In spite of the differences between Gandhi's and Ambedkar's personality, approach and social and political strategies, it is possible to have a conciliatory stance, showing their movements supplementary to each other. The objectives of both the leaders were the same and both were nationalists, Ambedkar, however was aggressive, but Gandhi soft and depended largely on the change-or-heart efforts. It is also said that the clout of Ambedkar's movement gave momentum to Gandhi's movement for the removal of untouchability. Gandhi's love for this objective was not new. "In 1915, Gandhi established one ashram in Ahmedabad, where he admitted Dudhabhai's family—which was Untouchable and dined with it, He adopted Untouchable girl as his daughter."

For the removal of untouchability, Ambedkar sought cooperation of Hindus, and took a lot of efforts for Hindu unity. He was under the impression that up to 1932 the Hindu Mahasabha was sincerely engaged in the removal of untouchability. Ambedkar employed two methods for reforming Hinduism and removing untouchability with the cooperation of the Brahmins and with the cooperation of non-Brahmins. First, he tried to seek the help of the Brahmins, because commoners never differentiate between the pure scriptures and interpolated ones. "They (commoners) are too illiterate to know the contents of the Shastras. They have believed what they had been told and what they have been told is that Shastras do enjoin as religious duty the
observance of caste and untouchability.\textsuperscript{92} The Brahmins interpret the Shastras and people believe in them. Hence, Ambedkar believed that if the Brahmins tried to remove untouchability naturally commoners would follow them. Ambedkar through all communication devices propagated that for saving and safeguarding Hindu culture and Hindu religion, Hindu unity was essential. Upto 1932, Ambedkar's stance about Hindu unity can be consistently observed though it became inconsistent later on. Gandhi's attempts of removing untouchability certainly were religious. Gandhi frequently said that for saving Hinduism the untouchability must die, because if untouchability survives, Hinduism will die. But, Gandhi never appealed for Hindu Sanghatan. This might be because of his broader outlook to get absorbed the people of all religions in the freedom movement or the Hindu (unity) might be in the interests of India. For Hindu (unity), Ambedkar started joint Ganeshotsava of the Sawarna Hindus and the Untouchables. He arranged 'Satyanarayana Pooja' which were administered by the Untouchables. He conducted interlining programmes. He declared that the freedom movement was nothing but a struggle between Hindu and Muslim cultures. To teach a lesson to the Muslim gundaism he effected a Sawarna-Untouchable combine. In all these efforts, he sought the cooperation of the Hindu Mahasabha and Shankaracharaya Dr. Kurtkoti. When Ambedkar stood as a witness in the Chavadar Lake Satyagraha case he expressed deep faith in the Bhagwad Geeta and accepted that he banked upon Savarkar's support. Ambedkar dubbed Gandhi's programme for the removal of untouchability as a farce. The Congress party made it compulsory for its members the use of Khadi and spinddling. Ambedkar thought that if non-observance of
untouchability was also made compulsory for the Congress members, the mission of removal of untouchability would have gathered momentum. Such suggestions to the Congress were made by him. Gandhi requested Ambedkar to join the Congress and mend it as per his desire. Ambedkar criticised Gandhi's Harijan Sevak Sangha. For removal of untouchability, Ambedkar suggested a programme which fell outside the purview of the Harijari Sevak Sangha. The Harijan Sevak Sangha was established to enable the Sawarna Hindus to remove their sins they committed by observing untouchability by serving them. Ambedkar pleaded that the Untouchables should have been given high posts of Harijan Sevak Sangha. It is possible that Gandhi desired that the Sangha should not be controlled by the Ambedkarites. However, Ambedkar's suggestion of waging a civil war for the removal of untouchability did not suit to any organisation which believed in democratic principles.

In satyagraha staged at Mahad, Nasik and Pune, Ambedkar drew support from the Hindu Mahasabha. Later, he left this device seeing that much of the energy was in actually launching satyagrahas and the litigations. Also a rift was caused amongst his followers in connection with the rivalry of leadership in satyagrahas. It is opined that in order to make the Untouchables aware of their rights the satyagrahas were started. But this does not explain why Ambedkar stopped them. For bringing the Untouchables and Brahmins together, he tried to prove that both belonged to the one and same race. He did not accept the opinion that the Untouchables inhabited India in pre-Aryan period. With the help of anthropometry Ambedkar tried to show that the Brahmins and Untouchables were of the same race.\textsuperscript{13}
The second way Ambedkar adopted in removing untouchability was to seek the help of the non-Brahmins. There was a close association between him and Rajarshi Shahu. This approach challenged the supremacy of the Brahmins. The Marathas possessed the potential to check the Brahmanic dominance. However, in social field Ambedkar realised that the Marathas were not honest. He also accepted that the Brahmins had more ability for social reforms. He had already made the leaders of the Satya shodhak movement aware of this fact. The experience of the Untouchable students in the Maratha boardings was not encouraging. Secondly the movement launched by Rajarshi Shahu was also Hindutvawadi. In his movement the Brahmin dominance was replaced by the Kshatriya dominance.

If the untouchability was removed by any of these two methods, it was bound to result in the Hindu Sanghatan. Ambedkar tendered an advice to the Hindu Mahasabha that if the Hindu Unity was to be really realised and Hinduism strengthened, instead of emphasising the Shuddhi (conversion) of the non-Hindus, it should try to render equal rights of Hindutva to the Untouchable Hindus, who in spite of being Hindus were deprived of their justifiable rights, and make the Hindu Sanghatan strong. Ambedkar argued that strength did not enhance by the number but by the Sanghatan. Neglecting the advice of Ambedkar, the Hindu Mahasabha did disservice to Hindu cause. Gandhi's programme of removing untouchability was also to sustain Hinduism but not its Sanghatan. The then contemporary Hindu Sanghatan, as it is today, was basically aggressive and was certain to create tensions in society. Gandhi took care that misunderstanding was not created between the Sawarna and the Untouchables. The episode of shambook, according to
him, was interpolated. In Ambedkar's programme of the removal of untouchability the danger of confrontation with non-Hindus was imminent, which was not with Gandhi. The writings of Ambedkar in the 'Bahishkrit Bharat' revealed his love for the Hinduism.

