




THE

# PERSPECTIVE



D. B. THENGADI



PRAKASHANA: SAHITYASINDHU, BANGALORE

# THE PERSPECTIVE

## PUBLISHERS' NOTE

The ink of the thinker has often been compared to the blood of martyrs. The written as well as the spoken words have been the precursors to many a revolution. But with the passage of time certain ideas and concepts have fallen into disrepute, some have been covered with cobwebs, certain others are running riot in their distorted form, some others are being mouthed glibly by self-seekers. It will be no exaggeration to say that in this book, Sri Dattopant B. Thengadi has succeeded in throwing a fresh, revealing light on many an unthought of aspect of gnawing problems and confusing concepts.

Sri Thengadi is a front-ranking representative of that new generation of young leaders which this century has thrown up. One of the top-notch trade-unionists of the country, he has been painstakingly striving to give a nationalistic bias to trade-union activities, and is the Founder-General Secretary of Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh. A Rajya Sabha member since 1964, he is loved alike by admirers and detractors for his gentle, unassuming and pleasant ways. His writings bear testimony to his suave and winning presentation. Even when fighting with the devil, he does not shirk from giving it its due.

Sri Thengadi who has just crossed fifty, is a man of multi-interests and a linguist. He has been constantly sharing his ideas with the public through varied writings in different journals. We are thankful to him for permitting us to present them in book form.

As the author himself has said, both he and the publishers will feel satisfied in their efforts if these articles provoke the readers to ponder over the issues raised in greater depth.

13-12-1971

BANGALORE

—PUBLISHERS

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. No Choultry Nationalism for India	1
2. Our Enemy Number Two	8
3. The Original Home of the Hindus	17
4. Eternal Dharma and Ever-changing 'Isms'	25
5. Real Character and Spirit of Hindu Law	28
6. Zend Avesta—A Neglected Hindu Scripture	32
7. Hindu Rashtra as Old as the Vedas	35
8. On 'Dravidianism'	40
9. Buddha, Marx & Dr. Ambedkar	52
10. Will the Religion of Buddha Be Betrayed ?	56
11. Buddha Did Not Establish a Church	62
12. Has the Condition of Scheduled Castes Really Improved ?	65
13. Salvation Through Hindu Nationalism	70
14. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar on Our Hindu Society	79
15. Confucianism Vs. Communism in China	84
16. Marxism Vs. Hinduism	91
17. Bharatiya Conception of Economic Order	101
18. Marxism Vs. Peasantry	116
19. Workers' Success is Communists' Failure	120
20. Islam and Communism are Incompatible	122
21. Nationalism Vs. Foreign Sectarianism	131
22. Denationalisation Diagnosed	138
23. A Word to Our Christian Compatriots	146

---

The invasion of armies is resisted;  
the invasion of ideas is not.

## No Choultry Nationalism For India

( *A brief study of the American experience* )

Having lived in this ancient land for thousands of years as a full-fledged nation, we have now set ourselves to the task of defining 'nationalism' — of understanding the import and implications of that concept. Instead of drawing conclusions from historical facts, our leaders are trying to adjust facts to their hypotheses. A nation, we are told, is only a *Dharma-shāla*; whosoever happens to reside within its frontiers is its national. To substantiate this theory of Choultry-Nationalism, they usually cite the example of the United States of America. Hence the need to inquire into the nature of American nationalism.

Has the process of national integration been complete in USA? Are the various groups that happen to reside in that vast country, integrated emotionally? Has the experiment of evolving a composite culture and a composite nationality been successful on the American soil?

### **British as Host Society**

Mr. Milton M. Gordon who has made an extensive study of the meaning and implications of minority group assimila-

tion in the United States, comes to conclude that while 'acculturation' or 'behavioural assimilation'—by which he means the absorption of the cultural behaviour patterns of the 'host' society—has taken place in America to a considerable degree, 'structural assimilation'—which refers to the entrance of the immigrants and their descendants into the social organisations, institutional activities and general civic life of the receiving society—has not, with some important exceptions, been extensive. Structural assimilation has been retarded there by religious and racial lines.

Red Indians, Negroes, Mexican - Americans and Puerto Ricans retain their separate social structures. The integration of Indians with the national society was never attempted. They were liquidated.

The Negroes were treated differently. They were enslaved and Americanised to the extent they could be. Today they are hardly the equals of American Whites. But they long ago forgot their languages. They do not even know who among them came from which African country. They have no particular feeling for America either.

### **The Negro Americanised**

The national society of USA is not, as someone would have us believe, just a congregation of whites belonging to different European countries retaining, even after their immigration, their separate national languages, national cultures and affinities. No doubt, there is a tendency on the part of the non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants to build up social institutions of their own ancestral groups within their ethnic enclaves. But there has also been an effort—conscious as well as unconscious—on the part of the 'host' society to 'acculturate' the alien newcomers. The chief instrument of their acculturation is the Public School system with its free

and compulsory education turning out the typical American all the time.

Though at the time of the Revolution, groups of almost all European nationalities were settled in America, the dominant group was English. British rule till the Revolution also gave America a wholly English orientation. Whoever came later had to fit into this mould. Even when immigration assumed huge proportions, some knowledge of the English language was required in all immigrants.

#### **Washington and Jefferson's Warning**

The founding fathers always had mental reservations about large-scale immigration of non-Anglo-Saxons. The basis of American Nationalism was 'Anglo-conformity' which implied "the desirability of maintaining English institutions (as modified by the American Revolution), the English language and English-oriented cultural patterns as dominant and standard in American life." Consequently, George Washington did not favour indiscriminate and large-scale immigration of non-Anglo-Saxons. "For", wrote Washington, "by so doing, they retain the language, habits and principles (good or bad) which they bring with them." Thomas Jefferson, though liberal otherwise, held similar views about mass immigration. The determination of the Germans in Pennsylvania to retain their distinct national characteristics was resented by Benjamin Franklin.

#### **Pro-Anglo-Saxon Movement and Laws**

This urge for Anglo-conformity expressed itself through the Native-American Movement of the 1830's and 1840's, the "American" or "Know-Nothing" Party of the 1850's, the Federal Selective Laws restricting immigration passed from 1882, and the "Americanisation" movement during the First World War period - all intended "to strip the immigrant of



his native culture and attachments and make him over into an American along Anglo-Saxon lines"; the national - origins formula for immigration quotas which was given effect to in 1929 and the various restrictive laws which were almost reaffirmed in the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. And so Anglo-Saxon England and Germany have a much higher quota than France or Italy, which are considered Latin, and so racially 'inferior'.

It was found that immigrants from Northern and Western Europe could more easily adopt the standard Anglo-Saxon cultural pattern and that Eastern Europeans were of a very different type. They did not possess the Anglo-Teutonic conceptions of law, order and Government; "their coming has served to dilute tremendously our national stock and to corrupt our civic life. Everywhere these people tend to settle in groups or settlements, and to set up here their national manners, customs and observances. Our task is to break up these groups or settlements, to assimilate and to implant in their children so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conceptions of righteousness, law and order, and popular Government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth."

It is not suggested that theories other than that of 'Anglo-conformity' have not been prevalent in the USA. But to be sure, they have neither dominated the American mind nor influenced the evolution of American Nationalism.

#### **Cultural Pluralism Not Realised**

Horace Kallen, for example, has been elaborating for close on half a century, his theme of 'cultural pluralism'. All non-English immigrants had created ethnic enclaves and rited to preserve some of their native cultural patterns—their

own languages, religious and communal institutions, and ancestral cultures. Kallen dreamt of the United States which were "in the process of becoming a federal state not merely as a union of geographical and administrative unities, but also as a cooperaton of cultural diversities, as a federation or commonwealth of national cultures."

The theory is recent in origin. The process as visualised by Kallen is "far from having been thoroughly realised." It has not been able to withstand the pressure of the 'Americanisation' programmes.

### **The Melting Pot Theory**

The Indian theory of composite culture and composite nationality has its parallel in the 'Melting Pot' theory of J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur, a French-born writer, Frederic Jackson Turner, author of 'The Significance of the Frontier in American History', and Israel Zangwill, an English-Jewish writer. The theory found its best expression in Zangwill's drama, 'The Melting pot', whose hero David says, "America is God's crucible, the great Melting Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and re-forming!.....Here you stand in your fifty groups, with your fifty languages and histories and your fifty blood hatreds and rivalries. But you won't be long like that, brothers, for these are the fires of God you have come to—these are the fires of God. A fig for your feuds and vendettas! Germans and Frenchmen, Irishmen and Englishmen, Jews and Russians—into the crucible with you all ; God is making the American !"

### **Mrs. Kennedy's Three Melting Pots**

These lines were penned in 1908. And on the eve of the First World War it became evident that the sentiments expressed in 'The Melting Pot' had no relevance to the realities. The immigrants from Germany had always defied

the processes of Anglo-conformity. They could not, therefore, identify themselves with the American Nation. In the middle of the last century, some of their leaders aspired to create an all-German state within the Union, while others hoped to carve out a separate German nation, "as soon as the expected dissolution of the union under the impact of the slavery controversy should have taken place." The World War turned every German into a dangerous citizen—a potential enemy of the American nation. Hence the propriety of the Americanisation movement during that period.

Even advocates of the 'Melting Pot' theory found out on subsequent investigations, that it could not stand the test of realism. Different non-English nationality groups exhibited a tendency to identify themselves—to an extent to which they were willing to give up their separate entities—with the different religious groups, and not directly with the American nation as a whole. This led Mrs. Kennedy to conclude that the American picture resembled a 'triple melting pot' based on religious divisions—major religious groups being Protestants, Catholics and Jews—rather than a 'single melting pot'. Mrs. Kennedy's observations are bound to disappoint the Indian advocates of composite culture and nationality.

#### **John Quincy Adams' Plain-Speaking**

The academic theories based upon wishful thinking notwithstanding, the attitude of those who founded the American Nation is properly reflected in a letter written in 1818 by John Quincy Adams, the then Secretary of State. "They (immigrants to America)", wrote Adams, "come to a life of independence, but to a life of labour—and if they cannot accommodate themselves to the character, moral, political and physical, of this country with all its compensating balance of good and evil, the Atlantic is always open to them

to return to the land of their nativity and their fathers. To one thing they must make up their minds, or they will be disappointed in every expectation of happiness as Americans. They must cast off the European skin, never to resume it. They must look forward to their posterity rather than backward to their ancestors, they must be sure that whatever their own feelings may be, those of their children will cling to the prejudices of this country.”

### No Choultry Nationalism

Whatever holds good in case of a younger nation of the West may not necessarily be true in case of the oldest nation of the world. The *Rāshtrava* as evolved in Bharat from ancient times is qualitatively different from the ‘nationalism’ of the West, though for practical convenience the two may be treated as synonymous. Nevertheless, the leaders of ‘India that is Bharat’ should not be allowed to twist historical facts regarding other nations. Students of history with a scientific attitude would prefer inconvenient facts to convenient illusions. The findings of Mr. Gordon of the Russel Sage Foundation would be equally helpful to all those interested in this subject.

As stated earlier, American Nationalism is facing the problem of structural pluralism. But the growth of national consciousness so far has been the result of the process of behavioural assimilation in which Anglo-Saxons played the role of a ‘host’ society. The founders of the American Nation did not subscribe to the *Dharmashāla* brand of nation-concept.

—Diwali, 1962

Next only to self-oblivion, confusion of thought seems to be the worst enemy of Nationalist Bharat which is entrusted with the eternal mission of saving humanity from the clutches of bestiality and leading it towards Godhood.

#### **Class-Conflict Partitions Nation Horizontally**

Even some of our leaders suffer from confused thinking. They feel that they can subscribe to the theory of class-conflict and still continue as nationalists. They fail to perceive the incompatibility between class-conflict and nationalism. Class-conflict partitions the nation horizontally. No patriot can tolerate such partitions—vertical or horizontal.

As Napoleon observed in his political testament, i.e., his letter of instructions to his son, “To divide the interests of a nation is .... to engender civil war. A thing indivisible by nature cannot be divided ; it can only be mutilated.”

And yet we come across Hindu leaders who seek to bring about a sort of compromise between Hinduism and Socialism. They describe themselves as ‘Hindu Socialists’ ! There is nothing wrong about such ‘synthesis’, they feel.

They innocently forget that it is impossible to import any foreign concept or custom without importing simultaneously its attendant psychological environment.

For example, can we continue to celebrate May Day without sowing seeds of internecine warfare?

But this basic psychological fact has escaped their attention. This indicates how the agents of Marxist philosophy have succeeded in misleading a section of innocent nationalists.

True to their imported technique of propaganda the communists have been conducting a systematic campaign to achieve this end. They have been trying to create an impression that before the advent of communism there was no activity in our land to improve the lot of the down-trodden in general and the workers in particular. As if the spirit of Bharatiya Sanskriti is not sufficiently humanising!

#### **Pioneers of the Indian Trade Union Movement Were No Marxists**

They would do well to remember that even in modern times Mahatma Jyotiba Phulay organised the labourers and conducted agitations for the redressal of their grievances during a period when Bharatiyas were not even acquainted with this fashionable 'ism' of the West.

The peasants' revolt led by Vasudeo Balwant Phadke was inspired by thoroughly Bharatiya ideals.

The humanitarianism of Sri N. M. Lokhande, the first labour leader of our country in modern times, had its roots in the traditions of the soil.

Pioneers of the regular trade union movement, organised after the end of the First World War, were all votaries of Bharatiya culture; no western 'ism' can claim the credit for their distinguished accomplishments.

Mahatma Gandhiji sought to build a labour movement on the foundation of Bharatiyatva.

Insistence upon austerity, simplicity, self-restraint and curtailment of wants; preference for the living, instead of lifeless machinery; firm faith in the dignity and sanctity of human labour; rejection of the western concept of economics divorced from ethics; urge for replacement of material and economic values leading to *himsa*, by human and ethical ones as symbolised by *ahimsa*—all these constitute the economic aspect of Gandhism which is an explanation or elaboration of the Ishavasyaic directive: *Tena tyaktena bhunjeethāh*.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, whose contribution to the labour movement of India has been quite substantial, would not touch communism with a pair of tongs.

“There is no possibility of my joining the communists”, declared Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar at the District Conference of the Depressed Classes held at Masur under his chairmanship in September 1937.

“I am a confirmed enemy of the communists who exploit labourers for their political ends”, he added.

The gradual and intelligent conversion of Sri M. N. Roy, yet another labour leader of stature, from communism to New Humanism illustrates further the hollowness of the communist claim.

True, in ancient Bharat no one ever organised a strike or staged a demonstration—with the slogan *Hamāri Māngen Poori Karo*. But this absence of feverishness on the economic front was the result of our economic prosperity and social stability. The over-emphasis on ‘demands’ indicates backwardness—economic as well as intellectual.

### Four Basic Urges

What are described today as 'basic demands' were recognised by our ancients as the 'basic needs'. They recognised four elemental urges: *Āhār nidrā bhaya maithunamcha*.

In keeping with the Bharatiya tradition of conveying maximum meaning through the minimum words, every one of these words is symbolic.

The term *āhāram* stands for what in modern terminology would be described as the right to livelihood, i.e., the right to work and wages. Basic wages, dearness allowance, increments, bonus and various other allowances would thus be covered by the term *āhāram*.

*Nidrā* symbolises the right to rest. Modern demands for the regulation of working hours and the workload, for paid holidays and adequate leave facilities, are all covered by the term *nidrā*.

*Bhaya* means apprehension. In the industrial context it stands for apprehension of unemployment, discontinuity of service, sickness, accident, old age, premature death etc; unemployment doles, provision for security of service, workmen's compensation, provident fund, Employees' State Insurance, old-age pension, gratuity, retrenchment compensation, widowhood allowance—all these and other social security measures which are calculated to ensure workers against all apprehensions.

The last term signifies minimum comforts of life. Different labour welfare schemes, industrial housing schemes etc., serve this purpose.

Thus these four terms symbolise practically all the Charters of Demands put forth by the workers' organisations. Instead of emphatically forwarding them as 'demands' our forefathers simply took cognisance of them as Elemental Urges.



Reasonable satisfaction of these urges was taken to represent the *prakriti*; starvation of or over-indulgence in these, the *vikriti*. The average human being is not inclined to subjective thinking unless and until these objective needs of his *prakriti* are adequately fulfilled. Normally, the sphere of *samskriti* begins where the reasonable Charter of Demands ends. Communists all over the world are claiming for their 'ism' the monopoly of economic thinking. It is however wrong to presume that there was no thinking on economic problems before Karl Marx, or that the great spiritual leaders of mankind were oblivious of the material aspect of individual and social life. They did not ignore economics, nor did they allow it to encroach indiscriminately upon all the various departments of human life and thought. The material aspect was assigned the place it rightly deserved in the Scheme of Life. It was realised that matter was only a superstructure on something non-material, which was basic. We, the Bharatiyas, evolved a perfect socio-economic order consistent with the Universal Laws, ensuring for every individual the attainment of the four *purushārthas*. In the Bharatiya Scheme of *purushārthas* the *artha* and the *kāma* were properly balanced and sublimated by the *dharma* and the *moksha*.

**Religion is Against Materialism,  
But Ensures Material Prosperity**

The tenets of all religions are conducive to the material welfare of the society, but they never cherished or declared it as their only or ultimate goal. Ideologically, all religions are opposed to materialism.

The permanent social planning conceived by the Vedic seers is calculated to secure both, the *samutkarsha* (material prosperity), as well as the *nishreyas* (spiritual emancipation).

The non-Vedic Hindu religions exhibit similar characteristics. Lord Buddha was not required to prescribe a complete or comprehensive Law.

Accepting renunciation as the highest ideal, Buddhism welcomes the acquisition of wealth as a great blessing; but it must be subject to *Vinaya*.

Seizing anything that is not offered is strictly prohibited. Servants and workmen are described as one of the six quarters deserving worship by a layman.

