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Editorial ……

The Sucharitha: A Journal of Philosophy and Religion. The rave reviews we received were heartening. Your support and encouragement facilitated us to come out with the next issue on time without compromising on the standard style. The journal has and the quality of the articles.

In the present issue, we have taken up in detail the philosophical and religious issues discussed in academic circles. There are well written articles covering a wide range of issues that are thought provoking as well as significant in the contemporary world.

My thanks to the Members of the Editorial Board, to the readers, and in particular I sincerely recognize the efforts of the subscribers of articles. The journal thus receives its recognition from the rich contribution of assorted research papers presented by the experienced scholars and the implied commitment is generating the vision envisaged and that is spreading knowledge. I am happy to note that the readers are benefited.

My personal thanks to one and all.

(Dr. Victor Babu Koppula)
1. Introduction

Development of a country is virtually dependent upon the quality of management if its resources. Management is a key factor in the economic development of a country. The economic development is no more the function of natural resources and technology available in the society; it is rather the function of natural resources, technology and management competence of that particular society.

Bhardwaj D.S (2009) rightly described with importance of management education with empirical analysis. According to him, the secret of Japan’s success lies mainly in its art of managing human and material resources with utmost accuracy and precision. About the Japanese it is said that they think, whatever they think they plan accordingly and whatever they plan they attempt enthusiastically to achieve. Further, they cry over, and leave no stone unturned to remove, any deviation which by chance arise between the planned and actual results. Thus, there is strong emphasis on well-thought planning, organising, directing, appropriate coordination and adequate control at all levels. Participative doctrine is a pre-requisite for decisions regarding all such acts. False ego and wastage seldom takes place in Japanese system. This is how the Japanese have climbed to the top. The above practices of prudent management are missing in other countries. This is particularly true in the case of developing countries. Thus, it can be said that Management Education provides managerial skills in all the productive areas.
2. Scope of management education

The scope of education varies time to time with the societal need of education. Management education involves teaching students the fundamentals, theories, and processes of managing a business. The managers learn and improve their skills not only to benefit themselves but also their employing organizations. The effectiveness of management is recognized as one of the determinants of organizational success.

There was a phase when management education was synonymous with only a handful of sectors like marketing, finance and personnel (HR). Over the past few years, the scope has expanded considerably in a trend that’s visible across sectors. Initially, it was the engineering students who began to follow up their degree courses with an additional management degree. Then, specializations emerged in sectors like insurance, retail, apparel, Information Technology; management had become a prerequisite for a career in just about every field. Along the way, most of the misconceptions about management education also began to fade. Responding to the needs of different sectors, management curriculum began to evolve.

With industry-academia interaction on the rise, management education made the transition from theory-oriented to industry-relevant. The combination of industry professionals visiting management campuses, students going for industry visits, events being held where a platform is provided to industry professionals and academicians to come together and share their experiences, has truly transformed the process. This also encouraged more students to enroll for management education. From a stage where B-Schools were the preserve of a restricted few, an increasing number of students from different fields began to view management education as a ‘value
addition’ to any industry-specific course completed at graduate or post-graduate level.

Getting a global perspective also helps immensely as one can fit seamlessly into the work environment at a multinational corporation with the scope for postings in different countries across the world. Today most institutes offer specialization in management in the field of marketing, finance, operations and information technology. Then there are specialised courses like in retail management, integrated management, financial services, tourism management, hospitality management, agriculture management, banking management, insurance management, event management, fashion management even media management for that matter.

3. Need for Management Education

To manage the available recourses in the countries, there is utmost need to pursue the goals of formal education in general and management education in particular, more vigorously than the practice has hitherto is. The need of management arises as soon as a cooperative endeavor is required to accomplish a given task. In this context, the importance of management education has been recognised since long but the world as a whole was never in a greater need of management education then at present. This is particularly true in the case of India.

Because of rapid growth of industries and other developments, there has been increasing demand for the managerial personnel. This is not only for managing the various businesses and other establishments but also for increasing their working efficiency. In foreign countries, the average ratio of managerial personnel to the total strength of employees in various establishments is 1:5. In the present context of Indian conditions, 1:20 is considered as the ideal ratio. Obviously, with greater advancement, it is hoped that the ratio may further improve,
resulting in greater demand for professional managerial manpower. Thus, the future of professional managers and management education is quite bright as far as demand aspect is concerned.

In this regard, Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao has rightly pointed out that education has got to be related to economic development. It means that, as a result of the training given in educational institutions, the pupils must acquire productive capacity, be in a position to add to the sum total of production, and in fact produce much more than they would have done in the absence of this education. Return on investment (ROI) in education, in India, can be judged on the basis of following parameters (D.G.E.& T. 2006):

(i) Employment

ROI may be said to be positive if there is no unemployment among the educated persons. In India, millions of educated youth are unemployed and hence ROI is said to be negative. As far as management education is concerned the position at the moment seems to be quite satisfactory. No unemployment is visible among those who hold MBA or equivalent degree. According to one estimate, if the present trend of increasing demand for professional managerial personnel continues then it would be difficult for the Business Schools (B-Schools) to keep pace with the growing demand for managerial personnel.

(ii) Level of earnings

By and large, there is positive correlation between the height of education and the height of earnings. Further, there is a positive correlation between professional training/education and higher earnings and between non-professional training and lower earnings. Broadly speaking, the longer the duration of education, the higher is the rate of earnings and the more professional the education, the higher is the rate of earnings.
Here again, management education, in general, has an edge over formal education. A management trainee with MBA degree approximately gets Rs. 2000 to Rs. 3,000 p.m. Junior level positions, to which these trainees rise, carry a basic salary scale of Rs. 2000 to Rs. 4500 p.m., middle level positions carry a scale between Rs. 5000 to 7000 p.m. Top level executives get Rs. 7,500 or more as basic salary. In addition, there are other usual perquisites such as rent-free furnished house, free conveyance and suitable car allowance etc.

(iii) Average earnings

In the case of a large number of educated people and the income that they earn, we find that the relation between non-professional and non-production-oriented education and the earnings accruing there from is perhaps even negative. Thus, in the case of a person who is a graduate clerk and a person who is a semi-skilled labourer and who may have studied up to only the third or fourth standard, it is found that the former would be getting a lower income than the later. This means a negative return as less expenditure on education gets a higher return.

(iv) Self-employment

Regarding self-employment, management education seems to be no better than formal education at the moment. However, a beginning has already been made in this regard as a few persons holding professional degrees are providing management consultancy services to their client, on the basis of consultancy charges. One can hope for the better in future.

Thus, management education enjoys a much better status than formal education in the matter of job opportunities, pay scales and average salary etc. Because of these factors, young students tend to glamour for a management career.
Simon Kuznets gives the comparative contribution of different factors to development in broad terms that the impact of management on per capita productivity is nine times more than that of labour and capital combined together. Thus, a nation and particularly a less developed region like ours, anxious for speeding up its development rate must emphasize and adopt in practice management as the most important development input. In this context, the need for evolving a comprehensive policy and strategy for promoting management education, training and research has become imperative (Bharati Sharnia, 2011).

4. Management Education - Worldwide

The world of management is changing dramatically due to global competition, economic conditions, innovations and advancement in technology. The advancement in IT, Internet and e-commerce is changing the way of doing business throughout the globe. The world is shrinking to a global village. Therefore, there is the need to take an integrated and increasingly global view of how a decision in one business discipline may impact others—exactly what is taught in business schools. Management education has become a major profession that attracts considerable attention across the world. The graduate business school—Harvard Business School—was established in 1910. In South Asia, the 1st business school was established in 1954, the 9th by 1959, the 14th by 1969, the 81st by 1989, and the 743rd by 1998. These schools are located in five South Asian countries. These schools adopted the curriculum and teaching styles from the US B-schools and tried to deliver the same.

Evidence of this is the inception of a new journal: “Academy of Management Learning and Education” by Academy of Management in 2002. Though the market has been growing, there have been attempts
to assess the adequacy of efforts at various points of time. This part is divided into three sections (Gurpreet Singh Gill, 2009):

1) Market for management education;

2) Some introspective attempts reported so far;

3) Directions in which it is moving.

**Market for Management Education**

It is estimated that the global corporate education and training market is around US$65 billion. The global management education market is estimated to be US $22 billion. It is growing at about 10-12 percent per annum. US are the largest market (Pfeffer and Long 2002). The number of corporate universities is on the increase.

**5. Evolution of Management Education in India**

Management Education in India has not grown in an evolutionary manner but American experience was grafted on to an existing educational system (Crummer E. Roy & Schatz Martin (1993). Management education in India is not very old; it has taken its practical shape during early sixties with establishment of Indian Institute of Management to train the people with management concepts. After that many institutions, universities have also come forward to provide management education to cater the increasing demand of good managers.

The post liberalization period witnessed a greater need of professional education. The 21st century promises to herald a different environment for human development in all walks of life, including education. It is going to be knowledge-driven century resulting a need of greater reform in all education related activities like teaching, learning, evaluating, natural production, curriculum revision, administration production etc. Management education in India is
offered in the following categories of institutions:

- Institutions of national importance,
- University departments,
- Colleges affiliated to universities,
- Non-university autonomous institutions,
- Distance/correspondence-based institutions, and
- Unaffiliated institutions.

At the top are the reputed institutions of national importance, like IIMs and some university departments, such as Faculty of Management Studies (FMS), which have maintained high quality in their teaching and research. The second rung institutes are those started by the industrial houses, private institutes and state-level educational institutes like Mudra Institute of Communications, Ahmedabad (MICA), Symbiosis, and so on, which offer quality management education at par with those offered by the reputed institutes. These come under the category of ‘non-university autonomous institutions’. The third-level institutes are the university departments and Open Universities (OUs), which provide management education through correspondence, distance and part-time.

As per the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) report 2011-2012, Number of institutions/programmes and approved intake capacity at postgraduate level in various technical education disciplines is recorded about 3541MBA Programmes with intake capacity of 346825 (AICTE, 2011-12).

6. Emerging Issues of Management Education in India

Management education in India has not changed as per the requirement of the industry need and before this gaps widen enough; proper steps need to be taken. The following various emerging issues of
Management Education in India which can help us get rid of this gap and produce managers as per requirement of Industry and society, respond to challenges that comes with dynamics of internationalization that are relevant to management education in generally and management education in India in particular (AICTE, 2011-12).

**Dedicated Governmental Body for Management Education**

In India governance of technical and management education is looked after by All India Council for Technical Education and its subsidiary the Board of Management Studies.

**Quality of Faculty**

AICTE and University Grant Commission has given sanctioning and affiliation to large number of institute, but The quality of management education remained inferior in the sense that the faculty paid not enough attention to application of knowledge, understanding of concepts, development of managerial skills institutions.

**Curriculum Design and Developing Material**

Developing a curriculum is a challenging task and has to be continuously updated to keep pace with the advancements. Curriculum should be change driven and periodically reviewed to match the industry needs. But in most of Indian universities and B School it takes years to get syllabus revised due to bureaucratic setup and private B School also don’t show much enthusiasm towards revision of syllabus because it may call for appointing new faculty and updating existing faculty which could be a costly issue.

**Emphasizing Research**

The management institutions do not provide support to research. Management institutes needs to work in this direction. Research not only leads to updation of knowledge in concerned subject,
but also leads to knowledge creation.

**Ethics and Values and Corporate Governance**

Corporate Governance has been buzz words for last few months especially after financial turndown in U.S.A and Satyam case in India. Lack of corporate governance system in management institutes is one of the major reasons for fall of quality management education. Corporate governance has to be made a part of accreditation. Government must take the governance of management education away from AICTE and a strong monitoring system and statutory reporting on the lines of SEBI, handled by independent management specialists should be enforced (AICTE, 2011-12).

**Development of Industry - Institute Linkages**

All Management education Colleges try to fill the gap between theory and its practical aspects. Development of industry interaction is an evolutionary process, Industry interaction has to be emphasized to greater extent so that student can be exposed to real problems and exposure of industry.

**Triad of Academic-Industry**

Development of industry interaction is an evolutionary process. In present curriculum student are exposed to six to eight weeks training which is not adequate to understand dynamics of industry in this world of liberalization and globalization. This is needed to be increased say to full semester.

**Customization of Specialization**

Customization is need of a day. Every industry has its on set of challenges & dynamics, and it requires specific skill set and expertise. This could be only done by bringing specialization in concerned field.
Multiple Perspectives

Management education is value laden field, but its value is deteriorating not just because way it is imparted, but also due to its nature. Management education need to inculcate multiple perspectives since technological, organization and personal perspectives could differ.

Inculcating a Global Mindset

Learning is a relative concept. Today success depends how fast you are enhancing your knowledge, sharpening your skills and pace of your learning. In Globalization era where information is increasing at pace of Pico seconds mastering knowledge and skills have become essential. If India needs to compete globally we need manager with world class talent which calls for developing a new approach of imparting teaching and learning.

7. Conclusions:

On the basis of above discussion, one can aptly describe that there is need for the right kind of managerial personnel who can ensure proper utilization of human and other economic resources through proper management education. In India, B-Schools have so far failed to meet the objective fully due to some serious drawbacks like lack of strong faculties, Shortage of funds, low priority to field training and case study, little interaction between B-Schools and industries, lack of education in human values, lack of opportunities for business executives to receive management education; either there is no reservation of seats for them in B-Schools or there is lukewarm response from business houses in sponsoring the names of their executives who are willing to receive management education and so on.

