
Difference between the Ideological of Gandhi and Ambedkar

Dr. Arpula Narsimha

Department of Philosophy, Osmania University, Hyderabad. T.S, INDIA.

ABSTRACT

Mahatma Gandhi and Dr.B R Ambedkar sought to reform the existing society by questioning its basic presuppositions. They fought various persistent evils of the Indian society, while both were rebels and reformers; they differed considerably in their Principles and ideologies. Mahatma Gandhi tried to rebuild India mainly through spiritual and higher values of the glorious ideals of India's past. Ambedkar wanted to rebuild India with a complete rejection of India's past. He held that "Any place there are social alright A wrongs, the strength of the bodypolitic requires that they will be expelled before they become the images of enduring a bad form. For it is the social and monetary shades of malice which wherever are the parent of unrest or decay."5 Ambedkar as well, accepted that religion is an establishment for human life and society and society can't get by without profound quality. He contended that an arrangement of virtues is important to advance amicable life, maintaining balance and fraternity and dismissing superstitious enchantment, unreasonableness and dazzle convictions. As a humanist and a logical mastermind, he was an unpleasant pundit of the Hindu social request. He hoped that Hinduism could be reformed if not revolutionized. At the point when he thought about deserting Hinduism for some other religion, he discovered his answer in the message of Buddhism. Buddhism was of Indian cause and was, as indicated by him, better than other religion including Hinduism. Hinduism frequented him for his entire life like an apparition; it is in Buddhism that he at last discovered his comfort.

KEYWORDS: *Mahatma Gandhi, Dr.B R Ambedkar, Ideological Buddhism, Hinduism.*

INTRODUCTION

The methods received by Mahatma Gandhiji and Dr. Ambedkarto improve the part of the majority in India were moved in various ways. It is by utilizing the standards of the humanistic Philosophy that Mahatma Gandhiji needed India to take care of every one of her issues and come up as a unified solid country. Ambedkar didn't consent to this arrangement, Humanistic and man making reasoning lectured that God is all invading and stays in poor people and the pathetic. In any case, the Hindus gave unfair treatment to poor people and the pitiful, Mahatma Gandhiji, that Hindus ought not surrender his religion however offer society to develop. It means that casteism and distance must be disappeared from our society. This was troublesome, as indicated by Ambedkar, in light of the fact that the adherents of Hinduism kept on rehearsing casteist thoughts and teachings in the social and political circles. The encounter among Gandhi and Ambedkar didn't stop with these issues and occasions. The last contrast between the two was over India's way of advancement itself. Gandhi accepted, and contended for, a town focused model of advancement, one which would neglect any hard way of industrialism yet look to accomplish what he called "Slam raj", an admired blended customary town network. Ambedkar, conversely, needed financial advancement and with it

industrialization as the essential for the abrogation of neediness. He demanded consistently that it ought to be laborer benevolent, not free enterprise, now and again contending for "state communism", (however he later would acknowledge a few types of private responsibility for) and he stayed as far as possible of his life fundamentally a fair communist. To him, towns were a long way from being a perfect; rather they were "cesspools," a cauldron of backwardness, convention and subjugation. Untouchables needed to escape from towns, and India likewise needed to dismiss her town past.

Albeit both Mahatma Gandhiji and Dr. Ambedkar were relatively incredible nationalists, then two were extremely dynamic and vivacious till the end and served the different reasons for individuals. Mahatma Gandhiji enlivened and guided a few dynamic and noticeable Indians who made 214 different foundations and Ashrams, schools and medical clinics and spread his message over the Indian subcontinent and over the world. Since Mahatma Gandhiji originated from the upper standing foundation, he had no obstacles to cross or embarrassments to endure just like the parcel of Dr. Ambedkar." Mahatma Gandhiji had another common preferred position. He had the sponsorship of the informed upper standing individuals who had cash, property, social and political experience and associations with construct and run, different foundations; They could without much of a stretch give and gather gifts. They could manufacture distributing houses to distribute the works by and on Mahatma Gandhiji, They could undoubtedly get the help of the legislature or regulatory organizations or workplaces. At the point when the pupils of Mahatma Gandhiji had gatherings or talks, they could get group of spectators of understudies and residents. Mahatma Gandhiji was a progressive yet he was a philosophical and social progressive. He was seen as a political progressive or a peril to the British domain or the administration of India. His assets and energies were not redirected for countering any ominous or antagonistic propaganda. He was wearing half necked garments and this directed moment gathering and acknowledgment of his character and mission. Individuals tuned in to his mindfully and pursued his recommendation promptly. He procured followers and disciples from all over India.

