



Jnanadeepa

Pune Journal of Religious Studies

ISSN P-2249-1503

www.punejournal.in

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4272108

Stable URL: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4272108>

Jnanadeepa: Pune Journal of Religious Studies Jan-June 2013 16/1

The Buddhism in the Contemporary Context of Religion, Morality and Law

Atul Lalasaheb More

Abstract: From time to time men find themselves forced to reconsider current and inherited beliefs and ideas, to gain some harmony between present and past experience, and to reach a position which shall satisfy the demands of feeling and reflection and give confidence for facing the future. If, at the present day, religion, as a subject of critical or scientific inquiry, of both practical and theoretical significance has attracted increasing attention, this can be ascribed to:

1. The rapid progress of scientific knowledge and thought;
2. The deeper intellectual interest in the subject;
3. The widespread tendencies in all parts of the world to reform or reconstruct religion, or even to replace it by some body of thought, more , rational and 'scientific' or less 'superstitious' and
4. The effect of social, political, and international events of a sort which, in the past, have both influenced and been influenced by religion.

Keywords: Buddhism and Social Work, Dhamma, Morality, Science

Cite as: More, Atul Lalasaheb. (2013). The Buddhism in the Contemporary Context of Religion, Morality and Law (Version 1.0). Jnanadeepa: Pune Journal of Religious Studies, Jan-June 2013 (16/1), 87-104. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4272108>

2013-01-10 | Updated on Nov 10, 2020

The Buddhism in the Contemporary Context of Religion, Morality and Law

Atul Lalasaheb More

Atul Lalasaheb More B.Sc. (Hons.), LL. M. (NET) is
an active social worker.

From time to time men find themselves forced to reconsider current and inherited beliefs and ideas, to gain some harmony between present and past experience, and to reach a position which shall satisfy the demands of feeling and reflection and give confidence for facing the future. If, at the present day, religion, as a subject of critical or scientific inquiry, of both practical and theoretical significance has attracted increasing attention, this can be ascribed to:

1. The rapid progress of scientific knowledge and thought;
2. The deeper intellectual interest in the subject;
3. The widespread tendencies in all parts of the world to reform or reconstruct religion, or even to replace it by some body of thought, more , rational and 'scientific' or less 'superstitious' and
4. The effect of social, political, and international events of a sort which, in the past, have both influenced and been influenced by religion.

Whenever the ethical or moral value of activities or conditions is questioned, the value of religion is involved and all deep-stirring experiences invariably compel a reconsideration of the most fundamental ideas, whether they are explicitly religious or not.¹ Ultimately there arise problems particularly of justice, human destiny and generally God, the universe and so on; and these in turn involve problems of the relation between 'religious' and other ideas, the validity of ordinary knowledge, and practicable conceptions of 'experience' and 'reality'.

This is more relevant in today's changed circumstances throughout the world, where so called theologians **firstly** try to establish the relation between religion and today's scientific development, morality and law and **secondly** avoid giving answer to the social, economic and political problems of the society. There is rather a view not only among the theologians but among law fraternity that these problems cannot solve by religion or by morality. Hence, in the present research paper my attempt is to bring into focus the true religion which can establish the proper relation between morality and law and gives scientific base to religion itself. In this article I have tried to establish that the Buddhist way of life is the suitable to make interlink between religion, morality and law at one hand and to provide the solution to the present social, economic and political problems in the various forms which are faced by the today's world on the other.

Before exploring the connection of religion, morality and law in the contemporary context I would like to point out the views of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, he said there is always one question raised against Buddha.² What are the teachings of the Buddha? This is a question on which no two followers of the Buddha or the students of Buddhism agree. To some Samadhi is his principal teaching. To some it is **Vipassana** (a kind of Pranayam). To some Buddhism is esoteric. To others it is exoteric. To some it is a system of barren metaphysics. To some it is sheer mysticism. To some it is a selfish abstraction from the world. To some it is a systematic repression

of every impulse and emotion of the heart. Many other views regarding Buddhism could be collected.