According to Triloknath, there were some fundamental drawbacks in Gandhi's movement for the removal of untouchability. Gandhi proposed fines as penance for observing untouchability in the past. Many people did it. Also, Gandhi did not carry out any activity for creating political consciousness among the Untouchables. He did not give any programme for the educated Untouchables. No doubt, there was some truth in the criticism made out by Triloknath. Yet Gandhi drew many of the Untouchables in the freedom movement. This can be a part of creating political consciousness among them. While commenting on Ambedkar, Triloknath said, "Indeed, it was rightly complained that his programme concentrated on providing opportunities to urban, educated Untouchables' elite to compete with caste Hindus and failed to take cognizance of the vast, rural Untouchable masses. Strangely enough, he neglected the fact that much of his criticism against Hinduism was indeed the by-product of poverty in an underdeveloped society. He did not understand that the economic solution would have not only liberated the Untouchables from their age-old thraldom but would have also destroyed the oppressive structure of Hinduism." The criticism made by Triloknath assumed that Ambedkar was bent upon destroying the structure of Hinduism, in fact he wanted to improve upon it.
Triloknath commented that Gandhi and Ambedkar did not philosophise the removal of untouchability. The criticism is not apt. Ambedkar while removing untouchability offered some theories to raise the morale of the Untouchables. As, to enthuse the Hindus and Muslims, history is used, Ambedkar tried to build up a theory that the Untouchables came from Aryan race. In his 'Annihilation of Castes' also, his inquiry of Hinduism and removal of untouchability revealed adequate theorisation.

Ambedkar ridiculed at Gandhi's movement of removing untouchability. He insisted that Gandhi should give more emphasis on the removal of untouchability than the freedom movement. Ambedkar advised his followers to keep away from the freedom movement. To some extent he succeeded in realising his objective. This weakened Gandhi's movement. If Ambedkar would have brought his followers, independently in freedom movement, the experience achieved there, would have been utilised in other movements. It would have, even silenced his critics who used to finger at Ambedkar's neutrality about the freedom movement. And participation in freedom movement would have boosted the morale of the Untouchables.

At the time of launching movement for removing untouchability, Ambedkar wanted to consolidate 'all Shudras' (non-Brahmins). If he had succeeded in this task, he would have been able to capture political power. However, he side-tracked it so much that he refused seats to the Adiwasis, because the Adiwasis were not politically conscious. It did not suit the democratic values, Ambedkar held. Ambedkar proposed that the seats to the Muslims should be reduced and given to the Scheduled Tribes. Ambedkar
suggested that a separate fund for the Scheduled Tribes should be raised; and used for their education to make them politically conscious. But this was suggested to bypass the legitimate rights of the Adiwasis. Ambedkar seemed to have determined not to give seats to the Adiwasis from the share of the Untouchables. It is quite clear that when the Adiwasis claimed share from the quota of Untouchables, Ambedkar laid condition that first they should become politically conscious but if the Adiwasis claimed share from the Muslim quota, he waived the condition. In the power sharing process in India it is observed that the culturally better people received more share. The Brahmins claimed more share by virtue of their education, then the Marathas raised eye-brows against them. The Brahmins pleaded their case saying they were better educated and hence must have more share. Afterwards, Maratha did the same when other backward communities demanded their share and surprisingly Ambedkar continued to harp on the same stringe when the Adiwasis claimed their share.

Though Ambedkar's criticism on Gandhi involved him more in the programme of the removal of untouchability, Ambedkar did not stop his barrage of criticism against Gandhi. Ambedkar criticised that Gandhi never risked his life for the well-being of the Untouchables. A bid on Gandhi's life was made when Gandhi was on tour regarding removal of untouchability. In Pune a bomb was blasted to blow up Gandhi's car, but fortunately Gandhi survived. Even Ambedkar protested against the attempt on Gandhi's life.

Ambedkar planned to unite Hindus by removing untouchability and then to launch joint venture of the Sawarna Hindus and the Untouchables for safeguarding the Hindu interests But Ambedkar's efforts in this direction...
were failed. The Hindu Mahasabha was not prepared to go beyond interdining and temple entry. Ambedkar tried to stress on the intercaste marriages;

The Hindu Mahasabha did not take a serious note of Ambedkar's programme. Ambedkar also did not have good memories of the Hindu Mahasabha; particularly of the Shankaracharya and NC. Kelkar, because they declined to witness in the Mahad Satyagraha case. Ambedkar tried his best to make Hinduism flexible. However, when Ambedkar did not see any ray of hope, to effect desired changes in Hinduism, he announced his desire of conversion in 1935.

The philosophy of Gandhi and Ambedkar on satyagraha is also different. In Gandhi's satyagraha, non-violence becomes an eternal value but it was not the case of Ambedkar. Sometimes he appealed the Untouchables to remain peaceful and sometimes to hit back, taking inspiration of satyagraha from Bhagwad Geeta. Ambedkar's satyagraha can be located between model of Gandhi's satyagraha and the Western model of passive resistance. Ambedkar might not have the limited objective of creating consciousness behind his satyagraha but quite wider one. He was, becoming increasingly convinced that the untouchability was counting its last days Writing in 'Bhishkrit Bharat' (23-12-1927) he said, "... now whatever, 'little' public opinion against removal of untouchability remains, it is the responsibility of the Sawarna Hindus to persuade it and some of the Brahmin leaders are doing something for it." Ambedkar made a logical demand. He said that the Untouchables were the Hindus and hence must be given all the rights which the Hindus enjoyed.
It is a fact that Ambedkar's satyagraha had more difficulties to encounter, and he was aware of that position. Ambedkar's Satyagraha was against the Sawarna Hindus and related to the delicate subjects like temple entry and taking water from lake. The Sawarna Hindus formed an opinion that Ambedkar was trying to destroy Hinduism. Ambedkar's satyagrahas one day or the other were heading towards the antagonism between him and the British Government and Ambedkar was not prepared for that. That was also one of the important reasons why Ambedkar stopped satyagrahas.