Thus, the educational institutions have to a need of hour to follow the directions of the concerned authorities like AITUC, UGC (recently management education taken in to under UGC) regarding
avoids the problems and to quality management education.
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“A people and their religion must be judged by social standards based on social ethics”. -B. R. Ambedkar

Concept of Man in Buddhism

The purpose of Buddha’s Dhamma is to ‘reconstruct the world’. This involves the all round growth of the individual and the development and harmony of social life. It does not require the postulation of the existence of the soul and its communion with God. This leads Ambedkar to sum up the essence of Buddhism in the relation of man to society. It does not mean that he has under-rated the rational nature of man in Buddhism. His references to man, as he actually finds him, are not only placed in the framework of theories concerning the soul and God, but also in the context of Morality and Nature; thus including both secular and realistic elements.

The Buddhist conception of man is, from the beginning to the end, anthropocentric rather than theocentric. From the theocentric point of view, it is quite distinct from the conceptions of man in Hinduism, Islam and Christianity. The Hindu view of man is based on the individual soul and the unity of Brahma. The Islamic conception cannot be conceived without the mercy and immateriality of Allah. In Islam, man is a spark of Light or an emanation from the effluence of God-head, where as Christianity holds that man is a creature, made in the image of God. He is an ‘original sinner’ and his redemption lies through Christ, or through recognizing Jesus, the son of God. The Buddhist
conception, on the other hand, works without the mechanism of soul and God. The Buddha’s doctrine of soul is called ‘An-atta’, no soul. Man is one, who has no eternal soul. Buddhism, thus, differs from other theistic religions.

Dr. Ambedkar holds that religion, based on the concept of soul, is based on ‘speculation’. For the soul is ‘unknown’ and ‘unseen’. He says that the thing that exists is not the soul, but the ’mind’, and ‘mind’ is quite different from the soul. Belief in a soul only ends in creating ‘superstition’ and ‘priesthood’; rather it is ‘unprofitable’. “For not only does it create a priesthood, not only is it the origin of all superstition, but it gives the priesthood complete control over man from birth to death”.¹

As regards the Buddha’s views on the existence of the soul, there are different opinions:

(a) That the Buddha did not express any definite opinion on the existence of the soul;

(b) That he did not repudiate the theory of the existence of the soul; and

(c) That he was always dodging the issue.

These statements, Dr. Ambedkar thinks, are quite incorrect. He observes that, to Mahali, the Buddha did tell in most positive terms that there is no such thing, as a soul. Therefore, his theory of the soul is called ‘An-atta’ i.e., ‘non-soul’² – in short, “the Buddha was known as the An-atta-vadi, or the teacher of impersonality”.³

Moreover, the Buddha’s theory against the existence of the soul as a separate entity, Ambedkar says, is called ‘Nama Rupa’. It is the result of the application of the ‘Vibhaja’ test, of sharp, rigorous analysis, of the constituent elements of ‘Sentient Being’ otherwise called ‘Human Personality’.⁴
Nama Rupa is a collective name for Sentient Being and, according to the Buddha’s analysis, a Sentient Being is a compound thing consisting of certain ‘physical elements’ and certain ‘mental elements’. They are called ‘Khandas’. The Rupa Khanda, primarily, consists of the ‘physical elements’ such as ‘earth’, ‘water’, ‘fire’ and ‘air’, which constitute the Body or Rupa. Besides Rupa Khanda, there is such a thing as ‘Nama Khanda’, which goes to make up a Sentient Being. Rupa Khanda and Nama Khanda, both form the structure of human personality in its empirical sense.

This Nama Khanda is called ‘consciousness’ or ‘vinnana’. According to Ambedkar, this Nama Khanda includes three mental elements:

(i) ‘Vedana’ (sensation springing from contact of the six senses—the eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body (organ of touch) and mind, with the world) i.e., momentary emotional states.
(ii) Sanna (perception) i.e., the conceptions and abstractions.
(iii) Sankhara (states of mind) i.e., the dispositions, inclinations and volitions.⁵

He regards consciousness as the centre of a sentient being, though it is sometimes spoken of, along with the three other mental states, as being one of them. He agrees with a modern psychologist, who says that consciousness is the mainspring from which other psychological phenomena arise. He differs from the Behaviourists, who under-rate or eliminate the role of consciousness in man’s reaction to his environment. Man in Buddhism, in his complete nature, is a complex of Khandas, only in thought can he be separated into Body (Rupa) and Mind (Nama).⁶

How is consciousness produced? Dr. Ambedkar holds it true that consciousness arises with birth and dies with death; at the same time,
can it be said that consciousness is the result of the combination of the four physical elements? He observes, the Buddha’s answer was not that “the co-existence or aggregation of the physical elements produces consciousness”. What the Buddha said was that “wherever there was rupa or kaya, there was consciousness accompanying it”. Once consciousness arises, man becomes a sentient being. Consciousness is, therefore, the chief thing in the Buddhist conception of man.

Dr. Ambedkar says that consciousness is ‘cognitive’, ‘emotional’ and ‘volitional’:

(a) It is cognitive, when it gives knowledge, information, as appreciating or apprehending, whether it is appreciation of internal facts or of external things and events.

(b) It is emotional, when it exists in certain subjective states, characterized by either pleasurable or painful traits; emotional consciousness means dominance of feeling.

(c) Consciousness, in its volitional stage, makes a being exert him for the attainment of some end. Volitional Consciousness means what we call will or activity.

Obviously, Dr. Ambedkar believes that all the functions of a sentient being are performed by the sentient being ‘though’ and as a ‘result’ of Consciousness. He says that no function is left to be performed by the soul; all functions assigned to the soul are performed by Consciousness; hence, there remains no necessity to believe in the existence of soul. This is the Buddhist conceptions of man without soul, more accurately, without a ‘permanent’ or an ‘eternal’ soul.

There is no doubt that Dr. Ambedkar does not feel it necessary to postulate the existence of any substance, any abiding individual self or any soul. It does not mean that all thoughts and things do not exist. Indeed, they exist, yet they do not have a substratum or a permanent essence in themselves. The learned Doctor believes in the dynamic
character of man in Buddhism and that dynamic character, he tells us, is best described by the formula, “being is becoming”.\textsuperscript{10} Thus, as also Prof. Takakusu observes, “It is unreasonable to seek an unchanging essence in an all changing being”,\textsuperscript{11} rather every being is a “stage of dynamic becoming”.\textsuperscript{12} This is possible, because all human beings are always changing, always growing.

**Death and After**

What happens after death is an important question. There are two different views—Eternalistic and Annihilationistic. The former view affirms that the soul knows no death; therefore, “life is eternal’. It is, indeed, renewed by ‘rebirth’. The thesis of the Annihilationists is summed up in one word, “Ucchedvad”, which means that death is the end of everything. There is, in fact, nothing left after death.

As for the Buddha, Dr. Ambedkar affirms, he was not an ‘eternalist’. He did not believe in the existence of the soul, the Buddha would naturally be expected to be an ‘annihilationist’. The learned Doctor asserts that the Buddha himself complained in the ‘Alagaddupammasutta’ that he was called an ‘annihilationist’, when as a matter of fact, he was called an ‘annihilationist’, when as a matter of fact, he was not.\textsuperscript{13} This raises a serious question: Did the Buddha believe in ‘rebirth’?

The Buddha was not an eternalist; he was also not an annihilationist, did the Buddha believe in rebirth? This raises a serious ‘dilemma’. In order to answer, accurately-Ambedkar splits this question into two parts: (i) Rebirth of What and (ii) Rebirth of Whom? This will make a clear distinction between rebirth and transmigration, and Ambedkar believes in rebirth, but not in transmigration.
Rebirth of What?

Dr. Ambedkar observes that, to the Buddha, there are four elements of Existence-(i) Earth; (ii) Water; (iii) Fire; and (iv) Air, which go to compose the body. When the human body dies, these four elements do not die; they join the mass of similar elements floating in space. Again, when the four elements from this floating mass join together, a new birth takes place. The four elements need not be and are not necessarily from the same body which is dead; somehow, they may be drawn from different dead bodies. Thus, according to Ambnedkar, the body dies, but “the elements are ever living”; only in this kind of rebirth must the Buddha have believed.

Rebirth of Whom?

Some religions hold that the same soul of the same body takes new birth in another body and is liable to be placed under the position, which the same man deserves in accordance with his deeds, done in his past or former life. This is known as transmigration. Ambedkar says that the Buddha did not believe in this thesis; and his answer regarding the regeneration of the same dead person, in his next birth, is that it is quite impossible. It depends upon the nature of the meeting of four physical elements in what way they may be combined to form a new body. Ambedkar believes that there is, indeed, rebirth, but not the rebirth of the same dead person, i.e., transmigration. If the same elements of the same dead body combine in a new birth, it is a ‘chance’ and not ‘necessity’. There is no rebirth of the same soul, as other theistic religious theories believe.

Moreover, Dr. Ambedkar tells us, when the body dies, it ceases to produce ‘energy’, and whatever energy escapes from the body joins the general mass of energy playing about in the universe. He says that ‘annihilation’ has a two-fold aspect: it means - (i) cessation of
production of energy and (ii) a new addition to the stock of general floating mass of energy.

From the standpoint of this two-fold aspect of annihilation, Ambedkar thinks that the Buddha was not an absolute annihilationist. Definitely, he was an annihilationist so far as the soul is concerned, but he was not an annihilationist so far as matter is concerned. It means that the Buddha, according to Ambedkar, believed in the ‘generation’ of matter and not in the rebirth of the soul, viz., transmigration. Indeed, in this thought, Ambedkar firmly believes, there is no contradiction; there can be rebirth, although there is no transmigration.

It is only in this sense that “the Buddha could be said to have believed in rebirth”. Modern science affirms that “energy is never lost”. Ambedkar says that annihilation, in the sense that after death nothing is left would be contrary to science; for it would mean that energy is not in constant in ‘volume’. Only in the above way could the dilemma be solved.

The Buddhist conception of a man, as Ambedkar thinks of, is that of a temporary entity, living in the continuity of the combination of certain physical and mental elements. The formation of human personality and the universe is similar, both consisting of matter and mind; the only difference being that, in the human personality, mind is dominant, while, in the universe, matter is dominant. There is no eternal soul in human beings and no God in the universe.

Here it may be asserted that the denial of a separate soul, an atman, and does not obliterate the personality of a man, but it liberates the individual from the false belief in an eternal soul, an absolute egoity. The Buddha’s Dhamma, as Ambedkar observes, removes from life the vanity of self, which is the result of an erroneous belief in the existence of atman and karma as separate entities. A man’s personality in Buddhism rests on his own deeds and aspirations. This concept of man
emanates from a deep ethical insight of the Buddha, who said in the Malunkyaputta Sutta, “The man whose heart is set on the dissolution of individuality feels cheerful, happy, and elated, like the mighty man who has swum unhurt across the swollen Ganges from the one bank to the other”

**Non-theistic Moral Order**

According to Dr. Ambedkar, there is an order in the physical world; there is an order in the movements and actions of the starry bodies; there is an order by which seasons come and go in regular sequence; there is an order, according to which seeds grow into trees and trees yield fruits, and fruits give seeds. These are called Niyamas (laws), which produce an orderly sequence such as Ruth Niyama, Bija Niyama. Similarly, there is a ‘moral order’ in society.¹⁹ how is it produced and maintained.

Those, who believe in the existence of God, have no difficulty in assuming that the moral order is maintained by Divine Dispensation. For, God created the world. He is the Supreme Governor and is the author of moral as well as of physical law. Moral law is for man’s good, because it ensues from Divine will. Man is bound to obey God, which maintains the moral order. This is an argument in support of the view that the moral order is maintained by Divine Dispensation.

Dr. Ambedkar, like other Buddhist thinkers, does not agree with the above view. He argues that, if the moral law has originated from God, and if God is the beginning and end of the moral order, and if man cannot escape from obeying God, why is there so much moral disorder? What is the authority of the Divine Law? What is the hold of the Divine Law over the individual? These are the difficulties in the way of the acceptance of Divine Dispensation.²⁰ somehow; this view is modified in another way by those, who believe in God.
In its modified form, the above theory asserts that creation took effect at the command of God; that the cosmos entered upon its life by His Will and by His direction, and that He imparted to the cosmos, once for all, the energy, which served as the driving power of a stupendous mechanism. God leaves it to Nature to work itself out in obedience to the laws originally given by Him, so that if the moral order fails to work out, the fault is of Nature and not of God.\(^{21}\)

This theory, according to Ambedkar, only helps to exonerate God from His ‘responsibility’. He argues that this theory leaves a lacuna as to why God should leave it to Nature to execute His Laws. What is the use of such an ‘absentee God’?\(^{22}\) The Buddhist social theory does not accept the view that God maintains the moral order in the universe. Moreover, it does not believe in the existence of God.

Dr. Ambedkar agrees with the Buddhist view, which holds that God is ‘unknown’ and ‘unseen’, that nobody can prove that God has created the world. The belief in God only ends in creating ‘superstition’ such as religious rites, ceremonies and observances, while superstition is the enemy of the Samma Ditthi (Right view), the most important element in the Buddha’s Ashtang marga.\(^{23}\) Again the belief in God gave rise to belief in the efficacy of ‘worship and prayer’, and the efficacy of ‘worship and prayer’ gave rise to the office of the priest. The priest, Dr. Ambedkar remarks, was the evil genius, who created all superstition and there by destroyed the growth of the ‘Right View’.\(^{24}\) Thus, believe in God is ‘unprofitable’.