This divergence of views is astonishing. Some of these views are those of men who have a fancy for certain things. Such are those who regard that the essence of Buddhism lies in Samadhi or Vipassana, or Esoterism. The other views are the results of the fact that the majority of the writers on Buddhism are students of ancient Indian history. Their study of Buddhism is incidental and occasional. Moreover, some of them are not students of Buddhism. They are not even students of anthropology, the subject matter which deals with the origin and growth of religion. Therefore, the important question arises did the Buddha have no Social Message? When pressed for an answer, students of Buddhism refer to the two points. They say the Buddha taught Ahimsa. The Buddha taught peace! But I would like to ask did the Buddha give any other Social Message? Did the Buddha teach justice? Did the Buddha teach love? Did the Buddha teach liberty? Did the Buddha teach equality? Did the Buddha teach fraternity? Could the Buddha answer Karl Marx? These questions are hardly ever raised in discussing the Buddha's Dhamma. My answer is that the Buddha has a Social Message. He answers all these questions. But they have been buried by modern authors. Hence, in the context of this view of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar I would like to say that we should find the answer in the teachings of Buddha to the contemporary problems which are faced by today's world.³

1. What is Religion?

The word "religion" is an indefinite word with no fixed meaning. It is one word with many meanings. This is because religion has passed through many stages. The concept at each stage is called Religion though the concept at one stage has not had the same meaning which it had at the preceding stage or is likely to have at the succeeding stage⁴.

Thus the conception of religion was never fixed. It has varied from time to time. It is developed in three stages as given below -

- a) In first stage Magic was the religion. Because most of the phenomena such as lightning, rain and floods, the occurrence of which the primitive man could not explain, any weird performance done to control the phenomenon was called **magic**. Religion therefore came to be identified with magic.
- b) In second stage beliefs, rites, ceremonies and sacrifices were treated as religion. The pivotal point in religion starts with the belief that there exists some power which causes those phenomena which primitive man did not know and could not understand. Magic lost its place at this stage. This power was originally malevolent. But later it was felt that it could also be benevolent. Beliefs, rites, ceremonies and sacrifices were necessary both to propitiate a benevolent power and also to conciliate an angry power. Later that power was called God or the Creator.
- c) Then came the third stage that it is this God who created this world and also man. This was followed by the belief that man has a soul and the soul is eternal and is answerable to God for man's actions in the world.

This is in short, the evolution of the concept of Religion.⁵ This is what Religion has come to be and this is what it connotes-belief in God, belief in soul, worship of God, curing of the erring soul, propitiating God by prayers, ceremonies, sacrifices and so on.

2. Draw-backs in Traditional Concept Of Religion

The today's reality is that the idea of religion in the world based upon analogies to what the European theologians called Religion. Therefore, some European theologians refuse to recognize other religions as Religion if they are not as per their

expectations of religion. Instead of entering into those controversies it is better to proceed to give an idea

about modern problems in religion and show how it differs to suppress the today's social problems.

As most Indian theologians are following the views of European theologians, so I would like to highlight the view of European theologians regarding the concept of religion.

Religion, it is said, is personal and one must keep it to oneself. One must not let it play its part in public life, which means it governs relations between man and God in all spheres of life. It is evident that man is alone in this universe hence he need religion for his salvation. It is fundamentally and essentially so. In other words, human beings cannot do without religion.

The purpose of Religion is to find answer of the following questions:

- (i) Is the world not eternal?
- (ii) Is the world finite?
- (iii) Is the world infinite?
- (iv) Is the soul the same as the body?
- (v) Is the soul one thing and the body another?
- (vi) Does one who has gained the truth live again after death?
- (vii) Does one not live again after death?
- (viii) Does one both live again and not live again, after death?
- (ix) Does he neither live again, nor not live again, after death?

In short the Religion is concerned with revealing the beginning of things and nothing else.