The non-violence was the core of Gandhi's satyagraha; on the contrary Ambedkar thought that the satyagraha could not be non-violent. He felt that the satyagraha thrust his opinion on his opponent. But in Gandhi's scheme of satyagraha the satyagraha is not declared abruptly. Prior to that through dialogue attempt is made to change the heart of the opponent. The satyagrahi who has undergone a tapascharya does not have hesitation about his objective and hence seldom is the possibility of erring. Ambedkar neglected the preparatory activities of the satyagraha, but indirectly he accepted that the satyagraha was a device to awake the people. Gandhi had battalions of trained satyagrahis, which Ambedkar did not. Ambedkar advocated the philosophy of passive resistance but he also knew the number and strength of his satyagrahis, and that of the opponents, the caste of the policemen and the future of the passive resistance. The very concept of satyagraha was not suitable to his nature. He basically was a scholar, a researcher and a thinker.

A comparison of Hinduism with other religions was inevitable even for Gandhi but in spite of being a devout Hindu he could examine Hinduism
objectively. Gandhi, though showed respect for all the religions, examined them strictly. Gandhi's approach to religion evolved in the framework of the composite Indian culture. Because of this, Gandhi's analysis of Hinduism remained distinct from that of the orthodox Hindus and Hindutvawadis, and at the same time he has been alleged as pretender by both Hindu and Muslim fundamentalists.

Ambedkar, Hindutvawadis and the liberals criticised Gandhi for his strange role in the Second Round Table Conference. Some researchers have also pointed out that Gandhi's behaviour was unbecoming. It can be observed that Gandhi and Ambedkar both had lost temper and were engaged in verbal conflict. The compromise between Gandhi and Ambedkar before the conference was not difficult. But before such compromise, the British Government recognised that the interests of the Scheduled Castes were different. If Gandhi would have compromised it was tantamount to recognising the separate interests of the Untouchables. Keer has argued that Gandhi had accepted the Muslim demands, Hindutva of the Untouchables but was not ready to grant the Untouchables anything. Though this indicated Gandhi's love for the Hinduism but indifference towards the Untouchables. Gandhi requested Agha Khan to take vow and not to support the demands of the Untouchables. It was indeed possible to persuade Ambedkar and to take him into confidence. But Gandhi did not do it. There was one more difficulty. Gandhi would have accepted the rights of the Untouchables but he was not prepared to recognise Ambedkar as their leader.
It is also interesting to record that during the Round Table Conference, Ambedkar, who was strongly making a case for the separate interests of the Untouchables, is said to have written a confidential letter pleading the case of Hindus to the then prime minister of England that the Muslim representatives were taking disadvantage of his arguments against the Sawarna Hindus. The Hindu representatives could not plead the case of the Sawarna Hindus. Ambedkar in that confidential letter pleaded the case of the Sawarna Hindus also.\(^9\)

In the Second Round Table Conference Ambedkar was also confronted with the problem as to who should he support to-Gandhi or the British Government. Several scholars have rightly suggested that the problem which rose up in the Second Round Table Conference could have been easily solved by granting reserved seats and joint electorates. Keer said that the followers of Gandhi misguided him about the popularity of Ambedkar otherwise he would not have opposed Ambedkar.\(^10\) However, Gandhi succeeded in showing Ambedkar that what He was about to receive with the mediation of the British was much less than what he got in direct negotiations and compromise with him. The Congress got the better of Ambedkar in election tactics. And Ambedkar's insistence that the reserved seats should be secured by his party only was not desirable.

Gandhi said that morality was necessary in personal life as well in politics. At the root of satyagraha and civil disobedience laid morality. Though the politics was not to be changed by him, Gandhi explained that the moral limits should be transgressed. Ambedkar held the welfare of the Untouchables
and gaining political recognition to them as the supreme value. Therefore other values to him became secondary. Gandhi did not hold the removal of untouchability as the most significant value. In attaining freedom, Gandhi thought the objective of bringing welfare of the Untouchables would be realised. Ambedkar adopted constitutional methods for achieving his objective. He tried his best to reap the maximum benefits of the political reforms, was of the opinion that the Congress or the Hindu Mahasabha could satisfy the demands of the untouchables. He would have preferred any of the two.\textsuperscript{11} Munje tried to contact him. Ambedkar without any economic support uplifted the crestfallen Untouchables. Ambedkar, for this, depended more on his Intellect and less on agitation. His study was deep and power of argumentation was profound. In solving the communal problem the skill he showed in making the Untouchables stronger than their actual potential was a good example of how to get maximum by constitutional ways. When the independence was in sight he tried to pressurise the Congress to get his demands fulfilled. He won the reserved seats in administration and legislature. But the Congress party got more seats than Ambedkar's group. Outraged by this, Ambedkar demanded to annul reservation in legislature. The reservation in administration and educational field encouraged renaissance among the Untouchables

In 1935, Ambedkar announced that he was going to embrace other religion. In 1936, the Jatpat Todak Mandal was holding its conference in Lahore. Ambedkar was proposed to preside over it. He prepared an address under the title, 'Annihilation of castes'. But due to some dispute between him and the organisers, Ambedkar declined the request to chair the conference.
He published the address. In it Ambedkar attempted a critical evaluation of Hindu religion and declared that though he was born Hindu he would not die as Hindu. It was feared that Ambedkar would embrace Islam because the then politics was carried out on communal lines. The Hindus and Muslim leaders were busy in getting more share in political power. If Ambedkar had embraced Islam it would have put big pressure on the Congress and Hindu Mahasabha. It was going to help the Muslim League which was in minority but looking back to his past history it was improbable that he would embrace Islam. Ambedkar only wanted to create and continue an impression that he might embrace Islam. Gandhi opined that conversion was concerned with the faith and material gains and social injustice were nothing to do with it.

