indian Round Table Conference (Second Session): Proceedings of Federal Structure Committee and Minorities Committee, Vol. I, pp. 425-9.

Federal structure committee and minorities committee proceedings.

Minority pact aII special claims of depressed classes A-E.

The text of communal award, 1932.

Gazetteer of India, Vol. II.

Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. VIII &: XI.

Indian Information, 1st January, 1943. (Govt. of India).

A.I.C.C's resolution, May 1923, Bombay.

Proceedings of the Session, SCF, 9th January, 1944.

Manifesto of SCF election and manifesto of the RPI.

F. Published Papers and Speeches of Dr Ambedkar

On Parliamentary Democracy, Hon. Secretary, Poona District, Law Library, Poona, 1952.

Future of Parliamentary Democracy, Speech on 28th October,.1951 in DA V College, Jullunder city.

Prospects of Parliamentary Democracy in India, Talk for B.B.C. London, 20th May, 1956.

Memorandum submitted to the minorities committee of RTC dated 12th November, 1930, which obtained a scheme of political safeguards for the protection of Depressed Classes in the future constitution of a self-governing India.

Ambedkar's statement on Cripp's proposals, April, 1942.

Ambedkar's speech, Bombay, 19th April, 1942.

Ambedkar's speech, Bombay, 30th April, 1944.

Ambedkar's speech delivered at Madras Municipal Corporation, 22 September, 1944.

Memorandum placed before the Cabinet Mission, New Delhi, 5th April, 1946.

Conditions precedent to the successful working of parliamentary democracy in India, by B.V. Ghote, Poona, 1953.

Ambedkar's letters to Gaikwad.

G. Secondary Books

Andre, Betrille; *Caste Old and New*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay 1969.

Athalya, D.V; *The Life of Lokamanya Tilok*, Bombay, 1921.

Ahluwalia, B.K. and Aluwalia, Shashi; *B.R. Ambedkar and Human Rights*. 1981.

Agarwal, L.B; *Harijans in Rebellion,* Taraporewala Sons & Co. (P) Ltd., Bombay, 1934.

Amin, Shahid, *'Gandhi as Mahatm' ;* Gorakhpur district, eastern UP, 1921-2', in Ranajit Guha (ed.), Subaltern Studies: writings on South Asian Studies, Vol. III, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1984.

Agarwal, Sudarshan (ed.); *"Dr.B.R.Ambedkar: The man and his Message",* Prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi, 1991.

Ahir, D.C., *Legacy of Dr. Ambedkar*, B.R.Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 1990.

Andrews, C.F; *Mahatma Gandhi's ideas*, Macmillan and Co., New York, 1930.

Stanley, A. and Walport; *Tilak and Gokhale*, California, 1962.

Buhler, George; *The Laws of Manu: Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. 25. Motilal Banarsi Dass Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Delhi, Reprint 1993.

Buhler, George: *The Sacred. Lawsof the Aryans, sacred Books of the East* Part I & II, Vol. 2 & 14 Moti Lal Banarsi Dass Pvt. Ltd. Delhi. Reprint 1991and 1992.

B.S. Sharma; *Gandhi as a Political Thinker*, Allahabad, Indian Press, 1956.

Balgangadhar Tilak; *His Speeches and Writings*, Madras. 1918.

Bhupendranath Datta; *Swami Vivekananda*; *Patriot Prophet*, Calcutta, Nabhabharat Publishers, 1954.

B.R Nanda; *Gokhale*, New Delhi. Oxford University, 1977.

Bhana, Surendra and Goolam, Vahed; *The Making of a Political Reformer: Gandhi and South Africa, 1893-1914*, Manohar, New Delhi, 2005.

Bhattacharya, Sabyasachi (ed. And complied); *The Mahatma and the Poet: letters and debates between Gandhi and Tagore, 1915-1941*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1997.

Bhattacharya, Buddhadeva; *Evolution of the Political Philosophy of Gandhi*, Calcutta Book House, Calcutta, 1969.

Birla, G.D; *In the Shadow of Mahatma: a personal memoir*, Orient Longman, Calcutta, 1964

Bondurant, Joan V; *Conquest of Violence: the Gandhian philosophy of conflict*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1958, also University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969 (revised edition)

Bose, Nirmal Kumar; *My Days with Gandhi*, Orient Longman, Calcutta, 1974.

Brown, Judith; *'The Mahatma and modern India'*, Modern Asian Studies, Vol. 3 (4), 1969

Brown, Judith; *Gandhi's Rise to power Indian politics, 1915-1922*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972.

Brown, Judith; *Gandhi and Civil Disobedience: the Mahatma in Indian politics*, 1928-1934, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977.

