

CHAPTER-2

Ambedkar's repudiation of Hindu Social Order

As an inegalitarian and unjust scheme

Chapter-2

Ambedkar's repudiation of Hindu Social Order As an inegalitarian and unjust scheme

The Indian social system is peculiar in the world. Hinduism is the only religion in the world that recognizes Caste and Untouchability. The Caste System, popularly known as *Varnashrama dharma* has derived its sanction from the *Vedas* and *Manu Smriti* which are the sacred book of Hindu religion. To Hindus, a religious book is sacred and infallible, so is Caste which is eternal, sacred and divine ordain. Hinduism without Caste is like body without life. So first in the living human history of India, Lord Buddha, a great social reformer vehemently protested against the inhuman Hindu Social System, rejected the infallibility of *Vedas* and *Smritis* and instead strived for the establishment of egalitarian Social System. In 20th century Dr.B.R.Ambedkar, a great figure after Buddha, exposed the evil practices of the Hindu Social Order. He regarded the Brahminical Social Order as poison; and Hinduism as the perpetuator of the slavery of Untouchability.

Hinduism is a myth:

The people living in India have been called Hindus since the middle of the 6th century B.C. To Dr.Ambedkar, the pivotal thing to be recognised in the Hindu Society is a myth. The name 'Hindu' is itself a foreign name. It was given by the Mohammedans to the natives for the purpose of distinguishing themselves. It does not occur in any Sanskrit work prior to the Mohammedan invasion. According to Ambedkar, the Hindu society does not exist. It is a collection of Castes. Each Caste is conscious of its existence. In Hinduism, there is no feeling of brotherhood and Caste is regarded as the important factor of identification. Thus, survival of each Caste is the be all and end all of its existence.¹To Ambedkar, the Hindu society lacked social endosmosis. There was no Hindu consciousness pervading the whole of society and making it an integral unit. There is an utter lack among the Hindus of what the sociologists call 'consciousness of kind'. Actually, there is no Hindu consciousness of kind. In every Hindu the consciousness that exist is the consciousness of his Caste. Therefore, the Hindu cannot form a society or nation. Though the Hindus have similarity of habits and customs, beliefs and thoughts but it is not enough to constitute

a society. Men constitute a society because they have things which they possess in common. The only way by which men can possess things in common with one another is through the process of communication and so also sharing and participating in common activities which arouse emotions for others. Unfortunately, the Caste System prevents common activity and debarred Hindus from becoming a society.² Babasaheb Ambedkar disagreed with the view that Hinduism has all along been the religion of India. He said Hinduism is the latest development of social thought in India. The religion of India has undergone three changes; Vedic religion which was practiced first and gave away in course of time, to Brahmanism and this in turn to Hinduism.³ Dr. Ambedkar perceived Hinduism as the modified form of ancient Brahmanism. He said that in Hinduism, there was no difference between law and religion and law and ethics. Both are concerned with “regulating the conduct of low class Hindus to *subserve* the ends of high-Caste Hindus”.⁴ Dr. Ambedkar felt that inequality is the soul of Hinduism. The morality of Hinduism is only social. It is immoral, infamous and inhuman to say the least. Thus, Ambedkar said that the Hindu society lacked social endosmosis. There was no Hindu consciousness, which fails to make an integral unit among themselves. That is why the Hindu cannot be said to form a society or a nation. There was no communication between four-fold Varnas due to large number of castes and sub-castes. He further said that Hinduism is riddled of contradictions between dignified thoughts and base behaviour.⁵ Undeniably Hinduism preaches separation instead of union. The language commonly used that Hinduism upholds Caste and Unsociability perhaps disguises and conceals its genius. It is no doubt that the real genius of Hinduism is to divide the society. Both Caste and Untouchability stands for separation. While Caste is another name for separation, Untouchability expresses the extremist form of separation of community from community.⁶ He writes:

Hinduism and social union are incompatible. By its very genius Hinduism believes in social separation which is another name for social disunity and even creates social separation. If Hindus wish to be one, they will have to discard Hinduism. They cannot be one without violating Hinduism. Hinduism is the greatest obstacle to Hindu unity. Hinduism cannot create that longing to belonging which is the basis of all social unity. On the contrary Hinduism creates eagerness to separate.⁷

The literature of the Hindu is full of Caste genealogies in which an attempt is made to give a noble origin to one Caste while an ignoble origin to other Castes. The Brahmin's primary concern is to protect 'his interest', against those of the Non-Brahmins and Non-Brahmin's primary concern is to protect their interests against those of the Brahmins. The higher-caste Hindus have deliberately prevented the lower-castes from rising to the cultural level. Thus, the Hindus are not merely an assortment of Caste but they are so many warring groups that each lives for itself and for its selfish ideal.⁸ In the Hindu religion; one cannot have freedom of speech. A Hindu must surrender his freedom of speech. He must act according to the *Vedas*. If the *Vedas* do not support the actions, guidance must be sought from the *Smritis*; and if the *Smritis* fail to provide any such instructions, one must follow in the footsteps of the great men. In the words of Ambedkar:

The Hindu has a code of life, which is a part of his religion. This code of life gives him many privileges and heaps upon the untouchable many indignities which are incompatible with the sanctity of human life.⁹

Thus, in his *Ranade, Gandhi and Jinnah*, Ambedkar analyses the Hindu religion as follows:

It is a religion which is not intended to establish liberty, equality and fraternity. It is a gospel which proclaims the worship of the superman- the Brahmin by the rest of the Hindu society. It propounds that the superman and its class alone are born to live and to rule. Others are born to serve them, and to do nothing more. They have no life of their own to live and no right to develop their own personality. This has been the gospel of the Hindu religion.¹⁰

Dr. Ambedkar found that the Hindu scriptures do not lend themselves to a unified and coherent understanding. There are strong contentions built into them within and across trends and traditions. There are cleavages within the *Vedas*; the *Upanishads* thought is in contention with the *Vedic* thought; *Smriti* literature arraigns against *Smriti* literature; sometimes the *Vedas* are considered lower than that the *Shastras*; Gods are pitted against one another and tantra is rallied against *Smriti* literature. The icons of Hinduism such as Rama and Krishna have little to recommend them; in fact there is nothing morally elevating about them.¹¹ The *Riddles in Hinduism* is a scholarly work

of Ambedkar and it was a critique to Hinduism. His text of writings on Rama and Krishna are based on Hindu scriptures. In the Introduction of *Riddles in Hinduism* (an exposition to enlighten the masses), Ambedkar said that this book is an exposition of the beliefs propounded by what might be called Bramhanic theology. It is intended for the common masses of Hindus who need to be awakened to know in what quagmire the Brahmins have placed them and to lead them on to the road of rational thinking. He wanted to make the mass of people to realise that Hindu religion is not Sanatan or eternal as it is claimed. The second purpose of this book is to draw attention of the Hindu masses to the devices of the Brahmins and to make them think for themselves how they have been deceived and misguided by the Brahmins. Religion or no religion what the Brahmins wants is Dakshina. Indeed the Brahmins have made religion a matter of trade and commerce.

In Ambedkar's view, the story in the Ramayana will clarify that Ram as a king maintained Chaturvarna. And his Ram Raj was based on Chaturvarna. There was a story that Shambuka, a Shudra, was being killed by Ram who had transgressed his class and wanted to be a Brahmin. That is why Manu-Smriti prescribes such heavy sentences as cutting off the tongue or pouring of molten lead into the ears of the Shudra, who recites or hears the Veda.¹² Krishna explains that he created the system of Chaturvarna and also uphold it. Krishna of course was very clever in seeking to give scientific explanation of the Varna system by applying the Sankhya theory of Guna dharma.¹³ In the views of Ambedkar, the religion of the Vedic Aryans was full of barbaric and obscene observances. Human sacrifices formed a part of their religion and were called Narmedhayagna. Most elaborate descriptions of the rites are found in the Yajur-Veda Samhita, Yajur-Veda Brahmins, Sankhyana and Vaitana Sutas.¹⁴ According to Ambedkar's observation, though Shudras were related as inferior animals and non-Aryans, the condition of the Aryan civilization was much degraded at the time when Buddha started on the mission of his life. The Aryan community of his time was steeped in the worst kind of debauchery; social, religious and spiritual. He further observed that gambling and drinking were widespread among the Aryans. Every King had a hall of gambling attached to his palace. King Virat, King Nala, and King Dharma (the eldest of the Pandavas) were the few names to be cited as an example. Liquors were of two sorts- Soma and Sura. The Mahabharata mentions on occasions when both Krishna and Arjuna were dead drunk. That liquor and dancing

were the common among the Aryan women is cleared from the Kausitaki Grihya Sutra I, 11-12, which says: Four or eight women who are not widowed after having been regaled with wine and food are to dance for four times on the night previous to the wedding ceremony¹⁵.