These are the two basic aspects of religion which are followed in European countries and in India also, which are totally contradictory with today's modern social life. They are contradictory because **firstly** the view that 'religion, it is said, is personal and one must keep it to oneself is not acceptable because today we are living in the modern civilized society, which means there are relations between man and man in all spheres of life and it is part of public life of everybody. In short when there are two men living in relation to each other they must be governed by certain law whether they like it or not. Neither can escape it. In other words, today society cannot do without law governing relation between man and man. **Secondly** the view that 'religion is concerned with revealing the beginning of things' has become contradictory with today's modern society because today's questions are class struggle, injustice, inequality, exploitation, corruption and so on. The above two views cannot give answer to the recent movement started at national and international level **viz.** - Occupy Wall Street, Corporate corrupt practices like inter trading, Exploitation, Violation of basic Human Rights, Right to Development and so on. In short today's question is the sufferings of human beings and neither the observance of rites and ceremonies or beginning of things.

3. Religion and Morality

After knowing these two problems of religion one may raise the question - Does religion not teach us morality? Therefore, it has become necessary to see the relationship between religion and morality. In this regard I would like to raise one question what is the place of morality in Religion? The answer is negative and mind blowing because as a matter of truth morality has no place in Religion. Because in narrower sense the content of religion consists of God, soul, prayers, worship, rituals, ceremonies and sacrifices. And in wider sense it binds together people of similar ideology. These both senses meant for either protection of interest of people of same religion or achieve so called salvation of own

people and nothing else. So today's society has been facing the problems as mentioned above

Therefore, I am of the view that morality comes in only wherein one comes in relation with another, whereas morality comes in into religion as a side wind to maintain peace and order. Because religion is a triangular piece, be good to your neighbour because you are both children of God. That is the argument of religion, which is not acceptable at all today. It is pertinent to note that every religion preaches morality but morality is not the root of religion. It is a wagon attached to the religion. Since ancient time it is attached and detached by so called religion as the occasion requires. The action of morality in the functioning of religion is casual and occasional. Morality in religion is therefore not provides effective base for its existence. Therefore, today there is question regarding making morality as a basis of religion, but it sad to say that it not possible to made morality as a basis of religion because of two reasons -

1. It is hard for mankind to liberate itself from the entanglement of God and soul. It is hard for mankind to give up belief in **rites and ceremonies**. It is hard for mankind to give up its belief in Karma.
2. Mankind not ready to accept the relevance of morality with the social, economic and political aspects. Generally mankind is happy to observe the morality casually and occasionally in their day to day life. For this always justification is given that mankind is intent on its selfishness and takes delight and pleasure in it. So it is hard for mankind to accept morality as a base of religion by overriding selfishness. Therefore, I dare to say that even though mankind is religious but not right one, hence we are facing the problems of as mentioned above.

4. Morality and Law

In the above context obviously the next question will be raised what is the place of morality in law? The simple answer is Morality is law and law is Morality. In other words, in law morality takes the place of God although there is no God in law. In law there is no place for prayers, pilgrimages, rituals, ceremonies or sacrifices. Morality is the essence of law. Without it there is no law. Morality in law arises from the direct necessity for man to love man. It does not require the sanction of God. It is not to please God that man has to be moral. It is for his own good that man has to love man.

Instead of going into theories of law I would like to say that law must be based on such religion which not only recognizes the morality but it must be sacred and Universal also. In this regard the question may be raised that when is a thing sacred? Why is a thing sacred? In every human society, primitive or advanced, there are some things or beliefs which it regards as sacred and the rest as profane. When a thing or belief has reached the stage of being sacred (pavitra) it means that **it cannot be violated**. Indeed it cannot be touched. It is taboo. Contrary to this, a thing or a belief which is profane (apavitra), i.e., outside the field of the sacred, **may be violated**. It means one can act contrary to it, without feeling any fear or qualms of conscience. The sacred is something holy. To transgress it is a sacrilege.

The next question will be why is a thing made sacred? To confine the scope of the question to the matter in hand, why morality should have been made sacred? Three factors seem to have played their part in making morality sacred¹ and got status of law.