Lord Buddha says in *Sigalovada suttanta* :

“In five ways does an Aryan master minister to his servants and employees as the nadir—by assigning them work according to their strength, by supplying them with food and wages, by tending them in sickness, by sharing with them unusual delicacies, by granting leave periodically. In these ways ministered to by their master, servants and employees love their master in five ways—they rise before him, they lie down to rest after him, they are content with what is given to them, they do their work well, and they carry about his praise and good fame.”

Marxism can provide no better guarantee against apprehension of injustice or inequality than the Zoroastrian prayer for the thought well thought, the word well spoken, the deed well done (*Humata, Hukhata, Hvershta*), and directive to the followers of the Way of the Wise Lord to be pure in thoughts and deeds, charitable to those in need, kind to all useful animals, and industrious in tilling the soil, growing trees, raising cattle or doing other profitable and useful labour.

Jainism, the religion of the self-conquerors, stands for complete self-abnegation. Express prohibition of economic exploitation would be superfluous in case of a religion that inspires men to nurse even animals, birds and insects.

Founders of other great religious systems were also not indifferent to the economic life of their respective times and climes. Judaism teaches that good life can be led only in a community. A man must always think of his fellowmen. And whatever one does, he must think of how it would affect other people. Hence the commandments of Jehovah through Moses to order the Israelites, among other things, not to covet or steal others' wealth and to enjoy a weekly holiday.

### **A Word About Islam**

The legal obligation to pay 'Zakat', the encouragement to 'Sadakat', the law of inheritance, the prohibition of interest, the declaration of certain forms of earning and spending as unlawful—through these and other similar measures Mohamed tried to regulate the economic life of Arabia fourteen centuries ago. But all the same he rejected materialism. In the last sermon of his life Mohamed said, "Allah had allowed His servant (Mohamed) to choose either the gifts of this world or the things which belonged to Him, but I chose for myself the latter." Obviously, he was opposed to materialism.

Regarding workmen Mohamed said, "Your servants are your brothers. God has placed them under your charge; who-soever then has a brother under his charge, let him feed him out of what he eats himself, and let him clothe him out of with what he clothes himself, and compel them not to do a work which will overpower them."

The compassion that characterises the Sermon on the Mount and particularly the Last Commandment for mutual love enabled early Christians to organise themselves into the 'Community of Goods'. Whatever anyone of them had, became the property of the entire community. But this was out of one's sweet will. And while praying for 'this day our

daily bread' it was not forgotten that 'man does not live by bread alone'. Could a materialist ever reject the offer of an authority over all the Kingdoms of the earth?

Thus, though attentive to the material needs of the peoples, all religions and their leaders differ from Marxism in that :

1. None of them subscribes to naked materialism;
2. None of them treats man as a mere economic being ; and
3. None of them relies upon external coercion as an instrument for reformation of men and matters.

### **Divinity versus Devil**

Notwithstanding their outward differences which are only apparent and not real, all religions together constitute the camp of the Divinity as opposed to the camp of the Devil led in modern times by the henchmen of Marxism. Essentially all religions are one. As Swami Vivekananda put it, "One Infinite Religion existed all through eternity and will ever exist, and this Religion is expressing itself in various countries in various ways."

In fact, spiritual disciplines of all religions lead to but one common goal, that is the realisation of Advaita. The same Realisation is described by different saints and prophets in different terms so as to suit their respective audiences. Natural culmination of all the spiritual disciplines is in the *Sakshātkāra* of Advaita. Not only that, all religions are thoroughly compatible with the Advaita. As a matter of fact, originally they spring from and ultimately they culminate in the Advaita Darshana. All religions are true because the Advaita is the Truth. This philosophy of spirit constitutes

the *Adhishthāna* of all the philosophies of God. The former renders validity to the latter.

Marxism has launched an offensive against this entire Camp of Divinity.

Who else, if not Hindus, are best suited to become the vanguard of these forces of Spirituality? Bharat Mata has been the eternal torch-bearer of the *Vishwa-Sanskriti*. For the welfare of all beings our nation has always served as the spearhead of the Universal Religion. Triumph of spirituality all over the globe would be ensured if Hindu Nationalism becomes victorious in this our holy land.

The Hindu nationalists must realise the historic importance of their mission. It is to their credit that they have defeated their enemy number one, that is, self-oblivion. Now they must gird up their loins to fight to the finish their enemy number two, namely, confusion of thought.

—15-8-1962

## The Original Home of the Hindus

(The Father of the Indian Constitution, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, was the foremost nationalist leader of the oppressed classes and an erudite scholar. The following is an account of the enlightening dialogue the author had with him. Though the author himself does not agree with all of Sri Ambedkar's conclusions, the dialogue is significant for the fact of Sri Ambedkar's total rejection of the theory of Aryan invasion as "a perversion of scientific investigation".)

**Question :** Do you believe that the Shudras were a non-Aryan aboriginal race?

**Dr. Ambedkar :** No. After deep study of the subject I have come to conclude :

- (i) That the Shudras were Aryans ;
- (ii) That the Shudras belonged to the Kshatriya Class ; and

- (iii) That the Shudras were so important a class of Kshatriyas that some of the most eminent and powerful kings of the ancient Aryan Communities were Shudras.

### Western Theories

**Q :** I know you are well acquainted with the various theories of Western writers about the origin of the non-*Traivarnikas* whom they describe as 'Non-Aryans'. Are there any points on which there seems to be a certain amount of unity among all of them ?

**A :** Yes. Such points comprise the following :

- (1) The people who created the Vedic literature belonged to the Aryan race.
- (2) This Aryan race came from outside India and invaded India.
- (3) The natives of India were known as Dasas and Dasyus who were racially different from Aryans.
- (4) The Aryans were a white race. The Dasas and Dasyus were a dark race.
- (5) The Aryans conquered the Dasas and Dasyus.
- (6) The Dasas and Dasyus after they were conquered and enslaved were called Shudras.
- (7) The Aryans cherished colour prejudice and therefore formed the *chāturvarnya* whereby they separated the white race from the black race such as the Dasas and the Dasyus.

**Q :** What is the basis for these Western Theories ?

**A :** The foundation on which the whole fabric of the theory rests is the proposition that there lived a people who were Aryan by race.

**Q :** Is this proposition correct ?

**A :** The Vedas do not know any such race as the Aryan race. A race may be defined as a body of people possessing certain typical traits which are hereditary.

An examination of the Vedic literature shows that there occur two words in the Rig Veda – one is *Arya* with a short *A* and the other is *Ārya* with a long *Ā*.

The word *Arya* with a short *A* is used in the Rig Veda in 88 places. The word is used in four different senses ; as (1) enemy, (2) respectable person, (3) name for India and (4) owner, Vaishya or citizen.

The word *Ārya* with a long *Ā* is used in the Rig Veda in 31 places. But in none of these is the word used in the sense of race.

The one indisputable conclusion which follows is that the terms *Arya* and *Ārya* which occur in the Vedas have not been used in the racial sense at all.

This is what Prof. Max Mueller says on the subject : “There is no Aryan race in blood ; Aryan, in scientific language, is utterly inapplicable to race.”

The Aryan Race Theory is so absurd that it ought to have been dead long ago.

**Q :** From where did the so-called ‘Aryan race’ come into India ? What was the original home of the ‘Aryan race’ ? Is the theory of Aryan invasion of India a historical fact ?

**A :** There is no evidence in the Vedas of any invasion of India by the Aryan race and its having conquered the Dasas and Dasyus supposed to be natives of India. There is no evidence to show that the distinction between Aryans, Dasas and Dasyus was a racial distinction. The Vedas do not support the contention that the Aryas were different in colour from the Dasas and Dasyus. The word ‘Varna’



originally meant a class holding to a particular faith, and it had nothing to do with colour or complexion.

The Vedic Aryans had no colour prejudice. They were not of one colour. Rama, Krishna, Dirghatamas, Kanva etc., have been described as dark in complexion.

The assertion that the Aryans came from outside and invaded India is not proved and the premise that the Dasas and Dasyus are aboriginal tribes of India is demonstrably false.

### **Invasion Theory a Concoction**

The theory of invasion is an invention. This invention is necessary because of a gratuitous assumption that the Indo-Germanic people are the purest of the modern representatives of the original Aryan race. The theory is based upon nothing but pleasing assumptions, and inferences based on such assumptions. The theory is a perversion of scientific investigation. It is not allowed to evolve out of facts. On the contrary, the theory is preconceived and facts are selected to prove it. It falls to the ground at every point. The Western theory is in conflict with the Rig Veda on a major issue. The Rig Veda being the best evidence on the subject, the theory which is in conflict with it must be rejected. There is no escape.

**Q :** Are there any Hindu scholars who supported this Western theory ?

**A :** This theory has received support from some Brahmin scholars. This is a very strange phenomenon. As Hindus, they should ordinarily show a dislike for the Aryan theory with its express avowal of the superiority of the European races over the Asiatic races. But the Brahmin scholar has not only no such aversion but he most willingly hails it. He claims to be the representative of the Aryan race and he

regards the rest of the Hindus as descendants of the non-Aryans.

**Q :** What is your opinion about the suggestion of Lokamanya Tilak that the original home of the Aryan race was in the Arctic region ?

**A :** This is of course a very original theory. There is only one point which seems to have been over-looked. The horse is a favourite animal of the Vedic Aryans. It was most intimately connected with their life and their religion. The question is : Was the horse to be found in the Arctic region ? If the answer is in the negative, the Arctic Home theory becomes very precarious.

So far as the testimony of the Vedic literature is concerned, it is against the theory that the original home of the Aryans was outside India.

The language in which reference to the seven rivers is made in the Rig Veda (x. 75.5) is very significant. No foreigner would ever address a river in such familiar and endearing terms as 'My Ganga, my Yamuna, my Sarasvati', unless by long association he had developed an emotion about it. In the face of such statements from the Rig-Veda, there is obviously no room for a theory of a military conquest by the Aryan Race of the non-Aryan races of Dasas and Dasyus.

As Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar points out :

"A careful examination of the Mantras where the words Arya, Dasa and Dasyu occur, indicates that they refer not to race but to cult. These words occur mostly in Rig Veda Samhita where Arya occurs about 33 times in mantras which contain 153,972 words on the whole. This rare occurrence is itself a

proof that the tribes that called themselves Aryas were not invaders that conquered the country and exterminated the people. For an invading tribe would naturally boast of its achievements constantly."

—'Life in ancient India in the age of the Mantras' (Pp 11-12):

### **The Fourth Varna**

**Q :** If the theories of European scholars are incorrect, how can one explain the emergence of the Fourth Varna suffering from a number of social disabilities and degradations?

**A :** The whole position can be stated briefly as follows :

- (1) The Shudras were one of the Aryan Communities of the Solar race.
- (2) The Shudras ranked as the Kshatriya Varna in the Indo-Aryan Society.
- (3) There was a time when the Aryan Society recognised only three Varnas, namely, Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. The Shudras were not a separate Varna but a part of the Kshatriya Varna.
- (4) There was a continuous feud between the Shudra Kings and the Brahmins, in which the Brahmins were subjected to many tyrannies and indignities.
- (5) As a result of the hatred towards the Shudras due to their tyrannies and oppressions, the Brahmins refused to invest the Shudras with the Sacred Thread.
- (6) Owing to the loss of the Sacred Thread the Shudras became socially degraded, fell below the rank of the Vaishyas and came to form the Fourth Varna.

**Q:** What about the origin of the Fifth Varna known as untouchables?

**A:** In Vedic times there was no untouchability. As to the period of the Dharma Sutras, there was 'Impurity' but there was no untouchability.

Manu's decision is that there is no Fifth Varna. There was no untouchability at the time of Manu. We can definitely say that Manu Smriti did not enjoin untouchability.

While untouchability did not exist in 200 A.D., it had emerged by 600 A.D. As has been shown by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, cow-killing was made a capital offence by the Gupta kings sometime in the 4th Century A.D. We can, therefore say with some confidence that untouchability was born sometime about 400 A.D.

**Q:** Can the hatred between Buddhism and Brahminism be taken to be the sole cause why 'Broken Men'\* became untouchables?

**A:** Obviously, it cannot be. The propaganda of the Brahmins was directed against Buddhists in general and not against the 'Broken Men' in particular. Since untouchability struck to 'Broken Men' only, it is obvious that there was some additional circumstance which has played its part in fastening untouchability upon them.

**Q:** Can we say that the 'Broken Men' came to be treated as untouchables because they ate beef?

---

*\* In a fight between two tribes, the surviving men of the vanquished tribe found it difficult to retain their identity because of their reduced numerical strength. They, therefore, used to approach the settled agricultural communities and enter into agreement with them. These were termed as 'Broken men'.*

**A :** There need be no hesitation in returning an affirmative answer to this question. No other answer is consistent with facts as we know them.

**Q :** Do the untouchables belong to a separate, non-Aryan race ?

**A :** As I said earlier, historians have made a mistake in proceeding on assumption that the Aryans were a separate race. In this connection, reference may be made to verse 23 of Adhyaya 65 of the Shanti Parva of Mahabharata. The verse says: "In all the Varnas and in all the Ashramas one finds the existence of Dasyus." This indicates that the term 'Dasyus' is not used for a non-Aryan.

If anthropometry is a science which can be depended upon to determine the race of a people, then the results obtained by the application of anthropometry to the various strata of Hindu society disprove that the untouchables belong to a race different from the Aryans and the Dravidians. The measurements establish that the Brahmins and untouchables belong to the same race. If the Brahmins are Aryans, the untouchables are also Aryans. If the Brahmins are Dravidians, the untouchables are also Dravidians. The racial theory of untouchability finds very little support from such facts as we know about the ethnology of India. Racial theory of the origin of untouchability must therefore be abandoned.

Sanatana Dharma is the Universal Law. It is not man-made. It is described as 'Hindu Dharma' because the Hindus were the first to 'see' it, even as in the West Newton was the first to 'see' the Law of Gravitation or Einstein the Law of Relativity. Hindus 'saw' the Dharma and based their socio-economic order on the foundation of its tenets. The details of their order varied from time to time in keeping with the changes in the circumstances which gave rise to different socio-economic problems. But, the guiding principle behind all these changes was the unchangeable, eternal universal Dharma. Dharma, the universal, manifested itself in different forms so as to suit the special requirements of different times and climes. There was difference in details, but what they revealed was invariably the same, i.e., Dharma. With a view to cope with the ever-changing circumstances the Hindus periodically altered the socio-economic details in the light of the Universal Dharma. This is the dynamism of Dharma.

### Isms are Closed Systems of Thought

'Ism' has a specific and limited purpose to serve. It seeks to solve the problems confronting a particular society during a particular period. Even during the same period, different societies are required to face different problems. And, again, one and the same society has to deal with problems different in nature during different periods. Obviously, no one 'ism' can be suitable for all societies during the same period or the same society during different periods. Circumstances are dynamic, isms are static. Ism is a closed system of thought. The moment it ceases to be closed, it ceases to be an 'ism'. Static ism has only limited utility in dealing with the dynamic circumstances—even granting that the ism concerned is as it ought to be.

Very often, isms are not what they are expected to be. The much talked of 'Marxism' is an instance in point. While in *Das Capital*, Marx explained how capitalism would crumble down under the weight of its own internal self-contradictions, curiously enough, he has not written a single word about the economics of socialism or its political mechanism. Consequently Marxism is quite inadequate as an 'ism'. This accounts for the fact that today every group of Marxists is deviationist in the opinion of some other group following 'Marxism'.

Ism suffers from another disadvantage also. Howsoever brilliant the founder may be, he cannot but rely upon the contemporary state of human knowledge for drawing his conclusions or formulating his theories. But frontiers of human knowledge are ever-expanding. In the light of additional facts, the so-far-accepted scientific theories become unscientific. Consequently the conclusions based upon them lose their validity. Thus in course of time, with the advance

of knowledge 'ism' becomes a 'wasm'. Hence our contention :

Old 'ism' changes  
yielding place to the new  
And Dharma fulfils itself  
in many ways  
Lest one good 'ism' should corrupt  
the World.

—September 1966.



Even as the attitude of Hindu Dharma towards different religions has enabled it to become a Confederation of all religions, its attitude towards Law has helped it to become a Vishva Dharma.

The codified laws are incapable of becoming universal in character. To those of us who are accustomed to Codes, the growth of Hindu Law will come as a great surprise. Various are the sources of Hindu Law. Firstly, the four Vedas and their six subsidiary sciences. Then, the Dharma Shastras. The compilers of Dharma Shastras flourished during different periods. They were Manu, Atri, Vishnu, Harita, Yajnavalkya, Usanas, Angiras, Yama, Apastamba, Sambarta, Katyayana, Bṛhaspati, Parasara, Vyasa, Sankha, Likhita, Daksha, Gautam, Satatapa and Vasishta. Other ancient sources being the Meemansa, the Nyaya and the Puranas. The Smritis, the current usage, good conscience—in absence of any other guide—and desire resulting from thorough deliberation are also important as sources of Hindu Law.

It is curious to note that the above authorities have been considerably overshadowed by subsequent commentaries or

digests (Nibandhas). The work of compiling Nibandhas was going on from the ninth to the nineteenth century. The last Nibandha, i.e., *Vivāda-Bhangārṇava* or *Vivādārṇava-Setu* was compiled at the request of Warren Hastings. These Nibandhas have given rise to different schools of Hindu Law governing different parts of the country, such as, the Dayabhaga School governing Eastern parts; the Banaras School governing the whole of Northern India including Orissa but excluding Mithila and Punjab; the Mithila School governing the tract of land bounded by the three rivers, Gandaka, Kosi and Ganges; the Western School governing Maharashtra, Berar, North Kanara and Sindh; the Southern School governing almost the entire area of the former Madras Presidency; and the Punjab School governing Punjab.

From times immemorial the Hindus are continuing their existence as a civilized society. But during this entire period they never formulated any Code of Law. The Smritis are not the codes. One Smriti does not exclude the other, nor does one Smriti repeal the others. They are like the American Restatement of Law or English Digests of Case Law. All the Smritis are sources of Law.

