CHAPTER 5

CASTES IN INDIA, THEIR MECHANISM, GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT AND ANNIHILATION OF CASTES.

*Castes in India, their Mechanism, Genesis and Development (1916).*

It is the title of the research paper of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar read on 9th May, 1916 before the Anthropology seminar of Dr. Goldenweigor when he was pursuing his doctoral studies at the Columbia University, New York, U.S.A. In this research paper, he focuses the framework of the castes, its origin and development in India. He traces how the castes are generated, framed and scattered in India. He delves the history of India to find out the system, creation and development of castes which is the part of the Indian society and by which the low castes people are marginalized. This caste system of India divided the Indian society into different castes. It makes the lower caste people the prey of the high caste and the lower caste became the marginalized and exploited by the upper caste. Due to this caste system and its sacred position in the mind of the people, the lower caste suffered a lot and become the victim of the injustice of the upper caste. In the hierarchy of the caste system, the people who are at the bottom are left to lead an insignificant life and become the slaves of the upper caste. Their basic rights are derived by the upper caste and the lower caste is made lifeless.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar in this paper searches the functions, roots and development of the caste system which made the lower caste socially, politically, religiously and psychologically paralyzed. In it, he also focusses the characteristic of the caste, customs by which the caste is preserved and propagated in India. He also discusses the different
theories of the origin of the caste and puts his own novel theory of the origin of the caste. He refuses the theories of others, reveals the fruitlessness and falseness of the theories. He also shows how the customs and the psychology of the people are responsible for the preservation and propagation of the caste system in India. H.C. Sadagni about the research paper says:

Ambedkar’s paper on caste was not a diatribe against the inequities of the caste system but rather an effort to present a theory of the development of the system.¹

He states above that this research paper of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar does not attack on the caste system but in it, he attempts to put a theory of the development of this caste system.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar at the outset of the research paper reveals his interest and curiosity regarding the subject of the caste in India. He states:

I need hardly remind you of the complexity of the subject I intend to handle. Subtler minds and abler pens than mine have been brought to the task of unravelling the mysteries of caste; but unfortunately it still remains in the domain of the “unexplained”, not to say of the “understood”. I am quite alive to the complex intricacies of a hoary institution like caste, but I am not so pessimistic as to relegate it to the region of the unknowable, for I believe it can be known.²

He acknowledges above that the subject which he is going to deal is difficult and obscure. He explains that the intellectuals have tried to solve the riddle of the caste. But unfortunately, the subject ‘caste’ is understood but not explained. They fail to explain the mystery of the caste. This indicates the obscurity and gravity of the subject. He points out that he is aware of this obscurity and difficulty of this antique institution caste. Though, he is aware of the obscurity of the caste, he would unravel the obscurity of the caste. He adds that as he is optimistic,
he would expose it and would not abandon the subject without deciphering it. He is confident to reveal the mystery of the caste.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar exposes that different tribes like Aryan, Dravidians, Mangolians and Scythians came to India in their tribal state. These tribes conflicted with the natives and settled in India. Each tribe arrived to India with their culture. It mentions that peoples of various cultures from various directions arrived to India and settled here. India, at that time, became the house of different cultures. These various types of people of different cultures settled peacefully and started to come in the contact of each other. After a period, they were so involved with each other that later they became the part of one culture. It discloses that the people of different culture later adopted a common culture. Due to the one culture they became the homogeneous people of India. They were affiliated to each other due to one culture. He points out this homogeneity which was developed due to a common culture is the obstacle in the way of unveiling the caste. Due to it, caste became difficult to understand and complex to expose. He states:

If the Hindu society were a mere federation of mutually exclusive units, the matter would be simple enough. But caste is a parcelling of an already homogeneous unit, and the explanation of the genesis of caste is the explanation of this process of parcelling.³

He states above that if the Hindu society were of different groups of castes, it would be easy to describe caste. But he adds that caste is already a division of homogeneous group and the exposition of the origin of caste means the exposition of the process of the division of the homogeneous group. It points out that if we desire to explain the origin of caste, we have to expose the process of the division of the Hindu society.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, before tracing the mechanism, genesis and development of the caste, quotes the definitions of caste by Mr. Senart, Mr. Nasefields, Sir H. Risely and Dr. Ketkar to draw out the nature of the caste. He quotes the definitions one by one as below:

(1) Mr. Senart, a French authority, defines a caste as “a close corporation, in theory at any rate rigorously hereditary: equipped with a certain traditional and independent organisation, 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”.

(2) Mr. Nesfield defines 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”.

(3) According to Sir H. Risely, “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 ancestors, 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) Dr. Ketkar defines caste as “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.”

By quoting these definitions, he asserts that these definitions are insufficient. He points out that these scholars have considered caste as a separate group which is a group within. He adds that these definitions are complementary to each other. He focuses that Mr. Senart, Mr. Nasefield and Dr. Ketkar denote that deny of intermarriage is one of the characteristic of the caste. It displays that these scholars are agree on the point that denying of intermarriages is the common feature of the caste.
He takes this feature as a thread and emphasizes it. This is the crucible point on which his research of the mechanism of the caste is based. He with this point traces the mechanism of the caste. He emphasizes this feature of denying the intermarriage i.e. endogamy. He puts:

\begin{quote}
\textit{caste in India means an artificial chopping off of the population into fixed and definite units, each one prevented from fusing into another through the custom of endogamy. Thus the conclusion is inevitable that Endogamy is the only characteristic that is peculiar to caste, and if we succeed in showing how endogamy is maintained, we shall practically have proved the genesis and also the mechanism of caste.}^{5}
\end{quote}

He asserts above that caste in India is not natural but artificial division of the people. These divisions are fixed and definite. It mentions that there is no flexibility. The people of the one caste are prevented to mix with the people of the other caste by the custom of endogamy. The people are separated from each other due to it. It also indicates that it is stiffed due to endogamy. Endogamy has made the caste unbreakable. Denial of inter-marriage is the obstacle in the way of people’s integration. It concludes that endogamy is the only feature of the caste. He assures that if we are able to expose how the endogamy is preserved, we would trace the origin and framework of the caste. It indicates that if we are able to trace which ways, methods are formed or framed for the preservation of the endogamy, we would invent to the roots of the origin and mechanism of the caste.

