CHAPTER VI

IDEAL RELIGIOUS ORDER

Great social, political or religious reformatory movements have been often given to society by single duals. Especially, the religious movements like Ju Christianity and Islam were given to society by Mos Jesus Christ and Prophet Mohamed respectively. Even India there arose so many radical religious movement as Jainism, Buddhism and Vırasaivism which were given to Indian society by Mahavira, Lord Buddha and the 3eya. All these religions were given to society due the break down of established social and cultural form. Such changes involve not only the development of new and cultural forms, but the breakdown of old ones. 1 Weber and Durkheim formulated three major reasons for emergence of new religious faiths. They are:

1. Inclination towards certain kinds of religious doctrines on the part of people is highly influenced by their social position in society.

2. Some religious ideas reflect more universal
3. Social change, and especially social discord, results in a loss of cultural consensus and continuity, and set men upon a "quest for community," looking for new values to which they may adhere and new groups to which they might belong.

This implies that the situations of social distress often given rise to messianic movements led by charismatic leaders promising this-worldly or other-worldly solutions to the oppressed. It is admirably true in the mission of Swami Vivekananda, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and Ambedkar.

Ambedkar was the accredited emancipator of the untouchables of India in the twentieth century. Many religious reformers in India started their reform movements to eradicate the evil customs in the Hindu tradition. For example, social reform movement inaugurated by Raja Ram Mohan Roy and others concentrate on restriction of child marriage, widows, women's rights to property, education and of child marriage etc. But Ambedkar's reform movements
customs in the name of religion. In other words, Ambedkar's reformatory movement relates to the abol of the caste system and re-construction of the Hindu and the Hindu family on the basis of egalitarian id

Ambedkar's dominant role as a champion of the untouchables and his endless struggle offered political and constitutional safeguards to his people. However, it has brought any visible changes in the attitudes of the Hindus towards the untouchables. With all his political acumen he knew that laws were necessary to in reforms, but at the same time, he understood that 'tution will be workable which is not acceptable to majority of the people.' Therefore, he suggests that meaning and content of the law should be provided to society and not by the force of government, which temporary means to alleviate the problems of the untouchables. No doubt, legislation alone does not change society; changes should be brought only by the majority of them with their own interest and change of heart.
attitude by themselves and not by laws. But it is possible in the midst of orthodoxy. Therefore, Am went in search of a new religion which would provide liberty, liberty and fraternity to the depressed classes.

Ambedkar initiated the historically famous religious conversion which was unanimously passed at the Yeola Conference, Nasik, in September 1935. According to the depressed classes must leave the Hindu fold and adopt another religion that gives social and religious equality to them. This conference was unique for many reasons: it did not attempt to decide on what religion should replace Hinduism. It is evident from the statement that any religion that gives you equality of status and treatment. Though it did not decide on this issue, the question of choosing a religion for them was entirely to Ambedkar’s wish and will. However, the chairman (Ambedkar) of the Yeola conference observes:

The only way to get rid of untouchability is for the Depressed classes should leave Hindu religion not necessarily by conversion to another religion.
However, leaders like Gandhi and Rajendra Prasad deplored the Yeola resolution wherein the change of was visualized by the depressed classes' leaders. was very critical of Ambedkar's decision which he as "unfortunate" in an article and said that he could stand the anger of highly educated persons like Ambedkar to the atrocities on the depressed classes. But, I "Religion is not like a house or a clock, which can be at will. It is a more integral part of one's own one's body. I am convinced that a change of faith and those who passed the resolution will not serve which they have at their heart."9

Ambedkar sharply replied to the question of Ga said, "it is right that religion is essential, but the religion of his ancestors is not essential who the same religion is opposed to his needs and is in the way of his welfare and progress."10 And th Ambedkar declared that "I had no faith in Hinduis hated hypocrisy."11
It is necessary to raise a few questions about his mission campaigns. They are:

1. Why did Ambedkar give up Hinduism? Was it material, social, spiritual considerations or a desire for freedom?

2. Why did he prefer Buddhism? Why not Christ, Sikhism, Jainism, or Islam?

Before studying all these questions it is necessary to consider the term "religion" in general and specifically how best Ambedkar receives religion from his point of view.