Brown, Judith; *Gandhi: prisoner of hope*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1990.

Bal, G.S. (ed.); *"Understanding Ambedkar"*, Ajanta Books International, Delhi, 2000.

Bose, Nirmal Kumar; *Studies in Gandhism*, Indian Associated Publishing Co. Calcutta, 1940.

Bapuji, B.R. (English translation); *For the solution of the 'Caste' question Buddha is not enough Ambedkar is not enough either Marx is a Must*; Telugu Original by Ranganayakamma, Sweet Home Publications, Hyderabad,2001.

Basham, A.L; *The Wonder that was India*, Rupa and Co., Calcutta, 1971.

Bhagwan Das; *Thus Spoke Ambedkar* (selected speeches), Bhim Patrika Publications, Jullunder, 1963.

Brown Mackenzie, D; *Indian Political Thought from Ranade to Gandhi*, Jaico Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1972.

Bandhopadhaya, J; *Social & Political Thought of Gandhi*, Allied Publications, 'Bombay, 1969.

Bhagwan, Das; *Thus Spoke Ambedkar*, (Selected Speeches), Bhim Patrika Publications, Jullunder, 1963.

Bhattacharya, J.N; *Hindu Castes and Sects*, First published in 1896, reprinted in 1970, By editions India, Calcutta.

Bhatt, Anil; *Caste, Class and Politics*, Manohar Book Service, New Delhi, 1975.

Chatterjee, Margaret; *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, Macmillan, London, 1983.

Chatterjee, Partha; *'Gandhi and critique of civil soci*ety', Ranjit Guha (ed.), Subaltern Studies: writings on South Asian Studies, Vol. III, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1984.

Channa, V.C; Hinduism, 1984, National Publishing House, New Delhi.

Christophe Jaffrelot; *Dr. Ambedkar and Untouchability Analysing and Fighting Caste (*Paperback*)*; Published by Orient, Delhi, 2005.

Chanchreek, K.L.*; "Dr. B.R. Ambedkar (1891-1991): Economic Writings*", H.K.Publications, New Delhi, 1992.

Chavan Sheshrao; *Gandhi and Ambedkar: Saviours of Untouchables*", Authors Press, Delhi,2001.

Collected works of Mahatma Jotirao Phule, vol. 2, Bombay: Govt. of Maharashtra, 1991.

Chouvye, G.S; *Caste and Class India*, Popular Book Depot, Bombay, II Ed, 1957.

Desai, A.R; *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1966.

Dubois, J.A Abee; (Tr. Hindu Manners, Customs and by Beechamp), Ceremonies,

Oxford Publications, London, 1906.

Dutta, Rajani Palme, *India Today* (second revised Indian edition), Peoples Publishing house, Bombay, 1949.

Dayanand Swami; *Satyartha Prakash* Translation into Light of Truth' by Chiranjiva Bharadwaja), Allahabad, The Star Press, 1906.

Dalton, Dennis; *Non-violence in Action: Gandhi's power*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1998.

Dasgupta, Ajit K; *Gandhi's Economic Thought*, Routledge, London and New York, 1996.

Dahlquist, Allan; Megasthenes and Indian Religion. Reprint 1977. Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi.

Dayananda Saraswati Swami; *Light of Truth*, (English translation of Satyarth Prakash, December 1972 Edition. Jan Gyan Prakashan, New Delhi.

Dhananjay, Keer; *Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission,* 1990. Popular Prakashan Pvt. Ltd. Bombay.

Desai Mahadev- *The Diary of Mahadao Desai* (Translated from the Gujrati and edited by Valji Govinji Desai.) Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1953.

D.R.Jatava; *The Political Philosophy of Dr.Ambedkar*, Pheonix Publishing House, Agra, 1965.

Dr.P.Malyadari; *B.R.Ambedkar His Relevance Today* (ed.) O.S.Narayan Rgo, Somasekhar, K. Audiseshaish, New Delhi Asian Publishing House, 1994.

Dr.S.S.Shashi, (ed.); *Ambedkar and Social Justice*, Government of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 1992.

Dumont Louis; *Homo Hierarchicus, The Caste System and its Implications,* Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1988.

Erikson, E; Gandhi's truth on the origins of militant non-violence, Faber and Faber, New York, 1670

Fisher, Louis; *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, Harper and Row, New York, 1981

Fisher, Louis; *Gandhi, his life and message for the world*, New Americal Library, New York, 1982.