He emphasizes that if there had exogamy in the India, there would have no opportunity of caste in India. Exogamy is the custom of inter-marriage. A custom by which the people of one group can form the relations based on weddings with the people of other group. But as endogamy is existed in India, caste is there.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar points out that exogamy i.e. the custom of marrying outside the groups was there in the Primitive society. India was not exception to this. The custom of exogamy was also prevalent in India. But gradually, it was disappeared from the Indian society. He asserts that but completely, it is not out from Indian society, still it is existed in the Indian society. Even today, he points out while matching the marriages, the marriages between Sapindas i.e. blood skins and Sagotras are avoided. These types of marriages are discarded considering them as profane. The marriages between different Sapindas and Sagotras are occured. In this form, he point out, exogamy is existed in India but the endogamy of caste in India is still existed. He writes:

> You will, therefore, readily see that with exogamy as the rule there could be no caste, for exogamy means fusion. But we have castes; consequently in the final analysis creation of castes, so far India is concerned, means the superposition of endogamy on exogamy. However, in an originally exogamous population an easy working out of endogamy (which is equivalent to the creation of caste) is a grave problem, and it is the consideration of the means utilized for the prevention of endogamy against exogamy that we may hope to find the solution of our problem.\(^6\)

He points out above that if there is exogamy; there is no caste because exogamy is the combinations of the different people. In exogamy, there is no room for castes. It indicates that exogamy means the casteless society. If the people pusue the principle of exogamy, if the marriages outside the groups are taken place, the people would come together and they would be fused. He points out that we have castes. Castes are created in India due to the superposition of the endogamy on exogamy. It is the setback to the exogamy by endogamy. In India, the exogamy was existed but it is altered into the endogamy which is responsible for the problem of the caste. He asserts that if we are able to find out the means, the methods which are employed to demolish the
exogamy from India, there is a hope to trace the solution of the caste, its mechanism, genesis and development. This indicates the positivity of him towards the mechanism, genesis and development of the caste.

He further points out that India was the country which had adopted the policy of exogamy. As exogamy that is the custom of marrying outside the group was there, there was no place for castes in India. India was a casteless country. All the people were living with integrity. There was no room for discrimination and marginalization of the people. But latter exogamy was replaced by endogamy. The intermarriages were disallowed. As the intermarriages were disallowed, the process of fusing of the people was ceased. The marriages only in the group was started to occur. The marriage outside the group was started to hinder. The merging of the people of the different groups was ceased due to it. Separate groups began to form by the endogamy. Due to the prevalence of the endogamy, castes commenced to shape in India and India which was casteless country became the country of castes.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar expresses that it is not easy to preserve the custom of endogamy. He refers the instance of an imaginary group to illustrate his point in detail which desires to transform itself into the caste. If the group desires to transform into the caste it has to observe the principle of endogamy. But it is not easy to observe this principle. The group has to face problem to preserve it. It has to take care that the member of their group should not marry outside the group. By observing this principle, it can maintain its caste. Otherwise, it is impossible to preserve the endogamy. He adds that for the preservation of the endogamy, it is also must to maintain the same numbers of marriageable two sexes i.e. male and female. It is essential to provide the conjugal rights of the members of the group to maintain the endogamy. Without
the proper numbers, it is not possible to observe endogamy. He further adds that to secure the endogamy, the group has to maintain the disparity between these two sexes. If the disparity of numbers of sexes is not maintained, there is a fear of collapsing down the system of endogamy. He points out that the nature of maintaining the caste and maintaining the endogamy is same. He asserts:

*The problem of caste, then, ultimately resolves itself into one of repairing the disparity between the marriage units of the two sexes within it.*

He states above that the problem of the caste finally settles into restoring the difference between the two sexes i.e. male and female in the marriage group.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar points out that the imbalance numbers of the two marriageable sexes will create the harm to the endogamy. If the balance is lost, it will shock endogamy. It is must to keep the numbers of the two marriageable sexes in balance to observe and preserve endogamy otherwise the surplus man and woman of the group to satisfy their physical need will marry outside the group and the endogamy will collapse. If the surplus man and woman do not find a suitable partner for them, they would cross the circle of the endogamy to find the suitable partner out of their group and they would beget child which would be outside the group. He points out considering this fact it is must to take the care of the surplus man and surplus woman to maintain the endogamy.

He further exhibits how the imaginary group would consider and solve the problem of surplus man and woman to preserve endogamy. He first focuses the problem of the surplus woman. He discusses how the group can get rid of the surplus woman to preserve endogamy of the
He points out two possibilities by which the group can get rid of the surplus woman.

He points out the first possibility to get rid of the surplus woman is to dispose the woman with her husband means to burn the woman on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband. He adds that it is not practical solution to dispose the surplus woman and it is not possible to burn every surplus woman with her deceased husband. Though it is an easy solution, it is hard to employ it in practical. He further points out that if such woman inhabit in a caste, she would cause double danger. The first is that to satisfy her physical need and not finding the suitable partner in the caste, she would marry outside the caste. By marrying outside the caste, she would break the custom of endogamy. The second harm is if she marries within the caste, she would snatch the bridegroom of other bride. She would deprive the right of the other bride. It indicates that if she is not burned with her husband, she will be a problem to the caste. So it is must to solve the problem of the surplus woman if she is not burned.

