

# Buddhism in Ambedkar's Philosophy: A Critical Analysis

**Md. Sajid Raza**

Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Aligarh Muslim University

## Abstract

This paper critically examines Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's reinterpretation of Buddhism and the socio-philosophical motivations behind his conversion. Unlike conventional religious conversions driven by spiritual concerns, Ambedkar's embrace of Buddhism was a strategic and ethical act of resistance against the caste system deeply embedded in Hinduism. He rejected Hinduism for its sanction of caste-based inequality and sought a religion aligned with justice, rationality, and human dignity. Among various alternatives, Buddhism appealed to him for its egalitarian ethos, rational principles, and compatibility with democratic values. Ambedkar, however, did not accept traditional Buddhism uncritically. He questioned metaphysical elements such as karma, rebirth, and nirvana, offering revised, socially meaningful interpretations. His redefined version, called Navayana or the "New Way," emphasized morality, social justice, and the empowerment of the marginalized. Dukkha (suffering) was interpreted not as a personal psychological state, but as a consequence of systemic social and economic injustice. Similarly, *Dhamma* was seen not as religious ritual but as a moral and ethical path rooted in compassion and justice. The paper also explores the mixed reception of Ambedkar's reinterpretation. While traditional Buddhists criticize Navayana as a deviation from canonical teachings, many modern scholars and activists view it as a timely and necessary reform that aligns Buddhism with contemporary social realities. Ambedkar's rational and ethical interpretation transforms Buddhism into a dynamic force for social change. Ultimately, this study argues that Navayana is a legitimate and philosophically grounded development in Buddhist thought, offering a powerful framework for combating caste, inequality, and injustice in modern India.

**Keywords:** Ambedkar, Navayana Buddhism, Social Justice, Caste System, Rational Religion, Dhamma, Buddhist Reinterpretation.

## Introduction

The Indian Renaissance gave birth to many great thinkers and ideas, and among them, Dr. Ambedkar holds a very high position. Unfortunately, due to his limited role in the freedom movement, he is often underappreciated. However, as the new India began to take shape, his thoughts gained increasing importance, and gradually his core ideas gained recognition (Spini, 2023). We are all familiar with his role in the making of the Indian Constitution and the Hindu Code Bill. However, his final philosophical book "*Buddha and His Dhamm*" is less widely read and known compared to his other works (Khamniungan, 2023).

This article attempts to reflect on some important questions related to this. The first question is: Why did Ambedkar, born into a Hindu family, finally decide to renounce Hinduism? The second question: Among

many available religions, why did he choose Buddhism? The third question: What were the traditional Buddhist principles that he chose to reform, and why?

Another related question is whether Ambedkar's reinterpretation of Buddhism can be accepted as part of the original teachings of Buddhism or should it be considered a separate tradition? Lastly, can the contemporary and future relevance of Ambedkar's efforts be assessed? What would be the possible role of neo-Buddhism in India's current socio-political context?

### Ambedkar's Journey to Buddhism

In Ambedkar's life, personal experience and social life were full of sorrow, insult, oppression, and exclusion. Seeing this condition, Ambedkar came to the conclusion that the root of this problem is the Hindu religion, which legitimized the caste system and made Dalits (untouchables) slaves of the so-called upper castes. He believed that this system was a barrier that could never let India attain true unity and independence (Raibhole, 2023).

Hence, he called upon Dalits and other backward communities to renounce this religion. His slogan was not only religious but also political and social. Ambedkar made it clear that no one should convert just for name's sake or for any worldly benefit. He clearly declared: "*I was born a Hindu, but I will not die a Hindu*" (1935). Accordingly, in the later years, he adopted different religions-Buddhism, Christianity, Islam for comparative study (Ayub, 2025).

Ambedkar deeply studied Islam and Christianity and came to the conclusion that Buddhism is the best. Consequently, before his death, in 1956, along with many of his close followers in Nagpur, he embraced Buddhism and gave up Hinduism and all other religions. Among all the religions, why did Ambedkar only adopt Buddhism? The background to this lies in his opposition to Hinduism and the caste system, for which there were many reasons. Since Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Jainism, etc., do not focus as much on caste issues, they did not attract him (Thepa, 2024).

