Dr. Ambedkar was amongst the prime thinkers and philosophers of modern India. His philosophy was mainly associated with freedom, human equality, democracy and socio-political freedom (self-reliance). He is a renowned philosopher who dealt with extreme insult, poverty and social stigma since childhood, still managed to be a personality of prime academic and philosopher. He was a revolutionary social reformer who possess firm belief in democracy and presented the moral base of society. He was the pioneer of various civil and political institutions of India and criticized those ideologies and institutions which advocated inequality and slavery. He voraciously and critically studied economy, social institutions, law and constitution, history and religion. He was the appointed as chairman of drafting committee for Constitution of India where he advocated its major sections with rational clarity and firmly represented his prudent facts regarding constitution. He accepted Buddhism and gave reformative insistence through modern and social techniques along with his numerous followers, gave it a new form and paved the way for its rejuvenation in modern India.

Dr. Ambedkar holds the viewpoint of modern age where there was victory of human discretion over myths, folkways – traditions and superstitions. He holds that world and human society could be better explained from human discretion and efforts. There is no need to summon supernatural powers to sought one’s objectives, in fact the truth about these supernatural powers is that they exhibit the feeble human abilities and under developed stage of human development. Thus, he was of firm opinion that expression of human discretion lies positively in science and modern technology.

Major work arena of Dr. Ambedkar was Constitutional Democracy, he was specialist of several constitutions especially of those which had exhibited wide accreditation of Movements. He was of the opinion that in order to bind every citizen in threads of unity and to provide equal opportunity in social tasks, regime of law is very much vital. He was very much sensitive regarding the interrelation among law and popular beliefs. His inclination towards law and democracy also exerted pressure over autonomy of State. He further adds that State is in grave need to leave those orthodox and narrow mentality wide spread in society which use State as an instrument to satisfy their specific needs.

Ambedkar was the first theorist in India who firmly believed that if state is bound to preserve the rights then state ought to think over the constitutional basis of “have nots”. He developed a typical standard to identify the needy or have nots. Untouchability is one of the biggest social loss and it is highly unacceptable and should be condemned at first place. Dr. Ambedkar exerted pressure on unique options based on the conception of rights over the goodwill wellbeing and benefit of backwards.

Presented research work throws light on various aspects of his life philosophy. The first part of the paper is the brief introduction of life of Dr. Ambedkar, second part describes his ideological philosophy, religious philosophy and social philosophy. Observation method is used to collect the data about Dr. Ambedkar