Ambedkar criticised the Hindu religion from the viewpoint of a reformer. Religiosity, as such was not attacked by him, but immorality of debauchery observed in some age-old practices came under his attack though they were not practised anymore. But his analytical method had to thoroughly research the root cause of the malpractices that went by the name of Hinduism. The religion that sanctioned an evil like Caste must be examined minutely to see why and how this evil came into existence, and how this evil came to be tolerated. People, specially, his people, the lowest of the Hindu society, must be informed, their eyes should be opened. Hinduism gave no shelter to them, and still they were called Hindus. A religion which gave them nothing instead of misery of wretchedness had to be exposed.

Dr. Ambedkar had proposed certain religious reforms. According to him, the following were the cardinal items in this reform.

1. There should be one and only one standard book of the Hindu religion acceptable to all Hindus and recognized by all Hindus. This of course means that all other books of Hindu religion such as *Vedas*, *Shastras* and *Puranas*, which are treated as sacred and authoritative, must by law cease to be so and the preaching of any doctrine, religious or social contained in these books should be penalized.
2. It should be better if priesthood among Hindus was abolished. But as this seems to be impossible, the priesthood must at least cease to be hereditary. Every person who professes to be Hindu must be eligible of becoming a priest. It should be provided by law that no Hindus shall be entitled to be a priest unless he has passed an examination prescribed by the state and holds a Sanad from the state permitting him to practice.
3. No ceremony performed by a priest who does not hold a Sanad shall be deemed to be valid in law and it should be made penal for a person who has no Sanad to officiate as a priest.

4. A priest should be the servant of the state and should be subject to the disciplinary action by the state in the matter of his morals, beliefs and worship, in addition to his being subject along with other citizens to the ordinary law of the land.
5. The number of priest should be limited by law according to the requirements of the State.¹⁶

Moreover, in this context Dr. Ambedkar prescribed the following remedies:-

1. The Hindu society must be recognized on a religious basis, which would recognize the principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.
2. To this end the sense of religious sanctity behind Caste and Varna must be destroyed.
3. This is possible only by disregarding the divine authority of the Shastras such as Manu Smriti.
4. The real remedy for breaking Caste is inter-marriage: nothing else will serve as the solvent Caste.
5. *Chaturvarna* is harmful, because it degrades the masses by denying them the opportunity to acquire knowledge and emasculates them by denying them the right to be armed.¹⁷

The Hindu philosophy whether it is a *Vedanta*, *Sankhya*, *Nyaya*, and *Vaiseshika* has moved in its own circle without in anyway- affecting the Hindu religion. It has never had the courage to challenge this gospel. That Hindu philosophy that everything is Brahmin remained only a matter of intellect. It never became a social philosophy.¹⁸ He underlined the fact that Hinduism is a political ideology of the same character as the Fascist or Nazi ideology and is thoroughly anti-democratic. If Hinduism is let loose this is what Hindu majority means-it will prove a menace to the growth of others who are outside Hinduism and are opposed to Hinduism. This is not the point of view of Muslims alone. It is also the point of view of the Depressed Classes and also the non-Brahmins.¹⁹ To him, Hinduism is not interested in the common man. Hinduism is not interested in society as a whole. The centre of its interest lies in a class and its philosophy is concerned in sustaining and supporting the right of that class. Thus, the philosophy of Hinduism suppressed and sacrificed to the interest of

this class of superman. Therefore, Dr. Ambedkar applied both the tests of justice and the test of utility to judge the philosophy of Hinduism. While speaking on justice he said that it is compendious one and foundation of a moral order. Justice is simply another name of liberty, equality and fraternity.²⁰ Unfortunately, the philosophy of Hinduism does not recognise them. In Hinduism you will find both social inequality and religious inequality imbedded in its philosophy. The law of Manu recognises Slavery. But he confined it to the Shudras. Only Shudras could be made Slaves of the three higher classes. But the higher classes could not be the slaves of the Shudras. In *Manu Smriti* (VIII.270), he says:

A once born man, who insults the twice-born with gross invective, ought to have his tongue slit; for he sprang from the lowest part of Brahma.²¹

However, in *Manu Smriti* Brahmins were given special privileges. Manu has confined the religious sacraments and Ashrams to the twice-born. The Shudras are excluded from their benefit. Manu tells the Shudras that he is born to serve the higher classes. With regard to occupation of the Shudra, Manu in his *Smriti* (1.91, X.129) says:

One occupation only the Lord prescribed to the Shudra to serve meekly even these other three Castes. No collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra even though he is able to do it; for a Shudra who has acquired wealth gives pain to Brahmins.²²

Thus, Manu not only non-recognised human personality but also advocated a deliberate debasement of human personality. In Ambedkar's views, Manu also denied Shudra and women from studying the Veda. He says:

The twice-born must never read the Veda in the presence of the Shudras, and women have no business with the text of the Veda.²³

However, in Hinduism, there is no social equality, economic security and there is no condition under which knowledge can be made available to all. Thus in Hinduism the very first condition for liberty is conspicuous by its absence. The philosophy of Hinduism is a direct denial of fraternity. In Hinduism, there is no brotherhood as the society is asymmetric. Among Sikhs and Muslims there are social cements which make them Bhai. The associated mode of life among them produces fellow-feeling.

Among Hindus there are no brotherhoods; one does not regard another as his Bhai.²⁴ In the opinion of Dr. Ambedkar this indifferentism is the result of caste system which has made Co-operations even for a good cause impossible. The brief analysis of the philosophy of Hinduism from the point of view of justice reveals in a glaring manner how Hinduism is inimical to equality, antagonistic to liberty and opposed to fraternity. Fraternity and liberty are really derivative notions. The basic and fundamental conceptions are equality and respect for human personality. Fraternity and liberty take their roots in these two fundamental conceptions. But, Ambedkar expressed his view that where equality is denied, everything else may be taken to be denied.²⁵ So to speak, there was no equality in Hinduism. It upholds privilege and inequality. This is Hinduism; the very first condition for liberty is conspicuous by its absence. Thus, in Hinduism, there is no choice of a vocation, no economic independence as well as no economic security. Hinduism compels people to serve ends chosen by others. Hinduism far from encouraging spread of knowledge is a gospel of darkness. Taking all these facts into consideration Hinduism is oppose to the conditions which liberty can thrive. The Shudra is morally obliged to serve the Brahmin because by worshiping of him he can gain all his ends. Thus it is quite clear from Manu Smriti (X.123) which declares:

The service of the Brahman alone is declared to be an excellent occupation for a Shudra; for whatever else besides this he may perform will bear no fruit.²⁶

Thus the philosophy of Hinduism does not satisfy the test of justice or of utility. Hinduism is not interested in the common man. Hinduism is not interested in Society as a whole. The centre of its interest lies in a class and its philosophy concerned for the supporting of the rights of a particular class. The philosophy of Hinduism cannot be called the religion of humanity. In Hinduism, there is no nourishment for ordinary human soul, no comfort for ordinary human sorrow and no help for ordinary human weakness. It leaves men in darkness face to face with the unthinking energies of nature which gives them birth after few fruitless struggles they succumb. So, the philosophy of Hinduism is superman's heaven and common man's damnation.²⁷ He further observed that the law of Manu did not recognise the principles of equality. Inequality was the hallmarks of the law of Manu. It pervaded all walks of life, all social relationships and all departments of state. It had fouled the air and the

untouchables were simply smothered. The principle of equality before law has served as a great disinfectant. It has cleansed the air and the untouchable is permitted to breathe the air of freedom. This is the real gain to the Untouchables and having regarded to the ancient past it is no small gain.²⁸ He added:

The Hindu social system is not only a system in which the idea of classes is more dominant than the idea of community but it is a system which is based on inequality between classes and therefore, between individuals. To put it concretely, the classes i.e., the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, Shudras and Antyajans or Ati-Shudras (Untouchables) are not horizontal, and placed on same level rather they are vertical i.e. one above the other.²⁹

Manu is the only divine law giver who has denied the common man the right to knowledge. The principle of graded inequality runs through the whole of the *Manu Smriti*. There is no department of life in which he has not introduced his principles of graded inequality. In the Hindu religion, one can't have freedom of speech. A Hindu must surrender his freedom of speech. He must act according to the Vedas. If the Vedas do not support the actions, guidance must be sought from the Smritis; and if the Smritis fail to provide any such instructions, one must follow in the footsteps of the great men.³⁰

Another ignoble institution of Hinduism is Caste. Ambedkar, having been born in a Mahar Untouchable family bear the burnt of Untouchability from his childhood. That is why he was very much critical to the Caste system. Because he felt that Caste was a barrier to social progress and a stumbling block to individual advancement. Ambedkar views that the Caste is an essential and integral part of Hinduism. Every Hindu believes in caste. A Hindu is as much born into caste as he is born in Hinduism. Indeed a person cannot be born in Hinduism unless he is born in Caste. Thus, Caste and Hinduism are inseparable.³¹ In his paper, '*Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development*' (1917), Ambedkar claimed to advance a theory of Caste.³² He confronted with the ideas of western authors that the Caste rested on theories of racial difference, namely that an Aryan 'invasion' had subjugated the Dravidians, thus relegating them to the ranks of the lower Castes. Ambedkar pointed out that western writer's importance on race is impregnated by colour prejudices. He argued, Caste is a social phenomenon, not a racial one.³³