The first reason was that Ambedkar wanted to politically empower the Dalits by converting them, and among the options, Buddhism was more closely connected to Indian traditions. The second reason was that Ambedkar did not want to adopt a religion rooted in a foreign land. Islam and Christianity were seen as foreign religions in India (Chaudhary, 2025). While this perception may not be entirely accurate, the truth remains that Ambedkar's choice of Buddhism was not driven by spiritual or religious motives but by its social and political implications (Sravanthi & Vamseedhar, 2025).

If political power had been his only goal, then Islam or Christianity might have been better options. But since Buddhism emphasizes peace and compassion, and its foundation lies in rationality and science, it was a more suitable choice for Ambedkar. Also, because of its Indian origin, it could help Ambedkar establish a new identity and strengthen social unity (Queen, 2021).

Thus, we must understand that among all Indian religions, Ambedkar chose Buddhism over Sikhism and Jainism. The decision was not taken lightly-it was based on deep reflection, and the specific features of Buddhism played a vital role. These features have been elaborated upon by Ambedkar in his book *The Buddha and His Dhamma*:

1. Buddhism gives importance to reason and logic rather than faith and blind belief.
2. Buddhism, based on rationality, does not believe in soul, God, miracles, etc., and focuses more on life-centred issues than other religions.
3. Buddhism strongly opposes the caste system.

4. Buddhism emphasizes morality and social responsibility. Its ethics are not based on fear of heaven or hell but on human values.

5. Buddhism teaches equality, friendship, compassion, renunciation, and service (Ambedkar, 1957).

Therefore, we can say that due to the rational, ethical, and egalitarian nature of Buddhism, Ambedkar found it the most appropriate alternative to Hinduism. However, Ambedkar did not accept traditional Buddhism blindly—he also rejected its supernatural elements. He reinterpreted it according to modern sensibilities, yet, even today, many of his interpretations are debated and not universally accepted. This suggests that traditional Buddhist texts also need reinterpretation (Gokhale, 2020).

In his book *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, Ambedkar presented a new interpretation of Buddhism.

Ambedkar called his reinterpretation *Navayana* (the “New Way”). Under this framework, he critically examined many aspects of traditional Buddhism and presented his own rational views. For example, he rejected the idea that people are born poor, diseased, or suffering because of their karma in a previous life. Influenced by his studies of Buddhism and other religions, he asserted that these teachings were later additions and not part of the original doctrine (Kumar, 2019).

Historically, it is said that during Buddha’s time, the Rohini River was a disputed boundary between the Shakya and Koliya tribes. According to Buddhist texts, Buddha persuaded both sides to resolve the conflict peacefully. He did not advise them to flee but guided them through ethical and moral reasoning to avoid war (Lewis & Tuladhar, 2010). According to Ambedkar, this shows Buddha was not an escapist, but rather someone who sought practical and moral solutions to worldly issues. Thus, when political and social conflict intensified, Ambedkar searched for resolutions through ethical and rational reform (Sampath, 2021).

While accepting the four noble truths, Ambedkar rejected their traditional metaphysical interpretation. He believed human suffering does not arise from desire in a spiritual or religious sense but from the social and economic injustices in human life. His efforts were aimed at addressing social inequalities, injustice, and human suffering. His path was not based on pessimism, but on a rational and humanitarian foundation (Debnath, 2024).

Ambedkar also emphasized the importance of morality in Buddhism. He rejected the notion of rebirth, karma, heaven, hell, and other metaphysical elements. His vision was to interpret Buddhism as a social and moral movement aimed at uplifting the oppressed (Rodrigues, 2024).

In the introduction to his book, Ambedkar raised the question: Should the Four Noble Truths be accepted or not? He believed that moral teachings were the essence of Buddhism, and because traditional Buddhism promoted pessimism and escapism, it had lost relevance for the masses. In contrast, Ambedkar’s version viewed Buddhism as a proactive and practical philosophy (Oza, 2019).

He did not see sorrow (*dukkha*) as limited to individual life experiences, but as a social issue arising from structural problems. Ambedkar argued that suffering exists not only in human life but also in the systems that perpetuate inequality. Buddha, in Ambedkar’s interpretation, did not preach to escape the world, but to transform it (Deokar, 2020).

So what did Buddha mean by “*dukkha*” (suffering)? According to Ambedkar, it was not metaphysical but practical—poverty, exploitation, and injustice caused by one person or class to another. That’s why he did not focus on spiritual liberation (nirvana), but on social emancipation (Kramer, 2020).