Life introduction:
Dr. Ambedkar (1891-1956) was born on 14th April 1891 in Mahu in an Untouchable Mahaar caste. He experienced various forms of social insult because of untouchability. At school he was not allowed to sit equally with fellow students, he was not allowed to drink water from the common water pot for student, he was prohibited to learn Sanskrit, after all these hurdles, he completed his graduation from University of Mumbai and went to United States of America to complete his Post Graduate degree and Ph.D. He was deeply attached and affected by deep rooted untouchability and caste system in Indian society. He also voraciously studied effect of colonialism on Indian Economics, Politics, and social life of India. After completing his Ph.D. degree he peddled back to Baroda Highness to serve in his administration, who sponsored him in USA. But after having prime qualities and eligibilities, he felt the pain of untouchability in Baroda Administration. He left his job and for some time he joined Sidenham college of commerce and economics in Bombay as Professor of Political Economics. Before Montesque chemsfords reforms, he gave a representation in front of southboro committee in...
which he demanded a separate representation for Dalits, which at that time were considered as lower and untouchable caste. In January 1920, he started a reading paper called MOOK NAYAK in Marathi and played an important role in the AKHIL BHARTIYA DALIT VARG SAMMELAN under the headship of Shahoo Maharaj of Kolhapur. After completing his D.Sc. degree, he took admission in London School of Economics, which he later on completed in the year 1922. Thereafter in 1923 in Mumbai he started his practice of Law and played a vital role in aggregating and strengthening the untouchables and Dalits. In the year 1924, he formed a BAHISHKRIT HITKARINI SABHA. In the year 1927 he was nominated in the Bombay Legislative Assembly. He successfully represented the famous SATYAGRAH in Choudar Talab in Mahaad. He demanded equal rights for untouchables to consume the water from the Pundr from which they were forbidden. In continuation to that, a copy of Manusmriti was also burnt. He started a reading paper titled BAHISHKRIT BHARAT and in the year 1927 established two organizations namely SAMAJ SAMTA SANGH and SAMTA SAINIK by the way of which the demand for equality of Dalits was raised strongly. He also established DALIT VARG SHIKSHA SAMITI in the year 1928 along with the publication of reading paper SAMTA. In these years, Dr. Ambedkar was active as Professor of Law. He presented a representation in front of Simon Commission and demanded the evaluation of constitutional reforms. In the year 1930, he lead the famous Satyargrah of KALRAM TEMPLE Nasik and demanded the entry of untouchables in the temple. In the year 1930, he presided the Depressed Classes Congress held at Nagpur. In the year 1936, Dr. Ambedkar established a new political party named as the Independent Labour Party in the year 1937 which contested on 17 seats and won 15 put of them in General elections. In the year 1942 he founded another political party named as All India Scheduled Castes Federation and was induced in the Viceroy’s Executive Council as Labour Member. Dr. Ambedkar was selected for constituent assembly in Bengal where he put forward his opinion of United India along with Muslim League and Congress. He was appointed as the Chairman of constitution framing committee and in August 1947, he was appointed as Law Minister in Nehru’s Union Council of Ministers. While holding these positions he voraciously pondered, created and nurtured the independent and socialist structure regarding social life in India and demanded for self-sufficiency for the religious minority groups and linguistic cultural groups along with protection of rights for the backward classes. In the year 1951, Dr. Ambedkar gave resignation from the Nehru Council of Ministers and deliberately worked to strengthen the social and economic democracy along with solving the loop holes in constitutional democracy. Further he opted for Buddhism and proposed for the establishment of Indian Republic Party. On the day of 6th December 1956, he left his mortal body leaving behind an immortal philosophy of equality among all the sections of society.

There are several aspects of Dr. Ambedkar’s philosophy. There is a very rare chance that any subject which was not discussed by him. He boldly put forward his opinion on several burning topics of the then Indian society. His versatile personality is evident in his thoughts over socio-political philosophy, economic thoughts and legal-constitutional ideologies.

Dr. Ambedkar’s Philosophy

Dr. Ambedkar had inculcated situations very closely and according to threshold boundary with reference to liberalists and Marxists people, he sometimes called himself as progressive extremist and sometimes progressive traditionalist/ orthodox. He was strong supporter of freedom. He looked upon freedom as a positive power and encouraged people to take decisions by unshackling the ties of economic exploitation, social institutions, religious orthodox, fear and presumptions. He was of firm belief that liberalism supports a mean outlook of freedom which give all the resources into the hands of few which causes the exploitation. He was of the opinion that liberalism is non sensitive towards social and political institutions which promotes formal equality along with deepening the differences rooted in economic social and cultural areas. He advocated that in every liberal system there is extreme inequality rooted for minorities. For example, condition of blacks in U.S.A and Jews in Europe. He further stated that liberalism is mere a tool to justify colonial exploitation and illegalities. A perfect society always demands for equal opportunity over means of production for every member of society so that everyone could get equal opportunity to develop. He was a strong critic of Brahmanism in Indian society. According to him, it was the most influential thought process in Indian society. He further stated that Brahminism had established again by its full force by uprooting the ideology established by Buddha. It advocated the categorical differences among the social institutions and system of relations, overlooked the concept of ability, promoted the concept of ascribed status by birth, promoted karmkanda and priestship. Brahminism had constantly pushed shudras and untouchables towards lower grade works and defamation. It promoted the unequal and unlawful distribution of posts and resources in society and provided religious acceptance to this unacceptable practice. It accepted that physical labor is lower than mental labor. Brahminism does not possess any sympathy towards backward and downtrodden classes. It had divided society into many closed groups because of this community feeling and we feeling of equality was never developed. It created a drift among different sections of society and for that reasons they never shared their life experiences, and were never able to nurture feeling of equality. In the nutshell, Brahminism never had any morality or is associated value in itself.
Dr. Ambedkar was voracious critic of Gandhism. He negatively criticized the Gandhian approach of eradication of untouchability by Gandhi because it negated the restriction regarding untouchability in religious texts and asked higher castes (savarna) to drop untouchability by their own. Dr. Ambedkar felt that rights and humanitarian behavior for Dalits can never be left at mercy and prejudice of higher castes. Unlike Gandhi, he never tried to marginalize caste system but inculcated the categorical differentiation in one frame of theory. If untouchability could have been eradicated by efforts of Gandhi, which in the opinion of Ambedkar was impossible, then also shudras would have been on the lowest status in the social stratum.