Moreover, the Buddhist doctrine of pratityasamutpada is against the belief in God. According to this doctrine, the question is how did the creator create this world: Did God creates something out of nothing or He create something out of something? Dr. Ambedkar argues that it is impossible that something could have been created ‘out of nothing’. If the so-called God has created ‘something’ out of something, then that
something out of which something new was created has been in existence before He created anything. Therefore, God cannot be said to be the creator of that something, which has existed before Him, nor He can be said to be the first cause.  

He agrees with the Buddha’s view that the centre of religion lies not “in the relation of man to God”, but “in the relation between man and man” – in short, “the purpose of religion is to teach man how he should behave towards other men so that all may be happy”. Thus Ambedkar endeavours to rule out any possibility that God produces and maintains the moral order in the world in favour of Buddha’s non-theistic theory. The world has some other grounds for the maintenance of the moral order, but it is not anything ‘supernatural’, like God.

Ambekar agrees the Buddha’s view that “It is the Kamma Niyama and not God, which maintains the moral order in the universe”. The moral order in human society may be good or it may be bad rests on “man and nobody else”. Kamma means ‘man’s action’ and ‘Vipaka’ is its ‘effect’. Therefore, if the moral order is bad, it is because man does Akushala (bad) Kamma; and if it is good, it is because man does Kushala (good) Kamma. The Buddha, Ambedkar says, propounded the law of Kamma and what the Buddha wanted to convey was that “the effect of the deed was bound to follow the deed, as surely as night follow the day”. Thus, Ambedkar believes that in the religion of the Buddha, “Morality has been given the place of God”, although it does not believe in the existence of God.

Social Ethics

The religion of the Buddha may be classified in to: (i) Dhamma, (ii) Adhamma and (iii) Saddhamma. Therefore, to understand his religion we must consider all the three – Dhamma, Adhamma and Saddhamma, as interpreted by Ambedkar.
What is Dhamma

Ambedkar pursues the Buddha in indicating the following components of Dhamma:  

(a) To maintain purity of life is Dhamma: There are three forms of purity – purity of body, of speech and of mind. To keep purity of body, one must abstain from taking life, from stealing, and from wrong practice in sensual lusts; for purity of speech, one must abstain from falsehood and from idle babble; and for purity of mind, one should not be covetous or malevolent of heart and must have right view.

(b) To reach perfection in life is Dhamma: There are three perfections – perfection in body, speech and mind. This three-fold perfection is possible by the destruction of the asvas – the heart’s release, the release by insight.

(c) To live in Nibbana is Dhamma: Nothing can give real happiness as Nibbana. Nibbana means release from passion and is to be reached by following the Noble Eight-fold Path. The idea underlying Nibbana is that it is the path of righteousness.

(d) To give up craving is Dhamma: This component insists upon the control over greed and craving.

(e) To believe that all compound things are impermanent is Dhamma: This component has three aspects – the impermanence of composite things, the impermanence of the individual being and the impermanence of the self nature of conditioned things.

(f) To believe that Karma is the instrument of the moral order is Dhamma.

What is Adhamma

Ambedkar has drawn from Buddhism the eight components of Adhamma. They are as follows:
(a) Belief in the supernatural is Adhamma: In repudiating supernaturalism the Buddha has three objects. (i) to lead man to the path of rationalism, (ii) to free man to go in search of truth and (iii) to remove the most potent source of superstition.

(b) Belief in God is not essentially a part of Dhamma.

(c) Dhamma, based on union with Brahma, is a false Dhamma.

(d) Belief in soul is Adhamma.

(e) Belief in sacrifice is Adhamma.

(f) Belief based on speculation is Adhamma.

(g) Mere reading the books of Dhamma is Not-Dhamma.

(h) Belief in the infallibility of books of Dhamma is Not-Dhamma.

**The functions of Saddhamma**

(i) To cleanse the mind of its impurities.

(ii) To make the world a kingdom of righteousness.

Besides of these functions of Saddhamma, the Buddha emphasized two other functions, which he regarded as of supreme importance:

The first is the “training of man’s instincts and dispositions” as distinguished from “offering prayers or doing sacrifices”. The second thing to which the Buddha attached great importance is the ‘courage’ to stand by what is right, even if one is alone. How does Dhamma become Saddhamma? This has been well depicted by Dr. Ambedkar as follows:

**Dhamma to be Saddhamma must promote Prajna**

(a) Dhamma is Saddhamma, when it makes learning open to all.

(b) Dhamma is Saddhamma, when it teaches that mere learning is not enough, it may lead to pedanty. Learning is not enough, it requires something more, i.e., intellect.

(c) Dhamma is Saddhamma, when it teaches that what is needed is Prajna. Vidya is ‘knowledge’, ‘learning’. Prajna is ‘insight’.
Saddhamma must attach more importance than Vidya to Prajna.

Dhamma to be Saddhamma must promote Maitri

(a) Dhamma is Saddhamma, when it teaches that mere Prajna is not enough, it must be accompanied by Sila. Apart from Sila, knowledge has no value.

(b) Dhamma is Saddhamma only, when it teaches that besides Prajna and Sila, what is necessary is Karuna. Karuna is “love of man to man”. Karuna is one of the pillars of the Buddha’s religion.

(c) Dhamma is Saddhamma only, when it teaches that more than Karuna what is necessary is Maitri. Karuna is love for human beings only. Maître is love for all living beings. This message is more valuable to the modern world than it had ever been. Karuna and Maitri are a unique blend of the Buddha’s message for universal peace, for a new and better world, a harmonious living, based on the spirit of love and good-will.

Dhamma to be Saddhamma must pull down all social Barriers

(a) Dhamma to be Saddhamma must break down barriers between man and man.

(b) Dhamma to be Saddhamma must teach that worth and not birth is the measure of man.

(c) Dhamma to be Saddhamma must promote Equality between man and man. He argues that a religion, which does not preach equality, is not ‘worth having’.

The Spiritual Values in Life

The spiritual values in the Buddhist way of life make for freedom from Dukkha (pain). Man’s life is essentially good; and his life is meaningful; but his life is distorted by his own craving, lust and vanity; and craving,
lust and vanity are the main causes of all miseries and sorrows. Thus, the aim of human existence, in the Buddhist view, is to get rid of Dukkha and to realize the peace of Nibbana through control over passion. The real purpose of spiritual values in Buddhism is to bring about freedom from Dukkha - social, political and economic.

The recognition of the four Noble Truths is the first step towards spiritual discipline. It is that knowledge of things, which is fundamental in all human societies. To go through the Eight-fold Path and to acquire the ten parmitas – sila (good moral temperament); dana (giving one possessions); uppekha (detachment); nekkhama (renunciation of pleasures); virya (right endeavour); khanti (forbearance); succa (truth); adhitana (resolute); karuna (love to human beings); maitri (love to all living beings) is to realize the aim of spiritual perfection, the great peace of Nibbana, which will essentially lead to human fellowship, i.e., spiritualism, in today’s society.

Conclusion

He agrees with the Buddha’s view that the centre of religion lies not “in the relation of man to God”, but “in the relation between man and man” – in short, “the purpose of religion is to teach man how he should behave towards other men so that all may be happy”. Thus Ambedkar endeavors to rule out any possibility that God produces and maintains the moral order in the world in favor of Buddha’s non-theistic theory. The world has some other grounds for the maintenance of the moral order, but it is not anything ‘supernatural’, like God.

All that Dr. Ambedkar aspired and desired to attain through religion may be explained in these points: peace and tranquility of mind; fortitude and consolation in adversity; social justice in human relations; and service of suffering humanity in the world. He found all these things in the Buddha’s religion. The ordinary man seeks his rest, peace and hope in soul and God, in next birth. For him, all questions find
their answer in the grace of God. But, Dr. Ambedkar did not seek refuge in such speculations. He sought refuge in the Buddha and his Dhamma based on the spirit of the universal compassion, wisdom and right understanding. The Dhamma, as he found in it, carries man in his onward and upward march to truth and moral regeneration by human efforts alone. Thus, in the Buddha’s Religion of Humanity, Dr. Ambedkar saw the true place for right knowledge and struggle for social justice, in the sacrifice of egoism, for all human beings.
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Introduction

Ambedkar’s political thought and its praxis can be best understood in the light of his contemporary streams of Indian politics. There were different political organisations with varied objectives in the second quarter of the twentieth century India. The influential among them were the reformists, who backed the British; the Congress that demanded self-rule; the radicals, who led armed struggle to overthrow the British; the communists, who tried to implant revolution; and the Muslim League that claimed separate country. However, none of them incorporated the major problems of the depressed classes in their agendas. Except their vested interests, all of them demanded freedom from externals; none of them considered the internal freedom from the clutches of caste system. Ambedkar captured the content of the context by saying that if Tilak had been born among the untouchables, he would not have raised the slogan ‘Swaraj is my birthright,’ but he would have raised the slogan “Annihilation of Untouchability is my birthright” (cited in Keer 1971: 81).

Issues Beyond Transfer of Power

The complex problematic of pre-independent India was comprehensive. It was not only the external problem of imperialism that grieved India, but also the internal problems of feudalism and Brahmanism which were equally problematic. Being an organic intellectual, Ambedkar understood the particular question of caste that
was also related to the problem of freedom from the colonial rulers. Millions of the depressed classes in India were excluded from power, higher education, science and arts and other departments of knowledge. At this juncture the basic question before him was whether, India being free, Indians would be free. In this connection, Ambedkar said:

One must distinguish between the freedom of a country and the freedom of the people in the country. The words such as society, nation and country are just amorphous if not ambiguous. There is no gain saying that ‘Nation,’ though one word, means many classes. Philosophically it may be possible to consider a nation as a unit but sociologically it cannot but be regarded as consisting of many classes and the freedom of the nation, if it is to be a reality must vouchsafe the freedom of different classes comprised in it, particularly those who are treated as the servile classes (Ambedkar 1945: 190-1).

On Ambedkar’s return to India from England, the struggle for political independence from the colonial power was in full swing. The bourgeoisie and landlords from upper class were interested only in the transfer of power from the British to the Indians. On the other hand, Ambedkar was more concerned about the internal enemy. Finding that the Congress and the allied groups were shying away from tackling the social problem he took a straight and stiff stand on this issue (Sunda 1991: 55). The reason why Ambedkar was averse to joining the Indian National Congress was that its leaders did not realise the significance of social reforms. They did have a programme to improve the status of the depressed classes. There was lack of enthusiasm on their part to do away with the disabilities of the untouchables. Ambedkar regarded most of its leaders as “Political Radicals and Social Tories” and he was of the view that political reform cannot with impunity take precedence over social reform in the sense of reconstruction of society (Ambedkar 1979: 42). For that reason, the political struggles have value and
permanence only when they accurately express those conditions which exist within a society.

Ambedkar maintained neutrality as a strategy towards the colonial state. He opined that British imperialism and Indian feudalism were the two leaches that clung to Indian people. However, there was a fundamental difference between his and others’ viewpoints on this question. In other words, Ambedkar did not approve equating opposition to imperialism with opposing the British. He noted that the opposition to imperialism could not be effective until its supporters within the country are left untouched. He thought that without struggling against the landlords, mill owners and moneylenders, the friends of imperialism within the country, it was not possible to wage an effective fight against imperialism. He clarified that if the Congress was fighting a real anti-imperialist war, he would wholeheartedly support it. Indeed, he raised the question of Hindu imperialism perpetrated through its caste system that was certainly seen as more vicious by its victims than the imperial rule. Ambedkar clearly distinguished that the fight for power and fight for freedom are quite different things by associating the middle class based Congress Party’s struggle as the struggle for power.

**Detachment with Marxists and Socialists**

The communists of India consider caste as a component of superstructure. They disregard the reality of caste as the entrenched system of production relations (Biswa 1991: 6). The Indian communist scheme visualises emancipation of the depressed classes under the leadership of the working class. The pathetic state of their poverty of philosophy was that while reformers like Vivekananda and Gandhi accepted caste as the natural order of things and called for reforms, the communists of India wrongly theorised on the possibility of emancipation of the depressed classes by the working class. Ambedkar
was also critical of socialists and he clearly stated that the socialists of India following their fellow brethren in Europe were applying the economic interpretation of history to the facts of India. In fact, no student of human society could accept that economic power was the only kind of power. The fallacy of the socialists lies in supposing that in the present stage of European society, property as a source of power is predominant, therefore, the same is true of India (Ambedkar 1987a: 45).

Ambedkar had a firm conviction that unless the socialists tackled social problems they could not usher India into the assembly of egalitarian states. In the peculiar Indian context, Ambedkar pointed out, “turn in any direction you like, caste is the monster that crosses your path. You cannot have political reform, you cannot have economic reform, unless you kill this monster” (Ambedkar 1987a: 47). Therefore, to preach that political and social reforms are but gigantic illusions and that economic reform by equalisation of property must have precedence over every other kind of reform would be putting the cart before the horse. In this connection, K. Venu observed, “The communists, in the name of leading the class struggle, not only diverted the anti-caste struggles, but also consciously tried to blunt the struggles of the oppressed caste people along the Ambedkarite lines” (cited in Mathew 1991: xi). Ambedkar firmly believed that the schisms among exploited classes cannot be settled unless and until the caste question is resolved. In this context, K.R. Sunda writes:

Social inequalities coupled with economic exploitation of the masses, suffering from double divide, do not permit emotional unity of the working class. Workers of India do not unite... India does not emerge as a nation... It divides the workers... Exploitation of majority (workers) by the minority (owners) continues. The caste system continues because the ‘twice-born’ have a common, mutually divided section of working class available for exploitation and oppression. Exploiters have
invented, codified and ruthlessly applied social, economic and political system which brings them together at the slightest danger to their vested interests. But a poor worker of upper caste does not feel the same concern for the plight of another worker, a co-religionist from a different caste... Marx could not perhaps comprehend this unique phenomenon where caste is class in itself. Dr. Ambedkar found out this reality as he was born and brought up here" (Sunda 1991: 55-56).

