

for removing untouchability and for securing equal rights to the Untouchables along with the Caste Hindus. The clause reads as follows:

“That no compulsion is to be used for securing rights, but that peaceful persuasion is to be adopted as the *only* means.”

This is a basic principle of the Sangh. It has struck me as strange and I am sure it will strike all others as strange. I want to ask the question—Why has the Sangh limited itself to peaceful persuasion of the caste Hindus as the one and the only means of removing Untouchability ?

Most social reformers, whether religious or rational, seem to imagine that men of power will immediately check their pretensions and their exactions as soon as they have been told that their actions and attitudes are anti-social. But as Prof. Neibhur points out¹ what these reformers overlook is an understanding of the brutal character of the behaviour of all human groups and the power of self interest and collective egoism which dominate all group relations. They also forget the fact that races, nations and classes are less moral than individuals which compose them and that justice between groups can therefore not be achieved purely by educational means. If conscience and reason can be insinuated into the resulting struggle they can only qualify, never abolish, the injustice. If injustice is to be abolished it must be resisted and when injustice proceeds from collective power, whether in the form of imperialism or class domination, it must be challenged by power. A class entrenched behind its established power can never be dislodged unless power is raised against it. That is the only way of stopping the exploitation of the weak by strong.

Why has Mr. Gandhi and the Harijan Sevak Sangh limited their means of resistance to the Caste Hindu domination to peaceful persuasion? Why do they not resist the injustice of the Caste Hindus by direct action? I can understand that in organizing resistance to injustice, the problem is to find forms of resistance which will not destroy the meagre resources for rational and moral action which groups do possess. But there can be no difficulty on that account. Satyagraha or passive resistance has been found by Mr. Gandhi as a form of resistance which is morally beyond cavil. Why does not Mr. Gandhi ask the Sangh to launch Satyagraha by the Untouchables against the Caste Hindus for the abolition of the injustice against the Untouchables. He asked the people of India to offer Satyagraha against British Imperialism. Why does he not want to use the same means against the caste Hindus in the interests of the Untouchables ?

¹ Moral Man and Immoral Society/*passim*.

What is the answer of Mr. Gandhi to this question? The only answer I can see is that it comes in the way of *his* politics. Mr. Gandhi must remain at the head of the nation. I wonder if life would be worthwhile to him if for some reason he ceased to be at the head of the nation. He is, I think, the most ambitious politician. I know, he regards as his rivals those whom he calls as friends. To be at the head of the nation means that he must preserve the integrity of the Congress. The Congress is ninety nine per cent composed of Hindus. How can Gandhi succeed in maintaining the integrity of the Congress if he were to direct the Sangh to carry on Satyagraha against the Hindus for the sake of the Untouchables. The Hindus would leave the Congress and the Congress would disrupt. This is detrimental to the interests of Mr. Gandhi. This is the explanation why Mr. Gandhi and the Sangh have adopted peaceful persuasion as the only means of removing untouchability. It is a means which is least likely to hurt the Hindus and the Congress. Not only in big matters but even in small matters the Sangh is careful to see that the Hindus are not hurt or annoyed. I am told that in distributing scholarships for instance the Sangh makes inquiries into the political affiliations of the applicant and if it is found that the applicant belongs to a community which is against the Congress or the Hindus, he gets no aid from the funds of the Sangh.

I wonder if any one will have any doubts left that Mr. Gandhi and the Sangh in limiting themselves to peaceful persuasions were controlled by political considerations of not annoying the Hindus and disrupting the Congress. This is what I meant when I said that the Sangha's politics and that its failure is due to wrong politics. I am sure I am using mild language when I describe it as wrong politics. It is treachery if the surrender of the interests of his ward by his guardian can be described as treachery.

Mr. Gandhi is often compared with Jesus Christ both by his Indian and European friends. What may be the justification for so strange a comparison? In one thing I see a complete contrast between the two. Both Jesus and Gandhi claimed to serve the lowly. This befriending attitude of both was resented by the upper classes. How did the two react? When Jesus was taunted by the Pharisees he retorted by saying—"They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick". How sharp is the contrast between this attitude of Jesus and that of Mr. Gandhi. Jesus did not worry about those who were 'whole'. Gandhi is devoted to those who are 'whole' and who are sinning at the cost of those who are sick and who are sinned against. Gandhi is no physician to the untouchables. At best a sympathiser and nothing more.

Even as a sympathizer of the Untouchables his sympathy for them is limited by two considerations. It is limited by his social aims. Secondly it is also limited by his politics. Lest this statement should be doubted, I wish to give two instances, one of each which have occurred recently. They have occurred not far from Shegaon in Central provinces where Mr. Gandhi resides.