1. The social need for protecting the best. The background of this question lies imbedded in what is called the struggle of existence and the survival of the fittest. This arises out of the **Theory of Evolution**. It is common knowledge that evolution takes place through a struggle for existence because the means of

food supply in early times were so limited. The struggle is bitter. Nature is said to be red in claw and tooth. In this struggle which is bitter and bloody only the fittest survive. Such is the original state of society. In the course of ancient past someone must have raised the question, is the fittest (the strongest) the best? Would not the weakest if protected be ultimately the best for advancing the ends and aims of society? The then prevailing state of society seems to have given an answer in the affirmative. Then comes the question what is the way to protect the weak? Nothing less than to impose some restraints upon the fittest. In this lies the origin and necessity for morality. This morality had to be sacred because it was imposed originally on the fittest, i.e., the strongest. This has very serious consequences. Does morality in becoming social become anti-social? Is it not that there is no morality among thieves? There is morality among businessmen to observe corrupt practice⁶. There is morality among fellow castemen and there is also morality among a gang of robbers⁷. But this morality is marked by isolation and exclusiveness. It is a morality to protect "group interest." It is therefore anti-social. It is the isolation and exclusiveness of this kind of morality which throws its anti-social spirit in relief. The same is true where a group observes morality whether in the name of religion or not because it has interests of its own to protect. This consequently results into:

1. Society becomes group organization of society.
2. If society continues to consist of anti-social groups, society will remain a disorganized and a factional society. The danger of a disorganized and factional state of society is that it sets up a number of different models and standards.
3. In the absence of common models and common standards society cannot be a harmonious whole.
4. With such different models and standards it is impossible for the individual to attain consistency of mind.

5. A society which rests upon the supremacy of one group over another irrespective of its rational or proportionate claims inevitably leads to conflict.

Therefore, only way to put a stop to conflict is to have common rules of morality which are sacred to all.

Safeguard the growth of the individual. Under the struggle for existence or under group rule the interests of the individuals are not safe. The group set-up prevents an individual from acquiring consistency of mind which is possible only when society has common ideals, common models. His thoughts are led astray and this creates a mind whose seeing unity is forced and distorted.

2. The group set-up leads to discrimination and denial of justice. The group set-up leads to stratification of classes. Those who are masters remain masters and those who are born in slavery remain slaves. Owners remain owners and workers remain workers. The privileged remain privileged and the serfs remain serfs. This means that there can be liberty for some but not for all. This means that there can be equality for a few but none for the majority. What is the remedy? The only remedy lies in making fraternity universally effective. What is fraternity? It is nothing but another name for brotherhood of men which is another name for morality. This is why the law is morality and as law is sacred so is morality.

5. Role of Law

In the above context any one can raise the question as traditional religion is failed and morality having no place in religion then by what today's society should be governed?

There are three alternatives to be chosen by today's society -

1. Society may choose not to have any law, as an instrument of Government. For law is nothing if it is not an instrument of Government. This means society chooses the road to anarchy.
2. Society may choose the Police State, i.e., dictatorship as an instrument of Government.

3. Society may choose Welfare State in which law enforced by the Magistrate wherever people fail to observe the law.

It is unbeatable reality that in anarchy and dictatorship liberty always lost. Only in the third choice liberty survives. Those who want liberty must therefore have accepted the Rule of Law. Therefore, today's modern world order needs new kind of religion, which not only recognizes the morality and law but which is scientific one also.

As per my view Buddha Dhamma will be the best foundation to establish welfare State which assures relation between religion, morality and law at par with today's demands of modern society. One may raise the question how only Buddha Dhamma can maintain the relation between religion, morality and law? How Buddha Dhamma can give answer to today's movement - Occupy Wall Street, Corporate Corrupt Practices, Corruption and so on? To answer these questions I would like to emphasis on the **Madhyama Marga (Majjhima Patipada)**, of the Buddha.

1. There were two extremes, a life of pleasure and a life of self-mortification. One says let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die. The other says, kill all vasanas (desires) because they bring rebirth.
2. He rejected both as unbecoming to man. Because - (a) So long as we remains active and continues to lust after either worldly or heavenly pleasures, all mortification is in vain, and (b) we cannot be free from self by leading a wretched life of self-mortification if we do not thereby succeed in quenching the fires of lust. Unless and until one has been conquered one self and become free from lust, not desire worldly pleasures, and the satisfaction of natural wants then nothing will defile him/her. So everyone should eat and drink according to the needs of body. The sensuality of all kinds is enervating. The sensual man is a slave of his passion. All pleasure seeking is degrading and vulgar. He further said that satisfy the needs of life is not an evil, to keep the body in good health is a duty, or

otherwise you shall not be able to keep your mind strong and clear and have the lamp of wisdom burning.