Ambedkar redefined the Noble Eightfold Path and called it a method “*to remove injustice and inhumanity that man does to man*” (Verma, 2010, pp. 56–57) rather than to attain nirvana. If the traditional path focused on metaphysical escape, Ambedkar’s version emphasized ethical living and social responsibility.

Thus, the basis of Ambedkar's reinterpretation of Buddhism was morality and the upliftment of society (Loftus, 2021).

At this point, it is important to reflect on how Ambedkar understood "*Dhamma*." Ambedkar gave morality a central place in his reinterpretation of Buddhism. In simple terms, Ambedkar considered *Dhamma* and morality to be synonymous. He rejected the presence of peace and divinity in religions based on faith in God, soul, and supernatural elements (Fuchs, 2019).

Most religions accept morality as based on religious or metaphysical beliefs. But in Buddhism, morality is not derived from religion; rather, Ambedkar made morality itself the foundation of religion. He wrote: "*In Dhamma morality takes the place of God, although there is no God in Dhamma ... morality is the essence of the Dhamma.*"

(*The Buddha and His Dhamma*, IV, 1.4 & 1.5)

In this way, Ambedkar wanted to bring about a moral revolution. Religious beliefs often revolve around the center of God, but in Ambedkar's Buddhism, morality becomes the center instead of faith. He gave morality a place of primacy in contrast to traditional religious beliefs that centered around God or the soul (Mahadevan, 2020).

Ambedkar reinterpreted traditional Buddhist beliefs such as *anatma* (non-self), karma, and rebirth, with rational perspectives. He did not deny the effect of karma entirely but separated it from supernatural beliefs. In Ambedkar's view, if there is no God, no soul, no heaven, and yet karma and rebirth are accepted, then how do we understand the consequences of actions? He argued that karma and rebirth should be interpreted rationally and ethically-not metaphysically. According to him, karma is not the result of past life deeds but the result of one's present moral actions. He refuted the idea that rebirth is a cosmic or supernatural process, and instead considered it symbolic of how one's deeds live on and impact society. Ambedkar asked: If there is no God, no soul, no supernatural karma and rebirth-then on what basis can morality be justified? His answer aligns with Immanuel Kant's view, but with a consequentialist approach. For Ambedkar, morality is not rooted in fear of punishment or desire for reward, but in the benefit it brings to humanity (Kumar, 2025).

Ambedkar emphasized that moral conduct should lead to the well-being of humanity. In his words:

"*Do kusala karma so that humanity may benefit by a good moral order which a kusala karma helps to sustain; do not do Akusala karma for humanity will suffer from bad moral order which an Akusala karma will bring about.*" (*The Buddha and His Dhamma*, III, VI, 25)

Ambedkar divided Buddha's teachings into three parts-*Dhamma*, *Nibbana*, and *Sangha*. Of these, he considered *Dhamma* as the philosophy of life. As explained earlier, he viewed *Dhamma* as a moral and ethical way of life, which enables one to live with self-respect without needing the help of God or supernatural forces (Queen, op.Cit.).

This is a moral perspective that emphasizes the ethical relationships among individuals in society, based on values rather than divine intervention. Ambedkar calls this sociality or social conscience. According to his social philosophy, values like compassion, friendship, and love are not occasional or accidental virtues, but are foundational and widely applicable values (Telang & Kudupale, 2022).

Along with this, the fight against caste discrimination and the promotion of social equality were, to him, essential elements of Buddhism. According to Ambedkar, personal moral life must serve broader social objectives. That's why he insisted that religion must aim for freedom, equality, and brotherhood. Before adopting Buddhism, Ambedkar had made it clear that he would choose a religion that promotes liberty and equality, and he found those ideals in Buddhism (Lone, 2022).

One more significant change Ambedkar made was in the role of the *bhikkhu* (monk). Traditionally, the role of a monk was considered to be focused on renunciation and personal spiritual development, avoiding worldly matters. But Ambedkar gave the monk a new, active social role. He believed that monks should spread the moral message of Buddhism among the common people, and not just engage in their personal spiritual goals (Gokhale, op.Cit.).

