A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CASTE BEHAVIOUR BY GANDHI VS AMBEDKAR

Om Prakash Gupta[1], Sandeep Kumar Gupta[2]

[1]*Mahatma Gandhi Central University, Motihari, India*
[2]*Ph.D. (B.H.U.), FDP (IIM, Indore), ADP (Wharton School, USA) QIP (IIT BHU), AMET Business School, AMET University, Chennai, India, e-mail: skguptabhu@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2670-2858*

Abstract. The ideas and views of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste and Untouchability were opposite to each other. The purpose of the article is to study and compare the main ideas and views of Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the issue of caste and untouchability were opposite. In the process of research, the methods of historical analysis, synthesis and generalization, as well as comparative analysis were used, which contributed to the achievement of the set goal. Gandhiji was a staunch follower of the Caste Institution whereas Arnbedkar was completely anti-Caste. The social philosophy of Gandhiji was built up upon the norms of the Caste System, the Vamashram Dharma and the Hindu religion whereas Arnbedkar made his social philosophy based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. Therefore, it can be pointed out that Gandhi 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.
Keywords: Caste system, Social Justice, Human rights.
JEL Classification: Y70, Y80
Formulas: 0; fig.: 0; tabl.: 0; bibl.: 40

Introduction. The ideas and views of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste and Untouchability were opposite to each other. Gandhiji was a staunch follower of the Caste Institution where s Ambedkar was completely anti-Caste. The social philosophy of Gandhiji was built up upon the norms of the Caste System, the Vamashram Dharma and the Hindu religion whereas Ambedkar made his social philosophy based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. He said, that a Vama of a person should be determined not by his birth but by his merits whereas Gandhiji emphasized the birth criterion in this context. The occupation of a person was decided by the principle of hereditary professions of his forefathers. Gandhiji emphasized the tradition of heredity in this contest. Gandhi favoured the concept of caste whereas Ambedkar was completely anti-Caste and built up an antiCaste thesis and strongly demanded the eradication of the Caste Institution. But Gandhiji was completely unwilling to attack politically the Caste System. Ambedkar raised their voice to annihilate this Institution. So he made up his mind to launch a direct anti-Caste movement. 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.

Literature review. The term 'caste' is not an Indian word. This term is derived from the Portuguese word "Caste". The Portuguese used the word "Caste" 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 Hindu society when they first arrived in India. But this word is founded particularly on race. The Indian word 'Jati' has corresponded with the word caste equivalent to the Latin gens and Greek yevos, 'race or nation'. Even the Indian words Varna, Jati etc. gradually rendered 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 which means pure. The Portuguese ordinarily used the term caste to identify the Indian social classification as they thought that the mechanism in the caste system was intended to preserve the purity of blood. Therefore, there is no satisfactory definition possible to define the 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 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. 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". According to Sir E.A. Gait, 'the main characteristics of a caste are the belief in a common on gm 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. 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 community. 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 inexorable social law to marry outside the group. But different scholars have formulated several 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 the Indological, socio-anthropological and sociological points 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:

Aims. The purpose of the article is to study and compare the main ideas and views of Gandhiji and Ambedkar on the issue of caste and untouchability were opposite.

Methods. In the process of research, the methods of historical analysis, synthesis and generalization, as well as comparative analysis were used, which contributed to the achievement of the set goal.

Results. We propose to investigate the main theories of castes, namely:
- 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;
- Theory of Ambedkar towards Caste Philosophy.

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 gained wide circulation in the Dharmasastras and the Puranas. Manu, an ancient lawmaker has established it without questioning and cited it as an authoritative pronouncement on this subject. Besides, the status and role of different caste 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 noted that the four castes 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 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. 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.

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. 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. It has been 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 have 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 caste groups henceforth more or less are going to determine only by the 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.