He points out the second possibility to get rid of the surplus woman, if she is not burnt alive with her deceased husband, is to enforce widowhood on her for the rest of her life. He adds that to enforce widowhood is more practicable than burning a woman with her dead husband. It is also easy to pursue than the first way. Due to widowhood, there is no menace of her remarriage and snatching the bridegroom of other bride. He further points out that there is the possibility of failing to guards the morals of the group. In imposed widowhood, the woman can lead her life but she is deprived of the right of becoming a legal wife. But such woman cannot limit her and she can cross the limit of moral. This is the harm which can be caused by her. The group can do one thing to avert this harm. By imposing the rule and regulation by which she is made
unattractive, the immorality of the group can be prevented. As she is made unattractive, no man would attract towards her or she would not allure any male towards her. Due to this, she would not become the cause of immorality and by this the morality of the caste would be safe.

He points out that by adopting these two possibilities the caste can solve the problem of the surplus woman and can preserve its endogamy. If these two methods are not pursued, the endogamy of the caste cannot be maintained. The surplus woman can violate the endogamy. She cannot live without a suitable partner. It is a natural and physical need of her to marry a man. She cannot suppress her natural and physical feelings. She will satisfy her needs by marrying outside the caste, if she doesn’t find a suitable partner in her caste.

It is must to take care of her to preserve the caste, to preserve endogamy. For the preservation of the caste, it is must to solve the problem of the surplus woman. Her problem was solved by adopting these two methods- to burn her with her dead husband and to enforce widowhood. By adopting these two methods, the problem of the surplus woman can be solved and the system of endogamy of the caste can be also preserved.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar then focuses the problem of the surplus man. He discusses how the problem of the surplus man can be handled by the imaginary group, which desires to preserve endogamy.

The surplus man is also a problem for the group which desire to preserve endogamy. The surplus man can also violate endogamy to satisfy his natural and physical needs. It is also essential for the group to settle the surplus man like a surplus woman to preserve the caste. He points out that like a surplus woman, the case of the surplus man cannot
be settled. It is not possible to burn him with his deceased wife as he is a man and as his status is higher than a woman in the group. He refers that the surplus man can be forced or pursued to observe celibacy, but considering the nature, it is not possible for a man to observe celibacy. On the other hand, if he becomes the active member of the group, he can generate a problem and can cross the limit of morality. Celibacy cannot be forced on him. He points out that if it is forced, he would not be of any use to enrich the group and maintain the numbers of the members of the group. He emphatically puts that imposing of celibacy is futile and not proper solution for the surplus man. As the numbers of two opposite sexes are same, it will not be easy to provide another marriageable woman to him as it will create disparity in the two sexes. The surplus man cannot marry again due to the similarity in numbers of the two sexes. He emphasizes if the surplus man remarries, he would create a problem to other bridegroom. If the surplus man is not married, he will get immoral and if he remarries, he would deprive the bride of other bridegroom. The surplus man, in this way, is a dilemma for the group which desire to preserve endogamy. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar suggests that the group can do one thing to overcome the problem and to tie down the surplus man to the group i.e. the group can provide unmarriageable girl to the surplus man.

He expresses that the problem of the surplus man can be solved by marrying him with the girl who is not the age of marriage. By doing this, the problem of the marriage of the surplus man can be solved. By this, the surplus man will remain in the group. He will be the active member of the group and will not violate endogamy. This solution is helpful for the preservation of the Cast and endogamy. As surplus’ man problem is solved, there is no fear of exogamy.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar points out that by applying these strategies the disparity between the two sexes can be balanced. These strategies can be employed to preserve endogamy and it will also helpful to preserve the caste. These strategies are the means to preserve the endogamy. He says:

*They create and perpetuate endogamy, while caste and endogamy, according to our analysis of the various definitions of caste, are one and the same thing. Thus the existence of these means is identical with caste and caste involves these means.*

He states above these strategies generate and preserve endogamy. He adds that the analysis of the various castes point out that the caste and endogamy. Therefore, the existence of these means is similar to the caste and caste also involves these means are same. It indicates that these means i.e. burning the surplus woman with her deceased husband, to impose widowhood on the surplus woman after the death of her husband, and to allow the man to marry with the girl who is not yet the age of marriage are the means which are helpful to preserve the endogamy.

He asserts that this is the mechanism, framework of the caste in caste system. The mechanism of the caste is based on these means. He, to refer the caste system in India, applies the same to the Hindu society. He writes:

*Complex though it be in its general working the Hindu society even to a superficial observer, presents three singular uxorial customs namely:
(i) Sati or the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband
(ii) Enforced widowhood by which a widow is not allowed to remarry
(iii) Girl marriage.*

He denotes above that the nature of the Hindu society is difficult to understand, superficially it can be seen that these three customs- Sati,
Widowhood and Girl marriage- related to woman are observed in Hindu society.

These three customs are existed in the Hindu society. He asserts that it is not mentioned why these customs are observed. The scientific reasons behind the observation of these customs are also not disclosed. He refers that these customs are only glorified and eulogized. He states that as the customs are not practical to observe, they are justified and moralized later. He claims that these customs are made popularized later to conceal the impracticability behind it. He adds that these customs are also philosophized later to reveal their greatness and to conceal the harshness behind it.