**Definition of Religion**

Ever since the dawn of civilisation "religion" has been the dominant concern of mankind. The term "religion" is derived from the Latin word "religio" meaning "to bind". It is difficult to define religion. "Defining" means "to draw a line around", so that we can distinguish what is religion from what lies outside it.
For example, the psychological theories suggesting that religion was a projection of primitive man’s mental like fear, frustration, guilt, etc., or that early men ascribed personality to such powerful natural phenomena as sun, moon, star and wind, or that the appearance in members of the tribe who had died led men to believe in the existence of spirit. It was Sigmund Freud, the well-known psychoanalyst, who put forward this view.

Then next in these series is the sociological theory which suggested that religious beliefs and practices, because societies needed sanctions to make their mental form to a way of life which would give stability to a group and increase its well-being, or that what primitive worshipped was society itself, was represented by the totem. This kind of sociological theory of religion was expounded by the French sociologist, Emile Durkheim.

These theories were helpful to understand the origin of religion in one way, but all these theories about it
From the conceptual point of view, "religion", according to Max Muller, "is a faculty of the mind which a man to grasp the infinite independently of sense reason." Tolstoy defines religion in his book, "What is religion?" (1902): "True religion is the establishment of such a relation to the infinite life around while connecting his life with this infinitude and his conduct, is also in agreement with his reason a human knowledge." James Martineau defines religion as "the belief in an ever living God, that is, in a Di and will ruling the universe and holding moral rela mankind." J.G. Frazer says, "By religion, then, I understand propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to are believed to direct and control the course of Na of human life." Herbert Spencer says, "Religion recognition that all things are manifestations of a transcendence our knowledge." According to J. Taggart, "It seems to me that it (religion) may be,
experiences of individual men in their solitude, as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation ever they may consider the divine."  

"Religion," Whitehead, "is the vision of something which stands behind, and within, the passing flux of immediate further, Macdonell conceives religion as a "system worship" which finds its expression in various form.  

W.T. Stace defines religion as "the hunger soul for the impossible, the unattainable, the inc.

From the above accounts regarding the question is religion", it is evident that these are descrip religion and do not say anything as to what religi

Wilfred Cantwell Smith in his work, *The Meaning of Religion* suggests that the term "religion" is s that we should stop using it. The word, "religion even less helpful. In his own words:

The term is notoriously difficult to define. At least, there has been in recent decades a "of definitions; and no one of them has commanded wide acceptance."
might argue that the sustained inability to clarify what the word 'religion' signifies, in itself suggests that the term ought to be dropped; that it is a distorted concept not really corresponding to anything definite or distinctive in the objective world. The phenomena that we call religious undoubtedly exist. Yet perhaps the notion that they constitute in themselves some distinctive entity is unwarranted analysis.

Therefore, in place of the word "religion" Wilfrid Smith used two expressions, "Cumulative Tradition" "Personal Faith". Traditions are made up of all the customs, formulas and sacred writings, which have come to us from distant past. They are what we look at as particular religion. Traditions will be different in different countries and within different sections of the same country, and they are inseparable from their cultural context.

Faith, on the other hand, is the individual response to the transcendent, where he understands this of a personal God or in some other way.

Ambedkar's View of Religion
to search for the need of religion to man and society. He says: "Some people think that religion is not essential to society. I do not hold this view. I consider the functions of religion to be essential to life and practice in society."

Ambedkar expressed his view of religion in the ceremony of the supreme court Judge, Justice U. Cha of Burma at Bombay on April 3, 1955. Ambedkar explained the need of religion to mankind and says that the religious granted two gifts to the human society. The creation of psychological instinct to maintain unity in the human society and the second one is that religion alone can create unity in human groups. For the success of democracy based on unity, there is an utmost necessity of the religion.

Further, religion, according to Ambedkar, should prosper the prosperity or elevation first in this world and the former should be the first article of faith of religion. He writes:
raised by destroying its self-respect. So, if really want to uplift the untouchables, you must them in the social order as free citizens, free carve out their destiny.31

Therefore "religion," according to Ambedkar, is a force" and "source of power"—a plan of action to man's hope of a fuller and happier life in this world. Hence, his ideal of religion is based on humanism.

Ambedkar also, perhaps, fails to define the term religion because his ultimate aim was not to find religion itself but he wants to explain the need of man and to society. Therefore, as a student of religion, Ambedkar confines his study of religion only to science. There is, however, a two-way relationship between religion and society. That is not only do social conditions affect the rise and spread of ideas and values, but ideas once institutionalized in a society affect the action of men.32 Hence, Ambedkar wants to study the effect of religion upon society, instead of the effect of society upon religion.
and goals of society are at any given moment only stable; slow but cumulative changes in them are constantly taking place. But, in Hinduism they have not given their past "cumulative tradition" totally which leads to stagnation in social structure.

