Ambedkar tried to endow the lower castes with a glorious history of sons of the soil to help them acquire an alternative; not-caste based; identity, to regain their self respect and overcome their divisions. In ‘The Untouchables, who were they and why they became Untouchables’ (1948), Ambedkar discredits Western creators clarifying standing progressive system by turning to racial factors. His understanding is strikingly confounded. He clarifies that all crude social orders have been one day or the other vanquished by intruders who raised themselves over the local clans. In separating, these clans as an issue of rule brings forth a fringe bunch that he calls the Broken Men. As indicated by Ambedkar these Broken Men were the most consistent adherents of Buddha not long after he started his lessons in the sixth century BC. What’s more, they remained Buddhists when the remainder of the general public got back to the Hindu crease under the pressing factor of Brahmans. Ambedkar made two determinations from it, …why the Untouchables regard the Brahmans as inauspicious, do not employ them as their priests and do not even allow them to enter into their quarters. It also explains why the Broken Men came to be regarded as Untouchables. The Broken Men hated the Brahmans because the Brahmans were the enemies of Buddhism and the Brahmans imposed untouchability upon the Broken Men because they would not leave Buddhism. (Ambedkar, 1989, p.317)

Subsequently, Ambedkar didn’t battle himself with expounding a hypothesis of standings which finished in reviewed imbalance; he additionally concocted a distant custom powerless to cure the previous. On the off chance that they perceived themselves as children of the dirt’s and Buddhists, the Untouchables could more readily overcome their divisions into such countless jatis and stand firm together as an ethnic gathering against the framework completely. Ambedkar contended that if Hindu India had been attacked by Muslims, Buddhist India had been oppressed by Brahmans outcasts much previously.

Ambedkar’s political activity was not kept uniquely to his endeavors to create parties. He additionally made a decent attempt to impact the administrations in his own ability, regardless of whether they were of the British or Congress, for better serving the reason for the Untouchables. Under the British Raj, Ambedkar was detainee for quite a while of a problem: from one perspective, he dismissed the development for freedom given that it was overwhelmed by a gathering, the Congress, which he saw as the outflow of the upper standings, though he got himself nearer to the British, with whom he shared libertarian esteems and from whom he expected a security against the ‘station Hindus’. Then again, he was an Indian and couldn’t surrender to see his nation overwhelmed by an unfamiliar force, which, on its highest point, stamped on the estimations of uniformity, opportunity and fellowship that he treasured most. Following quite a while of faltering, during the 1930s, his antagonism towards the Congress in the long run abrogated his patriot emotions. He at that point anticipated from his rapprochement with the British considerable increases for the Untouchables.

The participation of Ambedkar with the British didn’t permit him to accomplish his goals regarding relationship of the Dalits to the exchanges going before freedom; after the thrashing of the SCF in the 1945-46 decisions, Ambedkar was not tuned in to any more. Nonetheless, he acquired generous concessions for the Untouchables, as far as portrayal in the organization for example. The way that India was quick from the Ancient Regime, the Third State had the option to raise itself against the nobility and the government. In mechanical social orders, the middle class can raise itself against the bourgeoisie. In this paper, I propose to exhibit the Ambedkar was first to join the Dalits and, at that point, the Bahujan Samaj and, second to invest them with a different character that would offer them an elective course out of sanskritisation.
undeniable possibility for power. Ambedkar’s even minded way to deal with legislative issues isn’t to be confused with an unadulterated advantage. For he didn’t change partners as a result of the posts which either could offer to him, yet as per what could best serve the reason for the Untouchables. In August 1947, Nehru made Ambedkar, without a doubt under Gandhi’s tension, his Law Minister in the main administration of autonomous India. Ambedkar acknowledged the greeting of the Prime Minister on the grounds that, as he said later,

...in the first place the offer was not subject to any condition and secondly it was easier to serve the interests of the Scheduled Castes from inside of the government than from outside. (Austin, 1999, p.19)

As individual from the Constituent Assembly, Ambedkar didn’t have his state in a precise way, however. His frustrate with his partaking in the Minorities board of trustees headed by Sardar Patel is a valid example. Ambedkar proposed to the board that at any rate the competitor of a minority ought to be announced chosen just if a negligible extent of the individuals from his gathering decided in favor of him, yet he was not trailed by the sub-panel. Patel accentuated that such a plan would be as destructive as isolated electorates.