Jatav has remarked that material gains did not count in Ambedkar's decision of conversion. Ambedkar himself had refuted Javat's claims. The then existing socio-economic conditions of the Untouchables and Ambedkar's clemency towards them did not permit him to negotiate between religion and faith only. It is evidenced in his efforts to retain the facilities for the Untouchables which he could achieve through Pune Pact and constitutional provisions. Of course, his objective of conversion was not that of material gains only.

Ambedkar called Hinduism irrational. While emphasising rationalism in Buddhism, he argued that whatever was logical and rational belonged to the Buddha. Gandhi, even before Ambedkar stated the same thing about Hinduism. He said only that part in Hinduism is valid which is rational.
Ambedkar takes a rigid stand that the Buddha cannot be said to have behaved in irrational way while Gandhi about Hinduism takes a flexible stand. Gandhi accepted that the certain drawbacks crept in Hinduism but the irrationality in it could not withstand the time flow. He presented the tolerant and 'sanshodhak' (flexible) nature of Hinduism.

Gandhi treated all religions on equal footing. According to him practising any religion in its true sense eliminates any chance for conversion. It was not possible for Ambedkar to take such stand; though he could have done it. He 'used' the Hindu Dharma Shastra in improving upon Hinduism. He could have found out literature for establishing a compromise in different religious groups. Gandhi wanted to reconcile people of all religions and to inspire them to join freedom movement. But Gandhi has also criticised all religions.

Gandhi did not rank religions on the basis of superiority and inferiority. Ambedkar did not have such approach. Gandhi believed that the conversions would beget rivalry among the religions, which would disturb the society. Gandhi did not uphold chaturvarna in a traditional manner. He assumed that in the conditions prevalent then, all were the Shudras.

Gandhi and Ambedkar used religion for political purpose. Ambedkar thought that the 'dhamma' possessed potentials to control over anarchy and it was instrumental to ensue freedom, as other government device. Ambedkar based the dhamma on science but made it difficult to understand. He presented its theoretical aspect for the rational people, yet leaving certain weak links. When Ambedkar, with the help of 'karm-phal' theory analysed
the linkages between karma and phal, many questions arise, which do not find satisfactory replies in Ambedkar's further analysis. Ambedkar differentiated between the 'rule' and 'principle'. No doubt, the Bouddha religion envisages more freedom to its followers, but not to that extent as presupposed by Ambedkar. Otherwise there is no propriety to distinguish between 'what belongs to the Buddha and what not'. The freedom in Buddhism should allow the variations in interpreting Buddha. The difference between 'rule' and 'principle' in the background, it is difficult to recognise rules for defining 'Bhikku' and 'Upasak'. It cannot be said that Buddha's utterances are flexible. Ambedkar's argument that the war can be waged if needed and not willed was not even acceptable to Buddha himself who in any event, wanted to avoid war. This has been clearly, indicated in 'The Buddha and his Dhamma'. Buddha's 'Karuna' was so extensive that before reaching 'buddhatva', instead of waging a war he left his country. After reaching 'buddhatva' his 'karuna' must have extended further and it is difficult to believe that even if there was need for war, he would recommend war.

In Buddhism irrational matter is not entertained. Still, in his 'The Buddha and his Dhamma' Ambedkar included many myths. It can be acceptable that he did it for the sake of common people but on the basis of the criterion he established his 'dhamma' turns into 'dharma'. In Buddhism, though the women were given diksha they were not elevated to the position of men. Dange has amply explained this. Dange points out that Buddha had remarked that the pure nature of his religion was to last for a thousand years but because of admitting women in the Sangha it would remain in pure form for five hundred years only. Though Ambedkar refuted these things, one may accept
that the Buddhism might have lost its pure form in the course of long period. Every religion has enjoyed a period when it was practised in a pure form and therefore their propagandists desire to go back.

The Bouddhas revolted against the varna system not to blow it up. P. Laxmi Narsu who inspired Ambedkar, by offering evidence from Ambbat Sutta stated that the Buddha established the superiority of the Kshatriya. The Boudha religion stood distinct from other religions on theoretical and practical levels for some time but on practical level it was impossible for it to be so for a very long time. Ambedkar did not consider the 'Charwaks' when he left Hinduism. They had also denied the Vedas, Unpanishadas 'shabd-pramanya' and accepted rationalism and materialism. Ambedkar could have changed it to suit him and accepted it. When Ambedkar gave thought to conversion and came to a conclusion to embrace Buddhism, he considered Buddhism on theoretical level and other religions on practical level. During the lifetime of the Buddha his philosophy could not change the basic social structure.

Even when the process of taking decision to embrace Buddhism was going on, Ambedkar continued to bluntly criticise not only his political opponents but other religions also. On the contrary in spite of his political activities political maneuvering unsuitable to Mahatma Gandhi even as an orthodox Hindu, it seems was tilting towards Buddhism.

The democratic values are very close to those of Bouddha religion. Ambedkar's social philosophy was also influenced by Buddhism. He argued that Buddhism and government don't have different ends. Ambedkar's arguments stand witness of his high intellectual stature. Ambedkar would
have defended any other religion also, had he accepted it. He left Hinduism, because there was no other go, but he firmly resolved not to separate himself and his men from Indian culture.

He rejected Christianity and Islam because he wanted to avoid any undesirable turn to Indian politics. He directly and indirectly, complied that religion determines 'nationalism'. His thoughts on nationalism were like those of the Hindutvawadis. Upto Ambedkar's conversion, the relation he established between nation and religion was constant and this was also reason why he rejected the international but separate religions from Indian culture. Ambedkar's nationalism would have been appeared brighter if he had stuck up to his nationalist stand in spite of concentrated population of the Untouchables, having a strength to threaten Indian unity.