Ambedkar recognises a twofold classification of religion namely "religion of principles" and "religion of rules". He thinks that this distinction is "real and important". When rules are practical, they are habitual ways of doing things according to prescription. Principles on the other hand are intellectual and are useful methods of judging things. He seeks to tell an agent just what course of action to pursue, but principles do not prescribe a specific action. Rules do tell just what to do and how to do it. A principle such as that of justice supplies a man of head and heart by reference to which he is to choose the bearings of his desires and purpose; it guides thinking by suggesting to him the important considerations which should bear in mind. This difference betw...
responsibility, religion must mainly be a matter of principles only. It cannot be a matter of rule. The moment it degenerates into rules it ceases to be religion, as it kills responsibility which is essence of a true religious act.35

Apart from the classification of religion into 'of rule and religion of principle' Ambedkar maintain essential criteria for testing the utility of a
Ambedkar says: "That society must have either sanction of law or the sanction of morality to hold together. Without either society is sure to go to

In all societies law plays very small part. It tended to keep the minority within the range of discipline. The majority is left out and has to be left sustain its social life by the postulates and sanction morality. Religion in the sense of morality must, remain the governing principle in every society.

1) The religion as defined in the first proposal must be in accord with science. Religion is bound to lose its respect and therefore become the subject of ridicule and thereby not mere lose its force as a governing principle of society if it is not in accord with science.
2) The religion as a code of social morality must recognise the fundamental tenets of liberty and fraternity. Unless a religion recognises these fundamental principles of social life will be doomed.

3) The religion must not sanctify or enable poverty. Renunciation of riches by those who have it is a blessed state. But poverty can never be. Poverty to be a blessed state is to pervert to perpetuate vice crime, to consent to make living hell.37

Therefore, to Ambedkar, religion should be based on morality, reason and experience. Because being based on reason and experience they are free to modify or abandon any of the teachings if it was found that at time and given circumstances they do not apply.38

religion, to Ambedkar, is not to be encumbered with wood of the past. He wants that religion and its should remain ever green and serviceable at all times for the people.

Hence, Ambedkar holds that religion, morality and ought to go together and he does not believe in the dualistic idea.
Hindu religion, as contained in the Vedas and Sūtras, is nothing but a mass of sacrificial, social, political and sanitary rules and regulations. What is called by the Hindus is nothing but a multitude of commandments, says Ambedkar. 39

Ambedkar thinks, religion, in the sense of principles, applicable to all races, to all countries, all times, is not to be found in it, and if it is, not form the governing part of the Hindus' life. What the Hindus call religion is really law or a legalized class of ethics. 40 Ambedkar frankly refuses this code of ordinance religion. He says:

The first evil of such a code of ordinances, misrepresented to the people as religion, is that it tends to deprive moral life of freedom and spontaneity and to reduce it to a more or less anxious and servile conformity to external imposed rules. Under it, there is no loyalty, ideals, there is only conformity to commands. 41

From the above, both religion and morality for laws of conduct within a particular framework of
and morality are indispensable for a complete and
development of the society and individual. Therefo-
Ambedkar firmly believes that a radical change in t-
ture and thought of Hinduism and in the outlook of
is necessary to re-construct the Hindu society. Wi-
there will be no real reform in the Hindu social sy

Based on his personal experience and observatio-
concluded that the social philosophy of Hinduism is
on inequality and the roots of the Hindu Social sys-
depends upon the varnāśārama dharma prescribed in t
ṣaṁśīta. He writes "Such being the case, I do not t
it is possible to abolish inequality in Hindu socie-
the existing foundation of the ṣaṁśīti religion is a
and a better one laid in its place."48

Keeping in view of his observations about the
and society of the Hindus he has suggested the fol-
reforms:

shastras, and puranas, which are treated as and authoritative, must by law, cease to be the preaching of doctrine, religious or soci tained in these books should be penalised.

2. It should be better if priesthood among Hind abolished. But as this seems impossible, the priesthood must at least cease to be heredit. Every person who professes to be a Hindu must be eligible for becoming a priest. It should be provided by law that no Hindu shall be entitled to be a priest unless he has passed an examination prescribed by the state and holds a sanad or from the state permitting him to practise.

3. No ceremony performed by a priest who does not have a sanad shall be deemed to be valid in law. An act should be made penal for a person who has no right to officiate as a priest.