Another interesting feature of Hindu Law is the fact that in case of any inconsistency between the usage and the Smriti, the usage is supposed to carry with it greater validity. The case of 'Marumakatayam Law' prevalent in Kerala is instructive. Our society contained within its bosom various stratas of civilisation and within the framework of Hindu socio-economic order every strata was free to follow its own usages. The forest-dwellers and the hillmen had evolved their own customs and the same were left intact by the Hindu Law. This is very important from the point of view of considering the applicability of Hindu Law to different tribes.

and peoples of the world, if and when they realise that, in fact, unconscious of themselves, they are nothing but Hindus.

Among the Western educated people there is a tendency to confuse Religion with Law. But that is incorrect. There have been founders of religions that were not Law-givers, such as Abraham or Jesus. There have been a few in whom are combined both the roles i.e., of the Founder of Religion and also of the Law-giver. For example, Mohammed the Prophet. In view of the elastic, comprehensive and dynamic character of Hindu Law, it should not be difficult to bring all communities in India or abroad within its purview, except those who follow rigid codes. But in the latter case the concerned community will discern before long that the codes are already outdated and fossilised, irrelevant to the changing circumstances, and incapable of guiding their affairs properly under the new conditions.

According to Hindu Law, the term 'Hindu' is not co-extensive with the term 'Vedicist'. 'Hindu' is a large circle of which 'Vedicists' constitute an important part. But that is not all. Article 25 of the Constitution of India provides in unequivocal terms that the reference to 'Hindu' in sub-clause (b) of clause (2) of the said Article shall be construed as including a reference to persons professing the Sikh, Jain, Buddhist religions and the reference to the Hindu religious institutions shall be construed accordingly. This is the only Article in the whole of the Constitution which provides an authoritative definition of the term 'Hindu'.

Not that we consider the framers of Constitution as authorities on Hinduism. But the above definition certainly reflects the correct approach to the problem. It is in this sense that Mr. T. W. Rhys Davids says in his famous book 'Life of Gautama' that "he (Gautama) was the greatest and the wisest and the best of the Hindus." All were covered by

Hindu Law irrespective of their religious affinities. Even in ancient times, B̥haspati who founded the school of Materialism in India thousands of years before Demokrites, the father of Western Materialism, was accepted by even the theist Hindus as their preceptor. Kapila who challenged the authority of the previous scriptures was also a Hindu. According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, at the time when Gautama took *Paviraja*, besides the Brahminic Philosophy, there were as many as sixty-two different schools of philosophy.

If proper research is conducted in the social practices of the Parsis who accept 'Zend-Avesta' i.e., the '*Chhanda-Avasthā*', as their standard scripture, it will be found that they are already a part of the Hindu Order though both the sides are not yet clearly aware of it.

The real character and spirit of Hindu Law is a great asset to the task undertaken by the Vishva Hindu Parishad on the national as well as the international plane. The Hindu Law can embrace the entire mankind with the exception of those who deny themselves its magnificent benefits. It is significant that the sage Manu described his Smriti as the 'Manava Dharma Shastra'. This will continue to be an asset to Hindus if they wisely refrain from the Western concept of codification.

The Vishva Hindu Parishad is trying to bring together Hindus all over the world on a common platform. Hence it is necessary and useful that a thorough research is conducted into our many neglected scriptures. If these scriptures continue to be neglected the blame lies squarely on our own shoulders. The scriptural text of our Parsi brethren - Zend Avesta - falls into this category.

The researches made by Prof. Max Mueller, Dr. Hang, L. H. Mills, Sir William Jones and others throw on that scripture much light which reveals some important facts :

1. Zend Avesta is a corrupt form of *Chhanda Avasthā*.
2. At least sixty per cent of the words in Zend Avesta are of pure Sanskritic origin.
3. There is grammatic similarity in the language of the Vedas and the Avesta.
4. The corruption of Sanskrit words has followed a particular pattern. For example, Sanskritic *ta* has changed into *tha* in the Avesta; *swa* into *syā*, *ha* into *ja* and *sa* into *ha*. Even in Arabic, the Sanskrit *sa* has become *ha*.

5. *Aryamana* in Sanskrit means both a 'friend' and 'God'. In the Avesta also *Aairyamana* means the same. In Sanskrit, *Mitra* has three meanings — Sun, Friend and God. *Mithr* in the Avesta also means the same three things. *Gau* has the same two meanings — cow and earth — in both the languages.
6. The Vedic and Avesta languages are two forms of the same language.
7. Many prosodies of the Vedas such as *Gāyathri*, *Thrishtup*, *Anushtupa*, *Āsuri*, *Ushati* etc., are to be found in the Avesta.
8. The institution of *Yajna*, its different types and tools are treated similarly in both. They give the same importance to *Soma* and *Homa*.
9. Both deal with the significance and worship of *Agni* (Fire).
10. Both refer to the importance of the *Gau* (Cow) and *Gomutra* (Urine of the Cow).
11. The Parsis are described as *ārya* and *āryatva* is praised in the Avesta.
12. There is surprising similarity in the views of both about metaphysics, cosmology, the process of the evolution of the universe etc.
13. The thirty-three gods in Vedas resemble the thirty-three *rathus* in the Avesta.
14. The Avesta recognises the concepts of rebirth and Karma.

15. The Cow is considered as the representative of the entire society in the Avesta.
16. There is reference to ancient metaphysics in the Avesta.
17. The Parsis also have the Sacred Thread ceremony. It is called *Kushathi*.
18. The social order described in the Avesta is similar to *Chāturvarnya*.
19. The Brahmin is referred to as *atharva*, *atharvana* and the Kshatriya as *rathesto*, *ratheshta* in the Avesta.
20. Dr. Hang concludes that Brahmins and Parsis are two different types of the same caste.

Against the background of all these facts, it is our duty to consider Zend Avesta as a neglected Hindu scripture and conduct proper research into it.

Since the spirit of 'Rashtriyatva' was dominant in our country from times immemorial and since the dawn of human history saw Bharat as a full-fledged 'Rashtra', we the Bharatiyas are inclined to believe that Western 'nationalism' — which is taken to be the English equivalent of our 'Rashtriyatva' — must also be almost as ancient as the latter. This, however, is not borne out by historical facts.

**Nationalism in Europe as Recent as Napoleon**

In the early period of European history, family was the only social unit. It was subsequently replaced by tribe as the unit. All over the continent were scattered nomadic tribes, the very nature of whose means of livelihood required them to move continuously from place to place. This made it impossible for them to develop emotional attachment for any particular territory. Tribalism based upon blood-relationship, therefore, formed the foundation of social organisation during that period. Territorialism was evolved in course of a number of centuries after the settled agricultural communities came into being in the Middle Ages. Synchronisation of the two into 'nationalism' is as recent as the French Revolution.



For example, formerly England was a country inhabited by Englishmen. Now the position is different. Englishmen are now the people that inhabit England. The territories described as 'England' were formerly ruled by the 'Kings of the English'. King John was the first 'King of England'. Similarly 'Kings of France' were preceded by the 'Kings of the Franks'.

In the case of Bharat such synchronisation was already prevalent when History opened its eyes.

A critical study of the later period reveals that Greeks, who furnished the first organised leadership to Europe, did not constitute a 'Nation'. They had their city-states; but there was nothing like a 'Greek Nation'. Rome also was a city-state. When it attained the status of 'Empire', what it breathed was the spirit of international imperialism of a city-state, and not that of Roman Nationalism. Rome fostered the idea of Universality. Roman Empire was neither the cause nor the effect of Roman Nationalism. Under the Christian Church, all Christians belonged to one family. Growth of nationalism was inconceivable so long as the Church was influential. Before the beginning of the eighteenth century wars were either religious or dynastic. With Louis XIV, for example, England fought its 'King's wars'. The first purely patriotic war fought by the English was the 'War of Jenkin's Ear' in the eighteenth century.

#### **Hindu Rashtra as Old as the Vedas**

How far had nationalism grown in different continental countries when Napoleon conceived his ideal of the United States of Europe after the model of the United States of America or the Greek Amphictyonic League? "There are in Europe", said Napoleon, "more than thirty million Frenchmen, fifteen million Italians, thirty million Germans ... Out of each of these peoples, I wanted to make a united national

whole ... For France, unity has been wrought, in Spain it has proved unattainable; to establish the Italian nation, I should have needed twenty years; to make the Germans a nation would have required still more patience..."

Chatham had achieved for England what Napoleon did later on for France — the generation of the spirit of nationalism. Reaction of the English against the Papal dictatorship during the reign of Henry VIII, against the religious aggression of Spain during the Elizabethan period, against the Dutch military action in the Spice Islands, and finally, against French expansionism in Canada and India, crystallized, in the last analysis, into the strong sense of patriotism under the imaginative leadership of Chatham. In post-revolution days, France was pitted against the entire continent under the old order. The revolutionary zeal of the French was tactfully moulded by Napoleon into patriotic fervour. Crushing defeat of divided Germans in the Napoleonic wars was mainly responsible for the rise of German nationalism, and development of German national character centred round the *Pflicht-gefühl*, i.e., the supreme sense of duty. But for Austrian atrocities the growth of Italian nationalism would never have been accelerated. The torch of nationalism was lit in Netherlands by the inhuman persecution of Philips' Generals.

Nationalism in Europe is thus recent in origin and reactionary in character. Implications of this are obvious. In the first place, Western Nationalism is incapable of being as intense and sanctified as Bharatiya Rashtriyatva which is as ancient as the Himalayas. In Bharat, the Motherland and the National Society have been so very identified that it is impossible to think of the one without being reminded of the other. Blood and Soil — Soil and Blood! Consequently, the noblest, the most sacred and the most tender emotions of the

sons of the soil are naturally directed towards Bharat Mata. This is the unique feature of Bharatiya Rashtriyatva which it is impossible for any other country or people to attain for want of similar identification and that too for an equal length of time. For emotions to become soul-deep, time is the indispensable factor.

#### European Nationalism—Narrow, Reactionary and Anti-Religion

Secondly, the nature of Western Nationalism being essentially reactionary it is generally incompatible with the ideal of internationalism. The content of Bharatiya Rashtriyatva is positive. In the earliest period, the peculiar characteristic which distinguished Bharatiya people from the rest of mankind was its Sanskriti, which was nothing but Vishva Sanskriti. Vishva Sanskriti being its earliest mark of distinction, Hindu Nationalism could not but be internationalistic in its tendencies and approach—nay, it exhibited the spirit of Universalism. Western type of conflict between the concepts of nationalism and internationalism is consequently alien to the nature of Hindu Nationalism.

The third implication is equally pertinent. In the West, the concept of Nationalism was the latest to appear on the stage of human mind to claim its allegiance. It was therefore required to combat resistance of at least equally powerful concepts that were already influential with the social mind. By virtue of its supremacy for centuries, the Church constituted the greatest challenge to any other concept that emerged subsequently as its rival. All architects of European nations had to meet this challenge. "We have expelled Jews from public life", observed Dr. Goebells, inaugurating the Sudetan Plebiscite, "because their capital was Moscow; Catholics, because their capital was Rome; and Freemasons, because they talked of internationalism." Every European nation has been suffering, to a greater or lesser degree, from this

ailment of divided allegiance. This happens to be an additional factor responsible for further weakening of the intensity of Western Nationalism.

Bharatiya Mind presents the case of integrated allegiance. Loyalty of a Bharatiya is not torn between 'Fatherland' and 'Holy Land'. To him Bharat is both — both in one and both at once. Not merely because all places of his pilgrimage are situated within its frontiers but because every particle of its earth is sacred to him.

Hypnotised by Western education our intellectuals are tempted to gauge everything Eastern by the yardstick of the West. Hence this general misunderstanding about the precise meaning or import of the terms 'Rashtriyatva' and 'Nationalism'. Interchangeability of these terms has been blindly taken for granted. But there is such a marked difference substantial as well as qualitative between the two that the one cannot be treated as an equivalent of the other. Our 'Rashtra' concept is unique in many respects. For historical reasons, the West can boast of nothing similar or parallel to it.

-6.3.1961

The much talked of 'national integration' will remain a mirage unless the correct concept of nationhood is properly understood and every mischievous theory leading to wrong conclusions ruthlessly discarded. The theory of 'Dravidianism' ripening recently in the demand for a separate 'Dravidasthan' is one such deliberate mischief. Who is the originator of this Dravidian theory?

It is significant that the word 'Dravida' does not appear anywhere in the ancient Tamil literature of the *Muthar* (First), the *Edai* (Interim) or the *Kadai* (Final) *Canka* (Sangha) periods.

The originator of the Dravidian theory (first in the sphere of languages) was Bishop Caldwell. In his 'Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages' (1856), he jumped over the Himalayas to find out similarities between the South Bharatiya languages and those of China, Japan, Hungary, Lapland, Finland, Turkey and Caucasus, with a view to establish that the so-called Dravidians spoke the languages of the Turanian Group, which was also termed as the Scythic group—the other two groups of world languages

conceived by Europeans being the Semitic and the Indo-European. They placed Sanskrit in the last group. Bishop Caldwell tried to prove that the Dravidian languages had no structural relationship with Sanskrit; that the grammatical affinities of these languages were mainly Scythic-Turanian in the nomenclature of later years, occasionally Semitic; and that, where the affinities were Indo-European, these did not come into existence on Indian soil, but belonged mostly to the pre-Aryan period of the pre-historic past when the Aryans and the Turanians were living as one undivided race.

### Caldwell's Theories Disputed

In the opinion of Bishop Caldwell, "the non-Sanskritic portion of the Dravidian languages was very greatly in excess of the Sanskritic"; "the pronouns and numerals of the Dravidian languages, their verbal and nominal inflexions, and the syntactic arrangement of their words, everything, in short, which constitutes the living spirit of a language, was originally and radically different from Sanskrit"; "true Dravidian words, which form the great majority of the words in the Southern vocabularies, are placed by native grammarians in a different class from the derivatives of Sanskrit and honoured with the epithets 'national words' and 'pure words'"; "in general, no difficulty is felt in distinguishing Sanskrit derivatives from the ancient Dravidian roots"; "some of the Dravidian languages which make use of Sanskrit derivatives, are able to dispense with those derivatives altogether, such derivatives being considered rather as luxuries or articles of finery than as necessities" and "Tamil, the most highly cultivated *ab intra* of all Dravidian idioms, can dispense with its Sanskrit altogether, if need be, and not only stand alone but flourish without its aid."

These views were accepted in their entirety by most of the subsequent European scholars like Dr. Kittel, Dr. H. Gundert and others who did not take the trouble of investigating the facts for themselves.

But on the other hand, on subsequent investigations it was further presumed :

(i) That "the Scythian words which have been handed down by Greek writers are distinctly Iranian, i.e., they belong to the Indo-European family"; that the so-called Scythian languages "cannot, by any means, be brought together into one linguistic family"; and that "in regard to the Dravidian languages the attempt to connect them with other linguistic families outside India is now generally recognised as a failure." (The Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. IV)

(ii) That in the Bishop's theories certain things have been "taken for granted rather too suddenly in regard to the Dravidian dialects"; that "between the languages of Southern India and those of the Aryan family there are many deeply seated and radical affinities"; that "the differences between the Dravidian and the Aryan tongues are not so great as between the Celtic (for instance) and the Sanskrit"; that "by consequence, the doctrine that the place of the Dravidian dialects is rather with the Aryan than with the Turanian family of languages is still capable of defence"; that "the identity (was) most striking in the names of instruments, places and acts connected with a simple life"; and, that it was possible "to show that the prefixes and affixes (were) Aryan." (Dr. G. U. Pope)

(iii) That the originator and the subsequent advocates of the Dravidian theory were not sufficiently acquainted with the Vedic dialects and the Prakrits arising out of the latter.

(iv) That “most of the Dravidian grammatical forms have arisen from suffixal elements borrowed from Indo-Aryan”; that “the non-Aryan element even in the basic portions of the Dravidian vocabularies is not considerable”; that “the Dravidian grammatical elements are derived from Aryan sources”; “that Sanskrit words which had already undergone great mutilation in the Prakrits underwent further corruptions in the Dravidian languages, so that most of them have been transformed out of all recognition and it is impossible to identify many of them as Sanskrit *tadbhavas* without a familiar knowledge of the laws of sound obtaining in the Prakrits”; that, as a matter of fact, the vast majority of these supposed Dravidian words and verbal bases which Tamil scholars cherish as Cen-Tamil or Pure Tamil can be shown to be very corrupt *tadbhavas* of Sanskrit; that “the Demonstrative and Interrogative pronouns have been derived from Aryan sources”; that “most of the tense and modal suffixes used in Dravidian are of Aryan origin, ...the non-Aryan element in the vocabulary of the Dravidian languages is not considerable” and that “the vast majority of Dravidian grammatical forms are formations obtained by suffixing Aryan words and particles to Dravidian bases most of which are obviously of Indo - Aryan origin.” (Dravidian Theories, Ch. I)

#### **Mere Conjectures Become Historical Facts !**

Dravidianism which entered India through the backdoor of language controversy proceeded gradually to the drawing-room of nation concept. What were originally wild inferences by Bishop Caldwell became in course of time accepted facts—without any scrutiny or scientific investigation. The learned Bishop’s “might have existed” was transformed automatically into the fact of existence. His mere conjecture, or rather wishful thinking, was accorded the status of “historical facts”.



The unscientific attitude of the so-called 'authorities' on this subject deserves special attention. For example, Mr. V. A. Smith accepts in his "Ancient and Hindu India" (1920), the validity of the remarks of Bishop Caldwell. But he simultaneously admits that "the materials available for the study of early Dravidian institutions are too scanty and imperfectly explored to history being based upon them..... Some day, perhaps, the history of Dravidian civilisation may be written by a competent scholar skilled in all the love and languages required for the study of the subject but at present the literature concerned with it is too fragmentary, defective and controversial to permit of condensation." Nevertheless, Mr. Smith takes for granted the existence of "Dravidian Culture", "Distinct Dravidian Civilisation" etc., relying upon the unreliable and now exploded theories of Bishop Caldwell.