Dr. Ambedkar pointed out that the Hindu society, in common with other societies, was composed of classes and the earliest known are the (1) Brahmins or the priestly class; (2) Kshatriyas, or the military class; (3) the Vaishyas, or the merchant class and (4) the Shudras, or the artisan and menial class. Particular attention has to be paid to the fact that this was essentially a class system, in which individuals, when qualified, could change their class, and therefore, classes did change their personnel. At some time in the history of the Hindus, the priestly class socially detached itself from the rest of the body of people and through a closed door policy became a caste by itself.³⁴ To Ambedkar, endogamy was the main springboard of caste, and the caste system crystallized after the Brahmins turned inwards, henceforth refusing all matrimonial unions save those among their own community. This is why Dr. Ambedkar defined caste as a 'closed class' Dr. Ambedkar stated that the thesis of the superimposition of endogamy on exogamy towards the creation of caste and observed the role of customs, viz., (a) Sati, the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her husband, (b) enforced widowhood, and (c) girl child marriage are customs that were primarily intended to solve the problems of the *surplus Man* and *surplus women* in a caste and maintain the its endogamy. Strict endogamy could not be preserved without these customs. To him, caste without endogamy is fake notion.³⁵ Dr. Ambedkar noted two socio-psychological characteristics of the hierarchical organisation of the caste system, which produced (i) a spirit of rivalry among the different castes for dignity, and (ii) an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of contempt.³⁶ He recognised that the Caste system have come about by virtue of a belief in the superiority of the Brahmin and of the acquiescence by other castes of their inferiority. The strict observance of these customs and the social superiority arrogated by the priestly class in all ancient civilization are sufficient to prove that they were the originators of this "unnatural institution" founded and maintain through these unnatural means.³⁷ Dr. Ambedkar says:

Brahmins were the originators of this 'unnatural institution' founded and maintained through these unnatural means. At some time in the history of the Hindus, the priestly class (Brahmins) socially detached itself from the rest of the body of people and through a closed door policy became caste by it self. Brahmin class first raised the structure of caste... While making themselves into a caste, the Brahmins by virtue of this, created non-Brahmin caste.³⁸

The Caste in India is exclusive and isolated. There is no interaction and no modification of aims and objects. What a Caste or a combination of castes regards is their own interest as against other castes remains as sacred and inviolate as ever. Though they mingle and co-operate but do not change their character. Individual use one another so as to get desired results, without reference to the emotional and intellectual disposition.³⁹ Each Caste are conscious of its existence. Its survival is the be all and end all of its existence. A Caste has no feeling that that it is affiliated to other castes except when there is Hindu-Muslim riot. On all other occasions each caste endeavors to segregate itself and to distinguish itself from other castes. Each caste not only dines among itself and marries among itself but each caste prescribes its own distinctive dress. There is strong belief in the mind of orthodox Hindus that the Hindu Society was some how molded into the framework of the caste system, and this organisation is consciously created by the Shastras. Not only does this belief exist but it is being justified on the ground that it cannot but be good, because it is ordained by the Shastras and the Shastras cannot be wrong.⁴⁰ He writes:

The effect of Caste on the ethics of the Hindus is simply deplorable. Caste has killed public spirit. Caste has destroyed the sense of public charity. Caste has made public opinion impossible. A Hindu is responsible only to his caste. His loyalty is restricted only to his caste. Virtue has become caste ridden and morality has become caste bound. Here is no sympathy to the deserving. There is no appreciation to the meritorious. There is no charity to the needy and suffering masses. Though there is charity but it begins with the caste and ends with the caste. There is sympathy but not for men of other caste.⁴¹

Ambedkar argued that in Hindu society each caste, lives for itself and although the Hindus have similarity of customs, beliefs and thoughts, there are neither a society nor a nation in the true sense of the term. They are a collection of castes. Caste is the bane of the Hindus. It is the cause of the downfall of the Hindus. Due to the Caste system the Hindu's life has been a life of continuous defeats. Caste has made the Hindus the sick men of India. Caste has ruined the Hindu race and has destroyed, demoralized and devitalized Hindu society.⁴² In his seminal work '*The Annihilation of Caste*', which he had written exclusively for Hindus, Dr. Ambedkar argued:

Caste is not a physical object like a wall of bricks or a line of barbed wire which prevents the Hindus from mingling and which has therefore, to be

pulled down. Caste is a notion; it is the state of the mind. The destruction of Caste does not mean the destruction of a physical barrier. It means a notional change. Caste may be bad. The Hindus observe Caste not because they are inhuman or wrong headed. They observe Caste because they are deeply religious. People are not wrong in observing Caste. In my view, what is wrong is their religion, which has inculcated this notion of Caste and the *Shastras* which teach them this religion of Caste. Criticizing and ridiculing people for not inter-dining or inter-marrying or occasionally holding inter-caste dinners and celebrating inter-caste marriage, is a futile method of achieving the desired end. The real remedy is to destroy the belief in the sanctity of the *Shastras*. It is no use telling people that the *Shastras* do not say what they are believed to say, grammatically read or logically interpreted. What matters is how the *Shastras* have been understood by the people. You must take the stand that Buddha took. You must take the stand that *Guru Nanak* took. You must not only discard the *Shastras*, you must deny their authority, as did *Buddha* and *Nanak*. You must have courage to tell the Hindus, that what is wrong with them is their religion, the religion which has produced in them this notion of the sacredness of caste.⁴³

Dr. Ambedkar believed that the purpose behind the origin of the Caste system is involved in the economic motive and its main object was exploitation rather than economic efficiency of any sort. The manner in which the rules concerning the right to property, occupation, employment, wages, education, social status of occupations, dignity of labour, rules of graded slavery, and other economic relations were defined, these involved in themselves essentially an element of economic exploitation, particularly of caste which is located at the bottom of the caste hierarchy. This, in fact, implied that the caste system was primarily based on the principle of economic inequality and exploitation. The economic inequality (as much as socio-cultural inequality) under the Hindu social order has not emerged as a matter of indirect historical consequences but was a direct outcome of its governing principles and in fact it formed its core doctrine.⁴⁴ Nowhere in the world, according to Ambedkar, have social and religious ideologies intertwined in the economic sphere as much in the Hindu social system. He observed:

Nowhere has society consecrated its occupations-the ways of getting a living. Economic activity has always remained outside the sanctity of religion.

Hunting society was not without a religion but hunting as an occupation was not consecrated by religion and made sacred. Pastoral society was not consecrated by religion and made sacred. Farming as an occupation was not consecrated by religion and made sacred. Feudalism with its gradations, with its lords, villains and serfs, was purely social in character. There was nothing sacred about it. The Hindus are the only people in the world whose social relations are consecrated by religion and made sacred, eternal and inviolate. The Hindus are the only people in the world whose economic order-the relation of workman to workman-is consecrated by religion and made sacred, eternal and inviolate. It is not therefore enough to say that the Hindus are a people with a sacred code of religion. So are the Zoroastrians, Israelites, Christians and Muslims. All these have sacred codes. But they do not prescribe, nor do they consecrate a particular form of social structure-the relationship between man and man in a concrete form-and make it sacred and inviolate. He Hindus are singular in his respect. This is what has given the Hindu social order its abiding strength to defy the ravages and he onslaught of time.⁴⁵

The Caste-based economic order entails adverse consequence on economic growth and income distribution. The market failure associated with caste based market discrimination not only adversely affects economic growth, but also generates unequal income distribution and induced poverty particularly among the discriminated social groups. For an optimum economic outcome, an efficient functioning of markets for labour and other factors of production is of central importance. Fixed and compulsory caste-based division of occupations thus results in immobility of factors of production and imperfections in labour. Thus, far from promoting competitive market conditions, caste based division of labour and occupation creates segmented and monopolistic market situations resulting less economic outcome.⁴⁶ In his opinion, consideration of social efficiency would compel us to recognize that the greatest evil in the industrial system is not so much poverty and the suffering that it involves as the fact that so many persons have callings which make no appeal to those who are engaged in them. Such callings constantly provoke one to aversion, ill-will and the desire to evade. There are many occupations in India, which on account of the fact that they are regarded as degraded by the Hindus, provoke those who are engaged in them to aversion. There is a constant desire to

evade and escape from such occupations which the Hindu religion imposed upon its follower as a caste stigma. What efficiency can there be in a system under which neither men's hearts nor their minds are in their work? As an economic organization caste is therefore a harmful institution, as it involves the subordination of man's natural powers and inclinations to the exigencies of social rules."⁴⁷ While criticizing the Caste System, Dr.Ambedkar said:

1. Caste system is not merely division of labour. It is also a division of Labourers. Civilized society undoubtedly needs division of labour. But in no civilized society is division of labour accompanied by this unnatural division of Labourers into water-tight compartments. Caste system is not merely a division of Labourers, which is quite different from division of labour. It is a hierarchy in which the division of Labourers is graded one above the other."⁴⁸
2. (2) Castes disassociate work from interest. To Dr.Ambedkar, the Caste system will not allow Hindus to adopt occupations of their choice if they do not belong to the heredity. A Hindu is seen to starve instead of taking new occupations which is not assigned to his caste; it is due to the caste system. As a form of division of labour the caste system suffers from another serious defect. The division of labour brought about by the caste system is not a division based on choice. Individual sentiment, individual preference has no place in it. It is based on the dogma of predestination. By not permitting readjustment of occupations, caste becomes a direct cause of unemployment that is seen in the country.
3. Caste disconnects intelligence from manual labour. The theory of Caste is that a Brahmin who is permitted to cultivate his intellect is not permitted to labour, rather is taught to look down upon labour. While the Shudra who is required to labour, is not permitted to cultivate his intelligence.
4. Caste devitalizes a man. It is a process of sterilization. Education, wealth, labour are all necessary for every individual if he is to reach a free and full manhood. Mere education without wealth and labour is barren. Wealth without education and wealth is brutal. Each is necessary to every one. They are necessary for the growth of a man.
5. Caste prevents mobilization. Occasions arise when society must mobilize all its resources in order to save itself from a catastrophe. To face a catastrophe like

war, the society must mobilize all its resources for militarization. But this is not possible under the theory of Caste. Due to Caste the country is destined to be defeated as it is evident throughout history.⁴⁹

To conclude, Castes are anti-national in the views of Ambedkar not just they bring about separation in social life, but they are anti-national just because they generate jealousy and antipathy between Castes. Hence it should be removed as realist as possible to become a nation in reality.