At the time of conversion he was tearful, may be, due to solemnity of the ceremony or due to being overcome by parting from his beloved religion. He asked his followers to take anti Hinduist oath. Also this might be from desperateness. Before this, in 1947 when Delhi was rocked by the communal riots, the Muslims there, were frightened. The majority of the Muslim tongawalas shaved their heads and grew shendi (small bunch of hair, which Hindus retain after shaving head). They also spotted 'tilak(a mark the foreheads of the Hindus). They were trying to save their life by posing themselves as Hindus. Ambedkar asked one of his close associates, Shastri to bring some Arya Samaji leaders to convert them to Hinduism so that their problem would be solved and the number of Hindus would also be increased. Ambedkar introduced the Hindu Code Bill with a solitary intention of reforming Hinduism.
An attempt is made to show similarity between Hinduism and Buddhism. It is said that the grandfather of Addya Shankaracharya was Bouddha and Shandaracharya himself was a prachchanna Bouddha (real Bouddha i.e. overtly Hindu). He elevated the Buddha as the eleventh incarnation. The Buddhism is separate from Hinduism so far as varna system caste system inequality between men and women, concept of soul, God, incarnation, rebirth, hell and the heaven are concerned. However, culturally as Ambedkar thought the Buddhism was not different from Hinduism. Therefore the Indian culture absorbed other religions having their origin in India. The Indian culture removed the separate entities of the Buddhism and Jainism. Ambedkar must be in the know of this therefore in the Indian Constitution Buddhist, Jain and Sikh people are treated as Hindus.

After having a peculiar perception of human nature Gandhi had views on state and society. To him man is good, having conscience and respect for justice. At the same time he is having some drawbacks. But they could be removed. Morality has a high place in human life. According to Gandhi religion and morality are inseparable. He also claimed that power emanates from morality and his power came through morality. Gandhi defined democracy from moral angle. He felt that democracy was to safeguard the interests of the weaker sections. He condemned English democracy as barren prostitute. On this backdrop, Gandhi's refusal to give concessions to the Untouchables and afterwards to give them a few looks contradictory. When the issue of India's partition was simmering, Gandhi could not effectively use his power, he gained through morality on Nehru, Patel and Azad. Gandhi also seemed to have formed the definition that democracy was a state run on
the basis of majority consent. Ambedkar tried to safeguard the rights of the Untouchables. As Ambedkar paid more attention to the politics of power his grip over social movement was loosened. He was convinced that the welfare of the Untouchables could be realised by economic and political advancement. For this, he always needed constitutional help.

Ambedkar advocated the case for the creation of Pakistan. In doing so Ambedkar used the same logic which Lala Lajpatrai used. He thought that Hindu welfare was to be brought about by the creation of Pakistan. As love for Hindus made him say so, it was also suspicion about the Muslims. He was certain that Jinnah did not push the demand for Pakistan for the sake of negotiations only. Ambedkar's advocacy for Pakistan implied that the Muslims supported Jinnah's demand. In fact Jinnah's and League's political power was very limited up to 1946. Though League bettered its record in winning the Muslim seats, it had to face the stern resistance of regionalism. Hence it cannot be said that there was no option to the creation of Pakistan.

With the creation of Pakistan, Ambedkar heaved sigh of relief and remarked that it was good thing that the rotten part was operated upon, then there would not have been any danger to the body. None could expect from Ambedkar, a believer in the cultural unity of India, such a statement. In fact the unity of Indian culture implied undivided India! India has to forego Sindh—the symbol of Indian culture. Did it mean that the cultural unity collapsed?

The politics in the last phase of freedom movement was better apprehended by Nehru, Patel and Azad than Gandhi and Ambedkar. It is
remarked that Ambedkar did not appease the Muslims like Nehru. But Nehru and Patel threw Jinnah in desperate condition. Nehru was confident that without bowing before the demand of Pakistan the leaders of the League could be put in a tight corner. Right from the period of the Nehru report, the Congress continued the same policy. Wavell appealed to the Congress that it should not stress on the strength of number but on statesmanship. However, the Congress did not respond to this request and instead of statesmanship preferred show of strength. Chagla has a word of appreciation for Jinnah but he has also stated that the Muslim did not lend him support for the creation of Pakistan. Chagla says, "Jinnah's dominant characteristic was his tenacity. Once he made up his mind, nothing in the world could divert him from his chosen objective. No temptation, no bribe, no pressure had the slightest effect and it is a measure of the man that he succeeded in creating new country - Pakistan, with very little following and no strong press to back him, and with little financial assistance."

Dhananjay Keer has said that Ambedkar respected Azad. However, some of the writers have recorded otherwise. It is said that Ambedkar did not respect the nationalist Muslims in the Congress led by Gandhi, on the contrary he regarded them as formidable 'snakes' and advised the Hindus, to be aware of them. To disclose that Azad was also a snake, Ambedkar used to quote one paragraph from his lecture. Azad is said to have stated that the Muslims should not be afraid (of undivided India), because the Muslims would be having five states which have their majority against nine of the Hindus. The Muslims could retaliate in majority provinces what the Hindus would do to the Muslims in their majority provinces. This was not a mean advantage.
That was a device with which the Muslims could safeguard their rights. On April 16, 1946 in their interviews to the Cabinet Mission, the nationalist Muslims did not support partition. They opined that there should be joint electorates with reserved seats for the Muslims and in legislature and ministry the Hindus and Muslims should have equal partnership.

The background on which Azad projected his 'retaliation principles has to be taken into account. Certain complaints were received from the Muslims in the Congress ruled provinces. These complaints according to Ambedkar were false. For a moment if Ambedkar's reading is accepted, it should be remembered that in the election held in 1946 by virtue of 1935 Act, there was an understanding between the Congress and League to come to a compromise in forming ministries. But it was not put into practice. In such position Muslim League could not trust the Congress.

The Hindu Mahasabha made the same evaluation of Azad as made by Ambedkar. It said that Azad wanted to make the Muslims understand that in the Muslim majority provinces the Muslims would rule, where they were in minority they would get concessions and in the centre, they would enjoy equal sharing and thus dominate the entire country. With this view, said Hindu Mahasabha, Azad opposed India's partition. He pleaded that what political power Jinnah was assuring to the Muslims, he was assuring a more. The HindutvaWadi realised that Azad was after creating 'Akhand Pakistan' (undivided Pakistan).