So these two extremes which man ought not to follow the habitual indulgence on the one hand, of those things whose attraction depends upon the passions, and especially of sensuality a low and pagan way of seeking satisfaction, unworthy, unprofitable and the habitual practice thereof, and on the other band, of asceticism or self-mortification, which is painful unworthy and unprofitable.

3. Therefore there is a need to follow the middle path which avoids both these extremes. This middle path i.e. Dhamma (religion) had nothing to do with God and Soul. Dhamma had nothing to do with life after death. Nor has his Dhamma any concern with rituals and ceremonies.
4. He discussed basic postulate of Dhamma - (a) Man and the relation of man to man in his life on earth, (b) Men are living in sorrow, in misery and poverty. The world is full of suffering and that how to remove this suffering from the world is the only purpose of Dhamma. Nothing else is Dhamma. The recognition of the existence of suffering and to show the way to remove suffering is the foundation and basis of his Dhamma. This can be the only foundation and justification for Dhamma. A religion which fails to recognize this is no religion at all. Whatsoever recluses Brahmins (i.e., preachers of religion) understand not, as it really is, that the misery in the world and the escape therefrom, is the main problem of Dhamma, such recluses and Brahmins in my opinion are not to be regarded as, recluses and Brahmins; nor have those worthies come to know fully of themselves what in this very life is the real meaning of Dhamma.

One may think that if the foundation of Dhamma is the recognition of the existence of suffering and the removal of suffering, how Dhamma removes suffering? The Buddha's answer to this question is that if every person followed -

(1) **The Path of Purity**⁸ (Pancha shila) - It teaches that a person who wishes to be good must recognize some principles as principles of life. The recognition of the principles is most essential for every man. For every man must have a standard by which to judge whatever he does. And these principles according to my teachings constitute the standard. One may raise question why are these principles worthy of recognition as a standard of life.” The answer to this question you will find for yourselves, if you ask: “Are these principles good for the individual?” also if you ask: “Do they promote social good?” “If your answers to these questions are in the affirmative then it follows that the principles of my **Path of Purity** are worthy of recognition as forming a true standard of life.”

(2) **The Path of Righteousness**⁹ (Ashtanga Marga) - It is nothing but path of righteousness it is having eight constituents to make a life right one. They are (a) Right Views - to remove Avijja (Nescience), (b) Right aims, aspirations and ambitions - it means that aims, aspirations and ambitions shall be noble and praise- worthy and not ignoble and unworthy, (c) Right Speech - to make speech sensible and to the purpose, (d) Right behaviour - every action should be founded on respect for the feelings and rights of others i.e. the course of conduct which must be in harmony with the fundamental laws of existence, (e) Right livelihood - the individual should earn his livelihood without causing injury or injustice to others, (f) Right Endeavour - It has four purposes - 1) To prevent states of mind which are in conflict with the Ashtangamarga, 2) To suppress such states of mind which may already have arisen, 3) To bring into existence states of mind which will help a man to fulfill the requirements of the Ashtangamarga and 4) To promote the further growth and increase of such states of mind as already may have arisen. This ultimately helps to remove Avijja, (g) Right mindfulness and thoughtfulness - It means constant wakefulness of the mind i.e. watch and ward by the mind over the evil passions, (h) Right concentration of mind - It trains the mind to concentrate and to think of some Kusala Kamma (Good Deeds and Thoughts) during concentration and

thereby eliminate the tendency of the mind to be drawn towards Akusala Kamma (Bad Deeds and Bad Thoughts) arising from the hindrances.

These **Ashtanga Marga** ultimately helps the man to overcome five hindrances i.e. covetousness, ill-will, sloth and torpor, doubt and indecision, which are really fetters in the living right life.