He emphasizes that these customs are crucial to observe and preserve the structure of the caste, to carry out the framework of caste and helpful to continue the function of the caste. He illustrates the significance behind the creation of the caste. He says:

... sati, enforced widowhood and girl marriage are customs that were primarily intended to solve the problem of the surplus man and surplus woman in a caste and to maintain its endogamy. Strict endogamy could not be preserved without these customs, while caste without endogamy is a fake. 10

He asserts above that the customs of sati, forced widowhood and girl marriage are produced to solve the problems of surplus woman and surplus man in caste and to preserve endogamy. He adds that endogamy cannot be strictly observed without the observation of these customs and without the observation of the endogamy, the caste is frogery. It indicates that the caste is not maintained without these customs.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar discusses the mechanism of the caste in detail and then turns towards the second part of his research paper- the
genesis of the caste. Genesis means the origin of the caste. In this part, he discusses how the castes are originated in India which planted the poison of discrimination and which assigned the low status to the lower caste people and also attributed marginalization and segregated them from the main flow of the society. He writes:

As for myself I do not feel puzzled by the origin of caste in India for, as I have established before, endogamy is the only characteristic of caste and when I say Origin of caste I mean The Origin of the Mechanism for Endogamy.\(^{11}\)

He frankly, without hesitation, acknowledges above that he is not perplexed by the origin of the caste. There is no confusion in the mind of him regarding the origin of the caste. His point about the origin of the caste is clear as he has already explored that endogamy is the only characteristic of caste. He adds that the origin of the caste means the origin of the mechanism- framework, structure of the endogamy.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar focuses the history of India to invent the origin of caste. He reviews the circumstances which were existed in India before the origin of the caste. He refers that different classes were existed in India before the origin of the caste.

He points out that society is composed of the classes. There are different classes in the society. The class is based on economy, social relations and intellect. Hindu society was not exception to this. He exposes that classes were there in the Hindu society also. He further asserts that when the class started to enclose itself in Hindu society, the caste started to shape. Enclose of the class became the caste. Caste means an enclosed class. He traces the class which enclosed itself first. He points out that if we obtain the answer of the question which class
enclosed it, we would able to reveal the mystery of the growth and development of the caste.

He attempts to trace which class first enclosed itself and closed the doors for other classes. He points out with logic that if the class desires to enclose itself and to close the doors of it for others, it must have observed endogamy and also the customs- Sati, Widowhood and Girl marriage- which are helpful to preserve endogamy. It is essential to observe these customs to continue the process of endogamy. Endogamy means caste. The strict observation of customs is responsible for the formation of the caste. He asserts with logic that the class which enclosed itself first is Brahmin class. He says:

*These customs in all their strictness are obtainable only in one caste, namely the Brahmins, who occupy the highest place in the social hierarchy of the Hindu society; and as their prevalence in non-Brahmin castes is derivatives of their observance is neither strict nor complete. This is important fact can serve as a basis of an important observation. If the prevalence of these customs in the non-Brahmin castes is derivatives, as can be shown very easily, then it needs no argument to prove what class is the father of the institution of caste.*

He states above that the customs which assisted the formation of the caste are achievable in only one caste i.e. Brahmin. These customs can be strictly observed by the *Brahmins* who are on the top in social hierarchy and it is observed that they are not strictly pursued by non-*Brahmins*. He states that it clearly points out that as *Brahmins* are strongly adhered to these customs, they are the originator of this institution of caste. It indicates that by observing the customs which prevented to marry outside the class, they enclosed the doors for others. They restricted themselves. The non-*Brahmins* also observe these customs.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar exhibits that as these customs are strictly observed by the *Brahmins* and not strictly observed by the non-*Brahmins*, it mentions that the *Brahmins* first enclosed their class for others. Their adherence to these customs reveals that this class confined itself and by confining, transformed itself into the caste. This class first formed their own caste. It indicates the Brahmin class first broke the relations with other classes by observing the customs of sati, widowhood and girl marriage. They maintained these customs and denied the marriages with the members of other class. They preferred the marriages with the members of their own class by strictly observing these customs. Their strictness in pursuing these customs points out that they generated the endogamy. Their strictness exposes that the Brahmin class begot their caste in India.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar approaches to the last part i.e. the development of the castes in India of his research after tracing the mechanism and origin of the caste. He traces how the castes are developed in India. He traces how the caste developed among the non-*Brahmins*. He also attempts to trace how the poison of the castes spreads among the Indians by which Hindu society is divided and the discrimination among Indians is generated.

He first discusses the different claims of the scholars regarding the development of the castes. It is claimed by the scholars that Manu the composer of *'Manusmruti'* has assigned the law of caste. It means he has spread the poison of caste among the Indians. But Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rejects this. He does not acknowledge that Manu is the law giver of the castes to Hindu society. He writes:

*One thing I want to impress upon you is that Manu did not give the law of the caste and that he could not do so. Caste existed long before*
Manu. He was an upholder of it and therefore philosophised about it, but certainly he did not and could not ordain the present order of the Hindu society. His work ended with the codification of existing caste rules and preaching of caste Dharma.\textsuperscript{13}

He states above that Manu is not the law giver of the caste. He has not propagated castes in India. Caste was existed in India before the arrival of Manu. He is only the supporter and defender of the caste. Manu explained the caste system and philosophized it. The present order i.e. the caste is not the gift by Manu. He only collected and arranged the rules for the caste which was already existed and advised the caste Dharma to the people. He formed the rules for different castes in the system and advised the people regarding the caste Dharma.