In India, no political party has launched any program of social transformation for creating a casteless just social order. Though the Communist Party of India has been in existence since the beginning of twentieth century, it has not produced or groomed any leader of national level from the real proletariat - the untouchables or working labour class. It was observed that some of high class communist leaders though profess to follow Marxism but “they have strict faith in caste-system and supremacy of birth and this has kept the socialist proletariat at lower rank and file level” (Seniaray 1991: 77). For that reason, Ambedkar did not approve the philosophy of Marx in its entirety. HirendraMukerjeestates that Ambedkar never accepted Marxism though he appreciated some of its aspects - this is what he said himself - he knew how strong caste still was, but he knew that the concept of class was advancing. And he further indicates that it is petty and churlish to think of Ambedkar as pro-British and therefore suspect. Like almost all in the galaxy of our ‘social reform’ giants, he faces this charge which can be easily repelled, he was in pursuit of a single, undeviating purpose, the upliftment of the depressed classes which were bone of his bone and blood of his blood (Mukerjee 1999: 39).

The Congress and Gandhi

A well-documented literature on Indian freedom movement reveals that Gandhi and Ambedkar differed fundamentally on many social and political issues. Gandhi called the victims of untouchability as Harijans,
children of God and claimed himself as the champion of their liberation. Ambedkar protested calling the untouchables as Harijans and he preferred to name them Protestant Hindus or non-conformist Hindus or depressed classes. Besides, he held that the Congress dominated by the caste Hindus could never effectively stand for the cause of the depressed classes. Gandhi constantly invoked the metaphors of Hinduism to rally the depressed classes in his movement against the British imperialists. He launched formal movements for ‘cosmetic changes’ in the Hindu social order like temple entry Satyagrahas. In fact, Gandhi never forsook his allegiance to the caste system. He proclaimed the Chaturvarna as “divinely ordained,” and an “immutable law of nature”. He depicted Ramrajya as an ideal state and employed the heady discourse of Hindu spiritualism emphasising trusteeship, non-violence and harmonious relations between labour and capital to thwart the radical restructuring of social relations that was being attempted during the struggle for independence. He went on an indefinite fast in Poona to oppose the Communal Award by arguing that the British were promoting the untouchables to create a schism within Hindus. Consequently, Ambedkar was compelled to sign the Poona Pact to save the life of Gandhi. In taking a decision in favour of the Pact, Ambedkar admired the logic of Ranade. Ambedkar pronounced:

As to myself, it is no exaggeration to say that no man was placed in a greater and graver dilemma than I was then. It was a baffling situation. I had to make a choice between two different alternatives. There was before me the duty which I owed as a part of common humanity, to save Gandhi from sure death. There was before me the problem of saving for the Untouchables the political rights which the Prime Minister had given them. I responded to the call of humanity and saved the life of Mr. Gandhi by agreeing to alter the Communal Award in a manner satisfactory to Mr. Gandhi (Ambedkar 1945: 88).
As a result of Gandhi’s unjust fast, the British withdrew the Award and the depressed classes lost a historic opportunity of electing representatives of their choice by asserting dignity and identity. His skilful use of religion in politics benefited the hegemonic castes of the Hindu social order. At the backdrop of this context, K.R. Sunda’s (1991: 16) words are worth mentioning: “Caste system and its victims did not bother Mahatma Gandhi except that he disliked untouchability. He fails to recognise the basic principles of rationalism. If a system generates conflicts, conflicts cannot be resolved without destroying the system. Dr. Ambedkar wanted ‘Annihilation of Caste’ whereas Mahatma Gandhi believed in it.” Indeed, Gandhi’s intentions behind fasting were personal and he wanted to deal with the untouchables differently. In the same breath, he wanted to distance Muslims allying with untouchables against caste Hindus. While fasting for the revocation of the Communal Award, Gandhi himself has said:

Separate electorates for all other communities will still leave room for me to deal with them, but I have no other means to deal with untouchables. These poor fellows will ask why I who claim to be their friend should offer Satyagraha simply because they were granted some privileges; they would vote separately but vote with me. They do not realise that the separate electorate will create division among Hindus so much that it will lead to bloodshed. Untouchable hooligans will make common cause with Muslim hooligans and kill caste-Hindus. Has the British Government no idea of all this? I don’t think so (Gandhi 1953: 301).

Ambedkar criticised Gandhi’s anti-untouchability movement as paternalistic and treated him as an ill-equipped person who can never provide solutions for the problems of the depressed classes. Sunda recalls Gandhi’s own perception of Ambedkar as a fighter: “Once when
Gandhi saw emaciated goats being led to Kali Mandir, Calcutta for slaughter, he told Madhav Desai that he will do something to save these goats because they cannot attack their killers as there is no Ambedkar among them who can come to their rescue” (Sunda 1991: 56). As a matter of fact, untouchability is not just a religious system but an economic system which is worse than slavery. Therefore, annihilation of caste and abolition of untouchability could not be possible by Gandian publicity tactics. Ambedkar observed, “There have been many Mahatmas in India whose sole objective was to remove Untouchability and to elevate and absorb the Depressed Classes, but every one of them has failed in his mission. Mahatmas have come. Mahatmas have gone. But the Untouchables have remained as Untouchables” (Ambedkar 1945: 197, 326). It is axiomatic that anything that harms the body has to be discarded, so is true of caste-system. Instead of grasping the nettle and getting rid of the irrational caste system, a hallowed term of ‘Harijan’ has been benevolently bestowed on the depressed castes as if all others do not belong to lord Hari. While Ambedkar stood for annihilation of caste, Gandhi upheld Hinduism to justify it. As Baxi (1995: 22) pointed out, the conflict between Ambedkar and Gandhi on the issue of the separate electorates and the depressed classes, and the way in which it was resolved, has affected very fundamentally the nature of political participation by the depressed classes in contemporary India.

Ambedkar declared that in Gandhian ideological framework, the depressed classes have no space. His reactionary ideology treats excluded man as animal and no more. It may be suited to a society, which does not accept democracy as its ideal. Gandhi’s call for back to nature means back to nakedness, back to poverty and back to ignorance. He believes in caste and class hierarchy. It is his official creed. Ambedkar realised that Gandhi and the Congress were not really interested in the uplift of the untouchables. They were motivated by the
desire to prevent the untouchables from appearing as a separate element in Indian politics. However, undoubtedly, Ambedkar’s role in the freedom movement needs a new assessment as Hirendra Nath Mukerjee opines: Few things are more needed today than a careful, concrete, comprehensive and consistent study of Ambedkar and of Gandhi as they fought, in different ways, for the removal of this blight [untouchability] on Indian humanity. There were others also in the good fight, like A.V. Thakkar and M.C. Rajah, but Gandhi and Ambedkar remain pre-eminent in the role. The Mahatma stressed, in the main, that the conscience of the so-called ‘higher’ castes in Hindu society had to be roused against the crime as well as the shame which besmirched and branded the practice of untouchability. Ambedkar’s predominant emphasis was on evoking the submerged self-respect and the righteous anger of those who, cruelly conditioned by long repression into acquiescence in the horror, had to rise and fight the atrocious Hindu system (Mukerjee 1999: 15). It is perhaps Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer who locates and assesses Ambedkar vis-à-vis Gandhi in the social horizon of history: Ambedkar was a rebel who brought in a new paradigm of social democracy annihilating caste, the root evil. A paradigm shift is must if the Indian village is to be rid of the pollution factor, apart from the poverty factor. Even if it be true that Gandhiji and other reformers condemned caste as an aberration, there were others with progressive airs justifying the existence of downgraded castes on the theory of Karma. Social hierarchy, institutionally structured creates iron curtains which withstand the Constitution. As between Gandhi and Ambedkar the more forthright was the latter, the former being against untouchability and the sub-human status of Harijans but still not condemnatory enough against the root cause of Varna theology (Iyer 1990: 22).
Resignation from the Cabinet

Ambedkar differed with Nehru precisely on the socialist and secular models of development. He condemned Nehru on his half-hearted commitment to socialism and he was disappointed with Nehru’s disapproval of the Hindu Code Bill. Ambedkar presented an alternative model of social development in India which was not dear to Nehru. When Nehru passed a resolution on the aims and objectives of future Constitution in the Constituent Assembly, Ambedkar differed with him and sincerely said: I must confess that coming as the resolution does from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who is reputed to be a Socialist, this resolution, although non-controversial, is to my mind very disappointing. I should have expected him to go much further than he has done...there are certain provisions which speak of justice, economic, social and political. If this resolution has a reality behind it and sincerity of which I have not the least doubt coming as it does from the Mover of the Resolution, I shall have expected some provision whereby it would have been possible for the state to make economic, social and political justice a reality and I should have from that view expected the Resolution to state it in most explicit terms that in order that there may be social and economic justice in the country, that there would be nationalization of land. I do not understand how it could be possible for any future Government which believes in doing justice socially, economically and politically, unless its economy is a socialist economy (Ambedkar 1947: 9). Besides, Ambedkar disagreed with Nehru on Indian foreign policy and resigned from the Cabinet as law minister. In fact, along with Gandhi and Nehru, Ambedkar devoted his life to resolve the major problems of India. Unfortunately, Ambedkar was projected negatively and narrowly as a depressed class leader.
Conclusion

The analysis of Ambedkar’s contemporary politics of India shows that the political fraternity of his time totally submerged in their vested interests, demanded freedom from externals and concerned with issue of transfer of power from the British to the Indian bourgeois. The Congress Party’s struggle was the struggle for power. Gandhi’s intentions behind different technologies of non-violence were personal and his strategies were of no use for the liberation of the untouchables. Muslim League tilted towards partition politics. Nehru engaged in so-called socialist model of development that discarded Dalit inclusion. The communists and different brands of socialists, in the name of steering the class struggle and evolutionary progress, not only diverted the anti-caste struggles, but also consciously tried to brand Ambedkar’s relentless struggles for the liberation of Dalits as liberal bourgeois politics. On the other hand, Ambedkar was more concerned about the internal enemy and maintained neutrality as a strategy towards the colonial state. He raised the question of Hindu imperialism perpetrated through its caste system that was certainly seen as more vicious by its victims than the imperial rule. Ambedkar presented an alternative model of social development in India which was not dear to Nehru. However, his political philosophy and practice transcended beyond the rest of his contemporaries and provide a worldview and paved a novel path for the liberation of the depressed humanity.
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For centuries Philosophers have struggled to define personal identity. The traditional problem of personal identity is this: under what conditions are Person A and Person B one and the same person? Consequently there are also philosophers who support the no soul theory that is the rejection of the notion of personal identity. In the history of discourse on the subject of the self and personal identity, conflicting viewpoints have arisen. Some suggest that the self is simply the mind which thinks; others posit that the self is identifiable with one’s body; still others claim that to even conjure an idea of the self is impossibility.

There are various concepts like Persistence, Substance, Simplicity, Unity, Evidence, etc. and several theories such as Ownership, Memory, Physical body, etc. depending on the perspectives such as Foundationalism, Essentialism, Teleology, Deconstruction and so forth, besides bizarre imaginary cases. We see that there are two approaches to this philosophic concept of personal identity. One position claims that personal identity can persist over time if enough enduring characteristic persist between stages of a human person’s existence. It is called the body identity theory. The second approach is that personal identity is not what matters in discussing whether the same individual persists over time. The quality that matters to what personal identity intends to explain is the continued consciousness of experience particular to oneself over time. This continued consciousness is referred to as a special relation between being
conscious of having memories of experience in a unified body. However during the European Enlightenment, there emerged thinkers like Locke, Hume and many others who have raised certain fundamental questions on the very possibility and sustenance of personal identity. Here I am going to discuss the concept of personal identity taken up by John Locke and David Hume.

**Locke’s Theory of Personal Identity:**

John Locke stated that the criterion (or “Principle” or thing) that makes someone the same person over time is Consciousness. Just as long as someone retains consciousness (i.e., memory) of some past action, the one remembering and the one remembered are one and the same person. Locke holds that personal identity is a matter of psychological continuity, being foundationalist in method. When he first tackled personal identity, he himself defined person as a ‘forensic term’; we have to be able to re-identify persons in order to hold them responsible for their past actions and commitments. Hume has apprehensions to it and much of Kant’s epistemology, which led him to his ideas about the mind and personal identity, is a response to Hume as much as to any other philosopher.