Dr. Ambedkar, in any case, was in a situation to have a solid effect on the creation of the Constitution after he was delegated leader of the ‘Drafting Committee’. This Committee, while it was not answerable for drafting the essential writings, had the fundamental capacity to get these into shape based on articles proposed by other, issue-based, Committees, prior to submitting them to the Constituent Assembly. The Assembly made a few readings and, each time, Drafting Committee individuals; and frequently its executive, Ambedkar; guided and channelized the conversation. Likewise, he was one of only a handful few individuals from the Constituent Assembly, who had a place, other than the Drafting Committee, simultaneously, to more than one of the 15 Committees; including the ‘Minorities Committee’ where shields for the Dalits were examined. On this record he had the option to follow intently up and down the discussions on articles as significant as those concerning the privileges of the minorities. Above all, as leader of the Drafting Committee, it was to him that was sent the recommendations of the different boards of trustees. Ambedkar was, in actuality, an ally of a solid Center, on grounds that a lot of federalism would hamper the uniform utilization of the Constitution on the whole domain of India. He contended, for instance, that the article canceling untouchability would not be equally authorized if the states appreciated too huge an independence. This incorporating alternative outraged normally the allies of Gandhi, who had consistently showed up extremely worried about decentralizing force straight up to the town level.

Be that as it may, Dr. Ambedkar neglected to have a solid effect on one of his need zones that is close to home laws a vital space for social change. During the discussions in the Constituent Assembly, he had exhibited his will to change Indian culture by suggesting the selection of a Civil Code of western motivation. He had then restricted the agents who wished to keep up close to home laws, particularly Muslim delegates who had all the earmarks of being exceptionally worried about the destiny of the Sharia. After the proclamation of the Constitution, Ambedkar militated for the change of the Hindu individual law. He needed to actualize in a reconsidered way the Hindu Code Bill that the British had step by step advanced. After over one century of enactment; going from the Abolition of Sati (1829) to the Hindu Women’s Right to Property Act (1937); they had chosen during the 1940s to merge in one code the changed Hindu individual law. Among its primary arrangements were the realities that little girls were given a portion of the legacy alongside children after the end of guardians, the widows were conceded supreme bequest, monogamy was a standard of law and separation was permitted in specific situations. In 1948, Nehru endowed the drafting of the new code to a sub-board of trustees of the Assembly and selected Dr. Ambedkar as its head.

Jawaharlal Nehru was joined to this code in which he saw, very as Dr. Ambedkar, one of the foundation’s of the modernization of India. He even reported that his administration would leave if this bill was not passed. Dr. Ambedkar squeezed him to submit it as fast as conceivable to the Parliament. The Prime Minister requested him for a tad from persistence and even split the Code into four subsets for defusing the resistance prior to submitting it to the Assembly on 17 September 1951. The discussion which followed affirmed then the antagonism of the most conservative Congressmen. At last, on September 25, the segment of the Hindu Code Bill concerning marriage and separation was twisted by changes largely covered without Nehru articulating the least dissent. Taking into account that he had not been upheld enough by the Prime Minister, Ambedkar sent him his letter of acquiescence from his administration on 27 September. The procedure of cooperation with the rulers had demonstrated its cutoff points, however it had bore organic products. The modernization of the Indian culture that the Constitution should allow could offer desire to Dr. Ambedkar of the approach of a more libertarian culture. However, he left the public authority a harsh man; and he turned out to be considerably more frustrated with the political framework subsequent to losing his seat in Parliament in the 1951-52 decisions. He at that point got back to a technique he had pondered previously: change out of Hinduism.

Converting to another religion to escape from the position framework legitimately followed from Ambedkar’s examination of Hinduism, whose innovation and strength laid in its show that in this development social order was consubstantial to religion. To leave it was consequently the lone way to accomplish equity. The primary reference made by Ambedkar to a transformation of the Untouchables goes back to 1927. During the Mahad Conference, he had in reality proclaimed,

We want equal rights in society. We will achieve them as far as possible while remaining within the Hindu fold or, if necessary by kicking away this worthless Hindu identity. And if it becomes necessary to give up Hinduism it would no longer be necessary for us to bother about temples. (Gore, 1993, p.91)

Dr. Ambedkar announced his decision to leave Hinduism in 1935, during the famous Yeola Conference,

The disabilities we have suffered, and the indignities we had to put up with, were the result of our being the members of the Hindu community. Will it not be better for us to leave that fold and embrace a new faith that would give us equal status, a secure position and rightful treatment? I advise you to sever your connection with Hinduism and to embrace any other
religion. But, in doing so, be careful in choosing the new faith and see that equality of treatment, status and opportunities will be guaranteed to you unreservedly. (...) Unfortunately for me I was born a Hindu Untouchable. It was beyond my power to prevent that, but, I declare that it is within my power to refuse to live under ignoble and humiliating conditions. I solemnly assure you that I will not die a Hindu. (Das, 1969, p.108)

In the wake of contrasting various religions and the ability of their chiefs in India to invite the Untouchables, Dr. Ambedkar declared his inclination for Sikhism in August 1936, on the grounds that he thought to have some obligation concerning the fate of the Hindu culture and human progress and didn’t have any desire to break with the greater part local area.