Gandhi influenced the framing of the Indian Constitution also. The Gandhian principles of economic and political decentralisation were
embodied in the constitution. It was the corollary of the adult franchise that the people in rural areas should be vested with the power of decision making. Ambedkar viewed the things from different angles. He said that the caste system would foil the matter.

Ambedkar endeavoured to model the Indian Constitution on Buddhism. He studied the constitutions of various countries. He also requested the Hindu Mahasabha to send the Indian Constitution if drafted independently. It is claimed by the Hindu Mahasabha that Ambedkar borrowed some clauses from it. Under the Chairmanship of Damodar Vishwanath, alias Baburz Gokhale a committee on drafting constitution was appointed, it prepared a draft, which was accepted by the Lokshahi Swarajya Paksha. Date says that Ambedkar called for a few copies of the constitution and extensively used it. In the drafts prepared by the Hindu Mahasabha and committee of the Indian Parliament many similarities can be found. 22

Two clauses from the constitution prepared by the Hindu Mahasabha could be cited ... (11) In the words of President Roosevelt the human rights are enshrined in four freedoms. (i) freedom to lead a happy life, (II) freedom from fear (iii) freedom of speech and (iv) freedom to 'worship. The Constitution should assure these freedoms "(13) equality of men and women before law. Their rights should be identical. By no order or law they could be discriminated." 23 These two clauses and some others in both the constitutions are similar. In democracy such similarities are bound, to come. However, Ambedkar also promised to select the saffron flag as a national flag. On July 10 (1947) Ambedkar was going to Delhi. Some of the leaders of the Bombay
Provincial Hindu Mahasabha and Maratha leaders met Ambedkar and handed him over a saffron flag. That time Ambedkar said that if an agitation was launched to accept saffron flag as national flag he would support it. He also told Babasaheb Bole and Anantrao Gadre that they were trying to furl the saffron flag on the constitutional committee at the hands of a Mahar's son. Ambedkar's car also bore a saffron flag with the emblem of 'Om'. As Ambedkar was for some time in America for education, he could observe the functioning of federation. He was well-versed in constitutional law. Though the creating forces of the American federation were different from those of India, Ambedkar must be knowing the political wisdom needed for running a federation. Lord Wavell opined that the compromise the Americans worked out, was also possible in India. Lord Wavell expressed the views of George Washington and Madison.24

Ambedkar also presented a scheme to avoid communal deadlock and creation of Pakistan.25 Since there were no provinces of Untouchables majority, Ambedkar assigned them so much weightage that without their cooperation it was not possible for the Congress or League to run the government. In the editorial of 'The Times of India (May 17, 1945) Ambedkar's scheme was heavily criticised. To refute the criticism Ambedkar presented the principle of 'relative majority'. The scheme provided that the Untouchables would be constantly in power. This could have been changed and accepted. But Ambedkar could not retain the support of his community. It was evidenced in the election of 1946. Ambedkar could not foresee the consequences of the election system in the Pune Pact. The election tactics of the Congress party were also responsible for Ambedkar's declining influence.
Ambedkar then requested Gandhi to have a compromise but Gandhi flatly refused the proposal aptly saying that his party's and Ambedkar's views were quite different.\textsuperscript{26} Though the members of the Scheduled Castes Federation fared better did not return to the legislature in proportion. Hence, again Ambedkar announced that the demand for separate electorate was appropriate.\textsuperscript{27}

In the power rivalry between the Hindus and Muslims, the interests of the Untouchables were neglected. Ambedkar warned Attlee - "... if this hope proves futile, for our protection we will have to seek the help of other countries. The British Government is paying attention to the dispute between the Hindus and Muslims. It does not care to look to the problems of the Untouchables. The British may quit when the Hindu-Muslim problem is solved. ... The Untouchables are not so weak to depend on the solitary help of the British only. If the British Government, the Indian nationalist are not anxious to help the Untouchables, they will call upon other countries to help them and they will be responded favourably and this will be harmful, to the British and the Hindus". Palshikar has alleged, "Ambedkar's demands after 1942 could have caused one more partition of India. (Ambedkar was favourable to the demands of Dravidistan made by Ramaswami Nayakar)."\textsuperscript{29}

Even if Ambedkar had participated in the freedom movement independently he would not have been so much isolation in the Indian politics.

There were certain reasons for Ambedkar's isolation. Some of them might be as under -
1. The Congress underrated him and other parties. (2) No other party in India resisted the British rule as forcefully as the Congress. (3) Ambedkar like Jinnah and the Congress were always at the logger heads and hence they lost Congress sympathy. (4) Some of the Untouchables and their leaders joined the Congress. (5) The British knew that it was only the Congress that could challenge their power. (6) For delaying independence of India, the British Government used Jinnah and Ambedkar, but as it was determined to free India, there was no need to entertain either Jinnah or Ambedkar. At this time, Ambedkar could not prove that his castemen were solidly supporting him.

Gandhi insisted Ambedkar's induction into ministry. About Gandhi-Ambedkar dispute Palshikar states that Ambedkar's reading about Congress and Gandhi was not certainly warrantable. Also, it was equally true that including Ambedkar in the ministry Gandhi did not oblige Ambedkar personally or his society but it was in fact the honour of the National Government that he was included in the ministry.¹³⁰

But, while doing so, the Congress very shrewdly put an end to the politics of Ambedkar. The Congress failed to bring him in its fold, however made use of his wisdom. The Congress recognised him as a great scholar but on organisational level finished his activities. Taking him up on the Constituent Assembly and ministry the Congress offered him an opportunity to serve his country, used his scholarship within the framework of Congress policy. This was evidenced in the discussion in the Constituent Assembly and discussion on the Hindu Code Bill. When in Constituent Assembly and ministry, Ambedkar successfully won the concessions for the backward classes but he
could not as per his expectation, raise the Untouchables as a social and political power. And in fact this mission was far more important than any other from his and his community's point of view. After drafting the Constitution if he had devoted his time to the task of building organisation, the rifts among the Untouchables would not have been created. When freedom became a near possibility, the Congress turned more and more complacent. Gandhi could not control over this situation. His policies were opposed within the Congress from the Second World War. Gandhi felt that non-violence should be accepted on a world level. The Congress leaders were not in mood to accept Gandhi's proposal. Ambedkar also criticised it. It seems that Gandhi also changed his policy. Lord Wavell always used to say that on this occasion Gandhi thumped the table and said, "If India wants blood-path she shall have it". Because of the dogmatic stand of the Muslim Leaguers and their intimidations Gandhi might have said like that.