Locke’s theory of personal identity does not rely on substance (or substratum) to explain personal identity. Accordingly, Locke is generally interpreted either as a memory-theorist or as a consciousness-theorist. Locke holds that personal identity is a matter of psychological continuity. He considered personal identity (or the self) to be founded on consciousness (viz. memory), and not on the substance of either the soul or the body. Locke presents his theory of personal identity, that is, his theory of what makes us the same person over time. According to Locke, “remaining the same person has nothing to do with remaining the same substance, either physical or mental. Instead, personal
identity has only to do with consciousness: it is by the consciousness of one's present thoughts and actions that the self is essentially altered because once something is essentially altered; it has a new beginning as a new thing.”³ In other words, identity is retained through continuous history conceived, and it is through the continuous link of memory that the self is extended back to past consciousness. Locke's argument for this claim rests on his idea of identity, which is defined in terms of a comparison between something presently existing and the existence of that thing at an earlier time. This notion of identity stems from the basic principle that no two things of the same kind can exist in the same place at the same time, as well as the extension of this principle that, therefore, no two things can have the same beginning and neither can anything have two beginnings. That other aspect of the human being, the human as a thinking, rational thing, Locke calls "person". The identity of person rests entirely in consciousness. A person is "a thinking intelligent being, that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing, in different times and places; which it does only by that consciousness which his inseparable from thinking"⁴. It is, therefore, in consciousness alone that identity must exist. According to Locke, self depends on consciousness, not on substance. Self is that conscious thinking thing, whatever substance made up of, (whether spiritual or material, simple or compounded, it matters not) which is sensible or conscious of pleasure and pain, capable of happiness or misery, and so is concerned for itself, as far as that consciousness extends.⁵

Locke called a "Person" a forensic term. He said, "Person, as I take it, is the name for this self. Wherever a man finds what he calls himself, there, I think, another may say is the same person. It is a

---

⁴ Locke, J., *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, p. 318
⁵ Ibid., p. 325
forensic term, appropriating actions and their merit; and so belongs only to intelligent agents, capable of a law, and happiness, and misery.”6 Identity, that is, “the sameness of a rational being, consists in consciousness alone, and, as far as this consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person. So that whatever has the consciousness of present and past actions is the same person to whom they belong."

We can sum up by saying that for Locke, Personal identity consists in the continued existence of consciousness, where consciousness is understood either as the ability to recall memories: about one’s past and present life, or as the continued existence of consciousness as a power. But the problem is that, since personal identity is based on consciousness, and that only oneself can be aware of his consciousness, exterior human judges may never know if they really are judging - and punishing - the same person, or simply the same body. Though Locke’s theory of personal identity fails, it is significant both for being the first attempt at such a theory as well as the theory upon which all further attempts have built.

Thomas Reid proposes a sound argument which is against the responses of Locke’s memory theorists. Reid’s objection is commonly referred to as “The Brave Officer Paradox” and is outlined in his essay Of Mr. Locke’s Account of Our Personal Identity. According to Thomas Reid, Personal identity consists of two define identity as “Identity in general I take to be a relation between a thing which is known to exist at one time, and a thing which is known to have existed at another time. If you ask whether they are one and the same, or two different things, every man of common sense understands the meaning of your question perfectly. Whence we may infer with certainty, that every man of common sense has a clear and distinct notion of identity.

6 Ibid., p. 331
If you ask a definition of identity, I confess I can give none; it is too simple a notion to admit of logical definition: I can say it is a relation, but I cannot find words to express the specific difference between this and other relations, though I am in no danger of confounding it with any other.”

Reid rejected Locke’s account that self consciousness in the form of memory of one’s experiences was the basis of a person’s being identical with their self over time. Reid held that continuity of memory was neither necessary nor sufficient to make one numerically the same person at different times. Reid explained with the help of an example: Suppose a brave officer to have been flogged when a boy at school for robbing an orchard, to have taken a standard from the enemy in his first campaign, and to have been made a general in advanced life; suppose, also, which must be admitted to be possible, that, when he took the standard, he was conscious of his having been flogged at school, and that, when made a general, he was conscious of his taking the standard but had absolutely lost consciousness of the flogging.

Reid’s objection invokes the logical axiom of transitivity which holds that if A is equal to B, and B is equal to C, then A is equal to C, applying it here to identity. He follows Locke’s logic insofar as that he suggests that, by Locke’s theory, the officer is the same person as he who took the standard, given his memory of having taken that standard, and he who took the standard is the same person as he who was flogged, given his memory of having been flogged. Reid has demonstrated that transitivity allows for the officer and the boy who was flogged to share a personal identity despite that the officer has lost all memory of his having been flogged. The fact that Reid arrived at this conclusion using Locke’s theory demonstrates that Locke’s denial of the general and the boy as the same person ignores the transitive property and is therefore absurd.
HUME ON PERSONAL IDENTITY

According to Hume, personal identity `has become so great a question in philosophy, especially of late years in England' (Treatise 1.4.6.15, 259). There is no doubt that Hume's discussion of personal identity is influenced by Locke, among others, but it also meant to provide a new response to the issues discussed. Hume does not adopt Locke's distinction between the terms `person' and `man'. What, then, is Hume's position? If we attend to the section "Of personal identity" in Book I of A Treatise of Human Nature, an answer is immediately forthcoming. Hume starts by pointing out that although some philosophers believe we are continuously aware of something we call the self, when we look to our experience there is nothing to substantiate this belief. We are never, says Hume, aware of any constant invariable impression that could answer to the name of self. What we experience, rather, is a continuous flow of perceptions that replace one another in rapid succession. The idea that “we are every moment intimately conscious of what we call our self ... and are certain ... of its perfect identity and simplicity” in the way that we cannot doubt its existence without doubting everything else. This assumption does not seem as clear to Hume as it has to some other philosophers. To have an idea of a self there needs to be an impression that corresponds to that idea and Hume asks in what way can we assert this identity since there is not any impression that is constant and invariable enough to give rise to such an idea of a self (A Treatise on Human Nature, p. 251). Instead all of our impressions, pain, pleasure, grief, joy and so on, are momentary and succeed each other rather than exist at the same time. Therefore, they cannot constitute the ground for a self. Our perceptions are also “different, and distinguishable, and separable from each other, and may be separately considered, and may exist separately, and have no need of anything to support their existence”. They do not need to be connected to a self to exist and since we cannot
observe such a self but only these perceptions, and cannot think of ourselves as existing without these perceptions. "When I enter most intimately into what I call myself," says Hume, "I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure. I never catch myself at any time without a perception, and never can observe anything but the perception." Within the mind, he continues, these perceptions "successively make their appearance; pass, re-pass, glide away, and mingle in an infinite variety of postures and situations". And there is nothing to the mind but these perceptions. There is consequently never any simplicity within the mind at one time nor identity at two different times. Nor, says, Hume, do we have any idea of a self; for every real idea must be derived from someone impression: "but self or person is not any one impression, but that to which our several impressions and ideas are supposed to have reference" (p. 251). So, according to Hume, "Self are nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions, which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity, and are in a perpetual flux and movement. From this Hume takes it to follow that “[t]he identity, which we ascribe to the mind of man is only a fictitious one”

Hume has to explain our belief in personal identity are the three associative principles, namely, resemblance, spatiotemporal contiguity and causation (see Treatise 1.4.6.6-20, 253-262). He quickly puts contiguity aside and argues that our belief in personal identity is to be explained solely on the basis of resemblance and causation. The notion of identity in general is one, given the considerations mentioned earlier, that Hume takes to be only a fiction so the notion of personal identity, as a particular form of the general idea of identity, must also be a fiction. In relation to the sense of personal identity, however, Hume adds a new consideration when he refers to the point that all our perceptions are distinct from each other, a point that follows from his general adherence to the separability principle. Hume then points out
that the mind’s tendency to think in terms of identity is itself grounded on association of ideas with each other. There is not, hence, an observed “real bond” among our perceptions, there is only a felt one between the ideas we form of our perceptions. When the imagination reflects on our ideas it attributes the quality of identity to different perceptions although this identity does not really belong to the different perceptions as some bond bringing them together. The only uniting principles are those of resemblance, contiguity and causation and it is on these that the idea of identity depends. The memory, for example, raises up images of past perceptions and in doing so the imagination is moved to pass from one previous perception to another until they all appear to belong together as part of the same object. So the memory, in producing a relation of resemblance between perceptions, produces the sense of identity. Memory is the chief source of personal identity on this account and it brings an association of causes in its train. By this process the discovery of personal identity is produced by the process of memory. On these grounds Hume dismisses deep inquiries into the identity of any specific thing as not really being philosophical difficulties at all but merely inquiries into the grammar of certain terms.

Thus the whole doctrine of personal identity leads us to the conclusion that all the questions concerning personal identity can never possibly be decided, and are to be regarded rather as grammatical as philosophical difficulties. He stated, “Identity depends on the relations of ideas; and these relations produce identity, by means of that easy transition they occasion.” As we already discussed that the problem concerning the identity of connected objects or the relation of parts gives rise to some fiction or imaginary principle of union.

7 Ibid., p.262.
Terence Penelhum was one of the leading philosophers examining the question of personal identity in the mid-twentieth century. One of the problems with Hume’s discussion, that Terence Penelhum also raises in ‘Hume on Personal Identity’, is that he does not seem to have a clear conception of the notion of identity. Hume regards identity as “a distinct idea of an object, that remains invariable and uninterrupted through a supposed variation of time”. This is seen in relation to the notion of diversity that is described as “a distinct idea of several different objects existing in succession, and connected together by a close relation” (Treatise, p. 253). It is in this distinction that Hume sees the confusion that underlies our talk about personal identity. Our image of a succession of related objects resembles that of an unchanging object and in that we mistake a case of diversity for identity. Hume’s account of identity and diversity may however be questioned. First, as Penelhum points out, it is not a contradiction to say that a succession of different objects also is one object, (one of the problems here lies in the loose meaning of the word object).

Second, there seems to be a problem in Hume’s basic claim that identity or sameness is seen in a thing not changing over a period of time. This idea does not reflect on how we usually think of something as the same thing, which is also apparent in Hume’s discussion where he gives examples of practices that he thinks show the ways we are mistaken when we say that something is the same thing. For example, we think of a ship as the same ship even if parts of it are changed, because all parts conspire to a common end (Treatise, p. 257).

What Hume misses in our talk about personal identity and people being the same over a period of time and changes, is that we in these cases are talking about identity in the numerical sense rather than in the specific sense. Throughout their lives people go through smaller and bigger changes which involves their physical appearance as well as their characteristics, and to maintain that the qualities of the
child and the full grown man are identical would be ridiculous. However, it is not ridiculous to say that it is the same person, in the same way as the tree we have in our garden is the same tree as the sapling that we planted there a number of years ago. There are of course situations where we say that people are not the same persons as they were before. Someone might, for example, undergo drastic changes in their personality as a result of an illness, drug abuse and so on, and change so much that their close ones do not recognize the person they know, or once knew, in them. That a person’s characteristics can change so much that we do not think of the person as the same as he was before seems to support Hume’s claim that the identity that we ascribe to persons is fictitious. This idea however, does not account for the importance we attach to a person being the same. If we could just shrug and say, ‘Well, no person is ever the same”, Hume’s claim might be in place, but this does not capture the tragedy we can experience in realising that somebody is not the same person any more. The tragedy that we may experience in the above mentioned examples is rather bound up with the fact that it really is the same person. It is not just any person, or another person, so that we even could be happy to get to know this new person, but a person we knew, a person we had a certain relationship with, shared a certain past with and so on. All this is now lost, and the painful part is that the person in a way still is here to remind us of this loss. A problem for Hume is that he, when tries to give an account of personal identity, focuses on the identity of the mind. If the identity of mind is what he is most concerned with, this might be a reason not to be too hard on his account of personal identity, but since he does seem to want to say something about the identity of persons, this objection might also be overlooked. What this focus on the identity of the mind misses out on is the fact that we are bodily beings and that a large part of our understanding of the identity of persons consists in this. A person is not only a mind, but also someone with a
body, a history, a name, a family and so on. It might sound as a trivial remark but in a way we might say that our identity partly consists in the information we have on our identity cards. In stressing the fact that person are bodily beings it is also important to see that a person is someone who leads a life, and that the continuity of this life, growing up and getting older, is part of our conception of personal identity. This goes to show that the way we go about ascribing identity to persons is not only something to do with recognizing unchangeable qualities in them, but is part of a life where we live as persons among other persons.

Hume characterises identity as remaining unchanged over a period of time and since he cannot observe anything constant and unchanging in a person, but only a diversity of perceptions, he concludes that “the identity we ascribe to the mind of man is fictitious”. This does not however follow from there being no unchanging core, a self, substance or soul, to a person, and Hume’s conception of identity seems to be seriously muddled. He recognizes that the ways we use to talk about identity and sameness differ, but takes this to mean that we sometimes are mistaken in talking about something as the same thing instead of seeing that we are talking about it in different ways. Sameness does not only consist in having identical or persisting qualities over a period of time, what we come to see as the same depends on the circumstances and the factors we chose to see as relevant in the certain situation. In emphasizing the identity of mind, Hume also misses the importance the fact that we are bodily beings with a history and a continuous life has when we ascribe identity to a person. We do not come to know minds in our life, we come to know human beings and persons that we can relate to and that can matter to us in certain ways.
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Introduction

Ahimsa an important concept found in Buddhism, is a term meaning to do no harm i.e., the avoidance of violence. Ahimsa means kindness and non-violence towards all living beings including animals; it respects living beings as a unity, the belief that all living things are not just connected but integrally part of the whole. Siddhartha or Gautama was overwhelmed with grief at the sight of disease, old age, and death. He was overpowered by abundant misery in the world. He renounced the world to find out the remedy for suffering. He discovered its cause and the way to stop it. He found the way to peace on earth, and preached it to the world. He became enlightened or Buddha.

Teachings of Buddha

The whole of the teachings of the Buddha is summed up in the four noble truths:

1. Life is full of suffering.
2. Cause of suffering. It is of three fold.
3. Cessation of suffering.
4. The way to extinction of suffering. It is the Eightfold Path.