4. A priest should be the servant of the state and should be subject to the disciplinary action the state in the matter of his morals, belief, and worship in addition to his being subject with other citizens, to the ordinary law of land.

5. The number of priests should be limited by 1 according to the requirements of the state as is done in the case of the I.C.S. 43

The foregoing account of suggestion of Ambedkar
them and indifference towards the social institut
Hinduism. Therefore, he advocates a radical chan
Hindu religion and Hindu society.

However, the rigid orthodoxy of the Hindus ma
give up any hope of reforming Hinduism. He says:
 orthodox Hindu is a strange fossil of humanity.
blind irrational tradition is greater than truth.
tide have no effect upon his mind. Therefore,
decided to give up Hinduism and to join some othe
which could provide a dynamic force to establish
tarian ideals of equality, liberty and fraternity
sons why he thought so can be understood from a r
quotation from Ambedkar's speech.

Religion is for man; man is not for religion.
If you want to gain self-respect, change your
If you want to create a co-operating society, your religion.
If you want power, change your religion.
If you want equality, change your religion.
If you want independence, change your religion.
If you want to make the world in which you li
change your religion.
Why should you remain in a religion that does
your manhood?
That religion which forbids humanitarian be between men and man is not a religion but a penalty.

That religion which regards the recognition self-respect as sin is not a religion but a

That religion which allows one to touch a but not a man is not a religion but a madness

That religion which says that one class may
knowledge, may not acquire wealth, may not
is not a religion but a mockery of man's li

That religion which teaches that the unlear remain unlearned, that the poor should rema is not a religion but a punishment.

Do not say that men who treat animals with than humans and who respects all Brahmans religious.

Do not say that men who feed ants with suga go without water are religious.

This clearly shows that he wanted to relin because of "obduracy of Hindu society" to the who demanded "equality and fraternity". It is caste-Hindus did not give respect to the cleriic untouchables to the strengthening of the Hindu to the increase of co-operation between the cas untouchables. Therefore, Ambedkar says "Since
From the above statement it is clear that Ambedkar was very firm to relinquish Hinduism, because he thought it appeared quite impossible to him, that their would be removed if they remained in Hinduism. At the same time it should be made clear that Ambedkar had no intention of destroying the Hinduism, but he reform it by advocating various means. When he left the mission he came to the conclusion that, in practice and untouchability were inseparable, and that if one had to free oneself from the misery of untouchability, the evils of the caste system, one should have to leave altogether. This, in short, is why Ambedkar gave up Hinduism.

He saw that, within the Hindu fold, it was impossible to be born as an untouchable to live as a human being; that is, with freedom and human dignity.

Ambedkar wants to explain the various aspects of conversion, because it is very difficult to transform conversion into reality. Conversion means the birth of a new religious belief. From rational point o
Material and Social Aspects of Conversion

To understand the material and social aspects, it is necessary to understand, according to Ambedkar, the nature of untouchability and how it is practised in day-to-day life of a Hindu. While considering this point Ambedkar argues:

The Hindu society insists on segregation of quarters of the Untouchables. The Hindu will in the quarters of the Untouchables and will not allow the Untouchables to live inside Hindu quarters. It is a fundamental feature of untouchability as practised by the Hindus. It is not a case of separation, a mere stoppage of intercourse for temporary period. It is a case of territorial segregation and of a cordon sanitaire putting the Untouchables inside a barbed wire, into a sort of a cage. Hindu village has a ghetto. The Hindus live in a village and the Untouchables in the ghetto.

Thus the Hindu society treats a section of the people as permanent and hereditary slaves. This
social rights, because they are not considered at all. This was the condition of the untouchat
time. Hence, he thinks, so long as they remain society, there is no salvation for them. Theref
have to get out of Hinduism to secure freedom for activities such as wearing dress, eating good for
education and living in the midst of a civilized

Turning to the social aspect of the problem, says that, although the problem looks like a strat social status, it is essentially a class struggl sions were a part of ceaseless struggle between and the unprivilaged. Therefore, he recalls the atrocities perpetrated against them in all parts country. He thinks that the struggle between ca and untouchables is a class struggle. This stru as soon as they claim treatment on par with the He argues:

It is your claim to equality which hurts the want to maintain the status quo. If you cont
Further, he says, that the Hindus practise and tyranny against the untouchables only, because they are helpless. It is evident from Ambedkar's analysis that the struggle between the untouchables and caste is a class-war. This is not a case of injustice being perpetuated by one man against another; it is a case of injustice being perpetuated by one class against another. Further, he felt that the system is aimed at showing how one class should relate with other class. Further, he felt that between the untouchables and caste-Hindus is a conflict, because, Hinduism assigns lowest status to untouchables in the social ladder. According to him, the social order is divine and eternal. Further, Ambedkar's argument is not warranted by the change of time and circumstances. Therefore, from Ambedkar's argument, it is not just for the untouchables to face the social and religious qualifications of Hinduism as long as they remain weak and divided, because they possess enough strength to face tyranny and inequality. Ambedkar suggests three means to overcome this problem. Firstly, acquiring man-power and secondly, financial stress...
Though he emphasises the material aspect of conv major aim was centred around the self-respect, h freedom of mind and spiritual well-being.

**Spiritual aspect of Conversion**

Regarding the spiritual aspect, Ambedkar obs the function of a true religion is to uplift the from his lower spiritual plane to the higher one purpose it should teach the virtues of fellow-fe equality and liberty. Hence, Ambedkar wants to the relation between man and society under three within that particular religion. They are:

1. the happiness of the individual is the u of social constitution;

2. the social constitution should help the to develop his innate capacities and power to tr degree; and

3. the end of an ideal social constitution
for the service of society alone, but for the de
his self. That is why a man cannot make anot
his slave in advanced societies. Therefore, the
which an individual has no importance is not acc
Ambedkar. According to Ambedkar, as a religion,
does not teach fellowship and has denied individ
education and wealth for the untouchables. Ambe
"because of untouchability, your merits go unreal
is no appreciation of your mental and physical c
untouchability is a curse that has ruined your e
tence, honour and name. Therefore, he urges
bles to leave Hinduism and seek another religi
offer them better conditions of life. However,
reason for conversion is not a positive belief in
religion, but a rejection of Hinduism. "To rema
and to attempt to abolish the caste system is li
poison," he says.

Rejection of other Religions

Before answering why Ambedkar preferred Bud
provide a meaningful social and political life framework of the egalitarian principles of equal and fraternity. With these general criteria he the living religions of India.

After the Yeola Conference Ambedkar searche
gion which would assure them basic civil right for them. Sikhism made an appeal to his mind.
ture, Sardar Walip Singh Doabria, Vice-President Golden Temple managing committee, sent a telegr saying that Sikhism fulfills the requirements r Ambedkar aspired from conversion. “The Sikh re theistic and all-loving, and provides for equal all its adherents.”

On January 13, 1936 Ambedkar attended a Sik Dr Solanki. In mid April 1936, he went to at mission conference. The Sikh leaders stress speches the need for missionary and uplift wor depressed classes. Ambedkar made a positive ge sending his son and nephew to Sikh Gurudwara Ma
... Looking at these alternative faiths purely the standpoint of Hindus, which is the best—Christianity or Sikhism? Obviously, Sikhism is best. If the depressed classes join Islam or Christianity, they not only go out of the Hindu religion but they also go out of the Hindu culture. On the other hand, if they become Sikhs they remain in the Hindu culture. This is by no means a small advantage to the Hindus.

What the consequences of conversion will be to the as a whole, is the primary question in Ambedkar's work. Therefore, conversion to Islam or Christianity will further accentuate and monopolize the depressed classes. If they go over to Islam, the numbers of Muslims will be doubled; and the colonial Muslim domination also becomes real. If they go over to Christianity, the numerical strength of the Christians becomes five to six crores. It will strengthen the hold of Britain on the country. On the other hand, if they embrace Sikhism, they will not only go out of the Hindu religion but they will help to strengthen the destiny of the country.

However, the move for conversion to Sikhism is not just the approval of prominent Hindu leaders like M.C. Ra,
to save the national solidarity. However, at a stage, Ambedkar rejected Sikhism and embraced Buddhism in the case of Emperor Ashoka, who renounced war and a religion sanctioning a fighting spirit and instead the path of Buddha's compassion.

From the above observation Ambedkar not only rejected Sikhism but also Islam and Christianity. He rejected them because of the Muslims of India always having a table constraint of a separate national feeling as a firm believer of women's liberation, rejection of the position of women. "No words can express the many evils of polygamy and concubinage, especially as a source of misery to Muslim women."