As an instance of the first I refer to what is known in India as the Khare episode. In 1938 last there was a ministerial crisis in the Central Provinces where the ministry was a Congress Ministry. The Prime Minister Dr. Khare fell out with his colleagues. As Prime Minister he demanded the resignation of other ministers which they were not prepared to give without the consent of the Congress Parliamentary Board. But Dr. Khare forced them to give their resignations which they ultimately did. Thereupon Dr. Khare formed another Congress cabinet and filled the ministerial offices with men of his choice. In his new cabinet Dr. Khare included an untouchable as a minister. Dr. Khare's conduct in dissolving the old cabinet and forming a new one without consulting the Congress Parliamentary Board came up for investigation before the Congress Working Committee. Dr. Khare was found guilty of breach of party discipline and was deposed from his primiership. One of the accusations levelled against Dr. Khare by Mr. Gandhi was that he included an untouchable in his new Ministry. The following is the full text of what Mr. Gandhi said to Dr. Khare on this point and reduced to writing by Dr. Khare for my sake:

“Mahatmaji took me to task for including a Harijan in my second cabinet. I retorted by saying that it was a Congress programme of uplift of Harijans for which Mahatmaji fasted unto death and that I did what I could in furtherance of that programme when opportunity offered itself and I think I have done nothing wrong in doing so. Thereupon Mahatmaji charged me of doing this for my selfish ambition. I repudiated this charge saying that any selfish motive is disproved by my resignation. Then Mahatmaji said that by my action I have thrown an apple of discord among the members of that simple community and have rendered disservice to the Congress cause by throwing this temptation in their way.”¹

That this is true and that Gandhi objected to the untouchable being included in the Cabinet is evidenced by the fact that when a new Congress Ministry was formed in Central Provinces this untouchable who functioned as a minister for a day was excluded. He should have been included as a matter of form, at least to keep up

¹ This statement was repeated by Dr. Khare at a meeting held in Servants of India Society's Hall in Bombay in support of his cause.

appearances. That he was not, shows that Gandhi was opposed to his inclusion on principle.

This is baffling because the Untouchable member of the Central Provinces Assembly who was chosen by Dr. Khare for ministership is a graduate, is a Congressman and is a strong party-man. Why should Mr. Gandhi have any objection to the inclusion of such a person in the Congress Cabinet. As a matter of fact if Mr. Gandhi was genuine in his professions regarding the untouchables he should have instructed all Congress Prime Ministers to include at least one untouchable in their Cabinets, if for nothing else, at least for its psychological effect upon the Untouchables and upon the Hindus. He should have done this irrespective of the party affiliations. Gandhi is not averse to congress making coalitions with other non-congress parties in provinces where it is not in a majority in order to secure offices. In such coalitions he has allowed Congress to include non-congressmen as ministers in their cabinets. If Gandhi can allow the congress to do this without losing its caste and its colour why Gandhi did not instruct the Congress Prime Ministers to include untouchables in the Congress Ministries if he wanted that when he talks about his love for the Untouchables he should be believed. But the case in the Central Provinces stand on a different footing. Here the Untouchable who was taken as a minister was a Congressman and a graduate. There could be no objection on the ground of his want of qualification or want of political faith. Why did Mr. Gandhi object to his inclusion? A crowd of Untouchables went to Shegaon to Mr. Gandhi for an explanation. Anticipating this Mr. Gandhi had started observing silence, so that no explanation could be had. Then the untouchables started Satyagraha against Mr. Gandhi for not including an Untouchable in the Central Provinces Congress Cabinet. To escape that embarrassment Mr. Gandhi left Shegaon and went on a tour to the North Western Frontier Provinces for teaching non-violence to the Pathans. I am sure Gandhi's silence on this occasion was not to commune with God. It was taken on as a convenient excuse for not being driven under the fire of cross examination to disclose his innermost thoughts about the Untouchables. In any case we have no answer to this question from Mr. Gandhi. To my mind there can be only one answer and that even if Gandhi had opened his mouth he could give no better. That answer is that Mr. Gandhi's ideal for the untouchable is a very low ideal and that all that he cares for is that the untouchable should be touched and that if he is touched without anybody taking a bath nothing further need be done about them. If Gandhi had tried and failed he would have been excused. But how can he be excused for entertaining so low an aim? Not failure but low aim is a crime.

As an instance of the second I refer to what is known as the Bachuma incident. If the first instance is baffling this second is gruesome. How gruesome it is can be seen from the brief summary of fact which I am giving. Bachuma, a small girl, 12 years old and belonged to an untouchable family which was living in *Wardha* (*This name is inserted as it was not mentioned in the MS.—Ed.*). One evening she was decoyed into the house of a Mahomedan who was the Sub-Inspector of Police. She was kept in his house and during the night this small child was raped by three Mahomedans, one was the Superintendent of Police himself, second a Sub-Inspector of Education and third a Lawyer. The three Mahomedans were tried in a Court of Law and two of them were sentenced to two years rigorous imprisonment and the lawyer was acquitted as the girl was not able to identify him. The two who were convicted appealed to the High Court but the High Court rejected their appeals and confirmed their convictions and sentences. From gaol they sent to the Governor-in-Council petitions for mercy. But they were also rejected. This happened before the Congress came into office. After the Congress came into office they submitted fresh applications for mercy to the Minister-in-charge. The Minister-in-charge, who was also a Mahomedan thought that there was nothing wrong in a Mahomedan committing rape on an untouchable girl and decided to set the culprits free. He granted the application of one—that of the Inspector of Education who is now a free man and is employed on a big job in the Education Department of a Mahomedan State. He was to release the other culprit also but in the meantime the agitation against him was so great that he had to resign his office. Every body expressed his resentment against the shameless act of the Minister but Mr. Gandhi has kept mum. So far he has not uttered a word of condemnation against this Minister. On the contrary he is even now engaged in the confabulations that are going on over the question of the reinstatement of this dismissed minister in his office which is still kept vacant. One likes to ask if Gandhi would have remained so silent and so unmoved if the little girl Bachuma who was raped by the three Mahomedans instead of being the daughter of an Untouchable had been Mr. Gandhi's own daughter. Why is Gandhi not able to make Bachuma's case his daughter's case? There are two answers. One is that Mr. Gandhi is not an untouchable. One must be born to it. Secondly Mr. Gandhi feels that by condemning the Muslim Minister for the sake of Bachuma he might destroy Hindu-Moslem Unity the maintenance of which is a fundamental creed of Congress politics. Does this now show that Mr. Gandhi's sympathies for the Untouchables are limited by his politics ?