Brahmanical Theory of Caste. According to. 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 benefit of Brahmins. The Brahmins created a mechanism for imposing severe restrictions to preserve their purity on the issue of social restrictions, marriage, eating, drinking etc. with the non-Brahmins. Their main motto of them was to satisfy their desire and to perform pure sacerdotal functions at their whims. 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. 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 role played by the Brahmins, as Abbe Dubois has done. Racial, religious, economic and other factors must have been responsible for creating the institution of the caste system.

Racial Theory **of** *Caste.* Herbert Risley was an ardent exponent of the theory of caste. Eminent scholars likeWestermarck, 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. 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 Tiage to them. But complete amalgamation between the conqueror and conquered groups was possible if these two opposition groups belonged to the same race or the 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 relationship 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 a superior race to the original inhabitants of 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 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 society and were called the chandals.

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 practising the same occupation of their forefathers over a long period. That is why; the occupational guilds came into existence and ultimately came to be known as castes. The feeling of superiority and inferiority in occupations gave birth to the creation of a hierarchy in the caste system. It depends completely upon the rank, position and culture of any caste as high or low in the Hindu.

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 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 are

involved in a struggle with each other due to their conflicting attitude relating to their boundary disputes or the girl kidnapping mentality of the opposite group. Therefore, the people of a particular tribal group always try to avoid making relations with another tribal group beyond their circle relating to marriage, social relations etc. They confined themselves to interaction in all respect with the members of their tribes. Ketkar said about the origin of various features of castes is because each feature 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, the ascendancy of the priests and their exclusiveness have their origin, an association of purity and impurity to various objects also has its origin.

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 the 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 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 about 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 ones. He finds out about certain similarities between 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. Gotra is an exogamous group in India; gens in Rome and phratria in Greece which confined their marriages to their groups. Even the Brahmins of India and the Patricians of Rome enjoyed the hypergamous rights of marriage. A 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 lndia can be compared with the 'interdict acquaet igni' custom in Rome 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 the caste system did not exist in the Vedic age. He 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.

Theory of Gandhian Caste Philosophy. Gandhi's thoughts and beliefs in Vamashrama 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 Vamashrama Dharma and the 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 Vamashrama

Dharma was an integral part of Hinduism. He identified himself as a 'Sanatanic Hindu' all through his life and explained why he called himself 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 Vamashrama 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 the Caste system. He believed in the hereditary birth circle of man. He advocated the hereditary Vama system and pointed out that the 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 Institutions. His attitudes towards the issues of Caste and untouchability were very much discouraging and self-contradictory. He said that inter-dining and intermarriage were matters of individual choice. Despite his unwillingness, Gandhiji was forced to allow untouchables to enter Hindu Temples. Gandhiji discouraged the inclusion of Mr. Agnibhoj who was untouchable in the Ministry of Dr. Khare. But Dr. Khare 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. Not only that but also Gandhiji noted the untouchable's problem as the moral stigma that would be removed by the acts of atonements whereas Ambedkar gave importance to implementing 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 a political problem that was 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 planning a campaign to win Swaraj and that he had no time to spare for the cause of the untouchables. But Gandhiji changed his attitude later on towards the issues of the untouchables and propagated untouchability as evil in 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 ironic fate that Gandhiji never used the weapon of Satyagraha against the so-called Hindus to get them to throw open wells, ponds and temples at the untouchables. He believed in social democracy. He fought for the sake of humanity. He stressed social reform rather than political reform. He said that socialists would have to fight against the monster of Caste institutions either before or after the revolution.

Theory of Ambedkar towards Caste Philosophy. Ambedkar was a symbol of revolt against all the oppressive features of 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 socioeconomic injustice. He emerged as a constructive social reformer and legal philosopher in India. His social philosophy relating to caste may be discussed in 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 Columbia University, New York, the 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 the ages. He vividly noted the mysteries of caste differently 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, the Indian caste would become a world problem. 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 way. Ambedkar said that all these definitions of 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 generally originated in priestly ceremonialism to maintain purity. Priest and purity had old associates. Naturally, the relationship 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 among its members. Risley made no new comments on the issue of Caste. Ketkar, a native scholar defined Caste and paid due attention only to those characteristics that were needed for the existence of a Caste system by excluding the all-secondary features of it. He emphasized two important features of Caste, i. e. prohibition of inter-marriage and membership by autogency. However, it was nothing but two aspects of the same thing. It was not at all two different things noted by Ketkar. The prohibition of intermarriage restricted the limited membership to those people who were born within the group. Ambedkar 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 based on 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 the viewing of 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 abstained from fusing into another through the norms of endogamy. Therefore, endogamy was the only peculiar feature of 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 concerned. He 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.