Fox, Richard; *Gandhian Utopia: experiments with culture*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1989. (43), 2003

Gier Nicholas; *'Gandhi, Ahimsa and self,* Gandhi Marg, Vol. 15 (1), 1993

Gier Nicholas, *'Gandhi, pre-modern, modern or post-modern?'* Gandhi Marg, Vol. 18 (3), 1996

Gore, M.S; The Social Context of an Ideology: Ambedkar's political and social thoughts, sage, New Delhi, 1993.

Gandhi or Ambedkar. Foreword by Radhakrishnann. Madras: Gandhi Era Publications, 1945.

Gajendragadhkar, P.B; *The Hindu Code Bill* No. 2, Karnataka University Publication, Dharwar, 1951

Ghurye G.S; *Caste and Class in India*, Popular Book Depot, Bombay, 1957.

Griffith, Ralph T.H.; *Hymns of the Rig Veda.* Vol. I and II, 1987. Munshi Ram Manohar Lal Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.

Glomey, Bolton;*The Tragedy of Gandhi*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1944.

Ganguli,Nalin Chandra; *Raja Rammohon Roy*, Calcutta , Y.M.C. A, 1934.

Gore, M.S; *Non-Brahmin Movement in Maharashtra*, New Delhi: Segment Books, 1989.

Haskar, Vinit; Rights, Communities and Disobedience: liberalism and Gandhi, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2001.

Herdiman, David; Gandhi in His Time and Ours, Permanent Black, New Delhi, 2003.

Horsburgh, H.J.N; Non-violence and Aggression: a study of Gandhi's moral equivalent of war. Oxford University Press, London, 1968.

Heimasath, CH.; Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, Princeton (New Jersey), 1964

Haridas T. Muzumdar; *Mahatma Gandhi-Peaceful Revolutionary*, London, Charles Scribner's, 1952.

Iqbal Singh; Raja Rammohan Roy - Life, Writings and Speeches, New Delhi, Asia Publishing House

Issac, Harold, R.; *India's Ex-Untouchables*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1965

Iyer, Raghavan, N; *The Moral and Political Thought of mahatma Gandhi*, Oxford university Press, Delhi, 1973.

Iyer Raghavan (ed.); *The Moral and Political writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, Clarendon Press Oxford, Vols 1 and 2, 1986 and Vol. 3, 1987.

Juergensmeyer, Mark; *Fighting with Gandhi*, Harper and Row, San Francisco, 1984.

Jatava, D.R; *Social Philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar*, Rawat Publication, Jaipur, 1997.

Jatava, D.R; *Political Philosophy of Dr. Ambedkar*, Malik & Co., Jaipur, 2001.

Jatava, D.R; *Ambedkar and Humanism*, ABD Publishers, Jaipur, 1999.

Jatava, D.R; *The Ideas of Humanist Culture*, Malik & Co., Jaipur, 2001.

Jatava, D.R; *The Humanism of Buddha*, Enashri Publishers, Jaipur, 1998.

Jatava, D.R; *Human Resources for Self and Social Development* , ABD Publishers, Jaipur, 2001.

Jatava, D.R; *The Social Philosophy of B.R. Ambedkar*, Phoenix Publishing House, Agra, 1965.

Jatava, D.R.; *The Political Philosophy of Dr. Ambedkar,* Phoenix Publishing House, Agra, 1965.

Keel, Dhananjay; *Dr. Ambedkar-Life and Mission*, Popular Publication, Bombay, 1962.

Keith, A.B; *Constitutional History of India (1600-1935),* Methuen & Co., Ltd., London, 1926.

Ketkar, S.V.; *The History of Caste in India*, Taylor and Carpenter Ithaca, New York, 1909.

K.R.Kamaji; *Political Thought of Dr.Ambedkar*, New Delhi, Intellectual Publishing House, 1992.

Kothari, Rajni, ed.; *Caste in Indian Politics*, Orient Longman, 2001.

Karunakaran, K.P; New Perspectives on Gandhi, Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Shimla, 1969

Kripalani, Krishna; *Gandhi: a life,* National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1968.

Kumar, R; *Essays on Gandhian Politics*: the Rowlatt Satyagraha of 1919, Clarendon Press Oxford, 1971.

Kuber, W. N; B. R. Ambedkar, New Delhi: Govt. of India, 1978.

Kadam, K. N; *Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar and the significance of his movement*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1991.

Kadam, K. N (ed.); *Dr. B. R. Ambedkar-Emancipator of the Oppressed*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1993.

Keer, D; *Mahatma Jotirao Phule-Father of Indian Social Revolution*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1974.

Lal,Shyam and Saxena K. S. ;(eds); Ambedkar and Nation-Building, Jaipur: Rawat,1998.