What good is a man who is not even free to sympathize according to his conscience.

III

And now the temple entry. This is advertized as another of Mr. Gandhi's boons to the Untouchables.

This question of temple entry is the outcome of the resolution passed at the public meeting of the Hindus held on 25th September 1932 which also was the originating cause which gave birth to the Harijan Sevak Sangh. This resolution mentioned some of the liabilities of the Hindus towards the Untouchables. This list included the removal of the bar against the Untouchables in respect of admissions to Hindu temples.

Although the promise of temple entry was there in the Resolution the Untouchables did not insist upon its being fulfilled forthwith. The untouchables, at any rate a vast majority of them have not been keen for temple entry. When asked by Mr. Gandhi what I thought about temple entry I gave my opinion on it in the form of a statement which was issued to the Press on February 10*, 1933, and which is reproduced below:

STATEMENT ON TEMPLE ENTRY

Although the controversy regarding the question of temple entry is confined to the Sanatanists and Mahatma Gandhi, the Depressed Classes have undoubtedly a very important part to play in it, in so far as their position is bound to weigh the scales one way or the other, when the issue comes for final settlement. It is, therefore necessary, that their view point should be defined and stated so as to leave no ambiguity about it.

To the Temple Entry Bill of Mr. Ranga Iyer as now drafted, the Depressed Classes cannot possibly give their support. The principle of the Bill is that if a majority of Municipal and Local Board voters in the vicinity of any particular temple on a Referendum decide by a majority that the Depressed Classes shall be allowed to enter the temple, the Trustees or the Manager of that temple shall give effect to that decision. The principle is an ordinary principle of majority rule and there is nothing radical or revolutionary about the Bill and if the Sanatanists were a wise lot, they would accept it without demur.

The reasons why the Depressed Classes cannot support a Bill based upon this principle are two. One reason is that the Bill cannot hasten

**This statement is shown as of 14th February 1933 in Dr. Ambedkar's 'What Congressetc.' at pp. 108-13.-Ed.*

the day of Temple Entry for the Depressed Classes any nearer than would otherwise be the case. It is true that under the Bill the minority will not have the right to obtain an injunction against the Trustee or the Manager who throws open the temple to the Depressed Classes in accordance with the decision of the majority. But before one can draw any satisfaction from this clause and congratulate the author of the Bill, one must first of all feel assured that when the question is put to the vote there will be a majority in favour of the Temple Entry. If one is not suffering from illusions of any kind, one must accept that the hope of a majority voting in favour of Temple Entry will be rarely realised, if at all. Without doubt the majority is definitely opposed to day—a fact which is conceded by the Author of the Bill himself in his correspondence with the Shankaracharya. What is there in the situation as created after the passing of the Bill, which can lead one to hope that the majority will act differently? I find nothing. I shall, no doubt, be reminded of the results of the Referendum with regard to the Guruvayur Temple. But I refuse to accept a referendum so overweighed as it was by the Life of Mahatma Gandhi as the normal result. In any such calculations, the life of the Mahatma must necessarily be deducted. Secondly, the Bill does not regard untouchability in temples as a sinful custom. It regards untouchability merely as a social evil not necessarily worse than social evils of other sorts. For, it does not declare untouchability as such to be illegal. Its binding force is taken away only if a majority decides to do so. Sin and immorality cannot become tolerable because a majority is addicted to them or because the majority chooses to practice them. If untouchability is a sinful and an immoral custom, then in the view of the Depressed Classes it must be destroyed without any hesitation, even if it was acceptable to the majority. This is the way in which all customs are dealt with by Courts of Law, if they find them to be immoral and against public policy. This is exactly what the Bill does not do. The author of the Bill takes no more serious view of the custom of untouchability than does the temperance reformer of the habit of drinking. Indeed, so much is he impressed by the assumed similarity between the two that the method he has adopted is a method which is advocated by temperance reformers to eradicate the evil habit of drinking, namely by local option. One cannot feel much grateful to a friend of the Depressed Classes who holds untouchability to be no worse than drinking. If Mr. Ranga Iyer had not forgotten that only a few months ago Mahatma Gandhi had prepared himself to fast unto death if untouchability was not removed, he would have taken a more serious view of this curse and proposed a most thorough-going reform