It is also claimed that Brahmins are the propagator of castes. But Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rejects this claim also. He asserts that to propagate the caste was beyond the ability of the Brahmins. It was impossible for them to impose the caste on non-Brahmins. They might have assisted the process by their philosophy but they did not go beyond it. They formed the castes for themselves. But they did not form the caste for non-Brahmins and they also did not spread it among the non-Brahmins.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rejects these two possibilities of the spread of the caste by Manu and Brahmins. He claims that the work of propagation of the caste is very vast and giant. If the law of caste was formed by Manu, the law would have not been existed after Manu. After him, no class would have pleased to suffer lot in the grind of the caste. Brahmins, as the work of propagation of the caste was not easy, are also unable to do it.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar after refuting the claims regarding the origin of the caste by Manu and Brahmins discusses the views and theories of the western thinkers about the formation and development of the castes in India. According to the western thinkers, the central part around which the caste is formed is occupation, survival of tribal organization, the rise of new belief, cross-breeding and migration. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rejects this by pointing out that these central parts which is considered for the formation of caste in India are also found everywhere in the world. But the castes are formed only in India and not anywhere, it means these central parts mentioned by the western scholars are not responsible for the origin of the castes. He also rejects the theories of castes advanced by Sir Denzil Ibbeston, Mr. Nesfield, Mr. Senart and Sir H. Risely by pointing out that these theories are based on the fallacy of logic. He also denies the formula of evolution. He denies that the caste is evolved naturally or it is evolved of the law of eugenic.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar after denying the different theories of western scholars puts his novel theory of the development of the caste. He points out that Hindu society was composed of classes. These classes were Brahmins or priestly class, Kshatriya or military class, Vaishya or merchant class and Shudra or the artisan or menial class. There was a provision of changing the class according to the qualification. But latter, the Brahmins or the priestly class confined itself. It socially isolated itself from other classes and transformed itself in the caste. The other classes were also divided due to the law of social division of labour. The other classes also confined themselves and shut the door for other classes. The provision of changing the class was closed and the classes confined themselves in a particular frame. The classes became rigid. Like the Brahmins or priestly class the other classes by confining transformed
themselves into different castes. It indicates that the other classes imitate the Brahmins or priestly class and like it each class confined itself in its circle. He writes:

*Endogamy or the closed –door system, was a fashion in the Hindu society, and as it had originated from the Brahmin caste it was wholeheartedly imitated by all the non-Brahmin sub-divisions or classes, who, in their turn, became endogamous class.*

He explains above that the endogamy or caste system is originated from the Brahmin caste. They first closed their doors for others. He adds that non-Brahmins subdivision and other classes imitated the policy of the Brahmin and transformed into the endogamous classes.

Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar puts the theory of imitation and points out that due to the imitation the castes are propagated in India. The caste system is the fruit of the imitation. It scattered like infection. The other classes are infected by caste due to their imitation of the Brahmins caste. By imitations of the the Brahmins, they isolated themselves from each other. The classes imitated the policy of enclosing themselves from the Brahmin caste. It demonstrates that castes are not imposed, they are not based on occupation or evolved, but they are imitated. Castes are the result of the imitation.

He points out to prove his theory of imitation and to make his argument powerful that for imitation two things are essential. He asserts:

*The conditions for imitation, according to this standard authority are:*

1. *that the source of imitation must enjoy prestige in the group and*
2. *that there must be “numerous and daily relations “among members of a group.*

He states above that if the source of imitation enjoys prestige and if the membeers of group come in contact with each other daily, imitateons is easily acquired.
Brahmins are at the top of caste hierarchy. They are believed as a superior class. Due to it, they are believed as prestigious. Their every activity is believed as an ideal. So their activities are imitated by other classes. These customs i.e. Sati, widowhood and girl marriage as they are observed by the Brahmin caste, the other castes imitated and attempts to observe these customs.

He further points out that all the customs which are responsible for the origin of the caste are not similarly observed by other castes, it means the castes, which are close to the Brahmin, attempt to observe the three customs i.e. Sati, Widowhood and Girl marriage. The castes which are not very close to Brahmins, they do not strictly pursue the three customs, they observe only two customs i.e. Widowhood and Girl marriage, who are away the Brahmins, they observe only one i.e. Girl marriage and who are far away from them, they observe only caste system. This also indicates that these customs are observed by the non-Brahmins only by imitation.

In this research paper Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar with the evidence of the history of India and with the logic puts that castes are formed due to endogamy. Endogamy is observed by pursuing Sati i.e. burning the surplus woman with her deceased husband, forcing widowhood on the surplus woman and girl marriage. These customs are formed to preserve the caste. In India, before this, there were no castes but classes. The classes were flexible. The members of the class could have changed their class according to the qualification. But later, the Brahmin class enclosed its class and broke their relations with other classes. This class observed the endogamy. They disposed the surplus woman and man by following the three customs to enclose the class and to preserve their class. By enclosing the class, the first caste is formed. The other classes imitate the
Brahmins, observed the customs and formed their individual caste. The class which was very close to the Brahmins observed all the customs but the classes which were close and distance were not similar in pursuing these customs.

ANNIHILATION OF CASTE

‘Annihilation of caste’ is an undelivered speech of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. He was invited to chair the Annual Conference organized by Jat-Pat-Modak Mandal at Lahore. This Conference was going to be held on 1st May 1936. He was going to deliver this presidential speech in that conference. But unfortunately, this conference was cancelled by the Mandal after reading his revolutionary views on the problems generated by caste and remedies on the eradication of caste expressed in the speech. It was informed to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. Before receiving the information, the copies were printed out and they were lying at him. He published these copies on 15th may 1936. Aishwary Kumar about the undelivered speech says:

_The death of the lecture in the British Punjab marked the birth in Bombay of a treatise, unparalleled in the history of anticolonial emancipation, a treatise that promised to emancipate not simply politics but the moral psychology of freedom itself from the dialectic on nation and empire._

He states above that the speech which was not delievered generated a printed book. He glorifies this book by calling it unique in the history of anticolonial emancipation. He adds that this book not only promised to free politics but the moral psychology of freedom itself from the dialectic on country and realm. Booker Prize winner and great Indian novelist Arundhati Roy about the book says:

_When I first read it I felt as though somebody had walked into a dim room and opened the windows. Reading Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar_
bridges the gap between what most Indians are schooled to believe in and the reality we experience everyday of our lives. 17

She states when she read the book, she was shocked. She compares her feeling of that time to a person who walks in a dull room and opens the window of it. She adds that the reading of this speech connects the teaching taught to most Indians and the experiences we face everyday of our life.

In this undelivered speech Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar discusses the problems generated by castes, replies that defends castes, points out the obstacle of caste in the development of the country and suggests remedies on the elimination of the caste which is harmful to the lower castes because of which they are marginalized.