Other European scholars have adopted the same unscientific attitude. Shri Kanakasabhai Pillai was the first reputed Bharatiya writer to deal with this subject. He gave free scope to his wild imagination and presented a fanciful picture of history. His fancies and fictions as well as those of Caldwell were welcomed and honoured by subsequent authors as historical facts. Conclusions based upon conjectures can rarely enjoy such privilege and prestige in the sphere of national history.

#### **Homeland that is a Dreamland !**

These self-styled European authorities were required to invent some Homeland for the supposed Dravidas, for elevating the Dravidian theory from the level of linguism to that of nationalism.

It was, therefore, presumed that the Limurian Continent, now submerged in the Indian Ocean, was the Homeland of the Dravidian civilisation. Is there any positive evidence in favour of this presumption? Not at all. No remnants—not

even a single reference in world literature. Nobody in the world had ever heard of the existence of this non-existent civilisation till these European scholars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries suddenly dreamt of it because their theory was badly in need of some Dravidian Homeland outside Bharat. Dravidian civilisation must have flourished in the Limurian continent, because otherwise the very 'fact' of the existence of any civilisation which could be termed as 'Dravidian' as distinct from 'Hindu' becomes challengeable. Thus the theory of the Dravidian Homeland is a hypothesis. These European Hypothetists seem to be far superior to the Hindu Yogins in point of *Antar-Jnyāna*. While the latter could travel back in the past and find out the conditions as obtaining then, the former are capable of discovering what never existed without taking the troubles of travelling back.

#### The Real Meaning of 'Arya' and 'Dasyu'

It was further necessary to establish that the so-called Dravidians of the far South were separate from the rest of the Hindu Nation. As stated earlier, the word 'Dravida' occurs nowhere in the ancient Tamil literature. The concept of 'Pancha-Dravida' as mentioned in the Skanda Purana does not substantiate the 'Dravida Nation' theory. As a matter of fact, it illustrates oneness of the 'Dravidas' with the rest of the then Hindusthan. Traditional 'Panch Dravidas' include Maharashtras and Gurjaras also, which is not convenient for the theoreticians of Dravidianism. The best way out of this difficulty was to find out or coin a separate word or term to denote the Hindu Nation excluding the Southern Hindus. The word 'Arya', it was thought, would best serve this purpose. Hence the Aryan Race theory, and the imaginary conflict between the Aryas and the Anaryas or Dasyus or Dravidas, who, it was asserted, constituted a separate anti-Aryan race.

What is the import of the word 'Arya'? Scholars like Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar have also realised that 'Arya' is not the name of any race or people. The word is derived from the root 'ṛ'. It means 'noble' or 'respectable'. For example, the 'Sahitya Darpanam' enjoins that the actress and the stage-director should address each other as 'Arya', and that even a youngster should refer to his elder brother in the same term.

All the four Varnas consist of Aryas and Anaryas or Dasyus according to the merit or demerit of the different individuals. Even a *Svapacha* (*Chandāl*) is entitled to become Arya. Mahabharata informs us that a *Mlechchha* named Dharmavyadha was recognised as 'Arya' and became authorised to instruct Kaushik Brahmin, by virtue of his penance. Prahlad who belonged to a dynasty traditionally opposed to Dharma was accepted by the Hindus as 'Arya'. According to Bhagavata, even a *Chandāl* can attain the 'Aryatva' through complete surrender to Dharma, while a Brahmin not following the tenets of Dharma cannot claim to be an 'Arya'. After attaining a certain level of self-elevation a *Chandāl* becomes an 'Arya', according to the '*Manishā Panchakam*' of Shri Shankaracharya. Every Varna has within its fold some individuals who must be described as 'Anaryas' or 'Dasyus'. The 'Dasyutva' is not confined to any particular Varna even as the 'Aryatva' is not. The Shanti Parvam of Mahabharata declares: *Drushyante Mānushhe Loke Sarvavarneshu Dasyavah* (Dasyus are found in all Varnas of human beings.) Thus 'Aryatva' is not the monopoly of any particular Varna. It is wrong to identify Aryatva with one Varna or the other.

All these considerations have led revered Shri Babaji Maharaj Pandit, a renowned authority on this subject to

accept the following traditional definition of the word 'Arya' as the standard one:

*Karthavyamācharan kāryam akarthavyamanācharan |  
Thishthathi prakrithāchāre savai ārya ithismrithehe ||*

(He indeed is 'Arya' who does what he ought to do and refrains from doing what he ought not to do, and is constantly engaged in carrying out his prescribed duty.) No European nomenclator can prove that the term 'Arya' is indicative of any race or people.

### **Bias Leads to Baseless Theories**

The theories of 'Aryan Race' and 'Dravidian Nation' were formulated by subsequent Western scholars in the following fashion.

In the first place, it was presumed that Bharat is not one nation, that Bharatiyas are not one people; that in any case they are not the original inhabitants of this country; that they represent different waves of immigration; that every wave was characterised by its distinct language so that the languages spoken by Bharatiyas are different in origin; that broadly they can be classified under two linguistic families; and that these two groups which were racial as well as linguistic were for a long period hostile to each other.

The whole theory leaned heavily upon the slender support of the supposed differences in the linguistic characteristics. But this could not stand the test of time. Before long it was noticed that what are supposed to be the peculiar Dravidian linguistic characteristics are not confined to the languages of the South which was presumed to be the land of the Dravidians. These characteristics were discerned in the languages of the North also.

Secondly, Sanskrit which was taken by these theoreticians to be a member of the Indo-European family did not

possess some of the distinct characteristics of that family. This fact taken along with the previous one could raise number of doubts about the correctness of the original theory.

Against this background any impartial scholar would have inferred—

- i) That, probably, Sanskrit is not a member of the Indo-European family in the sense in which such membership is understood ;
- ii) That Sanskrit is not alien to the so-called 'Dravidian' family of languages ;
- iii) That, probably, both Sanskrit and the Dravidian languages have descended from the same origin ; and/or
- iv) That the so-called Aryan family and Dravidian family of languages constitute in fact one and the same family.

Because of bias and prejudice the European scholars did not arrive at these conclusions which were more logical. Instead, they continued to stick to their preconceived notions and tried to explain away the difficulty by presuming that before Aryans entered India, Dravidians were spread in the North and the North-West which accounts for Dravidian influences on the Aryan languages. But they have not yet been able to substantiate this presumption by solid evidence of historical facts.

It was contended that Dravidian languages had prevailed in the North and North-West of India before the Aryans arrived in the country. How can this supposition be substantiated? Well, Dravidian characteristics are traced in Indo-Aryan idioms. The Dravidian influences are observed even in the Vedic idioms. (The main Dravidian charac-

teristics are stated to be: i) The adoption of the so-called cerebral letters in the Indo-Aryan forms of speech; ii) The irregular change of *r* into *l* and vice versa; iii) The increasing use of conjunctive participles instead of verb forms; iv) The formation of the active past participle and of the periphrastic future.)

It is interesting to note that some other competent scholars have emphatically asserted that most of these Dravidian characteristics in Aryan, turn out to be Aryan characteristics in Dravidian. They have also proved that the so-called Dravidian words that constitute the only evidence in support of the presumed existence of a pre-Hindu civilisation are in fact 'Aryan' (oryza, ginger, karpion, algum, tuki, etc.).

Advocates of the Dravidian theory are perplexed because they accepted without scrutiny :

- i) That there exists what is described as an Indo-European family of languages and that Sanskrit belongs to that family;
- ii) That there exists what has been termed as a Dravidian family of languages; and
- iii) That the two represent different waves of immigration.

The existence of a pre-Hindu civilisation, which was originally based upon mere conjecture, has been taken for granted by subsequent writers. Hence, this controversy about 'Dravidian characteristics in Aryan' and 'Aryan characteristics in Dravidian'. But the whole difficulty can be easily solved if we take into account the historical fact of 'one nation' and 'one people' in Bharata Varsha.

### It is One Nation, One People

In this context the following facts deserve serious consideration.

The first Tamil Grammar was written by the Hindu sage Agastya of the Potiya hill. The arrangement of the alphabet in this first Tamil Grammar follows the Sanskrit order.

The present script of Tamil dates back to the ninth century. The original script, i.e., *Vattezhuthu* is different from the present Tamil script. It, i.e., *Vattezhuthu*, is derived from the Brahmi variety of the Ashoka script. The picture we obtain from *Tholkappiyam*, *Irayanar Akapporul*, *Kuruntokai*, *Akananuru*, *Kalittokai*, *Pariṭatal*, *Pattuppattu*, *Cilappatikaram* and *Manimekalai*, is unmistakably and completely of a Hindu society. For example, the prescribed arrangement of different communitywise localities in the city as described in *Cilappatikaram* reminds one of similar arrangement during the *Arthashāsthra* period in Pataliputra and other cities in the north. In point of arrangement the city of Madurai resembled Pataliputra. Even the fortifications of the city of Madurai followed the specifications given by Kautilya. *Cilappatikaram* refers to, among other things, the patron deities of the four castes; the ceaseless noise created by the four assembled castes; the smoke of the offerings of Brahmins in their Yagas; the annual Indra festival; worship of the Vedic and the post-Vedic Hindu deities, such as, Shiva, Subrahmanya, Vishnu, Balram, Indra etc; dances of Shiva, Krishna, Kama, Durga, Sri-Devi and Indrani; Kama festival in the month of Phalgunā; the Hindu names of planets; and the Hindu system of naming the twelve months after the names of the full-moon constellations and the Hindu names of the months. The *Manimekalai* and the *Pariṭatal*, other early Tamil works, also reveal how the philosophy, deities, ways of worship, divisions of time and chronology, and the values of life of the

then Tamilnad were hundred per cent Hindu. The *Thirukkural* which is highly respected by the 'Dravidasthanis' has the Hindu Purusharthawise arrangement of chapters, the *Artha* section resembling Kautilya's *Arthashastra* and the general environment of the standard Hindu society.

All these facts lead us inevitably to the conclusion that there is no religion, philosophy, ideal of life, history, hero, scripture, language, science, socio-economic order, culture or civilisation which can be termed as 'Dravidian' as distinct from 'Hindu'. Whatever is hypothetically presumed to be 'Dravidian' turns out, after proper scrutiny, to be nothing but "HINDU".



Dr. Ambedkar was a confirmed opponent of the communists. In 1950, he expressed strong indignation over the publication of a pamphlet in Burma which sought to establish that Buddhism and Marxism were very much akin to each other. As a matter of fact, communism has declared war on all religions—not excluding Buddhism. It is equally certain that Lord Buddha would not have touched Das Capital with a pair of tongs. Dr. Ambedkar always considered communists as scripturalists with Marx as their Mohammed and Das Capital as their Koran. Buddha was opposed to such scripturalism. “Do not believe what your Teacher tells you merely out of respect for the Teacher. But whatsoever, after due examination and analysis, you find to be conducive to the good, the benefit, the welfare of all beings—that doctrine believe and cling to, and take as your guide.” No communist can afford to act upon this advice without being prepared to meet the fate of Trotsky.

Buddha did not deny the right to private property. He approved of the acquisition of wealth, only it must be subject to *Vinaya*. Renunciation is an ideal condition; but it must be

voluntary. It cannot, and should not, be imposed from above. Buddhist monks adopt the life of communal ownership out of their free will, not under compulsion. Buddhism does not prescribe this mode of life for laymen. And even monks are given the freedom to return to lay life—whenever they are inclined to do so.

The Marxist theory of class conflict indicates that Marx had no understanding of the “cosmic process which is called in Buddhism *samsāra*”. (In fact, as Francis Story puts it, there is no evidence that either Karl Marx or Lenin knew anything about any religion other than the particular type of backward Christianity prevalent in Tsarist Russia.)

Buddha believed that conquest by force could never settle any issue. “Not by hating does hatred cease, hatred ceases by love alone. This is the Ancient Law.” The basis of communism is hatred; that of Buddhism, love. For achieving its goal, communism relies upon external coercion, Buddhism upon internal reformation.

The approach of communism is objective, that of Buddhism subjective. “Within this fathom long body, equipped with mind and volition, O Bhikkus, I declared to you, is the world, the origin of the world, and the cessation thereof.” And therefore “to put an end to evil, to fulfil all good, to purify the mind—this is the Teaching of all the Buddhas.”

Communism depends upon ruthless dictatorship, which is incompatible with the teachings of Buddha. Buddhism champions the cause of individual freedom; the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ suppresses it. Every individual has a right to follow his own *dharmamata*; encroachment of State upon this right is un-Buddhistic. Concentration of all power in the hands of a few is dangerous. Buddha declared

that *Lobha*, *Dosa* and *Moha* were the three factors that dominated human mind. Absolute power would strengthen these tendencies in the ruling party.

After all, what is the goal of human life? Marxists believe it is the highest degree of material happiness. Logically it leads to the justification of the law of jungle which is Marx's 'dialectical materialism'. Buddhism does not approve of such a material motive. Craving (*Tanha*) is endless. The fire of craving can never be extinguished by adding fuel of sensual pleasures to it. Freedom from craving is the real way. Buddhism consequently stands for moral law which is expected to end all conflicts.

In fact the differences between Buddhism and communism are of even more basic character. According to Marx, nothing exists except Matter. Mind is only a superstructure on Matter. Man is entirely moulded by the external material conditions over which he has no control. The individual has no will of his own—no freedom of choice. All talk about morality or immorality is, therefore, irrelevant. Buddhism believes in the capacity of an individual to exercise free will. Hence its insistence upon moral and ethical values.

Buddhism is essentially spiritualistic though it rejects certain theories about soul and God. Buddha condemned the philosophies of materialism preached by the *Lokāyatikas*, the *Nāstikas*, and the *Vechedavādins* in his day. Marx propagated what in Buddhistic terminology would be described as *Vecheda - ditthi* or Nihilism. Being annihilationists, Marxists cannot accept the Buddhistic theories of Rebirth and Karma. In his *Brahmajāla Sutta*, Buddha exposes the hollowness of Nihilism which forms the very foundation of Materialism and Marxism. As materialists, communists

cannot be expected to accept the validity of the noble eight-fold Path leading to *Nibbana*.

Dr. Ambedkar wanted to convey this view-point to the neo-Buddhist masses, lest they should be misled by the false propaganda of the reds. With this object he wrote and completed a book, 'Buddhism and Marxism', a few weeks before his sad demise. After his death the major faction of his political party became too eager to shake hands with communists for immediate political gains. And somehow the book has not yet seen the light of the day. Is it mere coincidence? One does not know.

-30-4-1961

On December 6, 1960, a conference of the Buddhist religious workers and monks is scheduled to be held at Nagpur under the auspices of the Bharatiya Bouddha Mahasabha, an institution which organised and managed the Mass Initiation Ceremony on October 14, 1956, at Nagpur. This conference is the first of its type.

During the last three years no organised effort has been made to educate neo-Buddhists in the religion of Lord Buddha. Bodhisatva Charita Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar had his own plans of establishing *vihāras* and organising Universities for this purpose. But unfortunately he did not live long in our midst to execute these plans, and his political successors could hardly be interested in any constructive and 'colourless' religious activity. It is doubtful whether these political beings are acquainted with even the alpha of Buddhist religion.

Prior to the initiation ceremony, they were never accused of religious inclination by their friends or their foes. They have tactfully managed to keep their urge for spiritualism a closely guarded secret till this day. Even their

enthusiastic political followers do not place them in the category of Venerable M. Pannasiri, Maha Thero, Shri Devapriya Valisinha and other religious personalities. The latter do not command the confidence of neo-Buddhists for the simple reason that the latter do not belong to a particular caste in Maharashtra which is at once a socio-economic caste, a political party and a religious community. Thus the accredited political leaders have no genuine interest in anything religious and the competent religious Bhikkus are not accepted whole-heartedly and unreservedly as 'our leaders' by the mass of neo-Buddhists.

### **What was Ambedkar's Programme ?**

This has placed Buddhism in a very embarrassing position. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar expected Lord Buddha's religion to teach:

- “ 1) society to sustain itself on the sanction of morality ;
- 2) the gospel that is in accord with science and reason and fit to appeal to the modern mind ;
- 3) its code of social conduct that recognises the fundamental tenets of liberty, equality and fraternity ; and
- 4) to reject sanction, or ennobling, of poverty and go along the path of liberation from all kinds of suffering. ”

He wanted this movement to be essentially religious. For that purpose, the religious organisation of the Buddhists ought to have undertaken earnestly the original programme of:

- 1) promoting the spread of Buddhism in India ;
- 2) establishing temples for Buddhist worship ;
- 3) establishing schools and colleges for religious instruction ;

- 4) establishing orphanages, hospitals and relief centres ;
- 5) starting Buddhist seminaries for the training of workers for the spread of Buddhism ;
- 6) promoting comparative study of all religions ;
- 7) undertaking publication of Buddhist literature for giving a true understanding of the Buddhist religion to the common man ;
- 8) creating a new order of priests, if necessary ;
- 9) establishing a printing press or presses for the purpose of carrying on the work of publication for propagation of Buddhism ; and
- 10) holding gatherings and conferences of Buddhists of India for common action, and establishing fellowship.

#### **The General Secretary's Confession**

But unfortunately the Buddhist Mission supported by the major faction of the Republican Party has done nothing so far in this direction. In the words of the General Secretary of the Bharatiya Bouddha Mahasabha, "Three years have elapsed since the great initiation ceremony without any accomplishment.....nothing worth noticing has been done during this long period." He has also explained the reasons for this failure. "The reason for the dismal failure of the Buddhist movement is not far to seek. The Buddhist workers as well as the Buddhist people have relied too much on the present leaders who have made a big show of being sincere to the cause, but as a matter of fact they are not so. Their true nature has now been completely revealed by their contradictory action."