to ensure its removal lock, stock and barrel. Whatever its shortcomings may be from the standpoint of efficacy, the least that the Depressed Classes could expect is for the Bill to recognise the principle that untouchability is a sin. I really cannot understand how the Bill satisfies Mahatma Gandhi who has been insisting that untouchability is a sin. It certainly does not satisfy the Depressed Classes. The question whether this particular Bill is good or bad, sufficient or insufficient, is a subsidiary question. The main question is; do the Depressed Classes desire Temple Entry or do they not ? This main question is being viewed by the Depressed Classes by two points of view. One is the materialistic point of view. Starting from it, the Depressed Classes think that the surest way for their elevation lies in higher education, higher employment and better ways of earning a living. Once they become well placed in the scale of social life they would become respectable and once they become respectable the religious outlook of the orthodox towards them is sure to undergo change, and even if this did not happen it can do no injury to their material interest. Proceeding on these lines the Depressed Classes say that they will not spend their resources in such an empty thing as Temple Entry. There is also another reason why they do not care to fight for it. That argument is the argument of 'self respect'. Not very long ago there used to be boards in club doors and other social resorts maintained by Europeans in India, which said "*Dogs and Indians not allowed*". The Temples of the Hindus carry similar boards today, the only difference is that the boards on the Hindu temples practically say "*All Hindus and all animals including dogs are admitted only Untouchables not admitted*". The situation in both cases is on a parity. But the Hindus never begged for admission in those places from which the Europeans in their arrogance had excluded them. Why should an untouchable beg for admission in a place from which he has been excluded by the arrogance of the Hindus ? This is the reasoning of the Depressed Class man who is interested in his material welfare. He is prepared to say to the Hindus, "To open or not to open your temples is a question for you to consider, and not for me to agitate. If you think, it is bad manners not to respect the sacredness of human personality, open your temples and be a gentleman. If you rather be a Hindu than be gentleman, then shut the doors and damn yourself, for I don't care to come."

"I found it necessary to put the argument in this form, because I want to disabuse the minds of men like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya of their belief that the Depressed Classes are looking forward expectantly for their patronage. The second point of view is the spiritual one. As religiously minded people, do the Depressed

Classes desire temple entry or do they not? That is the question. From the spiritual point of view, they are not indifferent to temple entry as they would be, if the material point of view alone were to prevail. But their final answer must depend upon the reply which Mahatma Gandhi and the Hindus give to the following question:

What is the drive behind this offer of temple entry? Is temple entry to be the final goal of the advancement in the social status of the Depressed Classes in the Hindu fold ? Or is it only the first step and if it is the first step, what is the ultimate goal? Temple entry as a final goal the Depressed Classes can never support. Indeed they will not only reject it, but they would then regard themselves as rejected by Hindu Society and free to find their own destiny elsewhere. On the other hand, if it is only to be a first step in the direction, they may be inclined to support it. The position would then be analogous to what is happening in the politics of India today. All Indians have claimed Dominion Status for India. The actual constitution will fall short of Dominion Status and many Indians will accept it. Why? The answer is that as the goal is defined, it does not matter much if it is to be reached by steps and not in one jump. But if the British had not accepted the goal of Dominion Status, no one would have accepted the partial reforms which many are now prepared to accept. In the same way if Mahatma Gandhi and the reformers were to proclaim what the goal which they set before themselves is for the advancement of the social status of the Depressed Classes in the Hindu fold, it would be easier for the Depressed Classes to define their attitude towards temple entry. The goal of the Depressed Classes might as well be stated here for the information and consideration of all concerned. What the Depressed Classes want is a religion, which will give them equality of social status. To prevent any misunderstanding, I would like to elaborate the point by drawing a distinction between social evils which are the results of secular causes and social evils which are founded upon the doctrines of religion. Social evils can have no justification whatsoever in a civilised society. But nothing can be more odious and vile than that admitted social evils should be sought to be justified on the ground of religion. The Depressed Classes may not be able to overthrow inequities to which they are being subjected. But they have made up their mind not to tolerate a religion that will lend its support to the continuance of these inequities. If the Hindu religion is to be their religion then it must become a religion of Social Equality. The mere amendment of Hindu religious code by the mere inclusion in it of a provision to permit temple entry for all, cannot make it a religion of

Equality of social status. All that it can do is to recognise them as nationals and not aliens, if I may use these terms which have become so familiar in politics. But that cannot mean that they would thereby reach a position where they would be free and equal without being above or below any one else, for the simple reason that the Hindu religion does not recognise the principle of equality of social status; on the other hand fosters inequality by insisting upon grading people as Brahmins, Kashatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras which now stand towards one another in an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of contempt. If the Hindu religion is to be a religion of social equality then an amendment of its code to provide temple entry is not enough. What is required is to purge it of the doctrine of Chaturvarna. That is the root cause of all inequality and also the parent of the caste system and untouchability which are merely forms of inequality. Unless it is done not only will the Depressed Classes reject temple entry, they will also reject the Hindu faith. Chaturvarna and the caste system are incompatible with the self respect of the Depressed Classes. So long it continues to be the cardinal doctrine, the Depressed Classes must continue to be looked upon as low. For the Depressed Classes to say that they are Hindus is to admit their inferiority of status by their own mouth. They can call themselves as Hindus only when the theory of Chaturvarna and caste system is abandoned and expunged from the Shastras. Do the Mahatma and the Hindu reformers accept this as their goal and will they show the courage to work for it ? I shall look forward to their pronouncements on this issue as I have stated it with great concern. But whether Mahatma Gandhi and the Hindus are prepared for this or not, let it be known once for all that nothing short of this will satisfy the Depressed Classes and make them accept temple entry. To accept temple entry and be content with it, is to temporize with evil and barter away the sacredness of human personality that dwells in them.

