

Brahma is not Dharma - Baba Sahib Ambedkar

Baba Sahib explains the foundation of democracy based on Dharma and why it is different, he says, is the GREAT RIDDLE. (Dr. Ambedkar's handwriting from the Riddle NO 22 of his book titled RIDDLES IN HINDUISM)

345

Specimen of Dr. Ambedkar's handwriting from the Riddle No. 22 entitled 'Brahma is not Dharma'.

To support Democracy because we are all children of God is a very weak foundation for Democracy to rest on. That is why Democracy is so shaky whenever it made to rest on such a foundation. Don't recognize & realize that you and I are parts of the same cosmic principle leaves room for no other theory of associated life except democracy. It does not & merely preach Democracy. It makes democracy an obligation of one and all.

Western students of Democracy have ~~custivated~~ spread the belief that Democracy has stemmed either from Christianity or from Plato and that

T O

346

there is no other source of inspiration for democracy. If they had known that India too had developed the doctrine of Bramhaism which furnishes a better foundation for Democracy they would not have been so dogmatic. India too must be admitted to have a contribution towards a liberal foundation for Democracy. and

The question is what has happened to this doctrine of Bramhaism? It is quite obvious that Bramhaism had no social effects. It was not made the basis of Dharma. When asked why this happened the answer is that Bramhaism is only philosophy. As though philosophy arises not out of social life but out of nothing and for nothing.

Philosophy is no purely theoretic matter. It has practical potentialities. Philosophy has its roots in the problems of life and whatever theories philosophy propounds must return to society as instruments of re-constituting society. It is not enough to know. Those who know must endeavour to fulfil.

Why then Brahminism failed to produce a new society? This is a great riddle. It is not that the Brahmins did not recognize the doctrine of Brahminism. They did.

But they did not ask this question how they could support inequality between the Brahmins & the Shudras.

348

between man and ~~man~~ woman
 between Caste men and outcastes?
 But they did not. The result
 is that we have on the one hand
 the most democratic principle of
 Preambhaism and on the other hand
 a society infested with Castes,
 sub-castes, outcastes, primitive tribes
 and criminal tribes. Can there
 be a greater dilemma than this
 what is ~~more~~ ^{more} ridiculous is
 the teaching of ~~Shankar~~ the Great
 Shankaracharya. ~~How~~ ~~whom~~ ~~that~~
~~cannot~~ ~~be~~ ~~a~~ ~~greater~~ ~~idiot~~. For it
 was this Shankaracharya who taught
 that there is Preamba and this
 Preamba is real and that it pervades
 all and at the same time upheld

all these inequities of the Bramhmic Society. Only a lunatic could be happy with two such contradictions. Chavis being the proponent of two such contradictions. How the Brahmins killed Bramhism is a riddle that calls for an solution explanation.

Justly as the Brahmin is like a Cow. He can eat any thing and everything as the Cow does and remain a Brahmin.