The matrimonial alliance was completely based on the principles of exogamy. Therefore, it can be said that Sapindas (blood kins) could not marry and marriage even between the Sagotras (same class) was identified as a sacrilege. But the concept of endogamy was an imported custom to the people of India. Exogamous has prevailed among the different Gotras in India. Even the totemic organization was connected with this social custom and it (exogamous) ultimately became a creed. Despite 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 those who were violating the norms of exogamy rather than endogamy. Exogamy meant fusion and there could be no Caste if exogamy 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 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. The superposition of endogamy on exogamy hastened the process of the creation of the Caste system. It can be noted that exogamy was the rule of all matrimonial relations before the introduction of endogamy. It was a normal trend for all groups for making 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 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 the

equality of such a 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 centred 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 have happened in rare cases. If the husband has died before the wife, a woman must become surplus in society. That is why; an arrangement was made of disposing of this surplus woman either through intermarriage or she violates the norms of endogamy of the group. In the same manner, if the husband survived after the death of his wife, either he might be a surplus whom the group had to dispose of through the arrangement of re-marriage within the group or he had a 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 give birth to the offspring beyond the Caste circle. Ambedkar proposed a scheme to dispose of the surplus woman into 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 of 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 for a deceased woman on the part of 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 cases. The surplus woman 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 Caste. Naturally, a widow could take part in the competition for re-marriage that must be reserved for the potential brides in the Caste. The existence of a widow might create a menace in any case and the same thing must be done to her if she would not be barred from her deceased husband. The second remedy was to enforce widowhood on a deceased woman. Ambedkar pointed out that the best solution was to burn a widow than to 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 intact the morals of the group. The woman could live without a doubt in widowhood but it deprived her natural right of being a legitimate wife in future which increased immoral conduct. In this way, the position and condition of a woman were brought down into an 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 the surplus woman in a group to make itself into a Caste. It was well known to all that men had the upper hand in comparison to women as they enjoyed a dominant position in every group.

Discussion. *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, the 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. He was very much convinced by the traditions of Hindu society. He was an ardent follower of the norms and principles of these doctrines. He came forward to protect the socio-religious and economic interests of the privileged classes of Hindu society. Even he explained the inner truthfulness of these doctrines to establish the traditional institutions in perpetuity in Hindu society. Realizing the hard reality of the downtrodden sections of 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 beliefs. 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 pieces of literature 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 a hater of the Hindu religion. Despite 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-PatTodak Mandai 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 society. Ambedkar had already declared to deliver the last speech of his life as a Hindu on this auspicious occasion before leaving Hinduism. He was never puzzled by the decision the cancellation this conference. Rather than realizing the hard reality, Ambedkar

replied to their rejection by publishing his most wanted speech in the form of an article at his own expense.

Conclusion. The ideas and views of Gandhiji and Ambedkar towards the issue of Caste and Untouchability were opposite to each other. Gandhiji was a staunch follower of the Caste Institution whereas Arnbedkar was completely anti-Caste. The social philosophy of Gandhiji was built up upon the norms of the Caste System, the Vamashram Dharma and the Hindu religion whereas Arnbedkar made his social philosophy based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity. He said, that a Vama of a person should be determined not by his birth but by his merits whereas Gandhi emphasized the birth criterion in this context. The occupation of a person was decided by the principle of hereditary professions of his forefathers. Gandhi emphasized the tradition of heredity in this contest. Gandhi favoured the concept of caste whereas Ambedkar was completely anti-Caste and built up an anti-Caste thesis and strongly demanded the eradication of the Caste Institution. But Gandhi was completely unwilling to attack politically the Caste System. Ambedkar raised their 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 social democracy and political democracy in this respect. But Gandhi 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 Gandhi 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.