Social Democracy of Dr. B.R.Ambedkar According to Dr. Ambedkar, current majority rules system depends on assent of the individuals and goes for welfare of the individuals. He characterizes majority rules system as, "a structure and a strategy for government whereby revolutionery changes in the financial and public activity of the individuals are achieved without slaughter". In vote based system, the people who are appropriately approved by the individuals to administer over them attempt to present changes in the social and financial existence of the individuals, with the goal that welfare of the individuals could be conceivable. Having confidence in the belief system of parliamentary popular government Ambedkar held that the genuine soul of majority rules system comprised of genuine fairness. He stated, "Our point is to acknowledge by and by our optimal of exclusive one incentive in varying backgrounds. It is on the grounds that the agent government is the methods for the discouraged classes it is to give it an incredible worth." Dr. Ambedkar's objective was to understand the social, financial and political opportunity in the parliamentary type of popularity based government. He was very sure that it could get the vote based unrest India as it guaranteed self government just as great government, right to life, freedom and quest for joy, evacuation of social, monetary and political disparity and making it feasible for each subject to appreciate opportunity from need and dread. Thus, Ambedkar looked to activate the discouraged standings so as to build up parliamentary majority rule government in India.

Removal of Untouchability Movement: A short Comparison : Gandhiji constantly focused on truth and peacefulness in his works, while Ambedkar consistently encouraged to acknowledge "opportunity, correspondence and club" as the goals in the social reproduction. Dr. Ambedkar had an incredible beginning issue. His position consistently came in the manner. In spite of the fact that the Maharaja of Baroda and the Maharaja of Kolhapur gave him much help and help for his training and work, this was insufficient. He needed to battle all over the place. He got taught, a backer and a teacher yet it was difficult for him to get the same number of upper station companions and supporters as one would have wished. A large portion of his devotees and supporters originated from the lower ranks, uncommonly the Mahars and others. These didn't have any special or impact positions in the public arena.

Dr. Ambedkar scrutinized Gandhi's aims and responsibility to abrogate unapproachability. He considered Gandhi's situation on Varna and Caste an irresolute and a long way from the truth. He discovered Gandhi's view as literary, Gandhi used to state that Varna's are the division of Labor, useful specialization which is a component of any advanced society. Dr. Ambedkar held that varna is literary and standing is relevant. Practically speaking we don't have Varna framework, we have a rank framework and Gandhi himself doesn't pursue his Varna Dharma. After the preparation finished, I went on an individual journey to Gujarat, Gandhi's home state and the origin of the Salt March. I met with the proofreader of a Gandhi a diary in Gujarati, who revealed to me that he trusted Dr. Ambedkar saw things more precisely than Gandhi, and that his supporters have something to show the Gandhians. Gradually, the subtleties rose. The unpleasant question started during the 1930s, when Gandhi mounted a "quick unto-passing" in light of a British proposition, in light of Ambedkar's proposals, to grant the "discouraged classes" (the Dalits) a different electorate in the Indian parliament. Distraught exchanges under strain of sparing Gandhi's life brought about the Poona Pact which substituted an ensured number of seats in the parliament for the different electorate. In spite of the fact that the settlement was marked by Ambedkar, his devotees, and a considerable lot of Gandhi's supporters, the mind boggling arrangements expounded in it appeared to numerous to deny the Dalits any genuine access to control.

Regardless of what Ambedkar said at the opportunity to Gandhi and others, he later said he marked under monstrous pressure and guaranteed that Gandhi was really against balance for the Dalits. Ambedkar recommended in a 1955 meeting that Gandhi didn't really "merit" the title of Mahatma (incredible soul). But then, a nearby see Gandhi's own words drives me to presume that his position depended on a profound duty to completely killing distance from Hinduism. I have no trouble understanding and in any event, feeling for Gandhi's thinking. Gandhi didn't see political arrangements as such as principal and enduring. He looked for, rather, good and profound ways. He approached Hindus to make amends for and recover the transgression of unapproachability. He was worried that being politically isolated from the issue would leave Hindus without the inspiration to make the important difference in heart. He accepted that his eagerness to pass on would stir Hindus to the toxic substance of distance. To be sure, after his extraordinary quick, scores of networks expelled obstructions to "untouchables" going to sanctuaries and drinking water and eating with others. Ambedkar himself had initially felt that with widespread suffrage, held seats would be adequate. Be that as it may, general suffrage was not given, and the issues at the meeting spun around isolated electorates. Gandhi was accommodated to offering these to Muslims; he had just acknowledged their way of life as a different network. Not so for Dalits. At the point when