Along with Caste system, Dr.Ambedkar also exposed the *Chaturvarna* of Hinduism which was the most degrading form of social organization. In the views of Ambedkar there cannot be a more degrading system of social organization than the *Chaturvarnya*. It is the system, which deadens paralyses and cripples the people from helpful activity.⁵⁰ The *Chaturvarna* system prevailed in this country for a fairly long time. In this system, the Brahmins were enjoined to learn, the Kshatriyas to fight, Vaishyas to earn property and the Shudras to serve all of them. This way of life was the rule of the day.⁵¹ He argued that under the system of *Chaturvarna*, the Shudra is not only placed at the bottom of the gradation but he is subjected to innumerable ignominies and disabilities so as to prevent him from rising above the condition fixed for him by law. Indeed until the fifth Varna of the Untouchables came into being, the Shudras were in the eyes of the Hindus of the lowest of the low.⁵² Ambedkar closely examined the ideals of the social organization and convinced that the *Chaturvarnya* is impractical, harmful and has turned out to be a miserable failure. From a practical point of view, the system of *Chaturvarnya* raises several difficulties, which its protagonists do not seem to have taken into account. The principle underlying the Caste is fundamentally different from the principle underlying Varna. They are not only fundamentally different but they are also fundamentally opposed. And the Caste system is in itself a degenerate form of the *Chaturvarnya*, which is the ideal of the Hindu. Individually and socially it is folly and also a crime. The doctrine of *Chaturvarnya* is the root cause of all inequality and is also the parent of the Caste system and Untouchability, which are merely other forms of inequality.”⁵³

Dr.Ambedkar also stated about another sacred text of Hindus that is *Purusha Sukta*, which is unique for Hindus. The principal ground for which the *Purusha Sukta* is regarded as unique is the ideal of *Chaturvarnya*, which upholds it. The *Purusha Sukta* is a part of the *Veda*, and it cannot be difficult to realise that Manu invested the

social ideal of *Chaturvarnya* contained in the *Purusha Sukta*, with a degree of divinity and infallibility which it did not have before.⁵⁴ Dr.Ambedkar also denounced the organics logic which underlines the *Purusha Sukta*:

The equation of the different classes to different parts of the body is not a matter of accident. It is deliberate. The idea behind this plan seems to be to discover a formula which will solve two problems, one of fixing the functions of the four classes and the other of fixing the gradation of the four classes after a preconceived plan. The formula of equating different classes to the different parts of the body of the creator has this advantage. The part fixes the gradation of the class and the gradation in its turn fixes the function of the class. The Brahmin is equated to the mouth of the creator. Mouth being the noblest part of the anatomy, the Brahmin becomes the noblest of the four classes. As he is the noblest of the scale, he is given the noblest function, that of custodian of knowledge and learning. The Kshatriya is equated to the arms of the creator. Among the limbs of a person, arms are next below the mouth. Consequently, the Kshatriya is given an order of precedence next below the Brahmins and is given a function which is second only to knowledge, namely, fighting. The Vaishya is equated to the thighs of the creator. In the gradation of limbs, the thighs are next below the arms. Consequently, the Vaishya is given an order of precedence next below the Kshatriya and is assigned a function of industry and trade which in name and frame ranks or rather did rank in ancient times below that of a warrior. The Shudra is equated to the feet of the creator. The feet form the lowest and the most ignoble part of the human frame. Accordingly, the Shudra is placed last in the social order and is given the filthiest function, namely to serve as a menial.⁵⁵

For Ambedkar the *Purusha Sukta* establishes a completely unique social system because ‘no society has an official gradation laid down, fixed and permanent, with an ascending scale of reverence and a descending scale of contempt’. Dr.Ambedkar argued:

In propounding the doctrine of *Chaturvarna*, the *Purusha Sukta* plays a double game. It proceeds first to raise the real, namely, the existence of the four classes in the Indo-Aryan Society, to the status of an ideal. This is a deception because the ideal is in no way different from facts as they exist. After raising the real to the status of the ideal, it proceeds to make a show of giving effect to what it regards as an ideal. This again is a deception because

the ideal already exists in fact. This attempt of the *Purusha Sukta* to idealize the real and to realize the ideal, is a kind of political jugglery, the like of which, I am sure, is not to be found in any other book of religion. What else is it if not a fraud and a deception? To idealize the real, which more often than not is full of inequities is a very selfish thing to do. Only when a person finds a personal advantage in things, as they are what he tries to idealize the real. To proceed to make such an ideal real is nothing short of criminal. It means perpetuating inequity on the ground that whatever is once settled is settled for all times. Such a view is opposed to all morality. No society with a social conscience has ever accepted it. On the contrary, whatever progress in improving the terms of associated life between individuals and classes has been made in the course of history is due entirely to the recognition of the ethical doctrine that what is wrongly settled is never settled and must be resettled. The principle underlying the *Purusha Sukta*, therefore, a criminal in intent and anti-social in its results. Its aim is to perpetuate an illegal gain obtained by one class and an unjust wrong inflicted upon another.⁵⁶

For Babasaheb, if the Hindu religion is to be a religion of social equality then an amendment of its code to provide temple entry is to be made and its doctrine of *Chaturvarnya* should be given up. That is the root cause of all inequality and also the parent of the caste system and Untouchability. Unless it is done the Depressed Classes will not only reject temple entry, but they also reject the Hindu faith. *Chaturvarnya* 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 Class must continue to be looked upon as low.⁵⁷ To him, the Hindu looks upon the observance of Untouchability as an act of religious merit, and non-observance of it is as sin. So long as this notion prevails Untouchability will also prevail. One of the characteristics of the system of Untouchability and also of the Caste System is that the social status of the individual rises or falls with that of the community to which he belongs. Once an Untouchable means always an Untouchable is the rule of Hindu social life.

Brahmanism-a Mantra of Unequal Society:

Dr. Ambedkar rightly remarked that the history of India is nothing but a struggle between Buddhism and Brahmanism. Brahmanism came to the forefront over Buddhism when it came to power. Since then it has been trying to dominate the

individuals, the society, and over all other institutions with its weapon of Chaturvarnya, which means elevation for some and degradation for others. Interestingly the Brahmins have made them superior by birth. Therefore, Dr.Ambedkar, in his book '*the Annihilation of Caste*' characterized 'Brahmanism as poison'. To Ambedkar, it is a class of Superman. The Brahmin systematically preyed on society and profited in religion. The *Puranas* and *Shastras*, which they manufactured in tons, are treasure trove of sharp practices, which the Brahmin employed to befool, beguile and swindle the common mass of poor, illiterate and superstitious Hindus."⁵⁸ Dr.Ambedkar observed that the Brahmin scholar has two-fold interest to maintain the sanctity of their literatures. Firstly, the sacred texts are being the production of their forefathers it is their duty to defend these at the cost of truth. Secondly, as it supports the privileges of the Brahmins, they are very careful to do something which would undermine its authority.⁵⁹ In Dr.Ambedkar's view, Brahmanism brought about the following changes in society:

- (1) It established the right of the Brahmin to rule and commit regicide.
- (2) It made the Brahmins a class of privileged persons.
- (3) It converted the Varna into caste.
- (4) It brought about a conflict and anti-social feeling between different castes.
- (5) It degraded the Shudras and the women.
- (6) It forged the system of graded inequality and
- (7) It made legal and rigid the social system which was conventional and flexible.⁶⁰