The people, who are at the bottom of the caste hierarchy, are more affected by the caste system and lead the deplorable life. This caste system divides the country into different pieces of the caste. The castes which are up in the ladder of this hierarchy enjoy the rights offered to them by this system and the castes which are at the bottom suffer and marginalized by the upper castes.

At the outset of his speech, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar reveals that there is a relation among political power, social reforms and religious feelings. He states that without social reforms political power is vain. He expresses it is essential to do social reforms to be fit for political power. He states that political revolution in the history always occured after social and religious reforms. He refers three instances of religious movements which shocked and altered the political power. He refers the first instance of the religious reformation started by Luther before the political emancipation of the European people, in England; the second instance is of Puritanism, a religious movement which was responsible
for the establishment of political party and won the war of American Independence. The third instance of religious movement is referred by him is of Prophet Mohammad before the Arbas became a political power. He also refers the religious and social reforms by Lord Buddha, saints of Maharashtra and Guru Nanak which are responsible for the political revolution of Chandragupta, Shivaji Maharaj and the political revolution of Shiks subsequently.

He points out the significance of the religious and social reforms before the political power. He states that it is must to do social reforms before gaining the political power in the hands. He emphasises that if religious and social reforms are done, it would be easy to gain the political power. It mentions that if we desire a political power, we need religious and social reforms first. He, with reference to history, elaborates and explains the significance of the religious and social reforms before the political powers. He claims that religious and social reforms are helpful to bring out the political revolution.

Social and religious reforms are necessary for bringing the change or fall of political power. If social and religious changes are occured, people with the feeling of integration get ready to fall the political power or acquire it. The religious and social movements integrate the people against the injustice, tyranny and exploitation and these movements also instigate the need of the feelings of integration. These movements make the people aware about the unity among themselves. These movements assist to establish the relation of love, sympathy among the people. The relations based on love, sympathy are necessary to make the people together and such people together bring change or fall of the political power.
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar also refutes the views of the socialist that equalization of property is the solution over every kind of reform. The socialist establishes the connection between economic reforms and religious and social reforms. Socialists opine that only economic reforms are the key of all reforms. He denies that property is the only solution of all reforms. He explains that there are penniless Sadus, Mahatmas and Fakirs in India to whom there are millions followers and there are many people of India who sell their trifling trinkets and go to pilgrims. It indicates that property or well financial position is not the solution of the religious or social problems. If it is the solution of religious and social status, the penniless Sadus, Mahatmas and Fakirs have no significance and the rich persons are considered as a prominent. It points out that property is not the only aim but mental satisfaction is the aim of people.

He further points out that it is not possible to bring economic reforms without social reform. He also expresses that the equalization of property cannot be successful without affinity, fraternity and liberty. Due to caste system, there is discrimination among Indian people. There is a prejudice regarding the lower castes people. They are not treated equally. It points out that as caste system is existed in India, which divides the Indian society into High and Low caste, there is a lack of affinity, fraternity and liberty and due to it the socialism cannot be successful in India.

Economic reforms cannot be successful in India, as there is no affinity, sympathy and the feelings of love among the Indian people. It suggests that for economic reforms and equalization of property, there is need of social reforms. If social reforms are taken place, if the equal treatment is offered to the Low caste, they will be mingled with the upper caste and the healthy and amicable relations will be developed among the
Indians. Due to social reforms the rift of the discrimination will be dissolved and sympathetic atmosphere will be developed. Such healthy, amicable atmosphere is needed to develop the feeling of cooperation. The feeling of cooperation is helpful to equalize the property and economic reforms.

He exposes that in India, caste is the obstacle. It is the factor which is at the root of every problem in India. It hinders the development. It is must to abolish caste for the progress. Without the abolition of castes, no movements will be successful and also the expected changes for the benefit will not be taken place in India. He asserts:

*This is only another way of saying that, turn in any direction you like, caste is the monster that crosses your path. You cannot have political reform, you cannot have economic reform, unless you kill this monster.*

He states above that caste is the monster. It is the obstacle which prevents the way of all reforms. You cannot do any type of reforms without avoiding it. If you attempt to do reforms, the caste system will cross your path. You have to eliminate the caste to do the reforms. It is must to destroy this monster to do political and economic reforms. Without the elimination of castes, political and economic reform cannot be successful.

Caste is the factor in making India weak and poor. There are people who defend caste. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar regrets over the observation of castes and reviews the opinions regarding the defense and vindication of the caste. He retorts the claims one by one of the people who defend it. He refutes the causes one by one by which the caste is defended. He says:
It is a pity that caste even today has its defenders. The defences are many. It is defended on the ground that the caste system is but another name for division of labour and if division of labour is a necessary feature of every civilized society then it is argued that there is nothing wrong in the caste system.\textsuperscript{19}

He explains above and expresses pity that caste has defenders even today and has vindicators and supporters. It is defended by saying that it is based on the division of labour. It is asserted that division of labour is essential and it is the feature of civilized and developed society. It is also asserted that if it is a characteristic of civilized society, it is not wrong to observe the caste system.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar reveals the futility of the opinion that caste system is the division of labour and compares it to the system of other countries. He points out that caste system is not only the division of labour but it is the division of labourers. The caste system divides the labourers. It divides the labourers into different parts. It is based on hierarchy. The labourers are not only divided but graded one above the other. He further points out that this division of labour is not spontaneous. It indicates that it is forced on the labourer. The labourer has no option of selecting his labour. The labourer has forced to do a particular job. His capacity is not considered while assigning him the work. This is the feature pointed out by him of the labour and labourers in India which does not found in other countries.