the Ramsay MacDonald Award was declared giving separate electorates to Dalits, he fought with a quick to death. Furthermore, this carried him into head on showdown with Ambedkar. The showdown among Ambedkar and Gandhi was a notable one. It had its beginnings in the Round Table Conferences of 1930-32. Ambedkar had gone for the first, as the prime delegate of Dalits, or Untouchables. In any case, when Gandhi at last chose to go to the subsequent gathering, he contended intensely that he spoke to the Untouchables, since they were a basic piece of the Hindu overlap—which he spoke to. To Ambedkar, the Untouchables were not a piece of the Hindus but rather "a section separated" (an expression he had once applied to himself), a particularly persecuted individuals. They could acknowledge, even welcome, the happening to freedom and its inescapable control by the Congress (for example by station Hindus), yet they required "safeguards". Ambedkar had initially felt that with widespread suffrage, saved seats would be adequate. However, general suffrage was not given, and the issues at the gathering rotated around independent electorates. Gandhi was accommodated to offering this to Muslims; he had just acknowledged their way of life as a different network. Not so for Dalits. At the point when the Ramsay MacDonald Award gave separate electorates to Dalits, he fought with a quick unto demise. Also, this carried him into face to face encounter with Ambedkar.

For Ambedkar, the issue was basic. On the off chance that Gandhi kicked the bucket, in towns all through India there would be slaughters against the Dalits. They would be slaughtered. Ambedkar gave up, and the Poona Pact formalized this with held seats for Dalits—more than they would have had something else, however in voting public currently constrained by position Hindus. Ambedkar composed, numerous years after the fact, in What Congress and Gandhi have Done to the Untouchables: "There was nothing respectable in the quick. It was a foul and messy act. The quick was not to support the Untouchables. It was against them and was the most noticeably awful type of pressure against a powerless people to surrender the protected shields (which had been granted to them)." He felt the entire arrangement of saved seats, at that point, was futile. For a considerable length of time a while later, the issue of political portrayal stayed ceaseless. Ambedkar kept on requesting separate electorates, however needlessly. Before an amazing finish, at the hour of composing his Thoughts on Linguistic States in 1953, he surrendered these likewise and looked to something like corresponding portrayal. However, the Poona Pact stayed an image of severe thrashing, and Gandhi from that time on was looked on as probably the most grounded adversary of the Untouchables by Ambedkar and his devotees.

CONCLUSION

The confrontation among Ambedkar and Gandhi was a prominent one. It had its beginnings in the Round Table Conferences of 1930-32. Ambedkar had gone for the first, as the prime representative of Dalits, or Untouchables. Regardless, when Gandhi finally decided to go to the consequent social affair, he battled seriously that he addressed the Untouchables, since they were a fundamental bit of the Hindu cover—which he addressed. To Ambedkar, the Untouchables were not a bit of the Hindus but instead "a segment isolated" (an articulation he had once applied to himself), an especially oppressed people. They could recognize, even welcome, the incident to opportunity and its unpreventable control by the Congress (for instance by station Hindus), yet they required "safeguards". Ambedkar had at first felt that with across the board suffrage, spared seats would be satisfactory. Nonetheless, general

suffrage was not given, and the issues at the social event turned around free electorates. Gandhi was suited to offering this to Muslims; he had quite recently recognized their lifestyle as an alternate system. Not so for Dalits. Exactly when the Ramsay MacDonald Award gave separate electorates to Dalits, he battled with a speedy unto end. Likewise, this conveyed him into eye to eye experience with Ambedkar.

For Ambedkar, the issue was fundamental. In case Gandhi kicked the can, in towns every single through Indium there would be butchers against the Dalits. They would be butchered. Ambedkar surrendered, and the Poona Pact formalized this with held seats for Dalits—more than they would have had something different, anyway in casting a ballot open as of now obliged by position Hindus. Ambedkar made, various years sometime later, in What Congress and Gandhi have Done to the Untouchables: "There was nothing decent in the speedy. It was a foul and chaotic act. The snappy was not to help the Untouchables. It was against them and was the most observably dreadful kind of weight against a feeble people to give up the ensured shields (which had been allowed to them)." He felt the whole course of action of spared seats, by then, was useless. For an extensive time span some time later, the issue of political depiction remained constant. Ambedkar continued mentioning separate electorates, anyway unnecessarily. Prior to an astonishing completion, at the hour of creating his Thoughts on Linguistic States in 1953, he gave up these in like manner and looked to something like relating depiction. In any case, the Poona Pact remained a picture of serious whipping, and Gandhi from that time on was looked on as presumably the most grounded foe of the Untouchables by Ambedkar and his lovers.

REFERENCES:

- i. Promode Bandhu Sengupta (1967). Hand book of Social P h i l o s o p h y , Banarjee Publishers, Calcutta, p.289
- ii. Gandhi, M.K.,quoted in Polak.H.S.L. Brails ford, H. N.,Penhic Lawrence, Lord, Mahatma Gandhi - The Father of Modern India, Publications, Delhi, 1986, p,149.