There is no social evil and no social wrong to which the Brahmin does not give his support. Man's inhumanity to man, such as the feeling of Caste, Untouchability, Inapproachability and Unseeability is a religion to him. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that only the wrongs of men are religion to him. For the Brahmin has given his support to the worst wrongs that women have suffered from in any part of the world. Widows were burnt alive as Sati. The Brahmin gave his fullest support to Sati, the burning alive of a widow. Widows were not allowed to remarry. The Brahmin upheld the doctrine. Girls were required to be married before and the husband had the right to consummate the marriage at any time thereafter, whether she had reached puberty or not did not matter. The Brahmin gave the doctrine his

strongest support.⁶¹Historically, “the Brahmins who form a strong and powerful element in the governing class in India it is no exaggeration to say that they have been the most inveterate enemies of the Servile Classes, the *Shudras* (the old name for the non-Brahmins) and the *Ati-shudras* (Untouchables) who together constitute about 80 percent of the total Hindu population. If the common man belonging to Servile classes in India today is so fallen, so degraded, so devoid of self-respect, of hope or ambition, and so lifeless, it is mainly for Brahmins and their philosophy”. In the words of Ambedkar:

The record of the Brahmins as law givers for the Shudras, for the Untouchables and for Women is the Blackest as compared with the record of the intellectual classes in other parts of the world. No intellectual class has prostituted its intelligence to invent a philosophy to keep his uneducated countrymen in a perpetual state of ignorance and poverty as the Brahmins have done in India. Every Brahmin today believes in this philosophy of Brahmanism propounded by his forefathers. He is an alien element in the Hindu society. The Brahmin vis-à-vis the Shudras and the untouchables are as foreign as the German is to the French, as the Jew is to the Gentile or as the White is to Negro. There is a real gulf between him and the lower classes of the Shudras and untouchables. He is not only alien to them but he is also hostile to them. In relationship with them, there is in him no room for conscience and no call for justice.⁶²

To Dr. Ambedkar, the cardinal principles of Brahmanism were six-to use a correct expression, and techniques of suppression:

- (1) Graded inequalities between the different classes.
- (2) Complete disarmament of the Shudras and the untouchables
- (3) Complete prohibition of the education of the Shudras and the untouchables
- (4) Ban on the Shudras and the untouchables occupying places of power and authority
- (5) Ban on the Shudras and the untouchables acquiring property
- (6) Complete subjugation and suppression of women.

Thus, inequality is the official doctrine of Brahmanism and the suppression of the lower classes aspiring to equality has been looked upon by them and carried out by them, without remorse as their bounden duty.⁶³

Dr. Ambedkar believes none have realised that despite of equality and inequality principles there is also graded inequality in Brahmanism. Graded inequality is more dangerous than inequality. Inequality carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction. In inequality two things happen. Firstly, it creates general destruction and discontent, which form the seeds of revolution. Secondly, it makes the sufferers combine against a common foe and on a common grievance. But the nature and circumstances of the system of graded inequality leave no room for either of these two things happen. The system of graded inequality prevents the rise of general discontent against inequality. Therefore, it cannot become the storm centre of revolution. Secondly, the sufferers under inequality becoming unequal both in terms of the benefit and the burden; there is no possibility of a general combination of all classes to overthrow the inequity. Due to the principle of graded inequality there has been no revolution against Brahmanism. Brahmanism was keen on preventing united action by Non-Brahmins to overthrow Brahmanism and that is why the Brahmanism brought about this segmentation of Indian society. The same thing has happened in case of Caste, Brahmanism intended to paralyse the Non-Brahmins for action against Brahmins. In other words Brahmanism in instituting caste system has put the greatest impediment against the growth of nationalism.⁶⁴ To Ambedkar, the creation of the Caste system was end and aim of Brahmanism. Brahmanism enacted the prohibitions against inter-marriage and inter-dining. But Brahmanism introduced other changes in the social system and if the purposes underlying these changes are those which was suggested earlier, then it must be admitted that Brahmanism was so keen in sustaining the caste system that it did not mind whether ways and means employed were fair or unfair, moral or immoral to them.⁶⁵ By Brahmanism, Ambedkar does not mean the power, privileges and interest of the Brahmins as a community. That is not the sense in which he used the word. To him, Brahmanism is the negation of the spirit of liberty, equality and fraternity. In that sense it is rampant in all classes and is not confined to the Brahmins alone though they have been the originator of it. The effects of Brahmanism were not confined only to social rights such as inter-dining and inter-

marrying. It denied them also the civic rights. So omniscient is Brahmanism that it even affects the field of economic opportunities as well.⁶⁶

Ambedkar believes in a social system based on inequality, the low order can combine to overthrow the system. None of them have any interest to preserve it. In a social system based on graded inequality the possibility of a general common attack by the aggrieved parties is non-existent as the aggrieved parties are not on a common level. This can happen only when they are only high or low. In a system of graded inequality there are the highest (*the Brahmins*) below the highest are the higher (*the Kshatriyas*). Below the higher are those who are high (*Vaishyas*). Below the high are the low (*Shudras*) and below the low are those who are lower (*the untouchables*). All have a grievance against the highest and would like to bring about their downfall. But there is no unity. The higher is anxious to get rid of the highest but does not wish to combine with the high, the low and the lower, lest they should reach his level and be his equal. The high wants to overthrow the higher who is above him but does not want to join hands with the low and the lower, lest they should rise to his status and become equal to him in rank. The low is anxious to pull down the highest, the higher and the high but he would not make a common cause with the lower for fear of the lower gaining a higher status and becoming his equal. In the system of graded inequality there is no such class as completely unprivileged class except the one, which is at the base of the social pyramid. Even the low is a privileged class as compared with the lower. Each class being privileged, every class is interested in maintaining the social system. If the Hindu social order was based on inequality, it would have been overthrown long ago. As it is based on graded inequality so that the Shudras while he is anxious to pull down the Brahmin, he is not prepared to see the Untouchable raise to his level. He prefers to suffer the indignities heaped upon him by the Brahmins to join the Untouchables for a general leveling down the social order. The result is that, there is nobody to join the Untouchables in this struggle. He is completely isolated. Not only is he isolated but is also opposed by the very classes who ought to be his natural allies.⁶⁷ In addition to this, Ambedkar also identified the Creeds of Brahmanism which may be summed up in the following dogmas:

- (a) Belief in the Chaturvarnya
- (b) Sanctity and infallibility of the Vedas.

(c) Sacrifices to Gods is the only way to salvation.⁶⁸

To Ambedkar the Brahmins claim that the Hindu Civilization is *Sanatan* (unchanging). But it is unfortunate that Brahmins have always changed things to suit their interests. The Vedic Gods- *Indra, Vishnu, Varuna, Mitra, and Brahma*- whom they worshipped in the *Vedic* times were abandoned when they started worshipping *Non-Vedic* Gods, including the *Muslim Pirs* during the Muslim reign.⁶⁹

The Unjust and Inegalitarian Hindu Social Order:

Dr.Ambedkar was an ardent challenger of Brahminic Social Order. He strongly remarked that the Hindu Social Order is not free Social Order. For him to be a free Social Order means it must have two fundamental criterions. The first is that the individual is an end in himself and that the sole object of the society is the growth of the individual and the development of his personality. Society is not above the individual and if the individual has to subordinate himself to society. This subordination would be for the betterment of them and only to the extent necessary. The second essential criterion which gives importance on associated life between members of society must be regarded by consideration founded on liberty, equality and fraternity. These two tenets of a free social order are integrally connected. They are inseparable. If one admitted, the second tenets automatically follow. Once the sacredness of human personality is admitted the necessary of liberty, equality and fraternity must also be admitted as the proper climate for the development of personality.⁷⁰

To be called a free social order it is necessary that the Hindu Social Order should recognize these tenets. In Ambedkar's view the Hindu Social Order does not recognize these tenets. Moreover, the system does not recognize even the individual and also does not recognize the individual as a centre of social purpose. It is primarily based on Class or Varna and not on individual. In his essay 'the Hindu Social Order: Its Essential Principles', Dr.Ambedkar claimed that in the Hindu Social Order, there is no room for individual merit and no consideration of individual Hindu Social Order recognized only four Classes i.e. Brahman, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. But today it consists of five classes, the fifth being called the *Panchamas* (Untouchables).The unit of Hindu society is not the individual Brahmin or the individual Kshatriya or the individual Vaishyas or the individual Shudra or the

individual Panchamas. Even the family is not regarded by the Hindu social order as the unit of society except for the purposes of marriage and inheritance. The unit of Hindu society is the Class or the Varna. Due to the above position of the Hindu Social Order, there is no room for individual merit and no consideration of the individual justice. If the individual has a privilege it is just because of himself personally. The privilege goes with the class, and if he is found to enjoy it, it is because he belongs to that class. Otherwise, if an individual suffers from a wrong doing, it is not because of his conduct. But it is the disability imposed upon the class and if he is found to be labouring under it, it is because he belongs to that class.⁷¹

Dr. Ambedkar raised the question whether the Hindu Social Order recognises fraternity or not. To prove it he had supported the view that like Christians and the Muslims the Hindu also believes that men are created by God. While the Christian and the Muslims accept this as the whole truth the Hindus believe that this is only part of the truth. According to them, the whole truth consists of two parts. The first part is that men are created by God. The second part claimed that God created different men from different parts of his divine body. The Hindus regard the second part as more important and more fundamental than the first one. To prove his above point, Ambedkar, quoted extensively from the Hindu scriptures. Thus, he remarked:

The Brahmin is no brother to the Kshatriyas because the former is born from the mouth of the divinity while the latter is from the arms. The Kshatriya is no brother to the Vaishya because the former is born from the arms and the latter from his thighs. As no one is a brother to the other, no one is the keeper of the other. He expressed that as the different classes were created from different parts of the Divine body, generated the belief that it must be divine and they should remain separate and distinct. It is this belief which has created in the Hindu an instinct to be different, to be separate and to be distinct from the rest of his fellow Hindus.⁷²

He, further, pointed out that these do not limit up to five divisions only. These get further divided into sub-classes or castes. Their number is manifold. Castes become sub-divided into sub-castes by reason of change of location, change of occupation, change in social practices change due to pollution, change due to increased prosperity, and changes due to quarrel and changes due to change of religion. The splitting process has made social life quite impossible. It has made the

Castes split into such small fragments that it has marital relationship consistent with the rule of excluded degrees quite impossible. Regarding the question of recognition of equality in the Hindu Social Order, Ambedkar's opinion was quite negative. That men are born equal is a doctrine, which is repugnant to the Hindu social order. In the spiritual sense it treats the doctrine as false. According to the Hindu social order though it is true that men are the children of *Prajapati* the Creator of the Universe, they are not equal on that account. They were created from the different parts of the body of *Prajapati* as Brahmins were created from the mouth, the Kshatriyas from the arms, the Vaishyas from his thighs and Shudras from his feet. The limbs from which they were created being of unequal values and the men thus created are as unequal.

In Dr. Ambedkar's view the Hindu Social Order is based on the three principles:

The first and foremost is 'the principle of graded inequality'. It is just like a ladder of castes placed one above the other together representing an ascending scale of hatred and a descending scale of contempt. The Four Classes are not on horizontal plane, different but equal. They are on vertical plane. They are not only different but unequal in status, one standing above the other. In the scheme of Manu, as Ambedkar observes the Brahmin is placed at the first rank, below him is the Kshatriya. Below the Kshatriya is the Vaishyas, below him is the Shudra and below the Shudra is the Ati-Shudras or the untouchables. This order of precedence among the classes is not only conventional but also spiritual, moral and legal.⁷³

Dr. Ambedkar has noted that, the *Manu Smriti* perpetuates slavery in the form of social inequality. It recognised seven kinds of slaveries naming law of slavery, law of marriage, law of punishment and law of Samskaras and law of Sanysa. And the Hindu law recognised it as a legal institution. And "slavery is in the descending order of the Varnas and not in the ascending order". Manu and his successors therefore while recognizing slavery ordains that it shall not be recognised in its inverse order to the Varna system. That means that a Brahmin may become the slave of another Brahmin. But he shall not be the slave of the person of another Varna, i.e. of the Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra, or Ati-Shudra. On the other hand, a Brahmin may hold as his slave anyone belonging to the four Varnas. With regard to punishment of offences as laid down by Manu Smriti (VIII.270), the gross discrimination on Shudra is seen as accordingly to Manu:

A Shudra, who insults a Dvija with gross invectives, ought to have his tongue slit for he sprang from the lowest part of the Brahma.⁷⁴

Manu also opposed to inter-marriage. His injunction is for each class to marry within his class. But he does recognise marriage outside the defined class. Here again, he is particularly careful not to allow inter-marriage to do harm to his principle of inequality among classes. Thus Ambedkar observed that:

The principle of graded inequality has been carried into the economic field. “From each according to his ability; to each according to his need” is not the principle of Hindu Social Order. The principle of the Hindu Social Order is: “from each according to his need, to each according to his nobility”. The Hindu social order does not recognise equal need, equal work or equal ability as the basis of reward for labour. Its motto is that in regard to the distribution of the good things of life those who are reckoned as the highest must get the most and the best and those who are classes as the lowest must accept the least and the worst. It is needless to say that the Hindu social order is based on the principle of graded inequality. It pervades all departments of social life. The four Classes in point of their mutual status are linked together in an order of graded inequality.⁷⁵

The second principle, on which the Hindu Social Order is founded is that of “fixity of occupations” for each class and continues thereof by hereditary. Manu has assigned occupations to the four classes. For Manu the Brahmin is to acquire learning and teaching of the Veda. The Kshatriya is to fight in order to protect the people and to abstain from attaching himself to sensual pleasure, and that of the Vaishya to tend cattle and carry on trade and that of the Shudra to serve as menial labour to the other three classes above them. Every member must follow the trade assigned to the class on which he belongs. Under the Hindu social order an individual has no choice of work he is bound to perform of his ancestral work. It is an inexorable law from which one cannot escape.

The third principle, on which the Hindu Social Order is based, is the fixation of people within their respective classes. There is nothing strange about the fact that the Hindu Social Order recognizes Classes. There are classes everywhere and no society is without them. Even a free social order will not be free to get rid of classes. Thus, he remarked:

The aim of a free social order is to prevent isolation and exclusiveness being regarded by the classes as an ideal to be followed. So long as the classes do not practise isolation and exclusiveness they are only non-social in their relations towards one another. Isolation and exclusiveness make them anti-social and inimical towards one another. Isolation makes rigidity of class consciousness, institutionalization of social life, and the dominance of selfish ideals within the classes. Isolation makes life static; create a division between privileged and underprivileged, masters and servants. Hence, a free social order endeavours to do is to maintain all channels of social endosmosis. This is possible only when the classes are free to share in an extensive number of common interests, have a large number of values in common, when they have an equitable opportunity to receive and take from others. Such social contacts dissolve customs so also expand mental life and demand for the reconstruction of mental attitudes.⁷⁶

But the Hindu Social Order is its ban on free inter-change and free-intermingle between different classes of Hindu society. It is opposed to liberty, equality and fraternity. It does not admit the principle of equality, in stead of recognizing equality it makes inequality its official doctrine. Though the freedom of speech is exit, but it exit only for those who are in favour of the social order. While mentioning about the liberty of action in the Hindu social order, Dr.Ambedkar said:

There is no room for liberty of action in the Hindu Social Order. It provides no choice to the individuals. It fixes his occupations. It fixes his status. In regard to political liberty the Hindu Social Order does not recognizes the necessity of a representative Government which is composed of the representatives chosen by the people. Representative Government rests on the belief that people must be governed by laws and the said laws can be made only by the representatives of the people. The Hindu social order recognises the first part of this thesis which says that people must be governed by law. But it denies the second part of the thesis which says that law can be made only by the representatives chosen by the people. The tenets of the Hindu Social Order are the law by which people are to be governed is already made and its evidence to be found in the Vedas. Political liberty, therefore, is the liberty to frame laws and to make and unmake government which is futile in the Hindu Social Order.⁷⁷

Thus, the Hindu Social Order is an order based on Classes and not on individual. In this order classes are placed one above the other. It is an order in which the status and functions of the classes are determined and fixed. It is a rigid order, no matter what changes take place in the relative position of an individual, but his social status as a member of that class where he was born never changed. The first shall never become the last; the last shall never become the first.

Unique features of Hindu Social Orders:

Dr.Ambedkar has also pointed out three unique features of the Hindu Social order.

The first feature is the worship of the Superman: - In this respect the Hindu social order is nothing but Nietzsche's gospel. It is Nietzsche who admitted that he borrowed the ideas from the *Manu Smriti*. Nietzsche was interested to creating a new race of men which will be a race of Superman with worth as compared with the existing race of men. His philosophy advocates violence and denied spiritual values, sacrifices, servility to common man in the interests of the Superman. Therefore, his philosophy created horror in the minds of the people of his won generation. Like Nietzsche's philosophy of superman, the *Manu Smriti* also created the superman position of Brahmins in the Hindu Social Order.

The Manu says, the Brahmin by birth is first in rank because he was produced by God from his mouth. As he is the first- born, hence, he possesses the Veda. The Brahmin is highest on earth and lord of the creation; and the property on earth is the property of Brahmins. Being a deity, the Brahmin is above the law and the king. In the *Manu Smriti's* verse no X.3. Manu says, "From priority of birth, from superiority of origin, from a more exact knowledge of scripture, and from a distinction in the sacrificial thread, the Brahmin is the lord of all classes".⁷⁸ According to Ambedkar, the Superman (*Brahman*) of the Hindu social order enjoys much more privileges than the other community of the Hindu society. He is not bound to do charity for the upliftment of the common man. On the other hand, to receive charity is the monopoly of the Superman. For any other person to receive charity is a sin. Owing to keep the Superman satisfied, happy and secure the Hindu social order takes special care to keep the common man in a state of perpetual degradation. Manu, the Hindu law giver debarred the common men (*Shudras*) from acquiring knowledge. He, therefore, insists

on the Shudra to do service to the Brahmins without hesitation. He mentioned the division of a Hindu life into period as follows:

The first period is called Brahmachariya, the stage of a student. The second period is called Grahasthashram, the stage of married life. The third period is called Vanasprash, the stage of detachment from worldly life. The fourth period is called Sanyasa which is complete severance from the affairs of the world which is tantamount to civil death. But the Hindu social order denied the right of becoming a Sanyasi to common man (Shudras), the reason being that if a Shudra becomes a Sanyasi, ceases to serve the upper caste Brahmins.⁷⁹