Mahar J. Michael; *The Untouchables in Contemporary India,* Rawat Publications, New Delhi, 1998.

Mathur, R.Mohan; *Dr. Ambedkar: Jivan and Darshan*, Kitab Ghar, New Delhi, 1990.

Markovits, Claude; *The Un-Gandhian Gandhi: the life and afterlife of the Mahatma*, Permanent Black, New Delhi, 2003.

Mukherjee Hiren, *Gandhi; A study,* People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1991 (reprint)

Mukherjee Subrata and Sushila Ramaswsamy (eds); *Economic and social Principles* of Mahatma Gandhi, Deep & Deep, New Delhi, 1998.

Mukherjee, Subrata and Sushila Ramaswsamy (eds); *Political ideas Mahatma Gandhi*, Deep & Deep, New Delhi, 1998.

Moon, Vasant. (ed.)- *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Vols. 1-15*, published by the Education Department, Government of Maharastra for Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication Committee, Bombay,1987-1997.

Munshi, K.M; *Indian Constitutional Documents*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1967.

Mitra, Asok; *Caste and Class in Indian Society*, The Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1995.

Max Muller; F; *Rammohan to Ramakrishna*, Susil Gupta Ltd., Calcutta, 1952.

Max Muller; F (ed.); *Laws of Manu* (Tr.by G. Buhler), Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1964.

Namboodiripad, E.M.S; *The Mahatma and the Ism*, People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1959.

Nanda, B.R; *Gandhi and His Critics*, Oxford University Press Delhi, 1985.

Nanda, B.R; *Mahatma Gandhi*: 125 years, New Age International Publishers, New Delhi, 1995.

Nanda, B.R; *Mahatma Gandhi* , Oxford University Press Delhi, 1996 (reprint)

Nanda, B.R; *In search of Gandhi: essay and reflections*, Oxford University Press Delhi, 2004.

Narayan, R.K; *Waiting for the Mahatma*, Indian Thought Publications, Chennai, 2003 (reprint)

Nehru, Jawaharlal; *The Discovery of India*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1966.

Narain, J.P; *Socialism Sarvodaya and Democracy*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1964.

Nair, L.P; *The Protection of Minorities*, Christopher's, London, 1928.

Nanda, B.R; *Gokhale, Gandhi, Nehru*, George Allen Publishing House, London, 1974.

Orwell, G; 'Reflections *on Gandhi'*. Partisan Review, 16 January, 1949.

Omvedt, G; *Cultural Revolt in a Colonial Society: the Non-Brahmin Movement in Western India,* Poona: Scientific Socialist Education Trust, 1976.

Pantham, Thomas; *'Thinking with Mahatma Gandhi*: beyond liberal democracy', Political Theory, Vol., 11 (2), 1983.

Pantham, Thomas; *'Gandhi: swaraj, sarvadaya dn satyaraha'*, in Thomaas Pantham, Political Theories and social Reconstruction; a critical survey of the literature on India, sage, New Delhi, 1995

Pantham, Thomas and Kenneth L. Deutsch; *Political Thought in Modern India*, Sage, New Delhi, 1986.

Parekh, Bhikhu; *Gandhi's Political Philosophy*: a critical appreciation, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN, 1989.
Parekh, Bhikhu; *Gandhi*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1997.
Parekh, Bhikhu; *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: an analysis of Gandhi's political* discourse, sage, New Delhi, 1999.

Parel, Anthony J. (ed.); *Gandhi, Freedom and Self-Rule*, Vistaar, New Delhi, 2000

Pouchepadas, Jacques; *Champaran and Gandhi: Planters, peasants and Gandhian politics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1999

Pyarelal; *Mahatma Gandhi, the Early Phase*, 2 Vols., Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1956 and 1958.

Pimpulkar, R.N.; *Dr. Ambedkar*, Bombay, 1957.

Pyarelal; *The Epic Fast*, Ahmedabad: Mohanlal Maganlal Bhatt, 1932.

Phule, J; *Slavery: Collected works of Mahatma Jotirao Phule*, vol. 1, Bombay: Govt. of Maharashtra, 1991.

Parmeswaran, P; *Narayan Guru, The Prophet of Renaissance*, New Delhi: Suruchi Sahitya,1979.

Radhakrishanan, Sarvepalli (ed.); *Mahatma Gandhi*: essays and reflections, Jaico, Mumbai, 2003 (reprint)

Richards, G; *The Philosophy of Gandhi*: a study of his basic ideas, Curzon Press, Surrey, 1982.
Rodrigues, Valerian (ed.); *The Essential Writings of B.R. Ambedkar*, Oxford University Press New Delhi, 2004.
Rolland Romain; *Mahatma Gandhi*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1924.
Roy, Ramashray; *Self and Society: A Study of Gandhian Thought*, Sage, New Delhi, 1985.
Rajagopalachari, C.; *Ambedkar Refuted*, Hind Kitab, Bombay, 1946.