He further points out that caste is defended on the ground that caste is maintained to preserve purity of race and purity of blood. He says:

\textit{Some have dug a biological trench in defence of the caste system. It is said that the object of caste was to preserve purity of race and purity of blood.}\textsuperscript{20}
He states above that the defenders of the caste defense it on a sociological channel. They claim that caste is maintained to keep away it from impurity. It preserves the purity of race and blood. The observance of the caste keeps the race and blood safe. It prevents the mixture of different races and blood.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar refutes this claim which defends the caste system and points out the hypocrisy hidden behind it. He assets the falseness by pointing out the opinion of the Anthropologist who expresses that there is no man in the world who belongs to a pure race and all races are mixed everywhere in the world and especially there is a mixture of races in India. He also proves and makes his argument strong referring Mr. D.R. Bhandarkar’s research paper on ‘Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population’ which states that all castes, Classes are admixture of alien blood. He says:

*The caste system cannot be said to have grown as a means of preventing the admixture of races or as a means of maintaining purity of blood. As a matter of fact caste system came into being long after the different races of India had commingled in blood and culture. To hold that distinctions of castes or really distinctions of race and to treat different castes as though they were so many different races is a gross perversion of facts.*

He states that after a long period of the amalgamation of different races in blood and culture, the caste system in India has been commenced to observe. It proposes that there is no connection between the preservence of pure race and blood. So he points out that caste is developed to prevent the mixture of different races and blood is not fact but the perversion of the fact.

He further points out that racially all Indians are same. There is no difference between *Brahmins* and other castes in India. Even the race of
the untouchables and Brahmins is same. It indicates that race is not responsible for the creation and development of the caste. Caste is the division of the people belonging to the same race. He further opines that suppose if the castes are different races in India, there will be no harm if the people belonging to different races forms the relation based on blood because different races are not different species like animals. The intermarriages among the different races are not harmful. The intermarriages among the different races will also interbreed and produce an offspring.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar rebuts the views of the defenders and supporters of the caste system who consider that the observation of the caste system is proper as it is based on the division of labour and has a biological touch. He reveals the paucity of these two views which are employed to defend the caste system. He also exposes that these views are not scientific and not based on logic. It indicates that there is no scientific reason and logic behind the observation and defence of the caste system. It is baseless to defend and support the caste system.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar further points out the loss and effects of the castes. He exposes that the people of the caste see interest only of their caste. They have nothing to do with the people of other castes. The people of each caste are selfish. They do not see the interest of the other castes. It means the relations of the people of the different castes are not based on cooperation and sympathy. Instead of possessing love, they possess hate towards the people of other caste. Even the Sub-castes are not exception to this. These sub-castes also possess hatred towards other Sub-castes. There is no healthy relation among the people of the Sub-castes. He states that due to the caste consciousness, each caste possess hate towards other caste. The people of the one caste think that their caste
is superior to others. These create obstacles in the progress of the other castes. The upper caste never admits that the people of the lower caste should join them or do the progress and sit with them in the same rank. If the lower caste attempts to raise their social status, their efforts are suppressed by the upper caste.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar unveils the reality of the people of the castes. He focuses the nature of the people shaped due to the caste. He throws light on the psychology of the people of one caste to the other caste. Due to the caste, the minds of the people are spoiled. Their psychology regarding the other caste is impured. They harbour fury in their mind about other caste. They do not wish well of other caste.

The caste system has planted the poison of hatred, enmity among the people of India. It is harmful for the integrity and unity of the country. It prevents the people to unite. It generates differences among the people. Due to the caste system there is no room for uniformity among the Indian people. As they think only of their caste, they do not assist the other castes in the difficult situation. The other castes do not come into the rescue of other different castes when they are in danger. Though the castes belong to the same religion but due to the feelings of different castes, the people are not cemented and have the feelings of alien towards each other. There is also the lack of co-operation due to the caste system among the people. Caste has made the people narrow minded. They do not think out of their caste. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar writes:

*His responsibility is only to his caste. His loyalty is restricted only to his caste. 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. Suffering as such calls for no response. There is charity but it begins with the caste and ends with the caste. There is no sympathy but not for men of other caste.*
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He states above that the person belonging to the caste does not go beyond his caste. His thoughts revolve only around his caste. He is faithful, honest and thinks about the advantages only of his caste. He has no sympathy towards the people of other caste. In it, the people of the other caste, though he has merit, quality, is not appreciated. His merit is neglected as he belongs to other caste. The needy people, if they belong to different caste are neglected. If the people of the different caste are suffering, no sympathy and assistance is extended towards them. The feeling of kindness is not shown towards the people of different castes. Charity, kindness, sympathy and love are there among the people but it is limited to their caste and not for the people of other caste.

These various castes disorganize the society. It generates gap among the people. Due to it, the people are disintegrated and selfish. Peoples are separated from each other by the castes. These castes are based and graded over each other. This caste which develops hate, enmity and discrimination is the unhealthy practice developed in India. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar does not like the society which is raised on the caste system. He opposes the castes. He states that the society which is based on liberty, equality and fraternity is the ideal society. He writes:

An ideal society should be mobile, should be full of channels for conveying a change taking place in one part to other parts. In an ideal society there should be many interests consciously communicated and shared. There should be varied and free points to contact with other modes of association. In other words there must be social endosmosis. 23

He states above that ideal society should move freely. There should be ways for going from one place to another. It means there should be no prevention, no obstacle. In the ideal society, interests should be communicated and shared by all the members of the society. It reveals there should be healthy relations among the people of the ideal society.
There should be facility of putting contacts with the other social institutions and there should be social harmony among the people.

This is the ideal society of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar in which there is no room for hate and enmity. This is the society where the relations of the members of the society are based on understanding and love. In it, there is a communication and sharing of ideas among the people. There is no room for narrow mindedness and for selfishness. It is a platform where there is no limitation, no binding of castes. There is no room for injustice and social suppression. It is the stage where all the members will live amicably and peacefully. In this ideal society, there is a scope for cooperation, sympathy towards each other and respect for each other. There is no tension, burden and botheration in it. The members are even free to put relation with the other social institutions. They are not forced to lead a suppressed and limited life.