Religious Philosophy
The viewpoint of Dr. Ambedkar regarding religion was always a mixed one. He never supported the concept of faith in individualistic God. He was of opinion that just like mortality, religion provides a base for societies and enable group life to extend the tasks of improved life. Such type of religion lifts the aims, philanthropy and we feeling among the members of society. Such religion motivates humans and take stand against injustice, exploitation and struggle against unjustified practices. Dr. Ambedkar believed that for a good life, it is important to have independence, equality and brotherhood and for that a separate system of rights should be created. He not only understood rights in specified lights of liberal individualism but also understood in reference of human being and group rights. He advocated both individual rights and group rights in the discussions of constituent assembly. Apart from this he also put out strongly opinions regarding citizen and political rights, social and economic rights. He never saw these rights as opposite to each other but as a mutual strengtheners. Further in his view, if there is some dialect among the rights, then it should be discussed through citizen and political stages. He also supported the rights of cultural groups and minorities so that they could be able to retain and conserve their identity and beliefs along with developing a favorable environment to get justified place in the common matters open to society.

Although Dr. Ambedkar had written about several religions of the world but about most he had written about Buddhism he was of the view that several religious texts as Vedas and Upanishads in hindu religion are not in coordination with each other and follows with countless other disparity within themselves. Dr. Ambedkar gave a new definition of Buddhism and found it associated with social life. Buddhism gave consolation to poor and backwards and it is associated with world's happiness and sorrow. It does not believe in the existence of separate God neither in the concept of immortality of spirit it supports discretion and reasoning and existence of the world, advocated moral system and science. For freedom equality in society he found Buddhism vital.

Social Philosophy
Regarding caste and caste system Dr. Ambedkar’s philosophy assumed several changes. Initially he felt that caste is that homogenous concept which is imposed over heterogeneity. He felt that Sati, child marriage traditions and widow suppression were the outcome of this imposition. When one caste closed its boundaries, others also started the same. It was due to mean mentality of Brahmans, castes originated. Dr. Ambedkar rigorously pointed towards the homogenous characteristics of caste but seldom discussed other characteristics like division of labor, eating together, absence of the concept of birth etc. Dr. Ambedkar was of the opinion that caste is essential characteristics of Hindu religion. His argued that without managing community restrictions and without encouraging freedom and equality, eradication of caste system is almost impossible. For this purpose, he suggested the practice of intercaste marriages and intercaste eating. Dr. Ambedkar believed that untouchability is different from caste although untouchability possess the same mark of categorical discrimination. Untouchability is the extreme form of caste insult, it marginalized untouchables and polluted the idea of social interaction. He argued that apart from several differences all the untouchables are facing the same discomfort and upper caste Hindus are not behaving properly with them. Untouchables are forced to live outside the boundary of village, they are always insulted and are kept away from human contact and human society. Regarding untouchability and discrimination practices Dr. Ambedkar holds the opinion that there is no permanent solution to this problem. To get rid of untouchability, entire society needs to be changed. Respect and right for every person should not just be constitutional, but behavioral too. He felt that there is not much expected from others due to deep rooted differences regarding untouchability, it is the untouchables only that holds the responsibility to free themselves. For such self-help, not only struggle is important, but education and organization are also needed. Other then this constitutional democracy is also helpful in this regard.

CONCLUSION
Dr. Ambedkar had been projected as a politician who worked hard for the welfare of backwards and untouchables. He was a true nationalist who religiously supported the lower and have not class of India. He was a voracious supporter of democracy but he was of the opinion that democracy could not be controlled by any ruling system but should be made a life system. He was a rigorous critic of caste system and untouchability and tried a lot to eradicate that. He strongly admitted that social justice is the essential characteristics of good governance and suggested very effective measures. His philosophy was entirely different from his
contemporary philosophers and for that reason he is still relevant in every walk of social thinking holds a very respectable place among the citizen of every section of society.
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