Ray, B; (ed); Gandhi's Campaign against Untouchability, 1933-34-An account from the Raj's secret official reports, New Delhi: Gandhi peace Foundation, 1996.

Ranadive, B.T; *Caste, Class & Property Relation*, National Book Agency, 1991.

Roy, Binoy Gopal ; *Gandhian Ethics*, Ahmedabad, 1950.

Ray, Rammohan; *Life, Writings and Speeches*, Madras, G.A Natesan and Campany, 1925.

Rai, Lala Lajpat Rai; *The Arya Samqj*, London, Longman's Green and Co., 1915.

Shourie, A; *Worshipping False Gods*: *Ambedkar* and the Facts which have been Erased, New Delhi: ASA, 1997.

Sharma, K.K; *Life and Time of Lala Lajpat Rai*, Ambala, India Book Agency, 1975.

Sharma, R.S; *Shudras in Ancient India*, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1958.

Srinivas, M.N; *Caste in Modern India and other Essays*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1962.

Shahare, M.L; *Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar, His Life and Work*, NCERT, Delhi, 1986.

Shastri Sen, Dr. Muralimohan; *Manu Sanghita*, Dipali Book House, Calcutta, 1994.

Shastri, Shakuntala Rao; *Women in the Sacred Laws*, 1959,Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chaupatty, Mumbai.

Shastri, Shakuntala Rao; *Women in The Vedic Age*, 1960, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chaupatty, Mumbai.

Surendra, Kumar Dr; *The Manu Smriti* (Hindi), Arsh Sahitya Prachar Trust, Delhi.

Sethi, J.D; *Gandhi Today*, Carolina Academic Press, Durham, 1978.

Sanjana, J.E.; *Caste and Outcaste*,Thacker and Co. Ltd., Bombay, 1946.

Senart, E.; *Caste in India*, Methun and Co. Ltd., London, 1929.

Tagore, Rabindranath; *Mahatmaji and the Depressed Humanity*, Shantiniketan Viswabharati, Calcutta, 1932

Tahmankar; D.V; *Tilak, Father of Indian Unrest and Maker of Modem India*, London, 1956.

Tiwari, Chitra; *Sudras in Manu*, 1963, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi.

Tendulkar, D.G; *Mahatma: the life of Mohondas Karamchand Gandhi*, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1961.

Terchek Ronald J; *Gandhi: struggling for autonomy*, Vistaar, New Delhi, 1998.

The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CW), Original or Standard edition, Vols: 1-100, published by the Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi,1958-1994.

Vivekananda, Swami. *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*, Volume II, First Sabsidised Edition, 1989, Pithorgarh, Himalayas.

Vivekananda, Swami. *Selections from the Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda.*,

June 1986, Kolkata.

Venkatraman, S.R.; *Harijan through Ages,* Bharatidevi Publications, Madras, 1946.

Veerendra Grover,(ed.); *B.R.Ambedkar*, Deep and Deep Publication, New Delhi, 1993.

Varma, V.P; *Modern Indian Political Thought*, Laxminarain Agarwal, Agra, 1971.

V.C. Joshi (Ed.); Writings and Speeches of Lala Lajpat Rai, Delhi University Publications, 1966. (Ed.), Autobiographical Writings of Lala Lajpat Rai, Delhi, 1965.

Vivekananda, Swami; *Complete Works*, Calcutta, Advaita Ashrama, Practical Vedanta, Calcutta, Advaita Ashmma, 1958.

W.N.Kuber; *B.R.Ambedkar,* New Delhi, Publication Division, Govt. of India, 1978.

Weber, Thomas; *Conflict Resolution and Gandhian Ethics*, The Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1991.

Yadav, K. C; (ed.), *From Periphery to Centre Stage. Ambedkar, Ambedkarism and Dalit Future*, Delhi: Manohar, 2000.

Zaidi, A. Main & Shaheda eds.;*Encyclopaedia* of Indian National Congress, vols. 1-18, New Delhi, S. Chand, 1976.

Zaidi, A. M; *Communal Award*, New Delhi, S. Chand, 1978.

Zeaneth, Robbin; *Dr. Ambedkar and His Movement*, Ambedkar Publication Society, Hyderabad, 1948.

Zelliot, E; From *Untouchable to Dalit. Essays on the Ambedkar Movement*, Delhi: Manohar, 1992.