There is however one argument which Mahatma Gandhi and the reforming Hindus may advance against the position I have taken. They may say, "acceptance by the Depressed Classes of Temple entry now, will not prevent them from agitating hereafter for the abolition of Chaturvarna and caste". If that is their goal, I like to meet this argument right at this stage with a view to clinch the issue and clear the road for future developments. My reply is that it is true that my right to agitate for the abolition of Chaturvarna and caste system will not be lost, if I accept Temple Entry now. But the question is on what side will Mahatma Gandhi be at the time when

the question is put. If he will be in the camp of my opponents I must tell him that I cannot be in his camp now. If he will be in my camp, he ought to be in it now”.

My friend Dewan Bahadur R. Srinivasan expressed himself almost in the same terms on the question of temple entry. He said:

“When a Depressed Classes member is permitted to enter into the Caste Hindu temples he would not be taken into any one of the four castes, but treated as man of fifth or the last or the lowest caste, a stigma worse than the one to be called an untouchable. At the same time he would be subjected to so many caste restrictions and humiliations. The Depressed Classes shun the one who enters like that and exclude him as Casteman. The crores of Depressed Classes would not submit to caste restrictions. They will be divided into sections if they do.

Temple entry cannot be forced by law. The village castemen openly or indirectly defy the law. To the village Depressed Classman it would be like a scrap of paper on which word “sugar” was written and placed in his hands for him to taste.

The above facts are placed before the public in time to save confusion and disturbance in the country.”

But Mr. Gandhi felt otherwise that securing temple entry to the untouchables was a liability of the Hindus which ought to be liquidated first. Accordingly immediately after the Poona Pact he started a campaign among the Hindus for opening the doors of their temples to the Untouchables.

How far has Mr. Gandhi succeeded in this matter is a question that may legitimately be asked. But it is difficult to know the truth. As a result of the fast, many temples were reported to have been thrown open by the Hindus to the Untouchables. How far this was true and how far it is a part of lying propaganda which the Congressman is so good at it is difficult to say. That many of the temples that were opened as a sequel to the fast were purified and closed to the Untouchables is beyond dispute. Again the opening of a temple may be quite a meaningless act. There are hundreds and thousands of temples in which there is no worship. They are occupied by only donkeys. Instances of such temples can be seen at places of pilgrimage such as Nasik and Wai. If such a temple is declared to be open it is not only a meaningless act but it is an insult to the Untouchables. Again a temple may be opened to the Untouchable. But if it is abandoned by the Caste Hindus as a place of worship it cannot be said that it is open in the sense that they are welcomed to it by the Hindus. There is yet another possibility which must be taken into account in arriving at the truth.

A temple may be open to the untouchables in the same sense as the Ritz Hotel in London is open to all. We however know that the Ritz Hotel is not in fact open to all. It is open only to those who can afford. In the same way a temple may be open to the untouchables yet in fact it is open only to those untouchables who can afford to enter. If the cost of temple entry is assault or social boycott then the cost will be prohibitive and the temple though nominally open is really closed. Assault and social boycott are a matter of course with the Hindus and it would not be too much to assume that in some case the Hindus would resort to such means to prohibit the Untouchables who dare to enter a temple which is declared to be open to them. If the case is one like this then it is a fraud.

Which of the two classes of cases are more numerous, it is difficult to say accurately. But a guess may be made on the basis of certain facts. There are two classes of Hindus now in India—the orthodox Hindus who care more for religion than for politics and the Congress Hindus who care more for politics and less for religion. The former who have no political ends to subserve can be honest i.e. true to their convictions however wrong they may be. The latter who have to serve political ends cannot always take an honest view but are prone to adopt dishonest ways. The first method of abandonment though honest brings discredit upon the Hindu community in the eyes of the world and is therefore politically unsuitable. The second method of opening the temple nominally and closing it really by *Hindus* (*This word is inserted by us against the blank space of MS.—Ed.*) is politically highly advantageous. It has the merit of a system which shows to the world that credit is opened and which clandestinely but without the world knowing prevents its being drawn upon by the person in whose favour it is declared to be opened. The Congress Hindus are more numerous than the orthodox Hindus. That being the case I should think that the second classes of cases must be more numerous than the first.

That genuine cases of opening of temples are very few and that most of the published reports of opening of temples is just false propaganda is clear from the fate of the Temple Entry Bill of Mr. Ranga Iyer brought by him in the Central Legislature in 1934. Of that Bill I will speak of at a later occasion.

With this I would have closed this discussion of the subject. But Mr. Gandhi insists that a spiritual awakening has taken place among the Hindus and relies upon the Temple Entry Proclamation of Travancore. I am therefore obliged to deal with this claim.

The success of temple entry cannot be determined by the number of temples opened. It can be determined only by reference to the motive with which it is done. Is the motive spiritual ? That can be the only test.

Now I say that temple entry is not a spiritual act. It is a political manouver.

Is Mr. Gandhi acting from spiritual motive? In appealing to the Hindus Mr. Gandhi said:

“I have adressed this appeal to you, which proceeds out of my soul’s agony. I ask you to share that agony and shame with me and cooperate with me, for I have no other end to serve than to see *Sanatoria Dharma* revived and lived in its reality in the lives of millions who at present seem to me to deny it.”

This soul’s agony was born after the Poona Pact. What did Mr. Gandhi think of the Problem of Temple Entry before the Poona Pact? Before the Poona Pact Mr. Gandhi was of different opinion. That opinion was expressed not very long before the Poona Pact and not long before this appeal was addressed to the Hindus from which I have..... It was expressed in Gandhi Shikshan, Vol. II, p. 132. Mr. Gandhi then held the opinion that separate temples should be built for the use of Untouchables.