The first noble truth is suffering. ‘Birth is attended with pain; decay is painful; disease is painful; death is painful. Union with the unpleasant is painful, painful is separation from the pleasant; any craving that is unsatisfied, that too is painful. In brief, the five aggregates which spring from attachment are painful. The cause and conditions of individuality are painful. The whole world is on fire; where is the scope
for merry-making.’ Sensual pleasure is transitory and followed by pain. ‘Sorrow comes from merriment. Fear comes from merriment.’ The loss of objects of sensual pleasure leads to sorrow. The world is completely unsubstantial, void of being and perpetual becoming. It is afflicted with death and decay, and full of suffering. Therefore the wise do not grieve, knowing the nature of the world. Mere grieving is unavailing. When a house is on fire it must be extinguished by water. A man, who is pierced by the arrow of grief, must draw it out.

The second noble truth is concerning the origin of suffering. Craving which generates the cycle of birth and death is the cause of suffering. It is threefold: (1) Craving for sensual pleasures, (2) craving for being, and (3) craving for wealth and power! ‘Verify, it is craving causing the renewal of existence, accompanied by sensual delight, seeking satisfaction now here, now there—that is to say, the craving for the gratification of passions, or the craving for a future life, or the craving for success in this present life. This is the noble truth concerning the origin of suffering. Craving or will-to-live is the cause of suffering. All pain arises from individuality which is due to ignorance (avidya). Ignorance is due to will-to-live, which is the root cause of suffering.

The third noble truth is the extinction of suffering. It is complete destruction of craving or will-to-live. Delusion of individuality, desire for mind-body-complex and egoism are the causes of suffering. Destruction of egoism and will-to-live leads to extinction of attachment, aversion, delusion, and suffering. Nibbana is the extinction of desire, doubt, and sensual pleasures based on the reflection on nothingness. It is grasping at nothing, and possessing nothing. It us perfect calm and tranquility undisturbed by desires and passions. It is complete desirelessness. All desires for this life and the next life are extinguished in it. Non-grasping is attained by the knowledge of impermanence and voidness. Nibbana is insuperable, unchangeable, matchless.
The fourth noble truth is the way to the extinction of suffering. It is the eightfold path: (1) Right Belief, (2) Right Resolve, (3) Right Speech, (4) Right Conduct, (5) Right Livelihood, (6) Right Effort, (7) Right Mindfulness, and (8) Right Concentration. When the four noble truths are grasped, and craving or will-to-live is extirpated, there is no more birth. The four noble truths are suffering, the origin of suffering, the destruction of suffering, and the eightfold way of destruction of suffering. The eightfold path consists of moral conduct, and insight. It leads every aspirant to the complete extinction of suffering.

**Buddha’s Ethics**

The Buddha clearly enunciated the morality of Ahimsa. He says, “May all beings be happy and secure, may they be happy-minded”. “Let no one deceive another, let him not despise another in any place, let him not out of anger or resentment wish harm to another”. “Let man overcome anger by love; let him conquer evil by good. For hatred does not cease by hatred at any time, hatred ceases by love”. “Returning good for good is very noble, but returning good for evil is nobler still”. “Good men melt with compassion even for one who has wrought the harm”. “To the man who foolishly does me wrong I shall return the protection of my ungrudging love; the more the evil that comes from him, the more the good that shall go from me”. “With pure thought and fullness of love, it will do to others what I do for myself”. Hatred is conquered by love. “He, who has no wound in his hand, may touch poison with his hand; poison does not affect one who has no wound; nor is their evil for one who does not commit evil”. The wrong-doer cannot effects the purity of a virtuous person but he offends himself and degrades his character. If a man offends a harmless, pure, and innocent person the evil falls back upon that fool, like a light dust thrown up against the wind”. Evil should be conquered by good. “Do not speak harshly to anybody; those who are spoken to will answer thee in the same way. Angry speech is painful; blows for blows will touch thee”.
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Anger and resentment should be conquered by love. Since violence begets violence, it should pacified by love. “The awakened called patience the highest penance, long-suffering the highest Nirvana; for he is not an anchorite who strikes, he is not on Nirvana; for he is an anchorite who strikes, he is not an ascetic who insults others”. “Silently shall endure abuse as the world is ill-natured”. Wrongs should be endured patiently rather than crushed with violence. Patient endurance is better than violent opposition. It is not calm submission to evil, but it is acquisition of moral strength which makes wrong impossible. “Victory breeds hatred, for the conquered person is unhappy. He who has given up both victory and defeat, he, the contented, is happy”. If the wrong doer is crushed by violence, he will harbour hatred and enmity and inflict injury again. So violence should be overcome by endurance and love. “Let man overcome anger by love, let him overcome evil by good, let him overcome the greedy by liberality the liar by truth”. Anger should be overcome by love, evil by good, greed by liberality, falsehood by truth. The vices of others should be overcome by our virtues. “A man is not just if he carried a matter by violence: he who distinguishes both right and wrong, who is learned and leads others, not by violence, but by law and equity, and who is guarded by the law, is called just”. We should be guided by justice and equity and the law of righteousness (dhamma). “A man is not cultured (Arya) because he injures living creatures: he is called an Arya because he has pity for all living creatures”. Violence is a sign of barbarity. But non-injury, compassions, or love is a sign of culture.

Buddha says, “There is no shark like hatred”. “The fields are damaged by weeds; mankind is damaged by hatred”. “Let us live happily then, not hating those who hate us! Among men who hate us dwell from hatred.” Love in the cementing factor among mankind. Hatred is the disintegrating force among them. Bind men to men with golden ties of love. Do not separate them by hatred, malice, and ill-will. “Refrain from
hurting any creature, both those that are strong, and those that
tremble in the world”. “Suffuse the world with friendliness: let all
creatures, both strong and weak, see nothing that will bode them harm,
and they will learn the ways of peace.” Give up ill-will, a malice, and
hatred: suffuse the world with love and good will: and the world will be
filled with love, and peace and hatred and ill-will will disappear. As
light dispels darkness, so love dispels hatred. “A votary of ahimsa lives
as binder of those who are divided, a peace maker, a lover of peace, a
speaker of words the make for peace.” Love brings peace, but hatred
brings on war. “Do not harbour hatred: do not speak in hatred: do not
harm in hatred. Burn the roots of hatred by all-consuming love.
Liberally, courtesy, benevolence, kindness – these are to the world what
the linchpin is to the rolling chariot.” These are abundantly necessary
for the smooth running of the human society. The gaping wounds of the
heart of mankind urgently require the healing balm of universal love
and brotherhood.

**Eight-fold Path: The doctrine of Ethical Mean**

The Buddha rejects both Being and Non-Being and believes in
Becoming. He rejects both self-indulgence and self-mortification, and
enjoins the ethics of moderation. He preaches the doctrine of the ethical
mean. He lays down the eightfold path.

(1) **Right view or belief** consists in right knowledge of the four noble
truths, which leads to dispassion, self-control, peace and
nirvana.

(2) **Right resolve** consists in the determination to uproot
attachment to sensual pleasure, ill-will towards others, and
desire to do harm to them. Mere right knowledge of right and
wrong does not help the aspirant reach his goal. It must be
expressed in right resolve to do what is right and desist from
doing what is wrong. Right resolve is aspiration towards
renunciation, benevolence, and compassion.
(3) Right speech is an outward expression of right resolve. It consists in abstention from lying, slander, abuse, harsh words and frivolous talk. One should speak what is right, not what is unrighteous. One should speak what is pleasing, not what is pleasing. One should speak what is true, not what is false. One should speak well. One should speak what does not pain oneself nor hurt others. Truth should be in harmony with right and good. The just stand firm in what is true, in what is good, and in what is right.

(4) Right conduct consists in abstention from the destruction of life, theft, sex-indulgence, lying, drinking intoxicating liquor, eating between meals, attending social entertainments, the use of unguents and ornaments, the use of luxurious beds, and the handling of gold and silver, which are binding upon the monks. The first five duties are binding on lay men. They should observe chastity in their married life. These sins should neither be committed, nor caused to be committed, nor approved. Lay men have specific duties. The duties of parents, children, teachers, pupils, husbands, wives, masters and servants are laid down. Liberality, courtesy, kindness, and unselfishness should be cultivated by all.

(5) Right livelihood consists in earning living by honest means. Trade in arms, animals, flesh, liquor, and poison is forbidden. Earning livelihood by under-weights, fraudulence, bribery, ingratitude, crookedness, mutilation, persecution, confinement, robbery, and plunder is forbidden.

(6) Right effort consists in constant vigilance, effort, and activity which are necessary for self-control, sense-restraint, arrest of evil thoughts, stimulation of good thoughts and concentration of the mind on universal good- will. Restless mind is not conducive
to good thoughts, good emotions, and good conduct. Right effort consists in suppressing evil states and stimulating good states.

(7) Right mindfulness consists in recollection of the impurity of the body, the nature of feeling, pleasure, pain, and neutral feeling, the nature of mind endowed with greed, hatred, and delusion, the nature of dhammas, five aggregates, sense-organs, sensible objects, means to enlightenment, and four noble truths. Right mindfulness is an indispensable pre-requisite of right concentration.

(8) Right concentration consists of four meditations. It is the crown of the eightfold path. The first Jhana is a state of joy born of seclusion, accompanied by reflection and investigation, in which sensuality is destroyed. The second Jhana is a state of joy born of deep tranquility, without reflection or investigation, which are suppressed; in it thought is tranquilized, and intuition predominates. The third Jhana is a state of neutral consciousness in which all passions are destroyed. The fourth Jhana is a state of complete tranquility and self-possession in which joy and sorrow are destroyed. Buddhism stresses right conduct, right concentration and right insight. Right insight purges the mind of lust, becoming, and ignorance.

Buddhism emphasizes purity of the inner life. Mere pure external conduct does not suffice. The mind must be purged of all impurities. Greed, hatred, delusion, anger, envy, and jealousy must be rooted out. All passions that ruffle the calm of the mind must be extirpated. The mind must be sanctified.

Conclusion

The Buddhist morality is altruistic. Though nirvana is the highest good of an individual, it is realized through universal good-will and love. We should pervade the whole world with love, pity, sympathy, and
equanimity. Universal love, compassion for the distressed, joy for the virtuous, and indifference to the vicious are enjoined. Love generates compassion, joy, and indifference, and is consequently higher than these. Buddhist morality is the mean between self-indulgence and self-mortification. It advocates neither hedonism nor asceticism. Gautama underwent severe penances and self-torture which proved fruitless. Self-torture emaciates the body and fills the mind with evil thoughts. If the fires of lust, hatred, and delusion are not quenched, self-mortification can lead us nowhere. Craving for pleasure springs from egoism. When egoism is rooted out, craving for worldly and heavenly pleasures is quenched. On the other hand, self-indulgence is enervating and degrading. But to satisfy hunger and thirst, to keep the body in good health, to protect it from heat and cold, to save it from fatigue, to cover it comfortably and decently are necessary to keep the mind strong and pure. This is the Middle path that avoids both extremes. It resembles Aristotle’s doctrine of virtue as the mean between the two extremes of over-indulgence and total abstention. The Dharma spurns both pursuit of pleasures and self-mortification. It aims at purity of heart, purity of conduct, equanimity, peace, and enlightenment.

The ethics of non-injury (ahimsa) is the keynote of Buddhism. Hatred should be conquered by love; harm should be conquered by good. Evil recoils upon one who offends a harmless, pure, and innocent person. Hatred generates hatred. A harsh word excites a harsh word. We should be tolerant with the intolerant, mild with fault-finders, free from passion among the passionate. We should not offend anyone by body, word, or thought. A man is not just, if he carries a matter by law and equity. Non-injury, in thought, word, and deed, love, good-will, patience, endurance, and self-purification constitute the Buddhist morality. It is not inactivism; it inculcates calm and selfless life of activity for the good of humanity. It does not enjoin an active life
dedicated to God as the Bhagavad Gita teaches. It inculcates altruistic humanism.
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Meaning of Happiness

Happiness is something everyone wants to have. Happiness is that state of consciousness which proceeds from the achievement of one’s values. Happiness is essentially a state of going somewhere, wholeheartedly, one-directionally, without regret or reservation. According to Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary, “—A state of well-being characterized by emotions ranging from contentment to intense joy; b: a pleasurable or satisfying experience”. There are two main elements in the definition of happiness:

- A state of well-being and contentment,
- A pleasurable or satisfying experience.