Ambedkar emphasized that monks should work for justice, peace, and the well-being of society, not just their own salvation. According to him, renunciation should not be a selfish act, but a selfless commitment to uplift humanity. He believed monks should not retreat into the forest or isolation, but remain among the people and work to ease their suffering. He criticized monks who ignored social injustice. He famously said:

*“A bhikkhu who is indifferent to the woes of mankind, however perfect in self-culture, is not at all a bhikkhu.”* (*The Buddha and His Dhamma*, II, IV, 22)

We can see it clearly above, Ambedkar’s reinterpretation of Buddhism clearly shows that he transformed it from a traditional religion into a rational and ethical philosophy of life. He identified suffering with its social causes and emphasized the need for social transformation to end suffering.

His primary goal was to build a just society, which is why he deeply rethought the concept of *Dhamma* and redefined it with new meaning. In his famous book (1956), *Buddha or Karl Marx*, Ambedkar studied many of Marx’s foundational ideas and revolutionary socialist thought in history. He attempted to understand the origin of suffering and violence through them. However, unlike Marx, Ambedkar did not see suffering as only the result of economic inequality, exploitation, and poverty. His concept of *Dhamma* also included the idea that humans, through their own efforts, could overcome suffering. For him, social cooperation was key to the elimination of suffering, and he believed that no supernatural power could or should be relied upon. In this way, Ambedkar’s *Dhamma* is quite similar to Marxist humanism. However, beyond activism, he also opened up a space for philosophical reflection (Skaria, 2015).

The interpretation of Buddhism by Ambedkar has been met with various kinds of responses. The main reactions can be divided into two types:

1. **Traditionalist Buddhists** who believe that Ambedkar’s reinterpretation is not true to original Buddhism, especially because he rejected karma and rebirth-elements considered central to traditional Buddhist belief.
2. **Modernist Buddhists** who support Ambedkar’s rational reinterpretation and are willing to accept a version of Buddhism that fits with scientific thinking and human rights values (Fitzgerald, 1997).

According to Ambedkar’s interpretation, the ethical teachings of Buddhism are more important than its metaphysical or ritualistic aspects. He argued that Buddhism is not just a religion, but a moral and social guide that should focus on justice, compassion, and social transformation. Thus, in contrast to any other religion, Ambedkar considered Buddhism as the best alternative (Rajan & Barman, 2025).

Some, however, argue that Ambedkar first created a modern, secular version of Buddhism, and then later changed or adapted it to suit his political goals. These reactions must be studied carefully, and it is necessary to examine the logic and context behind them (Sharma, 2022).

Responding to arguments of religious absolutists, Ambedkar believed that religion should serve the purpose of social reform and human welfare. It should be open to criticism and revision. From a historical perspective, it is evident that even in traditional Buddhism, there were multiple changes and adaptations. Therefore, Buddhism too has undergone various phases of transformation in different times and societies (Mukerji, 2020).

The difference lies in how these teachings are interpreted and applied. It is difficult to say which version of Buddhist ethics is the truest representation of the Buddha's original message. Thus, just as Mahayana, Hinayana, and Vajrayana traditions are different in content, *Navayana* (Ambedkar's version) must also be seen as a valid continuation if not a complete break (Jaoul, 2016).

Ambedkar did not see karma and rebirth as central tenets. For him, the essence of Buddha's teachings was rationalism, equality, and love. He gave a modern, humanist interpretation of Buddha's message—one that emphasized justice and rights over rituals and beliefs (Gombrich, 2009).

This shows that Buddhism, through Ambedkar's lens, can be seen as one of the most relevant philosophies of the present era. On this foundation, Ambedkar tried to replace outdated traditions with rational ideas. We must not forget that Buddhism has had many interpretations in history—and Ambedkar's is one of the most transformative. The interpretations made by Ambedkar regarding Buddhism redefine the concept of “*dukkha*” (suffering), and from this point of view, Ambedkar's concept of *Dhamma* is also part of the Buddhist tradition (Maheshkar, 2018).

Jinano–Mano, a Buddhist scholar, in his book *Ambedkar and Buddhism*, accepted Ambedkar's interpretation of Buddhism as significant and said that Ambedkar tried to understand the constitutional, religious, and social contexts that led him to adopt Buddhism. However, Jinano–Mano critiques that Ambedkar's interpretation puts less emphasis on the metaphysical aspects of Buddhism and rejects them, saying that social suffering arising from the breakdown of human relationships is more important than spiritual problems (Panyamane, 2022).