Mr. Gandhi said:¹

“How is it possible that the Antyajas (Untouchables) should have the right to enter all the existing temples? As long as the law of caste and ashram has the chief place in Hindu Religion, to say that every Hindu can enter every temple is a thing that is not possible today.”

It is obvious that Temple Entry is not original with him and therefore not spiritual. The agony is caused by the grave and sudden provocation brought about by the demand of the untouchables for separate electorates. Mr. Gandhi was afraid of the principle underlying separate electorates. He felt that this principle may be extended and may ultimately lead to separation and cessation of the Untouchables from the Hindu fold. It was to counter this move that he changed his opinion and started the temple entry move. The motive of Mr. Gandhi is political and there is nothing spiritual about it.

I do not wish this conclusion to rest merely upon this evidence of change of front on the part of Mr. Gandhi. There is abundance of other evidence in support of it.

I will refer first to the Guruvayur Temple Satyagraha which was started by a caste Hindu by name Kellappan to secure entry into the Guruvayur Temple for the Untouchables. A few facts regarding this episode may be interesting.

¹ Quoted from ‘What Congress & Gandhi have done to the Untouchables’, p. 107 (Not in MS).

The point to note is the attitude that Mr. Gandhi finally adopted in this matter when he was challenged by the leaders of the orthodox Hindus. Mr. Gandhi became ready for a compromise with the orthodox. The terms of the compromise were as follows. I give them in Mr. Gandhi's own words as reported in the papers.¹

“During certain hours of the day the Guruvayur Temple should be thrown open to the Harijans and other Hindus, who have no objection to the presence of the Harijans and during certain other hours it should be reserved for those, who have scruples against the entry of the Harijans. There should be no difficulty whatsoever in the acceptance of this suggestion, seeing that in connection with the Krithikai Ekadashi festival in Guruvayur, the Harijans are allowed to enter side by side with the Hindus and then the temple or the idol undergoes purification.”

Asked if his suggestion was that the temple might undergo purification daily after the entry of the Harijans, Mr. Gandhi replied:

“Personally, I am opposed to purification at all. But if that would satisfy the conscience of the objectors I would personally in this case, raise no objection to purification. If purification has any value, then there are so many possibilities of daily defilement from a variety of causes referred to in various texts that there should be a daily purification, whether the Harijans are allowed to enter or not.”

This attitude is not spiritual. It is purely commercial. This is almost admitted by Mr. Gandhi. Asked if the compromise suggested by him did not still maintain a distinction between the Untouchables and the Caste Hindus Mr. Gandhi is reported to have said :

“The Harijans’ attitude should be this, ‘if there is a person who objects to my presence, I would like to respect his objection so long as he (the objector) does not deprive me of the right that belongs to me and so long as I am permitted to have my legitimate share of the days of offering worship side by side with those, who have no objection to my presence, I would be satisfied’.”

I do not know if any self respecting Untouchable would adopt this attitude of Mr. Gandhi. On these terms even dogs and cats are admitted in all temples when there are no human beings present in them. To divide the House of God in time or in space for worship for reconciling the rival claims of two opposing classes is in itself a quaint or grotesque idea. Mr. Gandhi evidently forgot that worshipping in the same temple is quite different from worshipping in common. Temple entry if it is to be spiritual must mean the latter. The former accepts that the presence of one class is repugnant to the other and proceeds to

¹ Times of India, 3rd January 1933.

reconcile the interests of the two. The latter presupposes that there is no repugnance between the two classes and that they accept the common denominator of humanity as being present in both.

This shows that Mr. Gandhi is least motivated by spiritual considerations. He is in a hurry to bring the Untouchables within the Hindu stables so as to prevent their running away.

Another piece of evidence which goes to disprove Mr. Gandhi's claim that he is acting from spiritual consideration is furnished by his conduct with reference to Mr. Ranga Iyer's *'Temple Entry Bill'*. It shows that the soul's agony is only a picturesque phrase and not a fact.

Some history of this Bill is necessary to understand the tragedy which ultimately befell Mr. Ranga Iyer the author of it.

Since the new constitution came into operation two Acts have been passed in two Provinces by the Congress Governments. One in Bombay and another in Madras. There is no substance in the Acts. They do not declare the Temples to be open. They permit the Trustees of the Temples under their management if they desire and as there is nothing to compel the Trustees to do so the Acts are just scraps of paper and nothing more. But the Madras Act has a history which is somewhat puzzling. The Madras Prime Minister who got the Act passed is Mr. Rajagopalachariar. He occupies a very high place in the Congress, so high indeed that he is called Deputy Mahatma. If one can solve the puzzle the solution will reveal the mind of the Author and therefore of Mr. Gandhi who is the living spirit behind all this.

Let me turn to the Travancore Temple Entry. The proclamation of 12th November 1936 issued by the Maharaja opening the Temple open to the Untouchables is a gorgeous document. It reads as follows:

"Profoundly convinced of the truth and validity of our religion, believing that it is based on divine guidance and on all-comprehending toleration, knowing that in its practice it has throughout the centuries adapted itself to the need of the changing times, solicitous that none of our Hindu subjects should, by reason of birth, caste or community, be denied the consolation and solace of the Hindu faith, we have decided and hereby declare, ordain and command that, subject to such rules and conditions as may be laid down and imposed by us for preserving their proper atmosphere and maintaining their rituals and observances, there should henceforth be no restriction placed on any Hindu by birth or religion on entering or worshipping at temples controlled by us and our Government."