Buddha raised the question that “Is not personal purity the foundation of good in the world? Is not personal purity undermined by covetousness, passion, ignorance, the destruction of life, theft, adultery and lying? Is it not necessary for personal purity to build up sufficient strength of character so that these evils should be kept under control? How can a man be the instrument of good if he has no personal purity in him? Why do men not mind enslaving or dominating others? Why do men not mind making the lives of others unhappy? Is it not because men are not righteous in their conduct towards one another? Will not the practice of the Ashtanga Marga, the path of right views, right aims, right speech, right livelihood, right means, right mindfulness, right perseverance, and right contemplation, in short, the Path of Righteousness, if followed by everyone, remove all injustice and inhumanity that man does to man? The answer will be “Yes.”

(3) **The Path of Virtue**”, it would bring about the end of all suffering. These are states of Perfection the path of virtue meant the observance of the virtues called: (1) Sila - it is moral temperament, the disposition not to do evil and the disposition to do good to be ashamed of doing wrong. To avoid to do evil for fear of punishment is Sila. Sila means fear of doing wrong, (2) Dana - it means the giving of one's possessions, blood and limbs and even one's life, for the good of others without expecting anything in return,, (3) Uppekha - It means detachment as distinguished from indifference. It is a state of mind where there is neither like nor dislike. Remaining unmoved by the result and yet engaged in the pursuit of it, (4) Nekkhamma - It is nothing but renunciation of the pleasures of the world, (5) Virya - It is doing with all your might whatever you have undertaken to- do with

never a thought of turning back, whatever you have undertaken to do, (6) Khanti - it means not to meet hatred by hatred is the essence of it. For hatred is not appeased by hatred. It is appeased only by forbearance, (7) Succha - It is nothing but truth. A person must never tell a lie. His speech must be truth and nothing but truth, (8) Adhithana - It is nothing but resolute determination to reach the goal, (9) Karuna - This means loving kindness to human beings and (10) Maitri - It is nothing but extending fellow feeling to all beings, not only to one who is a friend but also to one who is a foe: not only to man but to all living beings.

Buddha raised the questions Is not Dana necessary to remove the suffering of the needy and the poor and to promote general good? Is not Karuna necessary to be drawn to the relief of poverty and suffering wherever it exists? Is not Nekkhamma necessary to selfless work? Is not Uppekha necessary for sustained endeavour even though there is no personal gain? Is not love for man necessary?" He emphasized that Love is not enough; what is required is Maitri. It is wider than love. It means fellowship not merely with human beings but with all living beings. It is not confined to human beings. Is not such Maitri necessary? What else can give to all living beings the same happiness which one seeks for one's own self, to keep the mind impartial, open to all, with affection for everyone and hatred for none?" The answer to all this questions is ultimately "Yes."

Besides, this he said that the practice of these virtues must, however, be accompanied by Prajna, i.e., intelligence. One may raise the question that why Prajna is necessary? The answer to this question depends upon answer to the question that the qualities of a good man are - do no evil, think nothing that is evil, get his livelihood in no evil way and say nothing that is evil or is likely to hurt anyone. But is doing good deeds blindly to be welcomed? Certainly the answer is "no". If it was enough, then a tiny babe could be proclaimed to be always doing good. For as yet, the babe does not know what a body means, much less will it do evil with its body beyond kicking about: it does not know what speech

is, much less will it say anything evil beyond crying; it does not know what thought is, beyond crying with delight; it does not know what livelihood is, much less will it get its living in an evil way, beyond sucking its mother. The Path of Virtue must, therefore, be subject to test of Prajna which is another name for understanding and intelligence. There is also another reason why Prajna-Paramitas is so important and so necessary. There must be Dana. But without Prajna, Dana may have a demoralizing effect. Further, there must be Karuna. But without Prajna, Karuna may end in supporting evil. Every act of Paramitas must be tested by Prajna Paramitas which is another name for wisdom. He premise that there must be knowledge and consciousness of what wrong conduct is, how it arises; similarly, there must also be knowledge and consciousness of what is right conduct and wrong conduct. Without such knowledge there cannot be real goodness though the act may be good. That is why Prajna is a necessary virtue.

Buddha knows that one may express his view against Dhamma that it is pessimistic because it calls the attention of mankind to the existence of suffering. But such a view of against Dhamma would be wrong. No doubt his Dhamma recognizes the existence of suffering but forget not that it also lays equal stress on the removal of suffering. His Dhamma has in it both hope and purpose. Its purpose is to remove Avijja it means ignorance of the existence of suffering.