The word ‘happiness’ has two very different meanings. Usually it refers to a feeling: a sense of pleasure, gladness or gratification. We all enjoy happy feelings, so it’s no surprise that we chase them. The other meaning of happiness is ‘a rich, full and meaningful life’. When we take action on the things that truly matter deep in our hearts, when we move in directions that we consider valuable and worthy, when we clarify what we stand for in life and act accordingly, then our lives become rich and full and meaningful, and we experience a powerful sense of vitality. Happiness has been discussed as the absence of negatives hunger, suffering, poverty, loneliness, unhappiness, etc. or the presence of positives affluence, love, harmony, equilibrium, etc. A
correct analysis should handle any particular case of happiness. Happiness may be better understood by the following assumptions---

- Happiness is a relatively long-lasting thing. It does not come and go quickly, as some feelings do. In the feeling use, a happy feeling can be relatively short in duration, but in the life use the state of happiness is a relatively long-lasting thing.
- A person can have many pleasures or enjoyments and still not be happy.
- Happiness seems typically to be influenced by whether one is attaining the goals.
- Being in the process of achieving a goal or higher order end is at least in some cases more important for happiness than having achieved it.
- There is rather great variation in the particular kinds of lives that can be happy lives. There are people who enjoy and can be happy in a state of great stress;

The use of "happiness" has not reached so serious a stage that it denotes a "confused hurdle of objects, having nothing whatever in common." However, its use does require some sharpening, some precising. In addition to using these formal features of happiness to argue for his view, Aristotle argues for it by means of an argument about the function of man. Whatever his function is, it must be unique to him. Aristotle sees three possibilities: simply living, a life of sense perception, and "an active life of the rational element." The first two are excluded by the fact that they are not unique to man. Thus, it is an active life of the rational element, which has to do both with behaviour according to rules and wisdom. Happiness or "the good of man is an activity of the soul. Aristotle believes his view is confirmed by noting that it satisfies some of the important concerns of the popular views of happiness, such as that the most important goods are the goods of the soul, and that pleasure figures into happiness, since on his view there is
a pleasantness naturally accruing to virtuous activity. Happiness is
determined more by one’s state of mind than by external events.
Success may result in a temporary feeling of elation, or tragedy may
send us into a period of depression, but sooner or later our overall level
of happiness tends to migrate back to a certain baseline. Psychologists
call this process adaptation, and we can see how this principle operates
in our everyday life; a pay raise, a new car, or recognition from our
peers may lift our mood for a while, but we soon return to our
customary level of happiness.

Happiness as an End of Human Life—Happiness is desired by all.
The very purpose of our life is to seek happiness. Whether one believes
in religion or not, whether one believes in this religion or that religion,
we all are seeking something better in life. Psychologically, Happiness
is a “subjective well-being” as a combination of life satisfaction and
having more positive emotions than negative emotions. Augustine
defines happiness as the supreme good. This is the good which provides
the standard for all our actions: it is sought for its own sake, not as a
means to an end, and once we attain it we lack nothing that is
necessary for happiness.

According to Aristotle, Happiness is the meaning and the purpose of
life, the whole aim and end of human existence. Happiness is an "open
concept. Aristotle's view is that happiness ("Eudaimonia") is "an activity
of the soul in conformity with excellence or virtue, and if there are
several virtues, in conformity with the best and most complete." It has
sometimes been emphasized that "happiness" may not be a good
translation of "Eudaimonia" because "Eudaimonia" doesn't have the
hedonistic overtones and the suggestion of pleasure that Happiness.
Aristotle's argument for his view of happiness that there must be a final
good or ultimate end of all action, something we desire for its own sake
and never as a means, for if there were not, an infinite regress would
result, and our desires would be futile. Men agree in calling this final
good Happiness. Aristotle claims that men agree that the final good for man is to be called "happiness," but that this verbal agreement hides some genuine disagreement as to what it is, or how it is to be defined. Some view happiness as pleasure, others as whatever they lack of health, wealth, etc, still others as honour. Aristotle excludes these views by arguing that whatever happiness is, it must be final and self-sufficient. It is an end and never a means.

Aristotle notes that some external goods are necessary for happiness. Morally virtuous activity requires some goods to share in the case of something like generosity, and other people that one can deal with in a morally virtuous way. But, in addition to these goods needed in order to be morally virtuous, certain goods such as noble birth, good children, and physical beauty are, Aristotle believes, goods one must have to be fully happy. But it must be noted that these goods are some of the conditions of happiness, and are not to be identified with the nature of happiness.

For those who hold that the well-being of the individual consists in his wealth, also think that riches make the happiness of the whole state, and those who value most highly the life of a tyrant deem that city the happiest which rules over the greatest number; while they who approve an individual for his virtue say that the more virtuous a city is, the happier it is. Two points here present themselves for consideration:

- Which is the more eligible life, that of a citizen who is a member of a state, or that of an alien who has no political ties; and again,
- Which is the best form of constitution or the best condition of a state, either on the supposition that political privileges are desirable for all or for a majority only?

Since the good of the state and not of the individual is the proper subject of political thought and speculation, and we are engaged in a political thought and speculation, and we are engaged in a political
discussion, while the first of these two points has a secondary interest for us, the latter will be the main subject of our inquiry.

One thing that it is claiming about happiness is that it is a feature of a life that is considered very important, and here clearly the life use of "happiness" is what such a theorist would have in mind. However, then a shift is made, and happiness is identified with the kind of experience we generally call a feeling (the feeling use seems to come into play here) and this is identified with pleasure. There is a feeling use of Happiness. In its feeling use, "happy," or "happiness," is used for occasions of very great pleasure or joy. Typically the feeling use occurs when we are referring to successes and good fortune, for example, "She was very happy. She got the job." But the feeling use of "happiness" should not be confused with the life use, which refers to a life or a relatively long period of a life. Happiness is primarily a felt property of a single moment in a person's experience. The happiness of an experience lasting several moments can be analyzed in terms of his happiness at each separate moment constituting the longer experience. Happiness (life use) seems to be a long-term, rather than a short-term thing. It doesn't seem right to think of it in the plural, while it seems at least initially plausible to think of pleasure in the plural.

Another argument against the identity view was that pleasure is a relatively short-term thing, while happiness is a relatively long-term thing. The collection theorist can handle this fairly easily by noting that while pleasures are short-lasting, a collection of pleasures cannot be viewed as a short-lasting thing. Treating happiness as a collection of pleasures allows one to speak of it as a collection over a relatively long period of time. H. Sidgwick seems to hold the collection view. To make the meaning of "happiness" more precise, he suggests that by "greatest possible happiness" we understand the greatest attainable surplus of pleasure over pain; the two terms being used, with equally comprehensive meanings, to include respectively all kinds of agreeable
and disagreeable feelings. Sidgwick claims that the most convenient way to use "happiness" is as "denoting that of which the constituents are pleasures" can only be read as a claim that happiness is an aggregate or collection of individually discrete pleasures that outnumbers pains. Sidgwick claims that the most convenient way to use "happiness" is as "denoting that of which the constituents are pleasures" can only be read as a claim that happiness is an aggregate or collection of individually discrete pleasures that outnumbers pains.

Some of the uses of "happiness" might be related to the life use in terms of being indicative of a happy life. It could be argued that a happy feeling is a feeling which is seen as being indicative of one's having a happy life. Happy feelings or emotions are states of consciousness whose objects are typically notable success or cases of good fortune, or a state of affairs that greatly pleases one. Such feelings will typically be experienced when one is realizing an element of the life plan in a definite way. Sometimes "happiness" in the feeling use is applied when the feeling is more one of contentment than being positively pleased about something. Even here, though, we might note that this feeling of contentment would be a feeling of being satisfied with things the way they are, feeling there is nothing significantly wrong. Happiness, being the realizing of a life plan, cannot be measured or added in any neat, precise way. Happiness has often been viewed as "the good".

W. T. Stace calls happiness the "unique state of consciousness view". According to Stace view, happiness is a state of consciousness which is different from pleasure. Pleasures or satisfactions may lead to or contribute to happiness, but they do not constitute it. Stace maintains that satisfactions do not constitute happiness, as the collection view would maintain. They do play an important role in happiness. But one's happiness is not proportional to the number or intensity of one's pleasures or satisfactions, as the collection view would hold. Thus, the essential elements of Stace's theory seem to be the following:
- Happiness (feeling) = a unique state of consciousness attached to certain experiences and activities.
- Happiness (life) = a life "full of" happy experiences and activities.
- Relationship between happiness and satisfactions:
  - (a) Happiness is distinct from both particular satisfactions and collections of satisfactions.
  - (b) There is no proportional relation between intensity of satisfaction and amount of happiness: (1) Personality may affect how much happiness satisfactions produce. (2) How much happiness satisfactions produce is largely determined by the "specific nature" of satisfactions: higher pleasures or satisfactions contribute a greater amount of happiness.

Happiness both as a motive in advance of action, and as a benefit resulting from action. Happiness—the essentials for life and health—may be lacking through no fault of our own. Happiness is commonly understood as how much one likes the life one lives, or more formally, the degree to which one evaluates one's life-as-a-whole positively. Happiness is a highly valued in present day society. Not only do people aim at happiness in their own life but there is also growing support for the idea that we care for the happiness of other people and that governments should aim at creating greater happiness for a greater number of citizens. This philosophy of Happiness should be more acceptable and more practicable these days.

**Two Thesis's**— Our civilization is a complex system of individuals interacting with each other and interacting with the environment. Societal dynamics is via human actions, which are governed by decisions. The action of individuals is always a choice among the possibilities recognized as allowed by the circumstances. Jeremy Bentham says that Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. He advocates the idea that
'the greatest happiness of the greatest number’. According to this idea, there are two assumptions: ---

- Happiness of Individual is the maximum happiness
  Individual is a part of Universal
  Therefore, Universal Happiness is the maximum happiness

And,

- Universal Happiness is the maximum happiness
  Universal is constituted from Individual
  Therefore, Individual Happiness is the maximum happiness.

The concept of happiness has been most extensively analyzed by philosophers and historians. Most philosophers and historians agree that the concept of happiness in antiquity centered around good luck and fortune, whereas contemporary Americans view happiness as something over which they have control and something that they can actively pursue. Cultural and cross-cultural research has found that various cross-societal differences are associated with individualism-collectivism.

In an impoverished society, the focused quest for material gain as conventionally measured typically makes a lot of sense. Higher household income (or higher Gross National Product per capita) generally signifies an improvement in the life conditions of the poor. The poor suffer from dire deprivations of various kinds: lack of adequate food supplies, remunerative jobs, access to health care, safe homes, safe water and sanitation, and educational opportunities. As incomes rise from very low levels, human well-being improves. For most individuals in the high-income world, the basic deprivations have been vanquished. There is enough food, shelter, basic amenities (such as clean water and sanitation), and clothing to meet daily needs. In fact, there is a huge surfeit of amenities above basic needs.
Most people agree that societies should foster the happiness of their citizens. The U.S. Founding Fathers recognized the inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness. British philosophers talked about the greatest good for the greatest number. Bhutan has famously adopted the goal of Gross National Happiness (GNH) rather than Gross National Product. China champions a harmonious society. The idea of the emerging scientific study of happiness, whether of individuals and the choices they make, or of entire societies and the reports of the citizenry regarding life satisfaction.

In this world, there are two parts of the world, namely Western World and Eastern World. Very first assumption is found in the western. This is also known as individual approach. On the contrary in the Eastern World, especially in India, China and other eastern part, it is believed that happiness is a collective idea. Happiness is a gross thinking that state or any other agency like God or something is liable for happiness. There is a theory that ‘of the individual, by the God/state and for the individual.’ This is the main cause of poverty and backwardness in these countries. Surveys, reports and other studies implies these facts more clearly. Whereas in the western world, there is no such an agency or state involved in the same. State is only observer or manager of such enterprises, all tasks done by the individuals. There is a principle that ‘of the individual, by the individual and for the individual.’ In the western idea happiness is a idea of present, while in the east it is a idea of future. And in simple sense, according to common sense Happiness in the present is more effective than in future. We all wants our present life happier not the future. So we should make our life happier by present and should leading towards the future, because future is also a part of us.

**Conclusion**—All men seek happiness. This is without exception. Whatever different means they employ, they all tend to this end. Not only is our desire for happiness universal, however, but also our
inability to find happiness is as well. We need to stop chasing happiness and start seeking brief moments of fun and meaningfulness. Savoring experiences, practicing gratitude, and cultivating mindfulness all help to increase enjoyment and pleasure in what we do and, hence, increase levels of happiness our day-to-day enjoyment of life. The benefits of happiness extend to the workplace, as well, with happy individuals performing better and enjoying greater personal success on every level, including higher income. In fact, that higher income is more directly related to one’s level of happiness than to one’s level of education. Extensive research has also shown that organizations with happy employees are more successful, consistently demonstrating greater profitability; this isn’t surprising considering that happy workers are more productive, more loyal to the company, take fewer sick days, show up to work more consistently, have fewer conflicts with co-workers, quit their jobs less frequently, and generate greater customer satisfaction.
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FRAILTY, THY NAME IS ‘SOCIAL JUSTICE’

Dr. Ch. Vijaya Kumar
HOD. P.G. Dept. of History &
Vice-Principal
Andhra Christian College, Guntur

The caste – system of the Indian society split up the Indians into four main ‘Varnas’ – Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaisya and Shudra. Creating social inequalities found nowhere in the world and grading people into mutually exclusive groups basing upon different occupations and thus led to social immobility\(^1\). The untouchables, (Pariahs, Panchamas, Atishudras, Antyajas, Namashudras, Harijans or Delits) whose touch, shadow or voice were believed to pollute the Caste Hindus. They were denied social, religious, legal, educational and political rights. What a fun to call such a people ‘Harijans’ (the children of God), a term coined by Gandhiji in 1933. Any society, to be called an ideal one, must be based on liberty, equality and fraternity. No society will progress as long as one community looks down the other. Dr. Ambedkar, right from his childhood to his ‘Parinirvan’ suffered several imperfections and short –comings of the society. His very life was imperfect record innumerable insults and social injustices. Same was the fate of alluntouchables, who were treated not as human beings, even worse than beasts.