Ambedkar rejected the concepts of karma and rebirth as metaphysical beliefs and considered them secondary. Despite this, he attempted to link his moral interpretations with the traditional structure of Buddhism. Through this effort, he tried to unify modern understanding with Buddhist moral values. Although he reinterpreted Buddhist teachings and presented the Eightfold Path in a new form, he never denied the importance of the social dimension of Buddhism (Jal, 2005).

He also included new ideas and interpretations to make Buddhism relevant for social change and public engagement. However, the challenge remains that many who adhere to traditional Buddhism consider these reinterpretations to be a deviation. Therefore, reactions to Ambedkar's reformation of Buddhism cannot be considered unjustified either (Tartakov, 1990).

Here, we will not discuss the critical responses of traditionalists in detail but do acknowledge that a significant section of the public also views Ambedkar's Buddhism as a necessary reform for humanity's future. Ambedkar viewed Marx differently. According to him, Marx's ideas are insufficient for uplifting humanity because they focus on the material and economic aspects of life (Ong, 2024).

Ambedkar emphasized that the moral system should be rooted in social ethics. Though he appreciated Marx's concern for the poor and exploited, he felt Marx lacked spiritual and moral value. In contrast, Ambedkar's ethical interpretation of Buddhism deeply aligns with humanitarianism (Meena & Dhayal, 2025).

He consistently emphasized justice and equality, and also advocated for mental liberation. He believed the difference between *dharma* and *dhamma* must be clearly understood. In his view, if religion (*dharma*) becomes a tool for power in an unequal society, it loses its essence. But when it becomes a moral force rooted in values like compassion and justice, then it attains social legitimacy. Thus, religion should serve ethical and social purposes, not become a tool for oppression. Even when Ambedkar rejected traditional religion, he never dismissed spiritual effort or ethical struggle. He often focused on morality in action (Singh, 2023).

Ambedkar never said that religion should be rejected, but instead insisted that it must be evaluated based on ethical actions (Chaudhary, 2022).

*Dhamma* and state are not the same. Ambedkar only stated that *Dhamma* should be used by the state to regulate morality. He did not claim that the state and religion (or moral law) are identical or that the rules of *Dhamma* should be imposed through law. From this perspective, *Dhamma* and state cannot be seen as the same entity. The state functions on the basis of rules and laws, whereas *Dhamma* is a moral system, which may inform the state's vision, but the rules of *Dhamma* themselves cannot rule society directly (Ratnam, 2021).

Even within Ambedkarite Buddhism and humanism, there is a consciousness that recognizes the philosophical compatibility between Ambedkar's thought and humanism. But one must not forget that Ambedkar did not entirely reject the historical roots of Buddhism or its spiritual and philosophical dimensions. In *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, he acknowledged the importance of ethical values and moral ideals in the process of building society. He believed that morality is not born out of social contracts, but is foundational to the social structure itself (Guru, 2020).

Ambedkar advocated a universal morality that was free of blind faith and spiritual exploitation. Most importantly, he continuously emphasized the destruction of the caste system. In his famous work *Annihilation of Caste*, he stated that *true religion* is one that promotes liberty, equality, and fraternity. To him, this was what *Dhamma* meant—a religion that upholds these ideals through its precepts (Hiwrale, 2020).

Based on the above analysis, it can be said that where conservative Buddhists view Ambedkar's reinterpretation as a deviation from tradition, they may be overlooking that Ambedkar's Buddhism is deeply ethical and rational, integrating both moral and socio-political-scientific vision. To discard his version outright is incorrect. Where Ambedkar reinterprets traditional Buddhism while discarding only its dogmas and metaphysical speculations, one cannot ignore his moral commitment. That is exactly where his *Navayana* should be seen not as a break from Buddhism, but as a refined humanistic model of Buddhism (Pandya, 2022).

### Early Buddhism and Ambedkar's Buddhism

Despite Ambedkar's innovations, his Buddhism can still be considered a legitimate reform within the broader Buddhist tradition. This can be justified on the following grounds:

1. **Within Buddhism itself, there are many schools of thought and diversity:**

Hence, it is not difficult to say that Ambedkar's interpretation presents a new perspective, but it can still be recognized—using Wittgenstein's idea of “family resemblance”—as a legitimate part of the Buddhist family.

2. **From a scientific point of view**, Ambedkar's reinterpretation—like Early Buddhism—emphasizes rationality and realism. It presents a necessary ethical lens for understanding and resolving the issue of human suffering (*dukkha*).