The second special feature: - To Dr.Ambedkar, another special feature of the Hindu Social Order relates to the technique devised for its preservation which was twofold. The first technique is to place the responsibility of upholding and maintaining the social order upon the shoulders of the king. Manu wants to ensure that the king should perform his duty always to maintain and preserve the established order. If the king fails to deliver his duty it is only the three higher classes will have the right to wage rebellion against the king but not to Shudra. The second technique is devised for the maintenance and preservation of the established order which is quite different from the first one. Really speaking, this is a special feature of the Hindu social order. Ambedkar remarked that when the social order denies opportunity to rise, denies right to education and right to use arms, and also prevent rebellion against the social order. On the other hand, a social order allows right to education, and permits the use of arms; it cannot prevent rebellion by those who suffer wrongs. To preserve the social order will necessitate suppression of rebellion by the use of force and violence. The Hindu social order has adopted this method. It has fixed the social status of the lower orders for all generation to come. Their economic status is also fixed. It has denied education to the lower orders. As a result no one is conscious that his low condition is a ground for grievance. If they are conscious of their grievances, but there cannot be a rebellion by the lower order against the Hindu social order because the Hindu social order denies the masses the right to use arms.⁸⁰

*The third special feature:-*According to Dr.Ambedkar the third special feature of the Hindu social order is that it is a Divine order designed by the God himself. As it is sacred, hence it is not open to abrogation, amendment, or even to criticism. Shri

Krishna in the *Bhagvat Gita* supported Caste system. Ambedkar also pointed out that *Krishna* forbids propaganda against the Hindu social order. When the Hindu social order breaks down, Krishna does not want the people to undertake the work of reform. He asks them to leave the task to him. This is evident from the following admonition contained in the *Bhagvat Gita*. Krishna, the supporter of *Chaturvarna* of Hinduism also justified caste system. He summarized the following four pronouncements made by Krishna in the *Bhagvat Gita*.

- (1) “I myself have created the arrangement known as Chaturvarna (i.e., the fourfold division of society into four castes Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras) assigning those different occupations in accordance with the Native capacities. It is I who am the maker of this Chaturvarna”- Gita. IV. 13
- (2) “Even if I may be easier to follow the occupation of another Varna yet to follow the occupation of one’s own Varna is more meritorious, although one may not be able to do it quite efficiently. There is bliss in following the occupation of owns Varna, even if death were to result in performing it; but to follow the occupation of another Varna is risky”.-Gita. III. 35.
- (3) “The educated should not unsettle the faith of the uneducated that have become attached to their occupation. He himself should perform the occupation of his Varna and make others perform theirs accordingly. An educated man may not become attached to his occupation. But the uneducated and dull- minded people who have become attached to their occupation should not be spoiled by the educated by putting them on a wrong path by abandoning their own occupation”-Gita III. 26, 29.

Furthermore he said:

Oh, Arjun! Whenever this religion of duties and occupations (i.e. this religion of Chaturvarna) declines, then I myself will come to birth to punish those who are responsible for its downfall and to restore it-Gita IV,7-81. Whenever righteousness declines and unrighteousness becomes powerful, then I myself come to birth. I take birth in different Yugas for protecting the righteous and destroying the unrighteous.⁸¹

Thus, the above mentioned facts are not only special features of the Hindu social order but also extraordinary features. If we look at the ancient world countries like

Egypt, Persia, Rome, Greece, etc, each had its social order in which some were free and some were slaves, some were citizens, some were aliens, some of the race, some of another. Their social order were never consecrated by religion and made sacred and inviolate. The modern world has its order, in some it is Democracy, in some Fascism, in some Nazism and in some Communism. But that social order is not consecrated by religion and made sacred and inviolate. The Hindus are the only people in the world whose social order – the relation of man to man is consecrated by religion and made sacred, eternal and inviolate. The Hindus are the only people in the world whose economic order- the relation of workman to workman, is consecrated by religion and made sacred, eternal and inviolate.⁸²

Dr.Ambedkar added that the rock on which the Hindu Social Order has been built is the *Manu Smriti*. It is a part of the Hindu Scriptures and also sacred to all Hindus. Owing to its sacredness it is infallible. Every Hindu believes in its sanctity and so also obeys its injunctions. Manu not only upholds Caste and Untouchability but also gives them a legal sanction. The burning of *Manu Smriti* was a deed of great daring. It was an attack on the very citadel of Hinduism. The *Manu Smriti* embodied the spirit of inequality, which is at the base of Hindu life. According to Ambedkar's observation, though Shudras were treated as inferior animals and non-Aryans, the condition of the Aryan civilization was much degraded at the time when Buddha started on the mission of his life. The Aryan community of his time was steeped in the worst kind of debauchery; social, religious and spiritual.

Untouchables (Avarnas)-Outside of the Hindu Fold not out of the enslavement of Hinduism:

Dr.Ambedkar argued that the history of India is said to begin with the Aryans, who were came form Central Asia and invaded India, made it their home and established their own culture. But the original inhabitants of India called Nagas (non-Aryans), who were powerful people, whom Aryans were unable to conquer. A fierce fighting or war went on between the Aryans and the non-Aryans. Till their last they fought the war and upheld Buddhism and spread Buddhism across India and world. The Untouchables are the original inhabitants of India. They are pre-Aryans(non-Aryans),Dravidas,Adi-Dravidas,Pulayas,Pariahs, Vanniyas,Chamars, NamaShudras, and Panas etc. Their original name was Nagas. The Nagas were untouchables. They

were hard core Buddhist. That is why the Brahmins regarded Buddhism as the religion of low-caste people. In the views of Ambedkar ancient Indian history is nothing but a struggle between Hinduism and Buddhism. Hinduism is counter-revolutionary in nature. Dr. Ambedkar distinguished Hindu scriptures on the basis of Pre-Buddhist and Post-Buddhist. He considered the *Vedas*, *Brahmans*, and *Upanishads* as Pre-Buddhist while the *Bhagvat Gita* and *Manudharmashashtra* etc, were Post-Buddhist. Following Pushyimitra and his regicide, Brahmanism was ascendant and attempted to weed out Buddhism. For Ambedkar, the Gita is a text which legitimized this counter-revolution while appearing close to Buddha's teaching. He argued that the Gita has to be read out as general treaties on ethics, as commonly projected, but in relation to the discursive context in which it is situated.⁸³

By Aryan castes, Manu means the four Varnas namely Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. In other words, Manu regards the system of Chaturvarna to be the essence of Aryanism. By non-Aryan castes, he means those communities who do not accept the creed of Chaturvarna and he cites the community called Dasyu as an illustration of those whom he regards as non-Aryan community. Manu was not going to admit the Untouchables into the House the ancient Hindus had built by enlarging the Varna system to consist of five Varnas. That is what he meant when he said that there is not to be a fifth Varna. He wanted the Untouchables to remain out of the Hindu social structure it is clear from the name by which he describes the Untouchables. He speaks of them as *Varna-Bahyas* (those outside the Varna system).⁸⁴

Dr. Ambedkar had shown that *Savarna* is generally contrasted with *Avarna*. *Savarna* means one who belongs to one of the four *Varnas*. *Avarna* means one who does not belong to any of the four *Varnas*. The Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras are *Savarnas*. The Untouchables or *Ati-Shudras* are called *Avarnas*, those who have no Varna. Logically, the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras are within the *Chaturvarnya*. Logically, the Untouchables or *Ati-Shudras* are outside the *Chaturvarnya*. *Dvija* is generally contrasted with *non-Dvija*. *Dvija* literally means twice-born and *non-Dvija* means one who born only once. The distinction is based on the right to have *Upanayana*. The *Upanayana* is treated as a second birth. Those who have the right to wear the sacred thread are called *Dvijas*. Those who have no right to wear it are called *non-Dvijas*. The Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas have the right

to wear the sacred thread. Logically, they are *Dvijās*. The *Shudras* and the *Ati - Shudras* have no right to wear the sacred thread. Logically, they are both *non-Dvijās*. The *Traivarnika* is contrasted with the *Shudra*. But there is nothing special in this contrast. It conveys the same distinction which is conveyed by the distinction between the *Dvijās* and the *non-Dvijās* except the fact that the contrast is limited to the *Shudras* and does not extend to the *Ati-Shudra*. This is probably because this terminology came into being before the rise of the *Ati-Shudras* as a separate class.⁸⁵