Exploitation of Buddhism for political purposes was publicly condemned by the first conference of the Bharatiya Bouddhajana Mahasabha (Vidarbha Region), held at Deeksha

Ground, Nagpur, on September 28-30, 1960. The conference expressed the view that "for efficient working and proper channelisation, religious and political activities should be kept separate and independent of each other and, as far as possible, different persons should occupy offices in these two different fields of activity." The conference expressed its regret and concern that "in certain quarters direct domination of political power is sought to be imposed on religious institutions and is sought to be misused for personal benefit and bargaining." It was the considered opinion of the conference that this was a most unfortunate state of affairs, detrimental to the spread of religion and the progress of the society. The conference consequently declared that political domination of religious activities and misuse of religion for undeserved individual political gain must effectively be discouraged and disallowed.

#### **Neo-Buddhists Gang up with Communists**

Exploitation of neo-Buddhists for the political ends of the Republican Party was to an extent understandable. Though wrong in itself, it could be explained against the background of the peculiar fact of complete identification, at least in Maharashtra, of a social caste, a political party and a religious community. But, what is worse, the huge mass of neo-Buddhists is being utilised by the Communist Party of India for promoting its own anti-religious ideals. The leaders of Bharatiya Buddhists are openly supporting the communists whose armed forces raped Tibet and compelled His Holiness the Dalai Lama to quit that Buddhist country.

The demand for Deeksha Ground, Nagpur, is tenable only because of its religious character. But the pro-communist Republican Party leaders have invited the anti-religious communists to share the leadership of this religious agitation. As the Most Revered Shri U Chan Htoon, President, Buddha



Sasana Council, Burma, pointed out, communism is thoroughly incompatible with, and antagonistic to, the basic tenets of Buddhism. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was hundred per cent anti-communist. His desire to save scheduled castes from the influence of communism was one of the factors that prompted him to embrace Buddhism along with his followers. He honestly felt that he alone could accomplish this historic task of national importance. He considered himself the only effective barrier between scheduled castes and communists. On account of his religious move, he has become a still more effective and permanent barrier between the two. His political successors have been trying to undo whatever Dr. Babasaheb has done in the service of the Nation, the Scheduled Castes and Religion.

#### **Guruji, U Chan Htoon & Neo-Buddhists**

The real danger to Buddhism in our country is from its political followers, and not from those of its two sister religions, i.e., Vedicism and Jainism. Religion is brought into disrepute when it becomes a pawn in the secular game of irreligious politicians. Buddhism in Bharat has to guard itself against this dirty game.

This was made amply clear by the Most Revered Shri U Chan Htoon in the course of his tour two years back. He met Parama Pujaniya Shri Guruji, the chief of RSS, who apprised him of the general attitude of the non-Buddhist Hindus towards the problem of neo-Buddhism, and assured him of sincere sympathies, provided the movement was conducted on proper lines. This historic exchange of views between the two great exponents of Sanatana Dharma in modern times has considerably strengthened the forces of Dharma in Bharat as well as in South-East Asia. At Nagpur Shri U Chan Htoon addressed the leaders of the neo-Buddhists, conveying them the details of his talk with

Shri Guruji and urging upon them to eschew all politics in the interest of the religion of Lord Buddha. But, as the General Secretary of the Bharatiya Bouddha Mahasabha says, "It is really pitiable to see them promising the foreign Buddhist brethren, including a personality of no less stature than that of Hon'ble Justice U Chan Htoon, of not mixing religion with politics, but on the contrary are seen acting opposite of it." May Lord Buddha save Buddhism from its followers!

This is the work the First All-India Convention of the Buddhist Religious Workers is called upon to undertake. The Buddha Sasana Council of Burma can very well serve as a model for the religious organisation. If the convention conducts its deliberations and arrives at decisions in the light of the valuable advice of Shri U Chan Htoon, it will have rendered a signal service to the cause of the Nation and Dharma.

-5-12-1960

All semitic religions are exclusive and monopolistic. Not so the religions of the Hindus. According to Christianity, or, to be more exact, 'Paulity'—for Christ cannot be held responsible for all that St. Paul did or said—there cannot be salvation for a person except through the medium of Christ. Salvation in Islam is ensured only to those who accept that Mohammed is the Prophet of God and, again, that he is the last prophet. According to Judaism, it is not possible for any individual to reach the land of milk and honey unless he accepts the teachings of Moses, because they constitute the message of Jehovah. Communism, the latest semitic religion, claims for itself the monopoly of all human welfare which can be secured only through the agency of Marx.

No such claim has been put forth by any Hindu religion. Hindus have always realised oneness in the midst of diversity of religious views. They believe – *Sarvadeva Namaskārah Keshavam Prathigachhāthi* (Prayers offered to all Gods ultimately reach Keshava only.) When Lord Krishna declared, "Those devotees of other gods who pray them with devotion, they also, ye Kounteya, worship me only properly", He

certainly anticipated Jehovah, Allah or the Father in Heaven. Buddhism, a Hindu Religion of Rationalism, is equally free from these characteristically semitic tendencies.

Buddha never claimed that he was a prophet or that his religion was a Revelation. He never promised 'Salvation', which he said, must be sought by each for himself. "The *Tathāgata* is one who only shows the way." He did not say that his teachings were divine or infallible. He left it to every individual to question the validity of his concepts. He was opposed to scripturalism. Principle, he remarked, must live by itself and not by authority of any man—not even of himself. He kept his teachings separate from his personality.

That is why information about his life is so scarce. That is again why Kassappa, the President of the first Buddhist Congregation held after the death of the Buddha at Rajagriha, did not try to collect information about Buddha's life. The two questions Kassappa put to the Congregation were concerning the *Dhamma* (Dharma) and the *Vinaya*—nothing about the biography of the Founder. "If principle needs the authority of man", Buddha observed, "It is no principle. If every time it becomes necessary to invoke the name of the Founder to enforce the authority of *Dhamma*, then it is no *Dhamma*." On this ground he refused to appoint his successor. "*Dhamma* must be its own successor", he said. "Disputes in the confraternity about the Path cannot be settled by a dictator. What then can a successor do unless he acts as a dictator?"

Thus he never contemplated organisation of the Church of Buddhism. As a matter of fact there is sufficient justification to assert that he did not intend his teachings to crystallise into a separate cult. Otherwise, he would have introduced proselytisation. What he introduced was a *Sangh Diksha* or a ceremony marking the initiation of a person in the

Bhikku Sangh. But there was no *Dhamma Diksha* for initiation of an *Upāsaka* in the *Dhamma*. This clearly indicates that he never wanted to establish a separate sect of his own. Consequently, Upasakas could move freely from one religion to another and often they followed two or more religions at one and the same time. The absence of *Dhamma Diksha* is indicative of his intention, not of his omission. This is quite in keeping with the tradition and temperament of Hindu religions.

This fact deserves to be particularly borne in mind by the religious leaders of the neo-Buddhists since they have commenced the work of religious revival from the first conference of the Buddhist Religious Workers and Monks of Bharat. It has become necessary to sound this warning because these leaders became familiar with the sectarian outlook and approach of the non-Hindu religions long before they were called upon to study the tenets and trends of this Hindu religion. They would be doing grave injustice to Lord Buddha if they irrationalise his Hindu Religion of Rationalism on semitic pattern.

— 16-1-1961

## Has The Condition Of Scheduled Castes Really Improved ?

It is a matter of regret that even after nineteen years of our independence the conditions of the scheduled castes, on the social level, are extremely deplorable. In the rural areas, untouchability is almost as prevalent as it used to be before 1947. Even in the urban areas, this evil has not been completely eradicated. Amongst the scheduled castes themselves some castes are particularly despised, and virtually boycotted. The Valmiki in Delhi and other adjacent areas, the Doms in Bihar, the Bhangis in all the states, the Mangs in Maharashtra, the Lohars, Badhais and Dumnas in Himachal Pradesh are some castes that seem to have the distinction of being specially discriminated against.

### **The Curse of Untouchability Still Widespread**

Several scheduled castes observe untouchability even amongst themselves. They do not interdine or allow other communities to draw water from their wells. The barbers refuse to shave them. They are not allowed entry in temples and hotels. The law regarding untouchability, that is, the Untouchability (Offences) Act, 1955, is not sufficiently

publicised among the people for whom it is meant. The number of cases registered under this act has been going down, and the disposal of cases already registered takes an inordinately long time.

In all states except Nagaland, Manipur, the Andamans and Nicobar Islands, and the Laccadives, this problem is as acute as before. Adequate information on this problem is not available with the State Governments. The State Governments depend on the unrealistic data furnished by the officials in this regard. The Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity seems to have discontinued its propaganda work in this sphere.

### **They Don't Know Their Rights**

The Tribal Welfare Officers and the Social Welfare Officers generally lack the necessary missionary zeal, which is a pre-requisite for the success of this department.

Persons belonging to the above-mentioned castes are denied adequate interest-free loans to which they are entitled. In fact the various facilities given to them in law are denied to them in practice, because of their ignorance about their rights.

The Government has taken up housing as a priority item in urban areas. But the scheduled castes in rural areas are not extended the benefit of housing schemes. In the Central sector there are no schemes under the Third Plan for the construction of houses for scheduled castes. In the State sector, as against the total allocation of Rs. 345.39 lakhs, the expenditure incurred during three years adds up to Rs. 140.72 lakhs, that is, 40.74 per cent, which is obviously poor. Assistance under the Slum Clearance Schemes and the Village Housing Projects also has been quite inadequate.

### **Social Uplift Interlinked with Economic Independence**

The scheduled castes comprise mainly of landless agricultural labour. In its ostrich-like attitude, the Government has thought it proper to bifurcate the economic from the social aspect of the problem. This is highly unrealistic. The scheduled castes are not courageous enough to take advantage of the Untouchability Act, and other facilities, for the simple reason that they are not independent economically and most of them have to depend for their living upon the so-called higher castes. They are therefore nervous in trying to assert themselves. They cannot be expected to play their own part in this task of social self-improvement so long as they do not attain economic independence. Thus, the malady is manifold. The strong prejudices of the so-called high castes, the ignorance and the economic dependence of the scheduled castes themselves, the inefficiency of the various Government agencies and the lack of missionary zeal on the part of the officials concerned, all these factors have combined to perpetuate the misery of the scheduled castes. Even the Bhangis of the capital city of India are no exception to this fact.

### **The Chain of Social Revolutionaries We Have Produced**

So far as the social aspect of this problem is concerned, it would be useless to blame only the official set-up. The very approach of the Government is wrong. What is needed is a revolution in the social mind. This has never been achieved in any country through legislation or official drives. In our own land, many great leaders had dedicated their lives to this cause in the pre-independence era. Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Mahatma Phulay opened the gates of their homes and hearts to untouchables, even at the risk of incurring popular wrath. Shahu Chhatrapati, Raja of Kolhapur, in his Presi-



dential Address at a conference held at Nagpur for this purpose in December 1920, made a fervent appeal to the 'Caste Hindus' to consider the scheduled castes as the flesh of their flesh and blood of their blood. Shri Narayana Guru Swami of Kerala who preached and practised his well-known principle *Uru Jāti, Uru Matam, Uru Daivam*, that is, 'One Caste, One Dharma, One God', tried in his own inimitable way to solve this problem. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, who like Booker T. Washington dedicated his entire life for the uplift of his castemen, tried a different strategy of 'New Caste, New Religion, New God'. Dr. Hedgewar, the founder of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, tackled this problem in a different way. Instead of harping upon the differences, he laid great stress upon the fundamental oneness of the Hindu society. Mahatma Gandhi made this cause his life mission. Not one moment of his life was he oblivious of, or indifferent to, the tragic conditions of the scheduled castes. All these great leaders of the nation strove their best to bring about a social and psychological revolution in people.

### **Not Just Law, the Climate Must Change**

The Government is trying to achieve through legislative and administrative measures what should be the life mission of the social and spiritual giants. Regarding good literature, it has been observed that Hamlet could never have been written by a special sub-committee appointed by the Parliament. In the same way, I should like to say, a David Livingstone, a Florence Nightingale, a Father Damain, and to top the list, a Jesus Christ would never have been created or born in the materialistic West just by or through a piece of legislation. I urge upon the Government to appreciate this basic fact and strive to revolutionalise the entire psychological environment of the country so as to facilitate the resurgence of the spirit of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Mahatma Phulay,

Swami Vivekananda, Shri Narayana Guru Swami,  
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Dr. Hedgewar, Karmavir Shinde  
and Mahatma Gandhi.

— 16.8.1966

(Based on a speech in Parliament)

The problem of scheduled castes is essentially socio-religious. Politicians have rushed where spiritual giants have been cautious in treading; and the remedy they have presented seems to be decidedly worse than the disease. Encroachment of politics upon the sphere of sociology and religion has been allowed and even encouraged. Can there be any political solution for a characteristically non-political problem? Is it proper to exploit religion for the fulfilment of political aspirations? Will not leadership in religion by irreligious power-seekers create more problems than it seeks, or claims, to solve? Will the future of the millions be safe in the hands of political opportunists and adventurists?

**Wanted a Physician Interested in His Patients**

Religious exploitation of masses by religious priesthood deserves severe condemnation; but that is no justification for their political exploitation by political priesthood. Bharat welcomes both, saints and politicians. It appreciates the ideal of 'King Philosopher, Philosopher King'. Janaka and Marcus Aurelius have earned its high esteem. But just as it cannot admire, on the one hand, a political saint who would

be a politician among saints, it cannot welcome, on the other, a politician prophet who would damage politics through his 'religion', and religion, through his politics. A challenge in the socio-religious field would have to be met by socio-religious leadership. For centuries, the paralysed limbs of the Hindu society had been waiting eagerly for the arrival of a physician who would be interested only in the recovery of his patient, and not in fattening his bill. By God's grace, such a physician appeared on the national scene in the latter half of the last century.

Born of a poor peasant family of the Ezhawa caste at Chempazhanthi, a village near Trivandrum, in August 1856 (Malayalam Era 1032 Chingam), Shri Narayana advanced rapidly on the path of spiritualism. In early childhood the worship of the image of the goddess at the Manikkal temple situated near his house was a great attraction. Lord Krishna was his *Ishta-Devata*. Occasionally he used to visit Aiya Swami, a man of realisation, and subsequently he came in close contact with Vidyadhiraj, a yogin with high spiritual attainments who initiated him into spiritual exercises. (Vidyadhiraj was a Nair by birth.) In his inspiring company, Shri Narayana performed penances at Aravikira near Trivandrum, and also at Marutvamala near Nagercoil. Here he laid the foundations of his spiritual greatness.

Having attained realisation, he took a vow to utilise all his energies and faculties for the benefit of the depressed wings of the society whose pitiable plight had moved his entire being. To serve them was, to him, the noblest form of worship or Sadhana. This service was to be rendered with sincere devotion and maternal anxiety, not with patronising generosity or commercial calculation. For forty long years he consumed himself incessantly like the flame of the holy lamp, at the altar of his Deity.

### One People, One Dharma, One God

On the spiritual plane he was one with the Absolute. But the body could not keep pace with the spirit. His mortal frame had obviously certain limitations. He had, therefore, to accept corresponding limitations upon his field of action. It was physically impossible, he knew, to serve fully and effectively even the Ezhawas who numbered nearly three million. Instead of raising the fashionable slogan of 'Jai Jagat' which would have enabled him to shirk the responsibility of the welfare of any individual or group of individuals, he decided to confine his activity to this particular community. Nevertheless, he was aware that his action was capable of being misconstrued and misrepresented and that the illiterate Ezhawas were likely to degenerate into casteism or exclusiveness, unless the full implications of his policy were brought home properly to their innocent minds. He consequently gave them, and through them to the world, his famous motto: *Uru Jāti, Uru Matam, Uru Daivam, Manushyanae* (One People, One Dharma, One God, for man).

Thus he combined in himself the realisation of a religious leader with the realism of a social worker.

This happy blending of universality with particularity has been the unique feature of our Hindu heritage. Shri Guru insisted that every individual must follow strictly the tenets of his own religion, perceiving simultaneously, the oneness underlying all the religions. Once a Christian approached him with a request for 'Mantrām'.

"What is your religion?" inquired Swamiji.

"Christianity."

"Have you studied the Holy Bible and given a fair trial to its teachings?"

“No.....not yet.”

“Be a good Christian first”, was the advice. This incident reminds one of a similar conversation between a Christian aspirant and the late Revered Shankaracharya of Shringeri Muth. Shri Narayana used to say: “Whatever be the religion, it is enough if an individual is good.”

### **Silent, Solid Work**

Though a man of great spiritual stature, he was very particular about the minute details of daily life. He appeared to be immersed in worldly affairs; but it was only to elevate the downtrodden. He was a Sanyasin without the robes of one. He asked the Thiyas to abandon toddy-tapping, long before the Congress turned its attention to this problem. He insisted upon their cleanliness, reformed their domestic life, taught them temperance and economy, abolished evil customs, and encouraged industrious habits. He insisted upon work—the right type of work. He gave the Thiyas all the institutions they needed for their all-round progress—the most prominent among them being ‘Shri Narayana Dharma Sangham’, the Sanyasins’ order, and the S.N.D.P., the social organisation for the ‘Paripalam’ of ‘Shri Narayana Dharma’. And all this was achieved through personal contacts and casual conversations—without organising public meetings or launching formal agitations. He never resorted to modern means of publicity or propaganda. But his silent work could attract attention of great national leaders. In 1922, Ravindranath Tagore came to see Swamiji. In December 1925, Gandhiji visited Shiv Giri to have discussions with Swamiji on social problems. The circle of his disciples included, among others, notable persons like Mahakavi Kumaran Ashan.