There is hope in it because it shows the way to put an end to human suffering. Therefore, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar had found Buddha as a reformer, full of the most earnest moral purpose and trained in all the intellectual culture of not only his time but today's modern changed circumstances also, who had the originality and the courage to put forth deliberately and with a knowledge of opposing views, the doctrine of a salvation to be found here, in this life, in inward change of heart to be brought about by the practice of self-culture and self-control. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar said that what the Buddha calls Dhamma differs fundamentally from what is called religion. What the Buddha calls Dhamma is analogous to what

the European theologians call Religion. But there is no greater affinity between the two. On the other hand, the differences between the two are very great. On this account some European theologians refuse to recognize the Buddha's Dhamma as Religion. There need be no regrets over this. The loss is theirs. It does no harm to the Buddha's Dhamma. Rather, it shows what is wanting in Religion. Instead of entering into this controversy it is better to proceed to give an idea of Dhamma and show how it differs from Religion. As stated earlier religion, it is said, is personal and one must keep it to oneself. One must not let it play its part in public life. Contrary to this, Dhamma is social. It is fundamentally and essentially so. Dhamma is righteousness, which means right relations between man and man in all spheres of life. From this it is evident that one man if he is alone does not need Dhamma. But when there are two men living in relation to each other they must find a place for Dhamma whether they like it or not, they cannot escape from it. One may raise the question what is Dhamma? And why is Dhamma necessary? According to the Buddha, Dhamma consists of **Prajna** and **Karuna**. 'What is Prajna? And why Prajna? Prajna is nothing but understanding. The Buddha made Prajna one of the two corner-stones of His Dhamma because he did not wish to leave any room for superstition. What is Karuna? And why Karuna? Karuna is love. Because, without it Society can neither live nor grow, that is why the Buddha made it the second corner-stone of His Dhamma. This is the definition of the Buddha's Dhamma. How different is this definition of Dhamma from that of Religion. So ancient, yet so modern is the definition of Dhamma given by the Buddha. So aboriginal yet so original. Not borrowed from anyone, yet so true. A unique amalgam of Pradnya and Karuna is the Dhamma of the Buddha. This is the basic the difference between Religion and Dhamma .

6. Conclusion

In conclusion I would like to say that the Buddha Dhamma so ancient but has given correct place to the morality and law, and is the ray of hop to contemporary society. Therefore, todays should

be based on Dhamma, which is enforced by law, and govern the people wherever they fails to observe the path of righteousness. So the Buddha Dhamma is the only answer to the recent movement started at national and international level **viz.** -Occupy Wall Street, Corporate corrupt practices like inter trading, violation of Human Rights, Right to Development, Good Governance and so on, because all these movement are meant to eradicate the greed, passion or lust for the wealth from the powerful sections of society. But it is pertinent to note that these movements are not set on the proper basis or foundation or principles this consequently may be resulted into state of anarchy and chaos in those countries. This state will deny justice, liberty, equality and fraternity to everybody hence this state is not beneficial for the human society as a whole. So I am of the view that these movements should make Buddha and His Dhamma the guiding principle or basis because the Buddha and His Dhamma stresses on righteousness, which means right relations between man and man in all spheres of life. When there are two men living in relation to each other they must find a place for Dhamma as a law and they cannot escape from it. Moreover, his Dhamma consists of **Prajna** and **Karuna**. Because, without it today's modern society neither live nor grow. Hence, only Buddha Dhamma gives scientific answer to the today's social, economic and political problems faced by contemporary society.

Notes

1. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics Vol. X p. 669.
2. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar writings and speeches: The Buddha And His Dhamma, Vol. 11, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, Siddhartha Publication's, 4th Edt. Government Photozinco Press, Pune 1991, p. 225
3. Ibid p. 315
4. Ibid
5. Ibid p. 315
6. E.g. present crises in USA and European countries.
7. E.g. Godhara carnage in Gujarat, India
8. Ibid 9. Supra note 2 p. 122
10. Ibid p. 123