The Indian civilization, which is six thousand years old, has made 20% population as untouchables besides 10% of population as tribal people at the time of Dr. Ambedkar\(^2\). During his school days, Dr. Ambedkar as all other untouchables experienced the painful stigma of untouchability. One day, he and his brother were going to Goregaon to meet their father. They hired a bullock cart from Masur Railway station and were travelling. Knowing that those boys
were untouchables, the caste Hindu cartman in a fit of anger shouted, ‘You low – castes, you have made my cart and the bullock filthy by touching them’, and threw them out on the road. When the tottered tots offered to pay him double the bargain, the greedy cartman agreed to take them. Is this the social justice? Because of long journey, their mouths perched with thirst, but none offered them drinking water. One day when Dr. Ambedkar was drinking water from a public tap, six people came and beat him as they would beat a beast. This incident deeply wounded the young mind of Dr. Ambedkar. A barber refused to cut hair lest his razor should be defiled. At last, his sister trimmed him. If shaving a buffalo was considered to be holier than shaving an untouchable, where was social justice? The untouchables were never considered as their coreligionists.

Educational Institution, supposed to treat all pupils equal and provide equal opportunities, Dr. Ambedkar and his brother were to carry a piece of gunny cloth to sit outside the classroom for fear of polluting the upper caste pupils. The misery is that they never touched their note-books nor asked them to recite poems, nor asked them any questions for fear of being polluted. Even Government school teachers discouraged him telling that education was useless for an untouchable. Such numerous incidents left a deep scar on his psyche and sown the seeds of revolt quite early in his life.

After his return from U.S.A. Sayajirao Gaekward appointed Dr. Ambedkar Military Secretary in the state. But the staff and the peons treated this untouchable as a leper. Peons thought it sinful to hand over office papers and files to him. In 1918 he was appointed professor of Political Economy in Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay. First the students of Sydenham College, thought what an untouchable could teach the Caste – Hindu students. But ‘by and by Dr. Ambedkar’s provocative intelligence, meaningful exposition and flowery language fascinated his students. Such
outstanding professor also could not overcome the evils of untouchability at the place of learning where some Gujarati Professors objected to his drinking of water from the pot reserved for the professorial staff. Professors (teachers), who are the arbiters of the nation, could not be free from caste prejudice. Wonton insults and humiliations constrained him to quit the job.

Dr. Ambedkar determined to redeem the untouchables even by sacrificing his life. Poverty, jealousy, scandals and treat of violence under the garb of ‘Social Justice’ could not deter him from his chosen faith. While Gandhiji dedicated his life for the political freedom of the country. Dr. Ambedkar dedicated himself for the ‘Social Freedom’ of his oppressed brothers. Dr. Ambedkar and Gandhiji crossed swords on many an occasion about the social justice. Gandhiji projected himself as the ‘true and sole Champion’ of the Untouchables. Yet, Dr. Ambedkar was good enough to attend the Constituent Assembly, not to mention the other large number of Scheduled castes. Joachim Alva, a great publicist hailed him as the Messiah of his people. Dr. Ambedkar was committed to the principles of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. Dr. K.R. Narayanan has aptly remarked that ‘Dr. Ambedkar’ whole life was a ceaseless struggle for the attainment of social democratic justice to the Scheduled Castes. He advised his people to grab ‘Political Power’ to protect the interests of their own people. He attacked the Hindu religion which ‘watered down the enthusiasm of the down-trodden’. He confirmed that the only way of improving the status of the untouchables was to renounce Hinduism and to accept Buddhism. ‘Nothing ever happens without a definite cause.

On the 14th October, 1956 Dr. Ambedkar along with his second wife Dr. Savita renounced Hinduism and embraced Buddhism at Nagapur, when the world famous Buddhist Bhikku Mahaathaveer Chandramani of Burma, performed the ‘Deeksha’. He found that
Buddhism as an appropriate alternative religion for the untouchables because Buddhism was anti–Caste and anti–Brahmin. ‘I had vowed not to die as a Hindu. It has come true today. I felt that I am saved from the hell of Hinduism’, Dr. Ambedkar declared. On the 6th December, 1956 Dr. Ambedkar, the ‘Nav Buddha’ breathed his last.

Dr. Ambedkar is no more but the fire has lit, still burns brightly.
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სტილიზებული თეთრი ლომი რიგი

არხი შეიძლება ძალუძ იქნათ.

უკანასკნელი მოვალეობის საბჭო.

ერთ-ერთი გამოძახვები, რომელთა ურთიერთობა გამოიყენება.

იგი მიიღება ცდომილ ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

მიღებული ვარდები და შეადგენენ რამდენიმე ჯგუფში.

იგი მიიღება ცდომილ ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

იგი მიიღება ცდომილ ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

ზოგიერთი თავისუფალი წყარო ზოგადად გამოიყენება ბრევი.

შეიძლება გამოიყენება არაერთქალი იმწვანე ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

თავისი მონაცემები მოიცავს სხვადასხვა სწორ ბრევებს.

შეიძლება გამოიყენება არაერთქალი იმწვანე ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

ნების შეფასებაზე გამოიყენება არაერთქალი იმწვანე ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

თავისი მონაცემები მოიცავს სხვადასხვა სწორ ბრევებს.

მომენტად გამოიყენება არაერთქალი იმწვანე ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

თავისი მონაცემები მოიცავს სხვადასხვა სწორ ბრევებს.

ნების შეფასებაზე გამოიყენება არაერთქალი იმწვანე ადამიანთა მოცულობა.

თავისი მონაცემები მოიცავს სხვადასხვა სწორ ბრევებს.
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ఎప్పుడు ఎందుకు పిండి మరియు దిస్తుంటే ఎందుకు అందరు సంతొశించవచ్చు నుండి సమాధానం చేసుకోవచ్చు. మరుపువు మరియు ప్రసాదం ప్రామాణ్యం ప్రాంతం మరింత తమ్ముడు విశ్లేషించవచ్చు. దిశకాలం, ఆహారం, సాధనాలు, పరిస్థితులు- మాత్రమే సాధనాలు మాత్రమే కాని కాని సమీకరణ మాత్రమే కాని సమీకరణ మాత్రమే సంతొశించవచ్చు. అందుకే తమ్ముడు, తమ్ముడు మాత్రమే కాని కాని సమీకరణ మాత్రమే సంతొశించవచ్చు.

అనేకమే, అనేకమే తమ్ముడు తమ్ముడు మాత్రమే కాని కాని సమీకరణ మాత్రమే సంతొశించవచ్చు.

ప్రత్యేకంగా మాటలు ఆధారంగా ఉండి నిండి నింధి నింధి నని మాట్ల నింది నింది నింది ప్రత్యేక పరిస్థితి. మాట్లాడాలు ప్రత్యేక పరిస్థితి, పరిస్థితిలో నాటుండి ప్రతిభ మాట తమ్ముడు తమ్ముడు విశ్లేషించవచ్చు. మాట తమ్ముడు తమ్ముడు ఉపయోగించాడు. తమ్ముడు తమ్ముడు ఉపయోగించాడు. మాట తమ్ముడు తమ్ముడు ఉపయోగించాడు. తమ్ముడు తమ్ముడు ఉపయోగించాడు.
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“ఇక్కడ చేస్తే మీ సంపాదన మీకు విద్యుత్ చేసింది
మరలో సమాధానం చేసింది
మనిషిని సంపాదించి ప్రయత్నిస్తాను”

వరుసలో కొనసాగిన తెలుగు హుస్లను పట్టికగా తెలుగు సంస్కృతి ప్రమాణం చేసింది. ప్రత్యేకంగా చాలా తాత్క్షత కందించడం అంటే తాత్క్షతం ప్రమాణం. అప్పటి సమయం మరుంటే, ఈ పాతరిక పంచలి ప్రతి పంచలి ఇది. ఈ పంచలి విశేషంగా “చిత్రాల సంస్కృతి పంచలి లో విద్యుత్ చేసింది, మనిషిని సంపాదించి ప్రయత్నిస్తాను” అంటే. ఈ పంచలి అంటే చాలా చాలా పంచలి విచిత్రంపడింది.

“ఇక్కడ చేస్తే మీకు విద్యుత్ చేసింది
మరలో సమాధానం చేసింది
మనిషిని సంపాదించి ప్రయత్నిస్తాను”

“చిత్రాల సంస్కృతి పంచలి లో విద్యుత్ చేసింది
మరలో సమాధానం చేసింది
మనిషిని సంపాదించి ప్రయత్నిస్తాను”

“చిత్రాల సంస్కృతి పంచలి లో విద్యుత్ చేసింది
మరలో సమాధానం చేసింది
మనిషిని సంపాదించి ప్రయత్నిస్తాను”

ఈ పంచలి ప్రతి పంచలి విద్యుత్ చేసింది. ఈ పంచలి ప్రతి పంచలి ఇది. ఈ పంచలి ప్రతి పంచలి విద్యుత్ చేసింది. ఈ పంచలి ప్రతి పంచలి ఇది.
ముఖ్యమైన విషయం గుర్తించిన వాడులు, ఇతనాలు తెలుగు లో కల్పించిన సంఘాత సమయంలో మనం స్పష్టంగా కనుగొనవచ్చు. అందువలన వాడు లేదా వాడుతో “అగానుగు” కొంత సమయం తాకి రావడానికి, కొనసాగిన టీమ్ సమయంలో మనం “అగానుగు సమయం” కొంత సమయం తాకి రావడానికి, అందుకు అతి ప్రయత్నం చేయాలి. మూడవ వాడు అయిన మనం రాళ్ళాలు రావడానికి, స్పష్టంగా తెలుగు లో కల్పించిన సమయంలో మనం “అగానుగు సమయం” కొంత సమయం తాకి రావడానికి, అందుకు అతి ప్రయత్నం చేయాలి.

“మాటి తమ్ములు కొనసాగించండి సాధనాలు
విభాగాన్ని సహాయం చేసుకోండి
తమ్ములకు (అధ్యక్ష లేదా సంచానం)
సహకారిత్తు పెంచుకోండి”

తను పోరాడిన తదుపాన్ని నిదానికి, మనుష్యారణ, సాంస్కృతిక మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి, మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి. మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి. సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి.

తూలి పొందడానికి మాటివేయిడు అయితే మనం మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి, సమాధానాన్ని సమర్థం చేయడానికి మనుష్యారణ మాటికి ఇసుక దొరికి.
మామల్సు శరీరం కలిగే ‘కాంఠ రాగం‘ గాని వాడ్డపుడు అప్పటి రాగంతో తన్ని పైతం తినడానికి చలిపుడా.

‘చరిత్ర కండ చలిపడా– మార బాగా
ప్రస్తుతం మాది న్యాయ
చర్చింటకు విద్యార్థులు
కాంఠ రాగం ప్రస్తుతం
మామల్సు వారిని’

మౌలిక శరీరం ఎంత వచ్చింది న్యాయం కండశాంతికి అన్ని రూపాలు కలవండి. అంటే అప్పుడు ‘వాటిపట్టు’ ప్రాంతంపై ‘దర్శనం’ ఇందులో ఎందుకు రూపాలు కలవండి.

“తెలంగాణ ప్రాంతం ప్రాంతంలోని ముఖాంతరులతో కాంఠ రాగంలో నిప్పుగుతాడి. రాగం మాది న్యాయం ప్రారంభం అభిభూతం చేసుకుని సాధారణుడి మాదిని నిప్పుగుతుంది.

వారి విస్తారంలో మంచినా కానుకు నిప్పుగుని మనితితో వ్యతిరేకం, స్థానం, విస్తారం కంటే నిప్పుగు మనితితో వ్యతిరేకం. మనితితో వ్యతిరేకం ప్రాంతానికి అనేకంద్ర నిప్పుగుతుంది.

“చరిత్ర కండ ప్రాంతం కండశాంతికి అంశం చేసుకుని న్యాయం ప్రారంభం కలవండి. నిప్పుగు మనితితో వ్యతిరేకం. రాగం మాది న్యాయం ప్రారంభమయ్యే వారి కేసించడం అనేకంద్ర నిప్పుగుతుంది.”

మౌలిక శరీరం ఎంత వచ్చింది న్యాయం ప్రారంభం చేసుకుని నిప్పుగుతుంది ఉండి నిప్పుగుతుంది! -ఎందరు.
మయాదు తో నింపబడిన 
చిత్రానికి దృష్టిప్రముఖం: — అందసాధనం.

" బాధ్యత ప్రతి నాను 
నను చాలు చేస్తే 
స్వంతంగా తప్పంటే అభిప్రాయం 
కాని చర్చకు ప్రతి జ ప్రతినిధించేదించిన నిష్పత్తి!"

ఆంగ్లంలో కంతం కొనసాగిన కాడు ముందు “ని విలువలను తప్పండి నిర్మాణం యొక్క మూలం చేయండి. అయితే వారు తనం చాలి న పెద్ద ప్రాంతంలో రెండే నివాసానికి నిర్మాణం చేయండి”.

స్వప్నంతి తోడు చేసింది. పాలికిని పరిమితం చేసింది. మాత్రమే పెద్ద ప్రాంతంలో పెద్ద ప్రాంతాన్ని నిర్మాణం చేయండి. అయినంత వారు తనం చాలి న పెద్ద ప్రాంతంలో రెండే నివాసానికి నిర్మాణం చేయండి. అయితే వారు తనం చాలి న పెద్ద ప్రాంతంలో రెండే నివాసానికి నిర్మాణం చేయండి. నిర్మాణం కొంతం అందించికాని నిర్మాణం కొంతం అందించండి. మాత్రమే పెద్ద ప్రాంతంలో పెద్ద ప్రాంతాన్ని నిర్మాణం చేయండి.

పిండితి పాలికిని పరిమితం చేసింది. పాలికిని పరిమితం చేసింది. పాలికిని పరిమితం చేసింది. పాలికిని పరిమితం చేసింది. పాలికిని పరిమితం చేసింది.