What spirituality underlies this proclamation?

The proclamation was issued by the Maharaja of Travancore in his name. But the real active force behind the scene was the Prime Minister Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer. It is his motives that we must understand. In 1933 Sir C. P. R. Iyer was also the Prime Minister of Travancore. In 1933 Mr. Gandhi was fighting to get the Guruvayur Temple opened to all Untouchables. Among the many who took part in the controversy over the issue of Temple entry was Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer. No body seems now to remember this fact. But it is important to recall it because it helps us to understand the motives which prompted him to press the Maharaja to issue this proclamation. What attitude did Sir C. P. Ramawasmi Iyer have regarding this issue in 1933? It will be clear from the following statement which he issued to the press¹ :

“Personally I do not observe caste rules. I realise there are strong, though not very articulate, feelings in this matter in the minds of men who believe that the present system of temple worship and its details are based on divine ordinances. The problem can be permanently solved only by a process of mutual adjustment and by the awakening of religious and social leaders of Hindu society to the realities of the present situation and to the need for preserving the solidarity of the Hindu community.

“Shock tactics will not answer the purpose and direct action will be even more fatal in this sphere than in the political. I have the misfortune to differ from Mr. Gandhi when he says that the problem of temple entry can be divorced from such topics as interdining and I agree with Dr. Ambedkar that the social and economic uplift of the Depressed Classes should be our immediate and urgent programme.”

This statement shows that in 1933 spiritual considerations did not move Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer. Spiritual considerations have become operative after 1933. Is there any particular reason why these spiritual considerations should have been thought of in 1936?

This question can be answered only if one bears in mind the fact that in 1936 there was held in Travancore a Conference of the Yezawa Community to consider the issue of conversion which was raised by me at Yeola in 1935. The Yezawas are an untouchable community spread over Malabar. It is an educated community and economically quite strong. It is also a vocal community and has been carrying on agitation in the state for social, religious and political rights. The Yezawas form a very large community. The cessation of so large a community would

¹ *The statement is reproduced from Dr. Ambedkar's, 'What Congress & Gandhi have done to the Untouchables', p. 318. This was not mentioned in the MS.—Ed.*

be a deathknell to the Hindus and the Conference had made the danger real as well as immediate. It was this which brought about a change in the attitude of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer. The spiritual considerations are just an excuse. They did not form the motives.

How far did this Proclamation change facts and how far it has remained a show? It is not possible to get real facts as they exist in Travancore. In the course of the discussion on the *Malabar Temple Entry Bill* in the Madras Legislative Assembly certain facts relating to Travancore were mentioned by Sir T. Pannirselvam, which if true would show that the whole thing is hollow.

Sir T. Pannirselvam said:

“One of the arguments advanced by the Premier in support of the measure was that temples in Travancore had been thrown open to the “Untouchables”. A Maharaja vested with autocratic powers did so by an order. But how was it working there ? From representations received, he was led to believe that after the first flush of enthusiasm, Harijans had left off going to temples, and people who used to worship previously before Harijans were allowed to enter the temples, had stopped worshipping in temples. He would ask the Government to tell them if the measure was really a success in Travancore.”

On the third reading of the Bill, Sir T. Pannirselvam made a statement which must have come as a surprize to many. He said:

“He wanted to know whether it was a fact that the private temples of the Senior Maharani were excluded from the proclamation. What was the reason for it? Again during the celebration of the marriage of the daughter of the Senior Maharani it was found necessary, so he was told, to perform purificatory ceremony of the temple. If such a purification of temples took place, what happened to the proclamation?”

These facts were not challenged by the Prime Minister. Evidently they cannot be challenged. If they are incontrovertible then the less said about the Malabar Temple Entry proclamation as a spiritual testament the better.

It would not be proper to close this discussion without advertng to the fear which some Untouchables entertain regarding this Temple entry movement. It is just a movement of social reform or is it a strategy ?

The special privileges which the Untouchables have got in the matter of politics, in the matter of education, in the matter of services are founded upon the fact that they are Untouchables. If they cease to be Untouchables their claim to these special privileges could at once be

challenged. If untouchability goes then they would be just poor and backward. But as poor and backward they would not be entitled to any special privileges which they have as untouchables. What is the plan of these protagonists of Temple Entry? Is it just to open temples or aim is ultimately to take away the privileges? This fear is lurking in the minds of many a thinking Untouchables. That the fear is a real fear is clear from what is happening in Travancore itself. A correspondent of mine who represents the All Travancore Pulayar Cheramar Aykia Maha Sangham writes to me as follows in a letter, dated 24th November 1938. I give below the full text of the letter sent by him to me.

To
Dr. Ambedkar,
Bombay.

Camp Mayyanad, 24-11-1938
Quilon.

Respected Sir,

I have unaffected pleasure to draw your attention to the following facts for obtaining the valuable advice from you. Being the leader of a Harijan Community of the Travancore State, I think, it is my paramount duty to suggest you definitely all the grievances that the Harijans of this state are enduring.