### **Temples Became Instruments of Social Renaissance**

The average human mind cannot rise above name and

form, An image of some deity or other becomes, therefore, a spiritual necessity. But the Ezhawas were denied entry into the Hindu temples. How should they practise the *Saguna Upāsana* then? Other scheduled caste leaders tried to solve this problem by securing the right of entry by force. But Shri Guru did not adopt this cheap method. He had come 'to fulfil, not to destroy'. His approach to every problem was constructive, not agitational; his motive religious, not political. He exhorted Ezhawas to construct their own temples where Ezhawas or Thiyas themselves were to officiate as priests. Thus he built scores of temples which became centres of new social life. Almost every temple thus constructed was surrounded by a school, muth, dispensary, library, lecture hall, bank, rest house, garden etc. Consequently, apart from fulfilling the spiritual needs of the society, these temples became powerful instruments of social renaissance.

#### 'Ask Not, Say Not, Think Not, Caste'

Some of the leaders of the so-called caste Hindus failed to appreciate the significance of this movement. When one of them raised an objection that Thiyas could not act as priests to Shiva, one of the disciples of Shri Guru replied: "It is not the Brahmin Shiva we are worshipping; it is the Ezhawa Shiva."

Shri Guru threw open these temples to the pariahs and other castes supposed to be lower than the Ezhawas. In most of these temples he installed the image of Shiva. The last of his temples he built at Chertalai, near Alleppey. Here, to the surprise of all, he installed a mirror instead of some image. This was significant. Has not every seer said, "Know thyself"?

Differences arising out of 'casteism', which is the modern perversion of 'caste-system', have been responsible for the

social disintegration and the consequent miserable plight of the scheduled castes. Casteism has been condemned severely by every well-wisher of our society. Shri Guru wanted that society should get rid of this evil. He declared : "There is in truth nothing like caste. Ask not, say not, think not, caste."

But though he resented the intolerance and arrogance of the self-styled custodians of Hindu culture, he did not discard the Hindu scriptures. On the contrary, he laid his foundations deep in the Vedas, Upanishads and Gita. He hitched his wagon to the star, "while casting out the dross and keeping only the pure gold."

He studiously eschewed the superstitions and excrescences ; but he rightly held that "this world was only a probation for the next, and that man was capable of infinite perfection and could become one with God, by proper *karma*, *jnāna*, *dhyāna* and *bhakti*, guided by a proper Guru, and with the grace of God." As one of his disciples remarks, "He acted as a powerful check on irreligion, atheism and gross materialism."

#### **Not Condemnation, But Construction**

In those days social reformers used to advocate inter-marriage and inter-dining. Swamiji did not think that these measures were indispensable. He, however, wanted that nobody should have a right to prevent or condemn inter-marriage and inter-dining. While he did not preach vehemently the necessity of such reforms, it was his considered opinion that there was nothing objectionable about them. Thus in this respect he preferred to follow the middle-of-the-road policy. Maintenance of status quo would have meant perpetuation of the mischief ; premature imposition of drastic reforms upon an unwilling society would have shaken its



foundations. Shri Guru avoided both the extremes. He could not fall in line with those who, in the name of conservatism, opposed any surgical operation intended to remove the disease; nor could he relish the idea of butchery which would have finished both, the patient as well as the disease.

His genius was essentially creative and constructive. He never condemned anything or criticised anyone. His words or deeds provoked none. He brought about far-reaching social changes without incurring opposition from any quarter. "He created a revolution", observes one of his Sanyasin disciples, "before anybody knew its exact nature or consequences, without antagonising anyone, or demolishing any doctrine, or attacking any sect or creed."

#### **'Do Not Abandon Sanatana Dharma'**

When the historic temple-entry satyagraha was in progress at Vaikom in North Travancore, the disciples of Shri Narayana Guru Swami met at Varakkala to discuss the situation and to determine the appropriate line of action. At this convention Shri C. V. Kunhiraman, Dr. Palpu and other disciples condemned in strong terms the Hindu social order based upon injustice and inequity, and declared that the only way of salvation for the scheduled castes was, according to them, to get themselves converted to Christianity or Buddhism.

When requested to express his views on this important issue, Shri Narayana Guru said, "For spiritual elevation it is not necessary to abandon.....Swadharma. The idea of conversion has its origin in jealousy. Once it is realised that jealousy is an outcome of ego or arrogance (*ahamkār*) enthusiasm for conversion will die down."

Continuing, the Guru observed: "Sanatana Dharma is supreme (Sanatana Dharmamana Sarvapradhanam)." This

attitude of the Guru was responsible for retaining more than three millions of Ezhawas within the fold of Hinduism.

### **A Bold Exposition of Hindu Nationalism**

Shri Guru breathed his last at Varkala on Kanya fifth 1104 of Malayalam era (1928 A. D.). But his last message was delivered in the Mesha month of 1102 (Malayalam era) i.e., two years before his *Mahā Prayāna*. In this message Shri Guru reiterated his implicit faith in the Dharma. To close with, Shri Guru said, "To unite all those who have faith in this Sanatana Dharma would be, I feel, the best form of organisation."

Unlike some other movements launched initially to protect or reform Hinduism but which later degenerated into separate sects more or less outside the pale of Hinduism, Shri Guru's mission continues to be a dynamic power within its fold. As one of his devotees analyses, "His mission stands out as an expression and exposition of Hindu Nationalism, bolder than any hitherto attempted, but in full harmony with its previous manifestations from the day of the Upanishads through the Buddha and Shri Sankara down to Dayananda Saraswati."

The sweet scented manuscript was closed thirty years ago. But even today one cannot pass through Kerala without inhaling its fragrance. His life was a message in itself. While alive, he pointed out to the Hindus of Kerala 'the only way to the emancipation' of the scheduled castes. After death, his spirit can ably lead the Hindu Nation to its ultimate goal of an integrated corporate life. His life has been a correct and comprehensive reply to the country-wide query in the socio-religious field: "What then must we do?" Every patriotic heart is sure to pray to the immortal spirit of Shri Narayana Guru: 'Lead Kindly, O Light!'

### Shri Guruji's Tribute

Regarding the workers dedicated to his mission all patriots will join Pujya Shri Guruji, the chief of R.S.S., in his prayer to the Almighty: "May the Lord bless the workers and may the message of the unity of mankind so forcefully preached once again by Revered Shri Narayana Guru spread all over the country and the world, and may Peace, Universal Love and Dedicated Devotion to the Ultimate come once again upon this strife-weary earth."

—Diwali, 1958

(The 'Harijans' have not produced a greater scholar and leader than Dr. B. R. Ambedkar. Here the author summarises Dr. Ambedkar's little-publicised views, in his own words, about the basic questions concerning Hindu society. It makes revealing reading.)

From where did the Aryan race come into India ? .....Mr. Tilak has suggested that the original home of the Aryan race was in the Arctic region.....This is of course a very original theory. There is only one point which seems to have been overlooked. The horse is a favourite animal of the Vedic Aryans. It was most intimately connected with their life and their religion...The Question is : Was the horse to be found in the Arctic region ? If the answer is in the negative the Arctic home theory becomes very precarious.

So far as the Rig Veda is concerned, there is not a particle of evidence suggesting the invasion of India by the Aryans from outside India.....So far as the testimony of the Vedic literature is concerned, it is against the theory that the original home of the Aryans was outside India.....In the

face of these statements from the Rig Veda, there is obviously no room for a theory of a military conquest by the Aryan race of the non-Aryan races of Dasas and Dasyus... The assertion that the Aryans came from outside and invaded India is not proved, and the premise that the Dasas and Dasyus are aboriginal tribes of India is demonstrably false... The Western theory is thus in conflict with the Rig Veda on a major issue. The Rig Veda being the best evidence on the subject the theory which is in conflict with it must be rejected. There is no escape.

The conclusions that follow from the examination of the Western theory may now be summarised. They are :

(1) The Vedas do not know any such race as the Aryan race.

(2) There is no evidence in the Vedas of any invasion of India by the Aryan race, and its having conquered the Dasas and Dasyus supposed to be natives of India.

(3) There is no evidence to show that the distinction between Aryans, Dasas and Dasyus was a racial distinction.

(4) The Vedas do not support the contention that the Aryans were different in colour from the Dasas and Dasyus.

In this connection, reference may be made to Verse 23 of Adhyaya 65 of the Shantiparvam of the Mahabharata. The verse says :

“In all the Varnas and in all the Ashramas, one finds the existence of Dasyus.”

This statement from Mahabharata must be accepted as conclusive evidence that ‘Dasyu’ is not used as the name of a non-Aryan tribe.

**Shudras...Non-Aryans ?**

In the first place, it (the view that the Shudras are non-Aryans) is contrary to the view taken by Manu and by

the school of Arthashastra. Kautilya calls the Shudra an Aryan in the most emphatic and express terms possible.

(1) The Shudras were Aryans, of the Solar Race.

(2) The Shudras belonged to the Kshatriya class.

(3) The Shudras were so important a class of Kshatriyas that some of the most eminent and powerful kings of the ancient communities were Shudras.

### **Social Status of Shudras**

The explanation that there was no Upanayan of the Shudra because he was non-Aryan is a modern invention which has been shown to be completely baseless.

There can be no doubt that the Shudras did at one time wear the sacred thread. The 'Sanskara Ganapati' cited by Max Mueller contains an express provision declaring the Shudras to be eligible for Upanayan.

Shudras participated in the coronation of kings..... The king received his Sovereignty only when the Ratnis handed over to him the jewel of sovereignty.....It is a significant fact that one of the Ratnis was always a Shudra. ....The four Chief Ministers – Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra consecrated the new king...Shudras were members of the two political assemblies of ancient times, namely, the Janapada and Paura, and as a member of these, the Shudra was entitled to special respect even from a Brahmin. ...A passage from Shantiparvam proves that the Shudras were ministers and that they were almost equal to the Brahmins in number. ....The Shudras were not poor and lowly. They were rich. This fact is testified by the Maitrayani Samhita (iv. 2. 7. 10) and the Panchavimsa Brahmana (vi. 1. 11). ....Chhandogya Upanishad (iv: 1-2) relates the story of one Janasruti to whom Veda Vidya was

taught by the preceptor Raikva. This Janasruti was a Shudra. Kavasha Ailusha, a Shudra, was a Rishi and the author of several hymns of the Tenth Book of the Rig Veda.

### **Origin of Untouchability**

In Vedic times there was no Untouchability. As to the period of the Dharma Sutras, there was Impurity but there was no Untouchability.....Manu's decision is that there is no fifth Varna. There was no Untouchability in the time of Manu. We can definitely say that Manu Smriti did not enjoin Untouchability.....While Untouchability did not exist in 200 A.D., it had emerged by 600 A.D. As has been shown by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, cow-killing was made a capital offence by the Gupta Kings, some time in the 4th Century A.D. We can, therefore, say with some confidence that Untouchability was born some time about 400 A.D.

### **Root of Untouchability**

Can the hatred between Buddhism and Brahminism be taken to be the sole cause why Broken Men became Untouchables? Obviously, it cannot be. The hatred and contempt preached by the Brahmins was directed against Buddhists in general and not against the Broken Men in particular. Since Untouchability stuck to Broken Men only, it is obvious that there was some additional circumstance which has played its part in fastening Untouchability upon the Broken Men.....Can we say that the Broken Men came to be treated as Untouchables because they ate beef? There need be no hesitation in returning an affirmative answer to this question. No other answer is consistent with facts as we know them.

### **Due to Filthy Occupations ?**

It is, therefore, obvious that the Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas did the work of scavengers which is the

filthiest of filthy occupations... The theory of Filthy Occupations as an explanation of Untouchability is, therefore, not tenable.

### **Untouchability and Racialism**

We do not know whether the word 'Aryan' is a term indicative of race. Historians have, therefore, made a mistake in proceeding on the assumption that the Aryans were a separate race... If anthropometry is a science which can be depended upon to determine the race of a people, then the results obtained by the application of anthropometry to the various strata of Hindu society disprove that the Untouchables belong to a race different from the Aryans and the Dravidians. The measurements establish that the Brahmins and the Untouchables belong to the same race. If the Brahmins are Aryans the Untouchables are also Aryans. If the Brahmins are Dravidians the Untouchables are also Dravidians... The racial theory of Untouchability finds very little support from such facts as we know about the ethnology of India.....Racial theory of the origin of Untouchability must, therefore, be abandoned.

### **Why Living Outside the Village ?**

To put it definitely, the Untouchables were originally only Broken Men. It is because they were Broken Men, that they lived outside the village...The Untouchables from the very beginning lived outside. Untouchability has nothing to do with their living outside the village...They were not deported and made to live outside the village because they were declared Untouchables. They lived outside the village from the beginning because they were Broken Men...There was a time when the ancestors of the present day Untouchables were not Untouchables but were merely Broken Men.



*(Written before the Chinese invasion)*

Confucianism is the Dr. Jekyll of China, while Communism is its Mr. Hyde. Today it appears that this Mr. Hyde has succeeded in suppressing the Dr. Jekyll of the Chinese national mind. China's has been the case of 'split personality'— of course, on the national plane. Our beloved Prime Minister has often referred to the age-long and uninterrupted friendship between China and Bharat. The author of the "Glimpses of World History" seems to have conveniently forgotten the hordes of invaders under the leadership of Chenghiz Khan. Pandit Nehru has been in frantic love with this our neighbouring nation. But in modern China a psychological tug-of-war has been going on between the forces of Confucius and those of Cominform, though for the time being, the latter have obviously over-powered the former. In fact, psychologically there exist two Chinas—one belonging to Confucius and the other to Cominform. Which of the two Chinas Pandit Nehru has been trying to court at the cost of his nation ?

## Culture Vs. Communism

Westerners would find it difficult to understand the psychology of the Chinese people. During the last twenty-five centuries China was ruled by different dynasties, but none of them could ever attempt regimentation of their corporate mind. During this long period, the people had variety of governments—good, bad and indifferent. But culturally their hearts were ruled mainly by K'ung-fu-tze-Kung (Confucius) born at Ch'ufu in 551 B.C. i.e., 53 years after the birth of Lao-Tze, the founder of Taoism, and 9 years subsequent to that of Buddha. His influence persisted, notwithstanding changes in the government from time to time. It was Confucius who restated emphatically for the guidance of his people their cultural values, ideals and aspirations. Political upheavals were like so many waves incapable of moving the heart of the fathomless ocean. The current of culture and traditions remained undisturbed.

But Cominform wants to govern not only political but all the various aspects of individual and social life in China. This drive for complete control of the Chinese mind, life and intellect brought the Communist Government in direct conflict with the national culture.

It would be wrong to presume that the hundreds of millions of Chinese have voluntarily embraced Communism. On the contrary, the fact of frequent purges goes to indicate that even today the influence of Confucius has not been completely washed off inspite of the brain-washes by the red dictatorship.

It would be too early to judge whether Communism can ever come to stay in that land of the 'Statesman-Philosopher-King'. One thing, however, is certain. There are basic differences between Marxism and Confucianism, and their

synthesis is an impossibility. A few distinct characteristics of Confucianism would suffice to illustrate the point.

### Family Vs. Commune

What is the nucleus of the human society? In this context, Confucius attached great importance to the family organism. The foundation of society, according to him, is a disciplined individual in an orderly family. Beyond the family lies the State in which, what is natural affection in family, assumes the form of 'Duty'. The next higher organism is mankind.

According to Comrade Mao, the so-called "Peoples' Communes" built upon the ruins of the family system, embody a process of development. The communes have miscarried, though it is doubtful whether the family life they have sought to destroy can ever be restored with the same ease and efficiency. Family provided the best insurance to all its members against all contingencies. That insurance system based upon natural affection has been given the go-bye. And we are now told that the number of workers enjoying labour insurance in that vast country with a population of 650 millions was 13,780,000 in 1958!

Liquidation on mass-scale after the declaration of the policy of "letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend" is too recent to be forgotten. The strategy was simple enough. It was desirable to let the anti-Communists—"poisonous weeds which are hidden, or appear in disguise"—come out in their true colours. Hundreds of thousands of anti-Mao citizens were consequently given blood-baths. This was, of course, quite in keeping with the traditions of Marxism.

When asked about his reaction to the policy of "killing the unprincipled for the good of the principled", Confucius

replied, "In carrying on your government why should you use killing at all? Let your desires be for what is good, and the people will be good. The relation between superiors and inferiors is like that of between the wind and the grass. The grass has to bend when the wind blows across it.....He who exercises government by means of his virtue may be compared to the north polar star which keeps its place and all the stars turn towards it."

### Conscience Vs. Coercion

Dictatorship of the proletariat characterised by purges, liquidations, blood-baths, brain-washings, mass-massacres etc., is certainly not the ideal form of government as envisaged by Confucius. Marxists are materialists; they believe that matter conditions mind, that objective circumstances mould the mental make-up of an individual, and that, therefore, a new social order cannot come into existence except through the instrumentality of ruthless dictatorship of a particular class. Hence the shameless argument in favour of totalitarianism.

Contrast this Marxian approach with that of Confucius: "The ancients who wished to illustrate the highest virtue throughout the Empire first ordered well their own States; wishing to order well their States, they first regulated their families; wishing to regulate their families, they first cultivated their own selves; wishing to cultivate their own selves, they first rectified their hearts; wishing to rectify their hearts, they first sought to be sincere in their thoughts; wishing to be sincere in their thoughts, they first extended to the utmost, their knowledge; wishing to extend their knowledge, they first sought to investigate things." And again, "If one guides by means of decrees, and regulates by means of punishments, the people evade the laws and have no conscience. If one guides through the force of personality and through morals, the people have

conscience and attain good." This was the way to make the whole empire tranquil and happy.

### **Moral Being Vs. Economic Being**

It may be noted that this approach is essentially subjective. Self-development is the basis of social development. "The cultivation of oneself with reverential care" must be insisted upon. For Marx, man is an economic being. Confucius was convinced that man is a moral being. His 'Superior Man' is anxious lest he should not get Truth, he is not anxious lest poverty should overcome him. He lays stress upon the desirability of the contact of every individual with the universal human element at the bottom of one's soul.