3. The doctrines of karma and rebirth may be part of traditional Buddhism and found in many schools of thought, but they do not occupy a central place in all of them. The idea that suffering in this life is due to past bad karma or that good karma can yield a better rebirth is mentioned in texts like the *Satipatthana Sutta*, but Ambedkar does not emphasize this.

4. If we are to choose between the doctrine of *anatta* (non-self) and the karma-rebirth theory as the core principle of Buddhism, then the people must choose the former. Along with this, the karma-rebirth

theory's logical inconsistencies must be exposed. In my view, without the concept of a permanent soul, the karma-rebirth idea cannot be logically sustained-and in this regard, Ambedkar is right.

5. The uniqueness of Buddhism lies not only in its doctrines but also in its methodology. It is not a religion of mysticism or mere belief, but a rational approach that encourages critical thinking. Even the Buddha himself encouraged questioning and verification based on experience. From this standpoint, Ambedkar's interpretation aligns with the spirit of Buddhist rationality and inquiry.

## Conclusion

In the end, we must not ignore the fact that traditional Buddhism has many internal inconsistencies. Various philosophical schools emerged in later times, including Sautrantika, Vaibhasika, Yogachara, and Madhyamika, each with their own interpretations. Ambedkar's Navayana Buddhism can be placed in this lineage, even though it opposes the karma-rebirth theory, because it still embodies the core moral and rational spirit of the *Dhamma*.

Therefore, it can be said that despite rejecting certain traditional doctrines, Ambedkar's Navayana Buddhism represents a new synthesis and interpretation within the Buddhist tradition. When we look at influential Buddhist interpretations today, Ambedkar's *Navayana* stands out more prominently than traditional schools like Hinayana or Mahayana. That's because it is based on modern values such as rationality, scientific thinking, liberty, equality, fraternity, and compassion. Hence, it must be emphasized that his version of *Dhamma* can be equally placed among other contemporary ethical and philosophical systems like existentialism, humanism, and postmodernism.

One important point is that, due to his declining health, Ambedkar hurriedly completed *The Buddha and His Dhamma* in the final months of his life. This should be acknowledged while evaluating the book. Nevertheless, Ambedkar's interpretation of Buddhism is a serious philosophical contribution and deserves to be compared with other great systems of thought. Buddhist philosophy scholars should further explore and expand it-for it reflects Ambedkar's ultimate vision of human liberation and truth.

## References:

1. Ambedkar, B. R. (1957, 1974), *The Buddha and His Dhamma*, Siddharth Prakashan, Mumbai
2. Ambedkar, B. R. (1936, 1968), *Annihilation of Caste*, Bhim Patrika Publication, Jalandhar City
3. Ananya Vajpeyi (2012), *Righteous Republic*, Harvard University Press
4. Ayub, A. (2025). Exploring the Religious Identity of Dalits through the Lens of Religious Conversion. *Vilnius University Open Series*, 210-232.
5. Chaudhary, P. B. . (2022). Ambedkar and Annihilation of Caste-Performing Theory, Praxis, Counter Identity. *International Journal of Applied Ethics*, 8(2321-2497). <https://doi.org/10.51245/ijaethics.v8i1.2022.38>
6. Chaudhary, R. (2025, June 9). Why Ambedkar Rejected Islam and Christianity Before Embracing Buddhism. *The Mooknayak*. <https://www.themooknayak.com>
7. Compiled (1986), *Ambedkar and Buddhism*, Wheel Publication, Glasgow
8. Debnath, D. (2024). BABASAHEB DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR'S HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-POLITICAL UPLIFTMENT OF THE DEPRESSED SECTIONS IN INDIA. *Man in India*, 104(1-2), 77-92. <https://doi.org/10.47509/MII.2024.v104i01-2.05>