Hindutvawadis and Ambedkar have criticised that Gandhi did not pay heed to the Hindu interests. However, certain instances could be given which tell that Gandhi had even done it. Azad proposed a scheme to avoid partition. Ambedkar and the Hindu Mahasabha recorded their bitter reaction to it. Gandhi too felt that this scheme was to go against the interests of the Hindus. But Gandhi expressed all this in a soft manner. He said, "I did not infer from your letter that you are writing about my Hindus. Whatever you have in your heart has not appeared in your writing...My opinion differs from your." 31

Second instance is about a letter from Gandhi to Cripps. "As to merits difficulty about parity between six Hindu majority Provinces and five Muslim majority Provinces represent over 9 crores of the population as against 19 crores of
the Hindu majority Provinces. This is really worse than Pakistan. What is suggested in its place is that the Central Legislature should be formed on the population basis.\textsuperscript{32} At about 1947, Gandhi was increasingly influenced by Nehru and Patel. This means that Gandhi's theory that morality begets power lost much of its force. Gandhi did not read correctly about the civil war. Wavell stated, 'Gandhi seemed quite unmoved at the prospect of civil war. I think he has adopted Patel's thesis that if we are firm the Muslims will not fight.'\textsuperscript{33} Nehru (also) said, that the Muslims were incapable of launching direct action.\textsuperscript{34} Nehru wrote: "During the past five years the League has had a clear field in India. The Congress was almost continually under ban or in prison. We have thus had no approach to the Muslim masses

\ldots (that was the reason why League got the support of the Muslims) \ldots

During the last three months we have again started approaching the Muslim masses and the results have been remarkably encouraging."\textsuperscript{35} On the basis of this understanding Nehru repudiated the pact between Gandhi and Jinnah.\textsuperscript{36} Attlee opined, "... Pandit Nehru's present policy seemed to be, to secure complete domination by Congress throughout the Government of India. If a Constitution was framed which has this effect, there would certainly be strong reactions from the Muslims. Provinces with a Muslim majority might refuse to join a Central Government on such terms at all; and the ultimate result of Congress policy might be the establishment of that Pakistan which they so much dislike."\textsuperscript{37}

The experience of the interim government was not fair. The League did not comply to Nehru's prime ministership. It demanded the home ministry.
Patel declined to part with it. To perturb the League Congress gave it finance ministry which was under John Mathias. Raghabendra Chattopadhaya remarked that the League administered so nicely that the Congress had to repent. (Social Scientist June-July 1988 p. 77). Liaquat Ali's 'poor man's budget' caught Congress on the horns of dilemma. In fact Liaquat Ali toed the Congress policy and put the Indian capitalists in a dire fix.

Gandhi's influence was declining, because after 'Quit India' movement there was no chance for other movement. For playing constitutional politics, Congress possessed a big team. And the Congress needed Gandhi's moral support only. Though he had no hand in partitioning India, he was held responsible for it. A systematic propagation was carried out in this regard. He was also held responsible for the loss of Hindu lives and properties and then assassinated.

Gandhi had before him wide programme of freedom movement. Besides, he made many attempts to ameliorate the conditions of the Untouchables. He had to face wrath of his own partymen for that. He was criticised by the Hindu orthodoxy. He appeased Muslims but successfully persuaded them to partake in the national movement. It is not also fair to say that Gandhi did nothing for the Hindus. On the account that only Congress represented India, a dispute was bound to mount up between him and the leaders of the minority communities. Gandhi and Congress tried to bring several minority leaders in Congress to brush off their separateness. The same experiment was done with, the Untouchables. It is said that if Ambedkar had joined Congress he would have to play second fiddle. But with all respect for Gandhi, leaders
like Nehru, Patel and Subhashchandra Bose retained their independent entity and persuaded Gandhi to change his decisions. No doubt, certain groups in the Congress were behind Nehru and Patel, likewise Ambedkar could have formed his own group. Ambedkar was faced with the problem whether to support Gandhi or the British Government. Ambedkar thought that he could gain more from the British Government.

Besides, the Congress also compelled him to take that stand. In his book 'What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables?' there is a chain of reasons why Ambedkar was so much distressed by the Congress. Though, it is a fact that without knowing well Congress, and Gandhi, he criticised them, it is also true that the Congress was indifferent towards the Untouchables. The programme of the removal of untouchability undertaken by the Congress was bound to suffer certain limitations. Behind Gandhi stood the giant organisation of the Congress, and hence Ambedkar thought that if Gandhi 'ordered' his organisation, the untouchability would be removed. Ambedkar might be trying to expose the Congress and its programme.

Ambedkar programme of the removal of untouchability was not free from limitations. His political and social activities were centred around the main objective of materialising welfare of the Untouchables. It is the distinguished feature of his politics; his strength lies in it and also limitations. Upto 1932, he tempted the Hindus to remove untouchability in order to achieve the Hindu Sanghatan. The Congress handed over the task of the removal of untouchability to the Hindu Mahasabha. When Savarkar was not allowed to enter into the active politics, the Hindu Mahasabha restricted
its activities to social field. It was, at least, for the removal of untouchability
directed against the Hindu orthodoxy; and not the British Government.
Because of this common thread, Ambedkar might have joined hands with
the Hindu Mahasabha. However, in the witnesses and memoranda he offered
to the various commissions, he had argued to distinguish the identity of the
Untouchables in such a manner that he could be easily ranked as sworn anti.
Here also he does not deviate from main objective of the realisation of the
welfare of the Untouchables. This aspect of Ambedkar's work helps the
scholars who need to oppose the Hindutvawadis. But this aspect fails to
uncover equally important aspect which tells something very different.
Ambedkar seemed to have toed the line of Jinnah, who advocated the separate
identity of the Muslims and achieved his target. When restrictions on Savarkar
concerning participation in politics were lifted, the Hindu Mahasabha's
functioning was up. It also could not speed up its social activities along with
political activities. Ambedkar declared that the welfare of the Untouchables
was embodied in Swarajya. Jinnah tried to safeguard the Muslim interests.