At the point when Dr. Ambedkar considered transformation indeed, with regards to the 1950s that we had referenced above, he picked Buddhism. The commonality of Ambedkar with Buddhism returns up to his childhood. In 1908 one of his instructors, K.A. Keluskar, intrigued by his inclination, had offered him on the event of his accomplishment in the Matriculation assessment, the history of Lord Buddha he had distributed 10 years prior. This content practiced a significant impact at the forefront of his thoughts, despite the fact that he never alluded to it for quite a long time. In 1934, he worked at Dadar (Bombay) a house that he named as Rajgriha, the name of the capital of old Buddhists rulers of Bihar. In 1935-36, during the principal development for change, he didn’t visualize leaving Hinduism for Buddhism. However, his advantage in this religion filled during the 1940s, as he named his first school Siddharth, after the primary name of Buddha. Simultaneously, his exercises inside the Constituent Assembly arranged the ground for his transformation to Buddhism and the authority acknowledgment of this religion. In May 1947, he restricted K.M Munshi’s alteration which proposed to disallow the transformation of minors, in this way gambling hampering all change.

He additionally added to get Buddha Jayanti, the commemoration celebration of Lord Buddha, put in the schedule of true occasions. Ultimately, he was associated with the reception of the different Buddhist images with which the Indian Republic supplied itself somewhere in the range of 1947 and 1950: the chakra on the Indian banner, the lions of Ashoka, the Buddhist sovereign of old India as the public token and the engraving of a Buddhist adage on the pediment of Rashtrapati Bhavan, the home of the President of the Republic. In 1950, he went to Sri Lanka and started a gathering of Buddha’s compositions and called upon the Untouchables to change over to Buddhism. He rehashed this allure on his return, in the fall of the exact year and changed over in October 1956, half a month prior to his demise on 6 December 1956. Buddhism framed the most ideal decision for Dr. Ambedkar in light of the fact that it was a populist religion brought into the world in India; not the formation of outsiders. The way that Buddhism was seen by him as an option in contrast to the Hindu social progression is unmistakably reflected in the discourse he made during the service of his transformation in Nagpur on 14 October 1956.

By discarding my ancient religion which stood for inequality and oppression today I am reborn. I have no faith in the philosophy of incarnation; and it is wrong and mischievous to say that Buddha was an incarnation of Vishnu. I am no more a devotee of any Hindu god or goddess. I will not perform Shraddha. I will strictly follow the eightfold path of Buddha. Buddhism is a true religion and I will lead a life guided by the three principles of knowledge, right path and compassion. (Keer, 1971, p.500)

The impact of conversion to Buddhism varies according to groups (even individuals) and places. In Maharashatra, the conversion of the Mahars had mixed consequences. Their break with Hinduism seemed quite relative and the converts therefore did not get emancipated from caste hierarchy. Their name changed. They now called themselves “baudhda” in Marathi, but this move was only slowly and partially reflected in the emergence of a new collective identity. However, E. Zelliot admits that the glass is half full too.

What has happened is that even in areas where observers report ‘no change at all’, one finds that Buddhists no longer carry out what they feel are ritually submissive, degrading, or impure duties; that some young people, far more than in other Untouchable and backward communities, become educated; and that Buddhists do not participate in the Hindu public practices so long denied to them, not now out of a prohibition but out of a sense of separateness. (Zelliot, 2004, p.220)

The outcome is particularly mixed because the conversion of 1956, and those which followed, concerned almost exclusively the Mahars: if, in 1956, 55 per cent of the Untouchables of Maharashtra were converted to Buddhism so that the Buddhists crossed in numbers from 2,500 in 1951 to 2.5 millions in 1961; almost all the baudha came from the Mahar milieu. Above all, this phenomenon complicated the emergence of an identity common to all the Untouchables, transcending the cleavages of caste because of the reference to Buddhism.

To conclude I would like to say that, Ambedkar has tried all kind of strategies during his life for eradicating caste and, more especially, for emancipating the Dalit from this oppressive social systems. In the political domain, he promoted separate electorate, party building and public policies like reservations; and did not hesitate to collaborate with the ruler of the time; be it the British or the Congress for having things done. In the social domain, he militated in favour of reforms at the grass root level; education being his first goal – and reforms by the state – as evident from the Hindu code bill. None of his strategies really succeeded during his life time: he could not have separate electorate introduced, he could not build a Dalit or a labour party, he could not have the Hindu code bill passed – and he became a bitter man. As a result, conversion to Buddhism became the strategy of last resort. But it was not an exit option, Ambedkar did not take refuge in religion, but looked equality and social reform in religion since Buddhism was likely to endow the Dalits with a new identity and a sense of dignity. More than sixty years later, his contribution to the making of modern India is possibly more substantial than that of any other leader of his generation. He has not only prepared the ground for a silent revolution, but has also played a key role in the drafting of the Constitution of India which has set the terms for the development of the world largest democracy.
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