9. Deokar, M. A. (2020). Buddha and Ambedkar on Caste: A Comparative Overview. In P. Gokhale (Ed.), *Classical Buddhism, Neo-Buddhism and the Question of Caste* (1st ed., pp. 24–[end page]). Routledge India. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003045090>
10. Fitzgerald, T. (1997). Ambedkar Buddhism in Maharashtra. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 31(2), 225-251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/006996697031002003> (Original work published 1997)
11. Fuchs, M. (2019). Dhamma and the Common Good: Religion as Problem and Answer—Ambedkar’s Critical Theory of Social Relationality. In M. Fuchs & V. Schröder (Eds.), *Religious Interactions in Modern India* (pp.364-413). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198081685.003.0013>
12. Gokhale, P. (2020). Ambedkar and modern Buddhism. In P. Gokhale (Ed.), *Classical Buddhism, Neo-Buddhism and the Question of Caste*. Routledge India. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003045090>. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003045090-18>
13. Gombrich, R. (2009). *What the Buddha thought*. Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies / Equinox Publishing. <https://www.equinoxpub.com/home/what-buddha-thought/>
14. Guru, G. (2020). Neo-Buddhism, Marxism and the caste question in India. In P. P. Gokhale (Ed.), *Classical Buddhism, neo-Buddhism and the question of caste* (1st ed., pp. 16–[end page]). Routledge India. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003045090>
15. Hiwrale, A. (2020). Caste: Understanding the Nuances from Ambedkar’s Expositions. *Journal of Social Inclusion Studies*, 6(1), 78-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394481120944772> (Original work published 2020)
- a. [https://doi.org/10.15388/Anthro.2025\\_12](https://doi.org/10.15388/Anthro.2025_12)
16. Jal, M. (2005). *Reconstructing the World: B. R. Ambedkar and Buddhism in India*, edited by Surendra Jondhale & Johannes Beltz. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 64(2), [page range if known]. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911805001282>
17. Jaoul, N. (2016). Citizenship in religious clothing? Navayana Buddhism and Dalit emancipation in late 1990s Uttar Pradesh. *Religion and Society*, 7(1), [page range]. Berghahn Journals. <https://doi.org/10.3167/arrs.2016.070106>
18. Kasbe, Ravasoheb (1985), *Ambedkar and Marx*, Sugava Publications, Pune
19. Kaushambi, Dharmanand (1989), *Bhagwan Buddha*, Subichar Prakashan Mandal, Nagpur
20. Khiamniungan, C. (2023). On the Editions of Dr B. R. Ambedkar’s *The Buddha and His Dhamma*. *Studies in Indian Politics*, 11(1), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23210230231166190> (Original work published 2023)
21. Kramer, M. R. (2020). Overview of Buddhism and the Concept of Suffering. *Online Journal of Complementary & Alternative Medicine*, 2(1).
22. Kumar, B. (2025). Dr. B.R. Ambedkar’s Interpretation of the Doctrines of Karma and Rebirth. *Dhammacakka Journal of Buddhism and Applied Buddhism*, 1(1), 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.3126/djbab.v1i1.76092>
23. Kumar, S. (2019). Ambedkar’s Journey of Conversion to Buddhism. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 11(2), 107-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X19825959> (Original work published 2019)
24. Lewis, Todd, and Subarna Tuladhar, '16 A Dispute over Water', *Sugata Saurabha: An Epic Poem from Nepal on the Life of the Buddha by Chittadhar Hridaya* (New York, 2009; online edn, Oxford Academic, 1 Feb. 2010), <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341829.003.0017>, accessed 8 July 2025.