He is of the view that castes are harmful and dangerous to the country. Unless it is abolished, there is no progress of the country. He points out those castes are the hurdles in the way of progress of the country. He writes:

> There is no doubt, in my opinion, that unless you change your social order you can achieve little by way of progress. You cannot mobilize the community either for defence or for offence. You cannot build anything on the foundations of caste. You cannot build up a nation, you cannot build up a morality. Anything that you will build on the foundations of the caste will crack and will never be a whole.\(^{24}\)

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar emphasizes above the need of the change of social order. He asserts that there is no way of progress without altering the Social Order. As castes divide the people into different sections, he claims that it is impossible to organize the people for defence or offence. It indicates that castes are the obstacle in the way of the
organization of people. With caste, the people cannot come together. People cannot be united with the caste. He further points out that nothing can be build up on the foundations of the caste. The castes are also harmful for the nation. Nation cannot be built on the foundation of the caste. Social set of standards cannot be built on the caste. He warns that if you attempt to build anything on the foundation of the caste, it will fall down. You cannot build up whole on the foundation of the caste.

Caste is harmful to organize the nation. It creates disharmony among the people. It generates the atmosphere of hate and enmity among the people. It hinders national unity and also prevents the nation from development. It creates inequality, discrimination among the people and suppresses the capacity, ability of the people. It is also responsible for offering the low status to the low caste people. It gives the injustice. The upper caste looks down to the lower caste. It begets the communal violence and hampers social progress.

Without the eradication of the caste there is no development of the nation and there is no harmony among the people. It is essential to produce peace, healthy relations among the people. Equality, liberty and fraternity should be developed in the country. Democracy should be developed among the people. Equality, liberty and fraternity are helpful to develop the nation. But all these things are not possible with the caste. It is essential to develop the casteless society to implement all these things.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar is of the opinion that eradication of the caste is essential for over all development. Caste eradication is the key of progress. He adds that it is claimed that for the eradication of the caste, the distance among the Sub-castes must be destroyed. It is also claimed
that inter-dining should be arranged. If these two things are developed, they would assist to eradicate the caste system. But Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar points out that these things are not much helpful to eradicate the caste system. He points out that the distance among the Sub-castes can be dissolved but there is no guarantee that after the eradication of the Sub-caste, the process of eradication of the caste will be continued. The process will be limited to the eradication of the Subcastes and if it is stopped, it will create the negative aspect. He writes:

_In that case, the abolition of sub-castes will only help to strengthen the castes and make them more powerful and therefore more mischievous. This remedy is therefore neither practicable nor effective and may easily prove to be a wrong remedy._

In the above statements he makes us aware about the affect of the abolition of the Sub-caste. He opposes the view of abolition of sub-caste for the abolition of the caste. He points out that it is not a perfect remedy on the abolition of the caste. He reveals the possibility of danger that if the Sub-castes are abolished and if the process is not continued, the feelings of caste will become strong and it will be a more harmful. So this remedy is not practicable and effective and it will prove wrong.

He suggests that the second remedy of inter-dining is also not much powerful for the abolition of the caste. He points out that it is an inadequate remedy and not powerful to abolish caste system because there are many castes which arranges the inter-castes dinner but these types of dinner does not kill the feelings of caste. It indicates the inter-castes dinners are also failure to change the Social Order. These inter-caste dinners does not remove the feelings of the caste from the minds of the people.
The feelings and spirit of the caste is so strong that it cannot be removed from the mind of the people easily. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar suggests two remedies on the abolition of the caste. The first remedy is inter-marriages. He asserts:

*I am convinced that the real remedy is inter-marriage. Fusion of blood can alone create the feeling of being kith and kin and unless this feeling of kinship, of being kindred, becomes paramount the separatist feeling- the feeling of being aliens- created by the caste will not vanish.*

He advocates above that if inter-marriages i.e. inter-castes marriages are taken place the castes can be abolished. Inter-marriages would create the relation among the people of different castes. These relations would be based on blood and this will create the family feelings. These marriages will create the feeling of the family, the feelings of closeness among the members of different caste towards each other. And unless this feeling is not created, the feeling of separatist, the feelings of being isolated, feeling of belonging to different group cannot be vanished which are generated by the caste. This inter-marriage will remove the feeling and spirit of the caste and will assist to mingle the people.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar also suggests another remedy on the abolition of the castes. It is the elimination of Shastras which teaches to observe the castes. He points out that people observe the castes as they are religious. So it is must to fight against the Shastras which defence, supports and vindicates the caste system. He asserts:

*In my view, what is wrong is their religion, which has inculcated this notion of caste. If this is correct, then obviously the enemy, you must grapple with, is not the people who observe caste, but the Shastras which teach them this religion of caste.*

He points out above that if you want to abolish the castes, fight against the Shastras which teaches and inspires the people to observe
caste. He points out that the Shastras are the real enemy not the people who observe the castes. Peoples are taught to observe the caste by the Shastras. It indicates the root of the observation of the caste is in the Shastras. Shastras are responsible for the origion of the castes. The Shastras have generated discrimination among the people. The people are divided in the castes by the Shastras. He points out that it is must to destroy the feelings of faith on the Shastras which divide the people in different castes.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar in this thought provoking speech advocates casteless society. He states the importance of the abolition of castes and the importance of the casteless society. He also expresses the value of integration for the development of the nation. In it, he suggests remedies on the abolition of the caste. His remedies on the abolition of the castes are helpful to eliminate the castes from India. Abolition of castes means the abolition of marginalization. By this the people who are marginalized due to their Low caste will be brought in the main flow of the society. The lower caste will be free from marginality and will be free from sufferings, troubles and exploitation by adopting these remedies. Their talent, capacity will be employed in the progress of the nation and the marginalized will become the main part of the society.
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