1. The Temple Entry Proclamation issued by the H. H. The Maharaja is indeed a boon to Harijans; but the Harijans are enjoying all the other social disabilities except the temple entry. The proclamation is a check to the further concessions to us. The Government do not take any step for the amelioration of the Harijans.
2. Among 15 lakhs of Harijans, there are a few graduates, half a dozen undergraduates and 50 school finals and more than two hundred vernacular certificate holders. Though the Government have appointed a Public Service Commission, appointments of the Harijans are very few. All the appointments are given to Savarnas. If a Harijan is appointed it will be for one week or two weeks. According to the rules of the recruitment in Public Service the applicant is allowed to apply only after a year again, while a Savarna will be appointed for a year or more. When the list of the appointments is brought before the assembly, the number of appointments will be equal to the communal representation; but the duration of the post of all the Harijans will be equal to one Savarna. This kind of fraud is associating with the officials. Thus the public service is a common property of the Savarnas. No Harijan is benefitted by it.

3. There was a proclamation from H. H. the Maharaja, a few years ago that three acres of ground should be given to each Harijan to live in; but the Officials are Savarnas who are always unwilling to carry out the proclamation. Even though the Government is willing to grant large extent of ground for pasturing near Towns not a piece of the ground is given to the Harijans. The Harijans are still living in the compounds of the Savarnas and are undergoing manifold difficulties. Though large extents of ground lay in "Reserve", the applications of the Harijans for granting grounds are not at all regarded with importance or listen to. The most parts of the lands are benefited by the Savarnas.
4. The Government nominates every year of the election of members of the Assembly one member from each Harijan Community. Though they are elected to present the grievances of the Harijans before the Assembly, they are found to be the machinery of the Government viz., the toys of the Savarna officers, who are benefited by them. Thus the grievances of the Harijans cannot be redressed any way.
5. All the Harijans of Travancore are labourers in the fields and compounds. They are the servants of the Savarnas who behave them as beasts—no body to look after or protection—every Harijan gets only 2 chs (one anna) as the wage in the most parts of the State. The social disabilities are the same to them even after the temple entry. The workers in the factories in various parts of the State of Travancore and the Officers of the State are all Savarnas and they are at present agitating for responsible Government. Now the Harijans are demanding jobs in Government and in factories but the agitation in Travancore is a Savarna agitation by which the Savarnas are making arrangements to get rid of Harijans in Public Service and factories. They plead for higher salaries and more privileges. They pay the least care to the Harijan labourers while the people of Travancore are maddened with the agitation of the workers in the factories. The standard of salary of Harijan worker is very low while the standard of a factory worker is thrice the former.
6. Due to starvation and proper means of livelihood the heads of the children of Harijans are heated as a result of which they are likely to fail in school. Before proclamation the duration of concession in high schools was for 6 years, now, it has reduced to three years by which a good number of students stopped their education after their failure.
7. There is a department for the Depressed Classes and the head of which is Mr. C. O. Damodaran (the protector of the Backward Communities). Though every year a big amount is granted

for the expenditure, at the end of the year, 2/3 of the sum is lapsed by its sagacity. He is used to submit reports to the Government that there is no way of spending the amount. 95 per cent of the sum allotted for the Depressed Class is spent as the salary of the officials who are always Savarna and 5 per cent is benefited. Now the Government is going to make some colonies in three parts of Travancore. The officers are Savarnas. This scheme is, in my opinion, not a success for the Government do not pay greater to it. I regret that Travancore Government spends one anna for the Harijan cause, while Cochin State spends a rupee for the same.

The majority of the subjects of Travancore are now agitating strongly for Responsible Government under an organization "The State Congress". The leaders of this popular organization belong to the four major communities of the State namely, the Nair, Mohamedan, Christian and Ezhava community. The President of the State Congress Mr. Thanu Pillai issued a statement in which he stressed that special concessions would be given to the Depressed Class. All the leaders of the Depressed Class have been waiting for a time to see the attitude of the State Congress. Now we come to understand that there is no reality in the promises of these leaders.

Now I am sure that the leaders have neglected the cause of the Depressed Class. The State Congress was started on the principles of nationalism and now it has become an institution of communalism. Communal spirit is now working among the leaders. In every public speech, statement or article, the leaders mention only these four major communities, while they have no thought on us. I fear, if this is the case of the leaders of the political agitation of Travancore, the situation of the Depressed Class will be more deplorable when the Responsible Government is achieved, for the entire possession of the Government will be then within the clutches of the abovementioned communities and the Depressed Classes' rights and privileges will be devoured by the former. In the meetings of the working committee of the State Congress 2/3 of the time had devoted in discussion concerning the strike of the Alleppey Coir Factories; but nothing was mentioned in the meeting about the Harijan workers who are undergoing manifold difficulties. The workers in Factories are Savarnas and the agitation for obtaining Responsible Government is a kind of anti Harijan movement. The motive of every leader of the State Congress is to improve the situation (circumstance) of the Savarna. The leaders of the major communities have some mercenary attitude who are going to sacrifice the Depressed Class for their progress.

These are the conditions of the Depressed Class of the State. What are the ways by which we have to establish our rights in the State ? I humbly request you to be good enough to render me your advice at this occasion. I am awaiting for the reply.

Excuse me for the trouble,

Yours faithfully,
Srinarayanswami.”

If the plan of Temple Entry is ultimately to deprive the Untouchables of their statutory rights then the movement is not only not spiritual but it is positively mischievous and it would be the duty of all honest people to warn the Untouchables, ‘*Beware of Gandhi*’.

●●