Author contributions. The authors contributed equally.

Disclosure statement. The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

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 m India, Vol. I, Firma K.L.
4. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1968, p. 1.
5. Ketkar, S. V; History of Caste in India, op. cit., p. 14.
6. Dutta, N.K., Origin and Growth of Caste in India, Vol. I, op. cit., p. 2.
7. Ketkar, S. V; History of Caste in India, op. cit., p. 14.
8. Jha, Ganganath (Translated); Manusmriti, Vol. 7, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Delhi, p. 249.
9. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2005, p. 252.
10. Risley, H.H.; The People of India, W. Thacker & Co. London, 1915, p.
11. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, Rawat Publications, Jaipur, 2005, pp. 254-255.
12. Risley, H.H.; The People of India, op. cit., p. 56.
13. Narmadeshwar Prasad; The Myth of the Caste System, Patna, 1956, p. 25.
14. Leach, E.R.; Aspects of Caste in South India, Ceylon and North-West
15. Pakistan, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960, p. 5.
16. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, op. cit., p. 257.
17. Senart, Emile; Caste in India, op. cit., p. 26.
18. Nesfield; Brief View of the Caste System of the North Western Provinces and Oudh, 1885, p. 88.
19. Majumdar, D.N.; Races and Cultures of India, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1952, p.292.
20. Ketkar, S.V.; History of Caste in India, Ithaca, New York, 1909, p. 18.

21. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, op. cit., p. 264.

22. Senart, Emile; Caste in India, ESS ESS Publications, Delhi, 1975, p., preface-XIV

23. Ahuja, Ram; Indian Social System, op. cit., p. 265.

24. 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.

25. R Venkateswarlu, B. Ram Mohan Rao, "Mahatma Gandhi- The Doctrine of Trusteeship", International Journal of Academic Research, September 2016.

26. Bombay Sarvodaya Mandal, Gandhian Trusteeship as an 'Instrument of Human Dignity, GandhiTopia,

27. Gandhi Journal Article-III (May 2016). Mani Bhavan, "Gandhi's Philosophy- Gandhi 11 Vows".

28. Nina Martyris, "The Most Punctual Man in India", December 02, 2014

29. C.S. Dharmadhikari, "Gandhi's concept of Trusteeship". · Dr Nanduri Aparna Rao, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth", Management minus Jargon,

30. Learning Management & Leadership from the Mahatma. Bal Patil, "Gandhian Concept of Trusteeship: Core is What Matters", Gandhi Etopia, May 1, 2009.

31. Mukul Chaudhri, "Gandhi a Management Guru".

32. Suresh Kr Pramar, "Mahatma Gandhi: The Management Guru", August 17, 2008.

33. Shekhar Kapoor, "Learn Time Management from Mahatma Gandhi", soft skills capsules.

34. Gandhi M., Dandi March Speech (11 March 1930). Retrieved June 24, 2019.

35. Gandhi M., Thomas Merton (2007). "Gandhi on Non-Violence", p.40, New Directions Publishing.

36. Gandhi M., (1967). "Collected Works".

37. Famous quotes of Mahatma Gandhi. Retrieved June 24, 2019

38. Gupta, S. K. & Others (2019). Reinvented of Gandhian thought Sabka Sath and Sabka Vikas, Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, Vol 6(6), p. 87-87.

39. Gupta, S. K. & Others (2019). Mahatma Gandhi: A Role Model in Revolutionary Management, International Journal of Research and Analytical ReviewsVol 6(2), p 993-998.

40. Gupta, S. K. & Others (2019). Social inclusion of untouchables in the economic and social activities of Mahatma Gandhi, Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, Vol 6(6), p. 46-49.