To Ambedkar the case of the Untouchables is different. There is positive injunction against their incorporation in Hindu society. They must remain separate and segregated without being a part of the Hindu society. The Untouchables are not a part of the Hindu society. And if they are a part, they are a part but not of the whole. The idea showing the connection between the Hindus and the Untouchables were accurately expressed by Amapure Shastri the leader of the orthodox Hindus at a conference held in Bombay. He said that the Untouchables were related to the Hindus as a man is to his shoe. A man wears a shoe. In that sense it is attached to man and may be said to be a part of the man. But it is not a part of the whole for two things that can be attached and detached can not be said to form parts of one whole. The analogy though is none the less accurate.⁸⁶ It is quite untrue that slavery was not recognized by the Hindus. Slavery is a very ancient institution of the Hindus. It is recognized by Manu, the Hindu lawgiver and later elaborated and systematized by the other Smriti writers who followed Manu. Slavery among the Hindus was never merely ancient institution, which functioned, only in some hoary past. It was an institution which continued throughout Indian history down to the year 1843 and if it had not been abolished by the British Government by law in that year, it might have continued even today.⁸⁷ There was slave system in the US but in India the slave system still exists in the form of Untouchability; which is worse than US. Every village in India has become a ghetto, the worst part of which is reserved for these born bonded slaves who are expected to render free services to the Hindus without expecting anything in return. The American slave system was better than Indian slavery. In US, the slave owner had the obligation to feed the slave and keep him in good health. But under the Indian slavery system, there is no such obligation, because the US slave system had no sanction of Christian religion but Hinduism sanctions slavery as God's blessing. That is why it is called sanctified racism because Indian slavery is flourishing and

going stronger day by day.⁸⁸ Dr. Ambedkar's interpretation of Hindu Social order as a system of governance in general and a system of production, organisation, and distribution in particular is based on three inter-related elements. These included fixed rights, unequal and hierarchal or graded division of social and economic rights across castes and provision of strong instruments of social and economic ostracization to sustain the rigid system with philosophical justification in Hindu religion. The most important point is that the philosophy of Hinduism provided 'divine' justification for the origin and sustenance of the Hindu social system.⁸⁹ He said, 'Every man should have a philosophy of life, for every one must have a standard by which to measure his conduct. And philosophy is nothing but a standard by which to measure. Negatively, I reject the Hindu social philosophy propounded in the '*Bhagvat Gita*' based as it is, on the *Triguna of the Sankhya Philosophy* which is my judgment a cruel perversion of the philosophy of *Kapila*, and which had made the caste system and the system of graded inequality the law of the Hindu Social Life'.⁹⁰

Kancha Ilaiah in his book, "Why I Am not a Hindu: A Sudra Critique of Hindutva Philosophy, Culture and Political Economy", expressed how he was himself a victim of Hinduism being born as a Sudra and how Hinduism built a structure of spiritual fascism to torture Dalitbahujans. He underlined that Ambedkar understood the political chicanery of modern Brahmanism and developed a critique of Hinduism. His critique of Krishna, in his Riddles of Rama and Krishna and of Gita for upholding of Brahminical Dharma and subjugating the Dalitbahujans, should be understood against this background.⁹¹

To put it in brief, Dr. Ambedkar condemned the Hindu religion and Hindu Social Order because of its inegalitarian practices. His rejection of Hinduism was essentially based on rational- humanist ground. The Hindu social system that produced casteism is in-human in nature. Caste is anti-national and it kills public sprite. Even caste stands in the way to progress of nation. To Ambedkar, Manusmriti is the symbol of darkness, ignorance and inhumanity for millions of people and perpetuate untouchability and slavery of casteism. The Hindu Varna Dharma has ruined us. This would ruin the Hindus themselves and ultimately India. Hinduism can't save any body. There is no salvation for any body in Hinduism. To eradicate the evils of Untouchability and casteism, the only remedy is the change of religion. However, he believes religion is inevitable for man and society but its role can be

judged in terms of the test of 'justice' and 'utility'. Justice is another name for liberty, equality, and fraternity. Thus, he had strived hard till his last for the establishment of new social order on the principles of justice, equality, liberty and fraternity. It is to be noted that Dr.Ambedkar saw the Hindu Social Order and precisely the Purusha Sukta as a "scheme" to perpetuate the illegal gains of some over the multitude of others. The consequence of this very selfish motive, as he observed, was the infamous Hindu Caste-system resulting in the lack of a social endosmosis, which in due time, went down in history as a very important factor in the succession of events that shaped the history of the Indian sub-continent. He can surely be given the credit of showing the Hindu society by a new light-a view from the bottom of the hierarchy but with a perfect scientific and rational methodology.

References

1. Ambedkar B.R, Annihilation of Caste, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jalandhar, 1995, pp.45-46.
2. *ibid*,pp.46-7.
3. Narake Hari, ed, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches, Higher Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai, vol-17,part-3,2003, p.406.
4. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-3, 1987,p.84.
5. Mooknayak leader of the dumb, 31 January, 1920.
6. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-9, 1990,p.186.
7. *Ibid.*, p.187. / Ambedkar B.R, What Congress & Gandhi have done to Untouchables, Thakker & Co, Bombay, 1945,p.179.
8. *ibid*,pp.48-9.
9. Ambedkar B.R, Mr. Gandhi and the Emancipation of The Untouchables, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jalandhar,1995, p.36.
10. Ambedkar B.R, Ranade Gandhi and Jinnah, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jalandhar, 1995, P.18.
11. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol-4, 1987,pp.323-343.
12. *Ibid.*,p.61.
13. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-4, *op. cit.*,p.251.
14. *Ibid.*, pp.294-295.
15. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, *op. cit.*,p.108.
16. Ambedkar B.R, Annihilation of Caste, Bheem Patrika Publications, Jalandhar, 1995, pp.90, 91.

17. Ibid., p.107.
18. Ambedkar B.R, Ranade Gandhi and Jinnah, op. cit., p.18.
19. Moon Vasant,ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-1, 1979,pp.240-241.
20. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op. cit.,pp.24-25.
21. ibid,pp.26-28.
22. ibid, op, cit.pp.35-41.
23. Ibid.,p.42.
24. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op. cit.,p.54.
25. Ibid.,p.66.
26. Ibid.,p.74.
27. Ibid.,pp.77-78.
28. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-12, 1993,p.146.
29. Ibid.,p.719
30. Das Bhagwan, ed, Thus spoke Ambedkar, vol-4, Ambedkar Sahitya Prakashan, Bangalore, 1979, p.37.
31. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op. cit, p.336.
32. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-1, op. cit.,p.22.
33. Ibid.,p.21.
34. Ibid.,pp.17- 18.
35. Ibid.,p.14-15.
36. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,Vol-4, op. cit.,p.48.

37. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-1, op. cit, pp.9-17.
38. Ghurye G.H, Caste and Race in India, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1999,pp.15-18. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Vol-1, 1979,p.20
39. Moon Vasant (ed), Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-9, op. cit.,p.193.
40. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-1, op. cit.p,p.16-50.
41. Ambedkar B.R, Annihilation of Caste, op. cit.,p.56.
42. Keer Dhananjay, Dr.Ambedkar, Life and Mission, Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 2003, p.270.
43. Ambedkar B.R, Annihilation of caste, op. cit.,pp.75 -76.,
44. Sukhadeo Thorat & Kumar, ed, B.R. Ambedkar, Perspectives on Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policies, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2008,p-7. Introduction,p.7.
45. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,Vol-3, op. cit., p.129.
46. ibid., pp.67-71.
47. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,Vol-1, op. cit.,p.48.
48. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,Vol-3, op. cit.,p.67.
49. Ibid.,pp.67-71.
50. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,vol-1,op.cit.,p.63.
51. Das Bhagwan, Thus spoke Ambedkar, vol-4, op. cit.,p.43,.
52. Ambedkar B.R, Who were the Shudras? Thackers and Co. Bombay, Preface P- XI,XII.
53. 52. Ibid.,pp.59-230.

54. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-7, 1990,pp.24-25.
55. Ibid. p.32- 33.
56. Ibid.,pp.26-32.
57. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, vol-5, 1989, p.384.
58. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-1, op. cit., p.220
59. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-7, op. cit.,p.17.
60. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op. cit.,p.275.
61. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,vol-9, op. cit., p.216.
62. ibid, pp. 467-470.
63. ibid., p.215.
64. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op. cit.,pp.304-320.
65. ibid., p.293
66. Keer Dhananjay, Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., pp.303-304.
67. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-5, op. cit., p.101-116.
68. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-4, op. cit.,p.285.
69. ibid.,pp.5-6.
70. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-3, op. cit.,pp.95-99.
71. ibid.,pp.99-100.
72. ibid,p-100.

73. Ibid.,pp.102-107.
74. Ibid,pp. 107-109.
75. Ibid.,p.111.
76. Ibid.,p.113.
77. Ibid.,pp.114-115.
78. Ibid,p.116.
79. Ibid.,pp.121-123.
80. ibid,p.126.
81. Ibid., pp.80-128.
82. ibid,pp.128.
83. ibid,pp.267-371.
84. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-5, op. cit., p.169.
85. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches,vol-7, op. cit.,p.36.
86. Moon Vasant, ed, Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches, vol-5, op. cit.,p.169.
87. bid., p.9
88. Rajshekar. V.T &.Gopinath M, Dalit Movement in India, Meaning & Message, Dalit Sahitya Akademy, Bangalore, 1994,p.17.
89. Sukhadeo Thorat & Kumar, ed, B.R. Ambedkar, Perspectives on Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policies, op. cit.,p.7.
90. Keer Dhananjay, Dr. Ambedkar Life and Mission, op. cit., p.459.
91. Ilaiyah Kancha, Why I am not a Hindu, Samya,Kolkata,2005,p.86.