25. Loftus, T. (2021). Ambedkar and the Buddha's Sangha: A Ground for Buddhist Ethics. *CASTE: A Global Journal on Social Exclusion*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.26812/caste.v2i2.312>
26. Lone, S. (2022, June). Reflections of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's idea of Social Justice. *International Journal of Social Science Educational Economics Agriculture Research and Technology (IJSET)*, 1(7), 357–362. <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijset.v1i7.39>
27. Mahadevan, K. (2020). Social Solidarity or Individual Perfection: Conceptions of Religion in Ambedkar and Radhakrishnan. In P. Gokhale (Ed.), *Classical Buddhism, neo-Buddhism and the question of caste* (1st ed., pp. 22–[end page]). Routledge India. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003045090>
28. Maheshkar, P. (2018, January). आंबेडकरी बौद्ध धम्माची प्रासंगिकता [Relevance of Ambedkarite Buddha Dhamma]. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3950419>
29. Meena, H. K., & Dhayal, S. (2025). A Comparative Study of Economic Thoughts: Dr Ambedkar, Mahatma Gandhi, and Karl Marx. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i01.35380>
30. Moon, Vasant (1995), *Dr. Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*, Vol. X, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai
31. Mukerji, S. (2020). The “untouchable” who touched millions: Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Navayana Buddhism, and complexity in social work scholarship on religion. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, 39(4), 474–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15426432.2020.1784071>
32. Omvedt, Gail (2003), *Buddhism in India: Challenging Brahmanism and Caste*, Sage Publications, New Delhi
33. Ong, V. N. (2024). Buddhism and Marxism through the perspective of Bhimrao Ambedkar. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 4(3), 462–470. <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v4i3.1940>
34. Oza, P. (2019). BUDDHISM IN MODERN INDIA: ASSERTION OF IDENTITY AND AUTHORITY FOR DALITS (SOCIAL CHANGES AND CULTURAL HISTORY). *GAP Bodhi Taru: A Global Journal of Humanities*, 2, 46–49. <https://doi.org/10.47968/gapbodhi.230010>
35. Paliwal, Krishnadatta (2007), *Dr. Ambedkar: Social System and Dalit Literature*, Kitab Ghar, Daryaganj, New Delhi
36. Pandya, M. K. (2022). Ambedkar's novel *Navayan*: Pedestal and Ideology (With reference to addressed speeches and published magazines). *Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 7(11), 1–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31305/rrijm.2022.v07.i11.001>
37. Panyamane, P. (2022). Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar's Image and Thought as Perceived in Thailand From 1975 to 2017. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 16(3), 266–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X211066198> (Original work published 2024)
38. Queen, C. (2021). Ambedkar's Buddhist vision: A Social Democratic Republic. In *Buddhist Visions of the Good Life for All* (1st ed., pp. 25). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003100454>
39. Raibhole, P. M. (2023). The Problem of Caste and Its Solution Reflected in Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's *Annihilation of Caste*. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 5(1), Article IJFMR23011536. <https://www.ijfmr.com>
40. Rajan, M., & Barman, B. (2025). Dalit Emancipatory Movements and Ambedkar's Neo-Buddhism: An Assessment. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X241299865>

41. Ratnam, K. Y. (2021). Ambedkar's Democracy and State Socialism. In C. Mungekar (Ed.), *B. R. Ambedkar and Social Transformation* (1st ed.), p. 26. Routledge India. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429356759>
42. Rodrigues, V. (2024). *Ambedkar's Political Philosophy: A Grammar of Public Life from the Social Margins*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198925422.001.0001>
43. Sampath, R. (2021). The Persistence of Caste: Part I, The Impossible Simultaneity of Religion and Social Revolution in Ambedkar's Last Essay: Buddha or Karl Marx. *Journal of Social Inclusion Studies*, 7(1), 78-95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23944811211026987> (Original work published 2021)
44. Sharma, A. (2022, July). SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGION: A PERSPECTIVE OF DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development (IJNRD)*, 7(7), 327–333. <https://ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2207040.pdf>
45. Singh, R. S. (2023). Dr. Ambedkar's Concept of Dhamma: Transforming Global Human. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X231169187>
46. Skaria, A. (2015). Ambedkar, Marx and the Buddhist question. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 38(3), 450–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2015.1049726>
47. Spini, D. (2023). Educare, mobilitare, organizzare: linee di lettura del pensiero di Bhimrao Ramji “Babasaheb” Ambedkar. *Rivista Italiana Di Filosofia Politica*, (3), 219–242. <https://doi.org/10.36253/rifp-2024>
48. Sravanthi, G., & Vamseedhar, C. (2025). Buddha Dhamma and its Relevance to Ambedkarite Thought: A path to Social Justice and Equality. *Quest Journals: Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 13(3), 173–180. <https://doi.org/10.35629/9467-1303173180>
49. Tartakov, G. M. (1990). Art and Identity: The Rise of a New Buddhist Imagery. *Art Journal*, 49(4), 409–416. <https://doi.org/10.2307/777143>
50. Telang, S., & Kudupale, M. (2022). Situating Democracy in Ambedkar's Moral Discourse. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X221138359>
51. Thepa, P. C. A. (2024). The Great Spirit of Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar. *Journal of Social Innovation and Knowledge*, June 2024, Article 20241005. <https://doi.org/10.1163/29502683-20241005>
52. Verma, V. (2010, June 26). Reinterpreting Buddhism: Ambedkar on the Politics of Social Action. *Economic and Political Weekly: Review of Agriculture*, 45(26–27), 56–57.