He stands for five principles in the realm of ethics i.e., Ten (Humanitarianism), Yi (Righteousness), Li (Propriety), Chi (Wisdom) and Zun (Trustworthiness). It is ethics and not economics that governs the world. The economic, social, political and religious lives are one and indivisible—all governed by ethics. It is the duty of every individual to be in natural harmony with the universal moral order. Moral sense is the characteristic attribute of man; moral law, the law of his being. Perfect harmony in different social relationships is an integral part of the working of the moral order. Marxists are free from the bonds of that 'reactionary' and 'bourgeois' virtue called morality. Confucius was not so very "progressive". He had firm faith in God, though, as a practical guide, he laid greater emphasis upon actual code of conduct rather than upon theological discussions. His mind was ever in communion with his Deity. In this respect he was poles apart from Marx, for whom 'matter' was the ultimate reality.

### **Catholicity Vs. Fanaticism**

Marxism stands for revolution—for violent destruction

of the old order and forcible introduction of the new one. It seeks divorce from the past. It has no faith in tradition. Confucius, on the other hand, believed that "regulations of conduct handed down from generation to generation were no empty words but were life-moulds by which people should regulate their conduct." In this sense he was modest. He never claimed that he created anything new. "I am the transmitter" said he, "and not the creator." There is nothing sectarian about his preachings. He did not seek to give his people a new religion. Confucianism is not a religion or 'ism' in the recognised sense of the term. That is why it is considered to be the symbol of the entire Chinese culture, though, in actuality, the latter also embraces the two other systems of philosophy i.e., Taoism of Chinese origin and Buddhism of Bharat. This attitude of Confucius is in direct contrast with the sectarian fanaticism of Marxism. The latter is based upon hatred, the former upon all-embracing love.

### Superior Man Vs. Marxian Revolutionary

Confucius conceived of the 'Superior Man' whom he wanted to be at the helm of the family and the State. Every Hindu would be happy to go through the elaborate description of his 'Superior Man' who resembles to a great extent the *Sthita-Prajna* of Bhagwad Gita, and is certainly the very antithesis of the typical revolutionary of Marxism-Leninism.

The tenets of what may be termed as Confucianism are in no way incompatible with the spirit of Hindu Dharma. For, Confucius is not exclusive in outlook like Communism and other semetic religions. Mao is out to demolish the house that Confucius built. This is the inner conflict of the Chinese mind—the conflict between the two Chinas. All these years, Pandit Nehru has been lending his moral support to the

immoral suppression of the Chinese culture by the Chinese agents of foreign expansionism who can only claim to represent China as truly as the Indian Civil Servants under the British Bureaucracy represented the cultural heritage of our ancient land. Pandit Nehru has sinned against Confucianism.

Will the Dr. Jekyll of China forgive this aspirant for world-leadership who is always too busy to know what he says?

-30-11-1959-

Matter found its most ardent devotee in Karl Marx. For Marx matter was the only reality. It could be touched and seen. Existence of all objects was to be ascertained through senses or scientific apparatus. Nothing could be presumed or inferred to have existence unless it was certified by test-tube or telescope. The concept of God was to be treated as a myth since He refused to be subjected to the tests of the laboratory. Science, it was presumed, was capable of solving the riddle of the universe. It was the only reliable instrument of all knowledge. Religion or Ethics deserved to be discarded in so far as it was inconsistent with the findings of science. Mind has no separate or independent existence of its own. It was only the projection of matter, resulting from peculiar combinations of different atoms or molecules. Matter determined or conditioned Mind. Objective circumstances determined the nature of the subjective world.

#### **Darwin & Hegel's Influence on Marx**

The latter half of the last century was dominated by the doctrine of Darwin. His theory of evolution, based on the



principle of the 'survival of the fittest' through the process of 'natural selection', furnished the basis or justification for divergent theories, such as, the White-Man's Burden Theory of the British imperialists, the Aryan racialism of the Nazis and the class-conflict concept of the Marxists. Evolution was taken for granted, though occasional retardations and reverses were not completely ruled out. It naturally followed that, as a rule, every subsequent thought, idea, species or civilization must be necessarily superior to the preceding ones. Man was the crown of creation, and the arrival of the superman was predicted with certainty. The capitalistic order of society was indisputably more progressive compared to all the previous social orders; but it was, in its turn, bound to be replaced by a still superior system. All ancient civilizations were decidedly inferior to the nineteenth century civilization of Europe. Science was supreme and its scepticism marked the advance of human intellect which was freed for the first time from the bonds of slavery of medieval religions. Disbelief in belief and belief in disbelief were the characteristics of the most enlightened mind. Darwinism was the new gospel; it was to be made applicable to all fields of human knowledge. Sociology was no exception; and Marx was the Darwin of this social science.

Evolution was the Law of the Universe. Transformation of a capitalistic order into a socialistic one was inevitable. But what was the method of this sociological evolution? Darwin was also required to explain the method. He advanced his theory of natural selection. That provided the necessary clue to Marx's mind, which was further stimulated by the dialecticism of Hegel. Hegel's dialectic method in the realm of philosophy was to be applied to the sphere of sociology. Against this background Marx formulated his theory of Dialectical Materialism. It fitted wonderfully with the Darwinian concept of 'struggle for existence'. Progress is achieved

through the reaction of conflicting forces upon each other. "The conflict of contradictions with growth as its consequence" was the law of life. The history of all existing societies was a story of class struggles. It was primarily a tale of the exploitation of one class by another. Dialectical Materialism established the inevitability of revolt by the workers and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to be followed by the 'Withering away of the State', and emergence of the Stateless and Classless Society characterised by communal ownership.

#### **Communism - A New Semitic Religion**

With the evolution of this theory, Marxism became a perfect religion—with Marx as its Mohammed, Das Capital its Koran, the Secretariat of the Communist Party its priesthood, Dialectical Materialism its Allah governing all the various processes of the Universe, and the higher phase of Communism its Heaven offering everything to everybody. Mohammed was the last Prophet, and so was Marx—though it was not prudent to declare this unequivocally. Perfection of this latest religion was naturally accompanied by the fervour and fanaticism characteristic of all semitic religions.

It cannot be denied that Marx took great pains for formulating his theories. But it is equally indisputable that his approach was hypothetical instead of being scientific. His thought process was influenced by the presumptions and prejudices of his times and, in this sense, it was more imitative than original. Subsequent events have defied the over-simplified formula of Marx. They have proved that the data upon which he worked was insufficient, his information inaccurate, his attitude unscientific, his conclusions incorrect, his predictions untrue, and his theories untenable.

Marxism is not a *Darshan*; it cannot claim for itself that dignified position. It is only an intellectual parasite on

Newtonian Science, Darwinian Evolutionism and Hegelian Dialecticism. It is just one of the many systems of philosophy attempting to develop a social science of its own. Those who try to compare Marxism with Hinduism betray their ignorance of both.

### **Hinduism & Communism are Not Comparable**

Hinduism is a cosmology, different in type from and far more comprehensive in scope than, either Philosophy or Science in the Western sense of the term. Hindu Dharma is the Cosmic Law. It is not invented by Hindus; they have merely discovered it and utilized its knowledge for the building up of their social order. Any social structure, in order to be scientific, must be consistent with cosmology. Varna Dharma of the Hindus is the natural and inevitable corollary of their cosmic view. 'Isms' of the West represent views of different philosophers who cannot be compared with our seers, who were the medium or agency through which the Cosmic Principle revealed itself. Hindu mantras are the cosmic vibrations revealed in the form of *varnas* or *Shabdās*. No slogans, catchwords or phraseologies of Western scholars can rightfully occupy the same exalted position.

Nevertheless the most astonishing and equally creditable achievement of Marxism was its success in securing a few votaries for itself in this ancient land. That it was not the convincing nature of the theory but the impressive fact of the triumphant Russian revolution that attracted the otherwise frustrated Hindus to Communism, is evident from the fact that they gave a serious thought to this non-Hindu way of thinking only after 1917, though its formulation was finalised as early as 1848. Nevertheless that it could, at long last, enlist some support for itself in this country is highly creditable, particularly in view of the fact that materialism was not at all a new creed or concept in this land. Hindus had

evolved materialism during a period when Europe was barbarous, and then dismissed it since it was not helpful but detrimental to the progress and prosperity of mankind.

### **Hindus Enunciated and then Rejected Materialism**

Centuries before the birth of Demokritos, the father of Western materialism, the Hindus had systematically evolved a school of materialism. Curiously enough, the founder of Bharatiya materialism was none else than Bṛhaspati or Brahmaṇaspati, the preceptor of the gods. Barhaspatya school of thought challenged the validity of all knowledge and also of all evidence, perceptual or inferential. It denied all authority. Being subsequently reinforced by *Swabhāvavāda* i.e., Naturalism, it developed itself into the then best formulated system of philosophy known as *Lokāyata*. Its advocates asserted that the *Lokāyata* system alone was scientific; that the perceptual evidence was the only authority; that even ether could not be accepted as a fundamental element because of its imperceptibility; that consciousness was only a derivative of matter which was the ultimate reality; that mind had no reality of its own—it arose out of the vibrations of the molecules of the brain; that there was no causal relation between action and what could be described as its consequence; that the theories of Fate, Rebirth, Karmaphala or Swarga were nonsensical; that pleasure or pain accrued on account of *Swabhāva* or Nature; that scriptures were nothing but the machinations of shrewd priests; that politics was the only real form of knowledge; and that material prosperity and sensual pleasure were the 'Summum bonum' of human life.

Materialism was given full scope for development in Bharat. Freedom of thought has invariably been the characteristic feature of Hindu social life. Ours is a land of free thought. Hindu Dharma is the Manava Dharma—and so far as the philosophical approach is concerned, it is the

Federation of all Faiths of Humanity. Co-existence of all systems of thought has been practicable only under Hindu Dharma. All sects and cults are embraced by Hinduism. Materialism was ultimately discarded, not out of ignorance of its doctrines but after giving it fair trials all of which ended in failure. It is worth mentioning that after the natural culmination of materialism in hedonism of the worst type giving rise to a race of erotomaniacs, it was criticised and opposed vehemently by the Vedic as well as the non-Vedic Hindu faiths, i.e., Buddhism and Jainism. Materialism was defeated in the free and fair fight of philosophies. Red Charvakas of modern times are wrong in presuming that the Gospel of Materialism is entirely new to the Bharatiya mind and that it is a generous gift of the West to the East. Far from that! After the collapse of its faith in Christianity the bewildered West picked up as a new panacea the creed which was finally rejected long ago by the wise East after all its experiments and experiences.

#### **Projection, Evolution & Involution : Brahma, Vishnu & Mahesh**

Ancient Hindu seers realised that all existence is one, that various objects with different names and forms are only projections of the same Reality, just as ornaments are projections of the same gold. That Reality is Absolute, without a second; and the innumerable forms or appearances are the consequences of Its desire for self-multiplication. Christianity stands for the theory of creation, and even Darwin's evolution is inconceivable unless the entire process is presumed to have some beginning somewhere. But this is illogical inasmuch as there can be no beginning or creation without its preceding cause. Out of non-existence existence cannot emerge; and, again, existence cannot culminate itself into non-existence. Hindu sages realised the fact of the beginningless and endless chain of projection, evolution and involution. Nothing was

destructible. Involution resembles sleep. It is not akin to death, so that the subsequent process of evolution does not begin from the beginning. In sleep an individual loses his conscious plane. But after he is awakened he is not required to begin with the initial stages of his consciousness; he need not begin with the alpha and omega. The sentiments, feelings, emotions, ideas, thoughts or knowledge that he possessed while going to bed would be immediately revived after he is awake. Evolution of plant life took millions of years, no doubt, but every new tree would not require the same length of time for its growth from the seed. It need not undergo, for its coming into being, the whole process laid down by Darwin. Its journey commences from the stage of seed-life. While under involution properties are not dead or destroyed; they are dormant. They become patent as soon as the process of evolution commences. Thus involution is symbolised by the sleep of Lord Vishnu. Continuous, unintermittent, beginningless and endless cycle of projection, evolution and involution is symbolised by the governing deities of these processes, i.e., Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh. They again govern corresponding properties of existence on different levels; those on physical plane (*Tamas*) being governed by Rudra, on biological plane (*Rajas*) by Brahma, and on psychic plane (*Satvam*) by Vishnu. The Reality pervades, and is Itself all these properties on all levels, and yet It is far beyond and above all of them. Naturally so, since It is the Absolute—though with a passion for self-multiplication.

### **Western Science Also Leads to Hindu Philosophy**

From and through the Absolute the ancient Hindus proceeded towards the multiplicity. From and through the multiplicity, the modern scientist of the West is advancing

unconsciously towards the Absolute, and though he is still far away from It, it can be safely stated that he is today nearer to the Absolute than to the multiplicity. It is doubtful whether Hindus ever availed themselves of the well-equipped laboratories of the Western type. But they did develop an apparatus which was far more subtle, comprehensive and powerful than the scientific apparatus of the twentieth century. Through it they could commune and identify themselves with the Ultimate. Modern science is forced to admit that the ultimate reality is well beyond its access, though it is free to draw its own inferences.

From this point of view, the advance of science during the last century is noteworthy. Analytically, the scientist came to conclude, in the first place, that there are about half a million pure substances that have no other kind of stuff mixed with them. Each of these substances, the scientist found out, is made up of millions upon millions of particles, i.e., molecules, all exactly alike in any one substance, but different from those of any other. The molecule of each of these substances is again made up of combinations of particles of any two or more of the ninety-two chemical elements. Each element is further made up of atoms all exactly alike in structure in any one element, but different from those in the others. Every atom consists of a nucleus of the positron, proton and neutron, with electrons moving round it elliptically with immeasurable speed. The Universe of the science thus consisted of matter which had mass (or weight), acted upon by energy which could set matter in motion. Matter was made up of particles that attracted each other at distances not much greater than their own diameter, but which repelled each other strongly when brought closer. Those particles were in motion having, therefore, energy. That energy of motion was identified with heat. All the different forms of

energy were interchangeable — heat, work, electricity or light without any loss on the balance-sheet. The fundamentals of science were length, time and mass which could combine to give a number of other qualities, such as velocity. All the forces in the Universe could be reduced to three — gravitational, electrical and magnetic. Nothing could ever be without the action of these forces. Height, length and width were the three recognised dimensions, and the Universe extended for ever and ever into infinite space.

### **Even Matter & Energy are the Same Thing**

From the multiplicity of half a million pure substances, science gradually advanced towards the duality of matter and energy. As science progressed, it blew up its own established theories of the past. This process is not yet ended. And the recent strides of science would completely nonplus the most progressive scientist of the nineteenth century. Could he ever conceive that while today man appears to think because he has a brain, initially the growth of this extraordinarily complex organism called human brain was the result of his Will to Think? He could not have believed for a moment that space is curved and therefore finite; that the shortest distance between any two points is a curve instead of a straight line; that parallel lines would eventually meet; that light rays travel in curves and not in straight lines; that all motion is relative, conceivable only in relative terms, i.e., in respect to other objects; that length is not absolute—its measurement changing with the change in the speed; that motion being the natural state of all things there could be no fixed points of reference to facilitate establishment of standards for comparing velocities, size, length, mass and time, except as they might be measured by relative motions; that light is the only unvarying factor that is not relative, its velocity remaining unchanged; that time is the fourth dimension;



that time is a dimension of space and space that of time, and neither of the two can exist without the other; that time itself is not absolute—it being relative to the position and speed of the observer; that mass is not absolute and constant—with increase in velocity mass becomes greater; that “physical laws for the minute atom” were “equally applicable to immense celestial bodies”; that all physical phenomena are a single scheme rendering unifiable in one concept “the infinitesimal, whirling world of the atom and the vast reaches of star-filled space”; and that while energy equals mass multiplied by the speed of light, and again by the speed of light, mass is nothing but concentrated energy, and thus energy and mass are the same thing, differing only in state.

True, science has not yet endorsed all that our sages stated about consciousness. But, all the same, consciousness is no longer regarded as a mere derivative of matter. Its independent existence is now conceded, though investigation into its nature is beyond the scope of physical sciences. A section of psychology has arrived at the E.S.P. i.e., Extra Sensory Perception, scientific analysis of which is being attempted. The term ‘sixth sense’ has now become broadly intelligible to the common man. The theories and presumptions that formed the basis of Marxism have thus been completely exploded.

Before Marxian Materialism could accomplish the World Revolution, the concept of ‘matter’ was itself revolutionised. Marx was betrayed by Almighty Matter. Will the not-so-very-mighty-mortals succeed where their Almighty has failed?

'Culture' is not, as some one would have us believe, anything vague or ambiguous, though its comprehensive grasp is rather difficult because it embraces all departments of human life. The word 'Culture' denotes a trend of impressions on the Mind of a Society which is peculiar to its own, and which again, is the cumulative effect of its passion, emotion, thought, speech and action throughout its life. The peculiar characteristic of our culture is the identity of the world-culture with it, so that Bharatiya culture is nothing else but world-culture as **professed and practised by Bharatiyas.**

Culture has its own distinct ways of promoting human progress. It has its own laws regulating social conditions. Frequently there appear on the world-stage forces that are antagonistic to 'Culture', that run contrary to its laws, that obstruct the course of social progress and threaten mankind with total extinction. These forces of *Āsuri Sampat* must be annihilated if humanity is to enjoy peace, progress and prosperity. Culture has been ceaselessly conducting its fight against *Āsuri Sampat* through various individuals and institutions arising in different climes and times.

Industrial revolution introduced an era of exploitation in Europe. Handicrafts receded into the background. Machines became the chief means of production, concentrating unrestrained economic power in the hands of its owners, on account of its peculiar mode of production. The owners further came to wield, on the strength of their economic position, enormous influence over the State apparatus which was ever prepared to promptly assist them in all their designs, fair or foul, of promoting profits. The State became the instrument of Capitalism.