In Indian politics the Muslim League was inflating its demands and the
Congress was unable to restrict the process. At that time Lala Lajpat Rai
declared that if the Muslim League was placing its demands by organising
Muslims on religious basis, the Hindus should pay in same coin and the
responsibility of organising them could be better done by the Hindu
Mahasabha. Ambedkar like Jinnah placed demands on the communal
measure. Jinnah was able to rake more share in the facilities for minorities.
The Congress and Gandhi had more extensive dialogue with the League and
Muslim leaders. This fact might have enraged Ambedkar. But in spite of this
anger he was willing to enter either the Congress or Hindu Mahasabha. In the post independence period, according to him, these two parties would have a better prospect. Afterwards, Ambedkar rejected the Hindu Mahasabha as a communal party, but if it had accepted Ambedkar's demand, Ambedkar would have joined it.

In introducing the Hindu Code Bill also, his love for Hinduism could be noted. In the British period, all religious groups had their independent personal laws and Hindus were recorded as non Muslims. Ambedkar teased that no Sawarna Hindu was ever ashamed of it. He had an ambition to produce a progressive law for the Hindus. A question arises that if Ambedkar had affection for Hinduism why he criticised Hinduism. An answer has already been given to it in the preceding chapters. In a nutshell, it can be aid that Ambedkar's criticism on Hinduism was in fact on brahmanya, egoism and selfishness. Ambedkar remarked that for greed the Brahmins sacrificed the hour an unity in Hinduism. For some time he held the opinion the lost solidarity in Hinduism could be revived by the Brahmins only. They had adequate potentials for affecting 'Sanshodhakata' in Hinduism. Even before Ambedkar many social reformers criticised Hinduism with a view to modifying it.

Gandhi, bringing in morality in politics attempted to spiritualise politics. His theories of truth, non-violence, trusteeship, satyagraha were projected on the moral principles. There were certain drawbacks in them. One can find a gap between his principles and practice. During the second world war Gandhi was prescribing non-violence for the world. But at the time of the
creation of Pakistan, as stated by Wavell, Gandhi declared that if India wanted blood-path she should have it. Gandhi's concept of democracy also changed and became retrograde. But on the practical level, he was engaged in the services of the dishoused, oppressed riot victims of partition. He refined his life through experiments with the truth. He related the experiment with the sex to the violent events happening speedily. The unity of India which he valued more than his life was at stake. As the freedom came on the threshold the Hindus and Muslims were butchering each other. With his life's work in ruins, Gandhi felt deeply sad and frustrated, could not sleep for days, almost lost his will to live and was heard murmuring to himself, 'what shall I do? There is darkness everywhere'.

He had thought that he had a message for the world weary of violence, but evidently it had proved impotent even in his own country, under his own leadership...that there must be some serious flaw deep down in me which I am unable to discover.

He thought -If he was absolutely pure, with not a 'particle'. Impure desire or the slightest element of egoism and violence left in him, he should be able to mobilise his spiritual shakti.... Gandhi was afraid that his lapses in brahmacharya and non violence might be the reason of widespread violence in Naokhali. His sexual Yajna was a way of mobilising the capital of his spiritual 'shakti' and making it yield vitally necessary political dividends.

Bhikku Parekh says, "It was hardly surprising that his finest political experiment of successfully controlling violence in Naokhali should have conducted alongside his heroic sexual experiment. This was not a coincidence but a logical necessity within his philosophical framework." Gandhi tried to build up a new science of curacy and morality. In his old days Gandhi became more cautious about human aggressiveness hatred and will influence others and many subhuman
traits. The nature of woman was quite opposite and it could save the entire world from being annihilated, hence Gandhi tried to become a woman. It can be said that such experiment by a solitary person could not do anything. Possibly it might not, but the experiment revealed his imagination, mora confidence, clemency for the whole mankind and experimentability and urge to check the violence on national and international level. This can be treated as the most pregnant phase in the development of Gandhi's theory of nonviolence.

Ambedkar's key objective of his movement and thought was that of the welfare of the Untouchables. He did change his strategies to achieve this. It could also be observed in his literature also. It is possible that a misunderstanding might be created to show his strategies as 'merely reactions'. Rajshekhariah states, "His politics was essentially the politics of principles and not of pragmatism." However, this view can be contested. Ambedkar has contributed vitally to the concept of social democracy contemporary politics to him was theology in action. But he policised the Buddhism. His religious views were turning more ripe. The Indians were not lucky to see 'Bouddha Ambedkar' for quite a long time.

Ambedkar presented the state socialism also. In 1952, he partnered with the socialist party. He was in favour of extensive socialism. He suggested to nationalise agriculture. Here also his key principle was that of bringing welfare to the Untouchables. His programme of nationalization did not displace freedom. Ambedkar was favourable to emancipative distributive and organisational development of the rural area. The problem of the
landless workers was linked with agriculture. Ambedkar presented it in a wider perspective. Kuber says that Ambedkar took progressive stand about the abolition of Mahar Vatan.\textsuperscript{49}

Ambedkar intended to nationalise industries and land within the parliamentary democratic framework. One question remains that if obstacles cropped up, what plans he had to remove them? The Government which he assumed to remove them would exist in principle only. Because for carrying out massive nationalization totalitarian Communist Government was needed, which he rejected outrightly. The democratic framework falls short of carrying this task, and Ambedkar's expectations about Indian Government were very high.

Ambedkar has stated the concept of constitutional morality, which refers to the nature of enjoying rights with due respect for the constitution. India lacked this constitutional morality and hence the nature of administration should be decided in the constitution only. Ambedkar opined that due to the interference of the legislature the constitution loses its shape. Thus he travels from the concept of development through constitution.
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