On the same time Ambedkar did not criticise the Holy Koran, but criticised the Muslim who did not live up to the lofty ideals preached in it. Therefore, a materialist to the core, he thought that the Indian people must not emancipate the untouchables, but they indle themselves unhealthy customs on the untouchables who...
Regarding Jainism Ambedkar expressed the view that it is not a powerful religion and that too the ahimsa by Jainism was extreme and thus unacceptable to him. Before Ambedkar rejected Islam, Christianity and 9: the following reasons:

1. Islam and Christianity are not the native of India; they will denationalize the depr
if they get converted to Islam or Christian also he did not like to spoil the Bharath

2. If they go to Christianity or Islam, the strength of them will be doubled and it will then the political hold of the Muslims an over India.

3. There is no equality for women in Islam.

4. He rejected Sikhism, because of its milit

Rejection of Communism
All democratic thinkers of the modern age acknowledge that private ownership of property is the bane of society, that it is an obstacle to the equitable distribution of basic amenities to all. It cannot be justified means that millions of people should starve and made to linger between life and death, while all the lap of luxury and utilise their riches only to themselves further to the detriment of others. all rational, freedom loving, individuals will accept socialist ideology of class struggle and the doctrine of equalisation of property. Ambedkar too accepts the ideology in a broader sense. But he disagrees with Indian socialist in many ways, because he thinks equalisation of property alone will not bring equality in Hindu society. The economic equality may apply in the Western countries. The Westerners propound an economic creature, his activities, and aspirations are bound by economic facts. In other words, their source of power to them. Whereas in India, i
of property unless they know that after the revol
achieved they will be treated equally and that th
be no discrimination of caste and creed."65

From the above it is clear that without socia
there can be no political and economic equality.
socialism alone cannot liberate the Hindu society
clutches of casteism and untouchability. The sec
for his rejection of the ideology of communism wa
his commitment to democracy as a social and polit
ture; he believed that it is an instrument for so
formation and a means to attain the egalitarian i
ther, his mind was deeply influenced by the const
methods which made him reject the communistic way
This can be gauged from his speeches at Constitut
bly where he piloted the Constitution of the Repu
Free India. In one of his speeches he said that
is no scope for constitutional methods there is j
for the unconstitutional means for achieving the
in objectives. But "... where constitution
Therefore, according to him, democracy and consensual methods are the means to attain an egalitarian society.

Ambedkar's choice for Buddhism

After rejecting all major religions and concoctions, Ambedkar chose Buddhism as a final resort for the reason that he preferred Buddhism for different reasons. It was praised by Ambedkar because of its fundamental equality and humanistic spirit. Once in the B. R. Ambedkar said, "I prefer Buddhism, because it gives thrice the blessings in combination which no other religion does. Equality (prajñā) (understanding against super-naturalism) (compassion) and samatā (equality). This is what is meant for good and happy life." Perhaps, in other religions, there is a certain amount of superstitious and propitious beliefs about the nature of the ultimate reality. For instance, in Hinduism, the belief in Yajñā (as the theory of karma and dharma, the belief in the Vedas, etc., are the roots for various
criterion for the peaceful and happy life of man in society. According to Ambedkar, “Religion meant for man and not man for religion.” Religions teach its followers to recognize man as man and prosperity in this world and not in a trans-temporal world. Ambedkar argues that religions other than Buddhism concentrate on the problems of the soul, God and liberation are highly metaphysical in nature. They forget the social problem which is directly related to the this worldliness. But Buddha concentrated on the problems in this world and offered solutions to teachings. Therefore, Buddha’s main concern was that we should attain salvation in this world and he did not believe in salvation after death. Buddhism does not accept the varna classification of the Hindu society. Hinduism held the gospel of inequality, but Buddhism stood for absolute equality for all. A great opponent of caturvarna, Buddhism did everything it could to change it. According to Hinduism, a sūdra nor a woman could become a teacher nor c
to take concrete steps to destroy the inequality Hindu society. According to Ambedkar, if there who raised his voice against separatism and until it was Lord Buddha. Buddhism is the only religion does not recognise caste and offers full scope progress. 69

Buddha's teachings of rationalism and intelligence influenced Ambedkar very deeply, because claimed divinity for himself nor infallibility forings. It was evident, in the parinibbāna sutta; told Ananda, his disciple, that his movement was reason and experience and his followers should n teachings as correct and binding merely because from him.

Ambedkar rightly pointed out that, in the case religious teachers, the teachers themselves proc infallibility and became authoritarians. Their followers were forced to oblige and were even co accept their teachings as given to them. Buddha