### **Frustration Leads to a Reactionary Theory**

Profits, as distinct from human happiness, became the be-all and end-all of all industrial activity. The status of human beings working on machine was no better than that of its lifeless wheels. Exploited to the extreme by the owners of the means of production, i.e., the capitalists, and neglected by the State, the toiling masses became helpless, frustrated and desperate. Against this background proceeded the formulation of a theory which embodied the bitter and unbalanced reaction of a brilliant philosopher to his cruel surroundings. The theory was, in this sense, a reactionary one, and its correctness was circumscribed by the conditions at that time.

As a western materialist, Marx believed that the economic structure of society was the basic structure on which was based the superstructure of juridical, political and social institutions. Economics, the Marxists claim, is the basis of any social pattern. According to them, "the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in man's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought not in the philosophy but in the economics of each particular epoch."

Thus, to them, a social change implies a change in the economic structure.

Culture would question whether economics is the final and ultimate cause of social transformation. Economics, like politics, is no doubt one of the several factors that make their own contribution to structural changes. But is it the final cause? Does it constitute the very basis, and the only basis, of society? Culture knows that it does not.

### **Psychological Revolution Precedes Material Revolution**

History shows that political and economic changes are preceded by psychological ones. Subjective revolution in the collective mind has been followed by objective revolution in the material environment. Unless human thought is revolutionised first, enduring material changes through evolution or revolution are inconceivable. Psychology, and not economics, is the determining factor. Psychological structure of society forms the real basis, 'starting from which alone can we work out the ultimate explanation of the whole super-structure' of social, political and economic institutions.

Economics cannot be treated as the basic cause inasmuch as it is itself conditioned by, and is the outcome of, the psychological condition which, therefore, is the more decisive and basic factor in this context. Economic structure is but a form. Psychological social consciousness is the very life. Change in consciousness is a prelude to a change in the form. Psychological transformation precedes the structural one, just as function precedes organ. Artificial imposition of social structure which is not the natural result of appropriate psychological condition is not likely to last long except under the constant threat of an iron rod. Wherever structural change was effected through violence, without allowing the social psychology to become mature and strong enough to cause such a change in the normal course, the preservation of

the social structure had to be secured through abnormal terrorism and repressive autocracy. Hence the usual fear of a revolution being followed by a counter-revolution. There is no guarantee that a structural transformation will automatically bring about the appropriate psychological change. It can, however, be assured that the latter will certainly, and invariably, result in the former. This explains the complete authoritarianism of the Russian State.

### **Marx Ignored the Mind that Determines Matter**

Human mind is the cause, and material environment the effect, though it is not to be denied that mind, in its turn, is also affected to a certain degree by the environment. Though mind and environment act and react upon each other, mind is indisputably the basic factor. Otherwise the brave and successful fight of some distinguished individuals against the freezing environment which unnerved and completely subdued the masses would be inexplicable. Why should different minds react differently to the same environment? Rana Pratap Singh and Man Singh were in the midst of the same surroundings. But their reactions were different. Khando Ballal and Ganoji Shirke found themselves confronted with similar situations. Why should they have reacted differently under the same set of circumstances? Centuries of expulsions and trials and tribulations could not quench the thirst of the Jews for a homeland. Many other peoples, under similar circumstances, would have easily given way and struck a compromise with what would have appeared to them as the inevitable. What is the explanation for this unique tenacity of one race in the face of circumstances under which others would have preferred to surrender themselves?

Environment is the product of human mind. In accepting economics as the basis of society, Marxism has mistaken effect for the cause. Science today has proved the

incorrectness of Marxist assertions that everything in the universe can be explained in terms of matter, that matter determines mind, which is only a function of the former, and that human ideas and institutions are merely a superstructure on matter. Scientists of the twentieth century “know too much about matter to be materialists”! Matter is no longer accepted as the basic reality. Science has reasons to believe that matter is only a “projection of the consciousness of its perceiver”, that “matter is but an expression of energy”—an expression of the basic reality. According to our culture, mind determines the matter and, therefore, social consciousness determines the social structure. Culture deals primarily with the human mind, and, through it, with social structure. Marxism concerns itself solely with the structure, ignoring the subjective factor of human mind.

It is significant that even after thirty-eight years of communist rule in Russia, the “withering away of the State” is not yet in sight. Perpetuation of dictatorship is deemed necessary not merely to meet the threat of external aggression but also to suppress internal revolts and counter-revolutions. Tens of years after the Revolution, the veterans of the regime are still being Trotskeyed and Beria-ed, which suggests that either Stalins and Khrushchevs are extremely self-centred or Trotskeys and Berias are turning traitors, neither of which does credit to the dictatorship of the proletariat. These persecutions are a sad commentary on the efficacy of social structure in moulding social mind.

Let alone the question of the psychology of masses, what is there in the principles and practice of Marxism that would prevent administrators from degenerating into autocrats? There seems to be no justification for the presumption that in Russia the State will ever wither away.

### Ideal Stateless Society to be Found in Ancient Bharat

Ancient Bharat was an ideal Stateless Society. There was neither state nor state officials (*Na rājyam naiva rājāseet*), neither criminals nor prosecutors (*Na dandyo naiva dāndikah*). In keeping with Dharma, the law of the Being, people protected one another (*Dharmenaiva prajāh sarvā rakshanti sma parasparam*). No dictatorship was necessary to regulate social life. It could be practicable because of a certain elevation of the social mind leading to its adherence to Dharma. Society was self-governed. Discipline was self-imposed. There were no codes and constitutions, and there were no disciplinary actions (*Teshām nāseed vidhātavyam prāyaschittam kathanchana*). There was neither capital nor corporal punishment. Public censure was the only punishment then (*Purā dhigdanda evāseed vadhadandodya vartate*).

But in course of time society degenerated from such ideal conditions. It underwent a structural change for the worse. The process of social disintegration started at a rapid pace. What was the cause? It was to be found in the subjective factor, i.e., mind. According to Bhishma, individuals in the society became confused and perverted; their original psychological set-up was disturbed, and therefore they ceased to adhere strictly to the tenets of Dharma. This psychological disturbance was followed by chaotic conditions so far unknown to the self-governed Bharatiya society. Subsequently, states Bhishma, a deputation of the representatives of society waited upon Lord Vishnu and apprised him of the conditions then prevailing on the earth. Their memorandum stated in unequivocal terms that the disintegration of the social structure was a direct consequence of the degeneration in the social mind. *Bhagavan! Naralokastham nashtam brahma sanātanam : Lobhamohādibhirbhāvaih tanno bhayamupāvishat.* "O Lord! This ancient human

society is under the process of disintegration on account of the rise of *Lobha*, *Moha* etc. That is why we are apprehensive.” Consequently, Lord Vishnu advised them to adopt the institution of ‘State’.

This analysis of our ancient deputationists is in direct contrast with the ‘materialistic interpretation of history’. The structural transformation from statelessness, through chaos, to state-authority was caused on account of the psychological transformation of society from ‘Dharma’ to ‘Lobha’ and ‘Moha’. The stateless structure of society could not ensure the preservation of appropriate psychological atmosphere. Psychological upheaval was, however, unmistakably followed by drastic changes in the form of society.

Thus, to sum up, psychological structure is the basis on which there stands the entire superstructure of social, economic and political institutions. Real interpretation of history is psychological; materialistic aspect of history is merely an outward expression of this basic subjective factor. Even conflict which is the essence of dialecticism is conceived and conducted on ideological plane first and manifested on material plane only subsequently.

The approach of Culture is essentially subjective. The character of its contribution to human progress is, therefore, basic and fundamental. It is fulfilling its mission through various instruments.

### **Classlessness Through Class Struggle ?**

The Marxian process of eradication of class struggle through intensification of class struggle cannot but remind us of the Anglo-Saxon slogan of “War to end War.” Both are equally ridiculous. Intensification of class struggle must be preceded and accompanied by intensification of hatred. Now a pre-requisite for the stability of the classless society is all-absorbing Love. Cultivation of intense hatred, so indispens-



able for pulling down the existing social structure through class-conflict, is bound to disintegrate and shatter to pieces any other subsequent social structure—be it of a classless society—with equal ease and efficiency. Class-conflict presupposes self-assertion. Stability of a classless society, or for that matter any form of society, presupposes self-abnegation. It is difficult to imagine how the habit of hatred and self-assertion is going to culminate in that of Love and self-abnegation.

### Unconvincing Dialectics

Marx endeavours to establish the inevitability of class-conflict through dialectical materialism. His 'dialectics' is impressive but not convincing. In a given society, we are told, there is a social thesis which gives rise to its anti-thesis. The struggle between these two forces leads to a synthesis which, in its turn, becomes again a thesis giving birth to its anti-thesis. Granting that the tussle between the present social thesis and its anti-thesis would ultimately culminate in the synthesis of a classless society, the question would naturally arise as to what would be the anti-thesis of such a classless society which would then itself become a thesis. If classlessness is the best form of social order, its anti-thesis, if at all there exists any, cannot but lead to comparative social deterioration. In case we presume absence of any anti-thesis of the classless society, we will be compelled to conclude that either, in absence of any anti-thesis, humanity would stop progressing, or the theory of social dialectics would cease to operate after the classless society comes into being. This conclusion is hardly helpful in establishing the correctness of the theory: "The history of humanity is the history of its class-struggles." Would the Wheels of History stop moving after the abolition of classes and class struggles?

In fact, a society comprising of class-conscious individuals will find itself incompetent to maintain classlessness. Rousing of class-consciousness must inevitably lead to the emergence of a class-state. Classless society must have its foundations in the social consciousness of classlessness which necessitates complete elimination of class-consciousness.

One is also surprised to find trade union workers in our country quoting Marx more religiously and fanatically than the much-ridiculed Brahmin quoting the Vedas. This is nothing but conservatism—a new variety, of course—but conservatism nonetheless. This only indicates that scripturalism is still as strong as ever.

### **Marxism Out-of-Date**

Marxism, to say the least, is already out-of-date. A number of Marxian theories and predictions are already proved to be incorrect. Socialism emerged first, not in a highly industrialised country like England, as predicted by Marx but in Russia which was the most backward European country from the industrial point of view. Even today communism is more powerful in backward countries rather than in countries like the U.K. or U.S.A. It has also now become evident that the abolition of private property is not necessarily a guarantee for economic equality. Abolition of existing classes will not automatically result in classlessness. The present social structure may undergo a change after a red revolution, but classes will continue to remain all the same—with the only difference that under the communist regime the vested interest would be represented by a group of party leaders controlling the administrative apparatus of the State. Under capitalistic system, exploitation is mercilessly conducted by a few private capitalists. They would be replaced by a group of communist leaders but exploitation would still be there. There would, however, be some difference in the two

cases. While exploitation by private capital can be checked, regulated or controlled to a considerable extent under the non-communist democratic set-up, there would be no power within the communist State to control the group of exploiting administrators.

Indian communists have often ridiculed the Sarvodaya concept of 'Change of heart'. Tatas and Birlas, according to them, would never voluntarily surrender their present privileged position. True. But then it is still less justifiable to presume that the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' which is far more powerful than private capitalists, would one fine morning liquidate itself voluntarily. If regulated power can corrupt Tatas, there is no valid reason to believe that absolute power will not corrupt Stalins and Maos absolutely. Contrary to the Marxian theorisation, the Russian rulers have taken every precaution to see that their dictatorship does not become just a transitory stage to Socialism. 'Withering away of the state' does not appear to be even a distant possibility. Such an authoritarian State may nationalise industries; but that does not lead to the 'Socialisation' of the property in the real sense, since industries may be owned by the State, but the State itself is not owned by the People. Rather it is the State that owns both, the People as well as the Property. In communist Russia, capitalism is done away with, but a classless, democratic and international society of the free and the equal is not yet born. This gives a direct lie to the Marxian theory that socialism is the only alternative to capitalism.

### **Managerial Society**

Russia today reminds one of the 'Managerial State' as defined by James Burnham, in which the entire authority is concentrated in the hands of the administrators of the State and the managers of the industries. Managerial society,

according to Burnham, is neither capitalistic nor socialistic. Marx did not anticipate the rise of such a third variety of State, just as he could not correctly foresee the constantly growing power and prominence of a middle class—‘a new intermediate class of the salaried employees of large scale business’—a class of professionals, scientists, chemists, technicians, engineers and experts, a class possessing better modes of production and more commanding position than the Proletariat.

Needless to add, the above enumeration is merely illustrative and not exhaustive. What is more important is the basic fact that under the pressure of the progressive scientific knowledge, Marx’s ‘Matter’ has now definitely yielded to ‘Mind’.

This is not to say that the contribution of Karl Marx to human thought is insignificant. Far from it. Marx was indisputably a great genius; and if he failed to foresee a number of developments in the times to come it was none of his fault. We have great regard for Karl Marx, notwithstanding the fact that according to us his theories are inaccurate and incomplete. But his followers have done great injustice to him. They have made dogma of a theory which stands against all dogmatism. They have elevated him to the status of a Prophet which goes against the very spirit of his theories.

### **The Religion of Marxism**

Marx denounced religion. But Marxism today has become a religion of the irreligious ones, possessing all the qualities of a religion, such as its sacred book, its heresies, its prophets, saints, martyrs, its ceremonials, its festivals, and, above all, its fervour and fanaticism. Paradoxically enough, Marx has now become a God of the godless ones! The virulence of the Marxian dogma is detrimental to the

progress of human thought. It is against the spirit of science. Instead of leading humanity on the path of progress, it is bound to put the clock back. In view of the claim that Marx himself was endowed with a perfectly scientific attitude, one would be justified in saying that there is nothing Marxian about the present Marxism.

Let us free ourselves from the irrational influence of slogans and catchwords. Let us go to the very root of the problem. What is the attitude of the Bharatiya Mind towards the basic problem of the distribution of wealth? Does it stand for economic equality?

Our answer would be in the affirmative as well as in the negative; in the affirmative because we resent inequality; in the negative because the current concept of equality is too shallow and inadequate to be able to solve any of our problems satisfactorily.

#### **What About Non-Humans?**

It is said that all men are equal, with equal right to the wealth of the world. Very well. Something has been conceded to those who were deprived of everything. But what about the relationship of species other than human to the things that constitute 'wealth'? Are they to be deprived of their equal right to the total wealth? Who has authorised human beings to divide the entire wealth of the earth among themselves, to the exclusion of the sub-human world? Is not such authority self-arrogated? Or are we to force beasts and birds and others out of existence if and when it suits the convenience of the human species? Are we to deny the non-human living beings an equal right to existence and sustenance? Is it not being homocentric? Western advocates of economic equality have completely, and conveniently, ignored the claims of other species. This omission is not accidental; it is character-

istic of a materialistic mind. Secondly, there is no justification in materialism for the concept of equality. Why should a person with superior talents or powers agree to stand on an equal footing with others? Materialism can furnish no reply. That is why those who assumed power with the avowed object of bringing in equality are themselves responsible for gross inequalities in their land. That further explains why a revolution in the name of equality has miserably failed to yield the desired results. Western ethics of equality is baseless, since it has its roots in western materialism. In the long run, equality cannot be imposed from outside, it has to be inspired from within. It must become an instinct first. Materialism has no regard for mind.

#### The Ism that Gives

What can inspire a sense of equality in the human mind? Materialism cannot fulfil this historic need. The west has evolved socialism that 'takes'; it has failed to conceive of any ism that 'gives'.

The history of Bharat abounds in examples of willing self-sacrifice. Bharat produced world-conquerors who distributed their entire wealth on occasions of the *Vishvajit Yajna*. Multiplication of such illustrations is hardly necessary. It is, however, worthwhile to note that such sacrifices were performed spontaneously and not under any coercion from authorities above or pressure from below.

What inspires sacrifice? It would be too much to expect that an average man would voluntarily give up anything for the benefit of anybody outside the orbit of his 'Myself and Mine'. Perception of oneness inspires spontaneous sacrifice. In the absence of such perception, genuine sacrifice is inconceivable. No one can ever aspire to become a Raghu or a

Shibi unless the orbit of his 'Myself and Mine' i.e., the sphere of his perception of oneness is widened or extended to an extent which would astonish even the most imaginative materialists of the west.

Bharatiya seers and sages had realised that all Existence is One; that the whole universe is pervaded by the same principle; and that different objects, animate and inanimate, with different names and forms, are but the various projections of the same Principle which, they declared, is the 'One without the Second'; 'I am the Brahman'; 'Thou art That' and 'All this is Brahman indeed.' They realised that 'All IS One', not even that 'All ARE One.' All is one; I am a part and parcel of that 'One without the Second'; you too are nothing but That; we are different manifestations of the same Existence.

This was not a mere theory but realisation.

#### 'All is One'

'All is One' is the only appropriate attitude which can justify, explain and inspire willing sacrifice. I would not prefer suffering for you so long as I am I, and you are you. Your assertion of your equal rights is more likely to be responded by my assertion of my superior rights on account of my better talents. But the entire position is changed when both of us catch even a glimpse of the Truth that 'All is One.' This Truth is the source of all genuine sacrifice, the basis of the 'ism that gives' which is in refreshing contrast with the western 'socialism that takes'. Assertion of equality unaccompanied by the realisation of this fundamental oneness has already created more problems than it has sought to solve. Against the background of this realisation, all talk of 'equality' appears to be superfluous and immature. This alone can furnish the solid psychological foundation of a new social order by restoring order in the inner life of

humanity. This alone has enabled Bharat to succeed where the west failed so miserably.

And the western philosophers have not been slow to appreciate this. Max Mueller declared: "If I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted, in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact, more human....., again I should point to India."

— 12-12-1955



Socialism and agricultural prosperity go ill-together. As a rule, communist countries have failed on the food front. Whenever they scored success – which used to be only short-lived – it was at a heavy cost. Deviation from Marxism or socialism was the price of those temporary and exceptional successes in the sphere of agriculture.

Socialist or communist agrarian policy must fail – this has been the unanimous verdict of history, psychology and economics. Of all the factors that will ultimately bring about total extinction of communism from the face of the earth, this weakness of that hypothesis is the most important one.

#### **The Bias and Ignorance of the 'World-Prophet'**

Marx, the 'World-Prophet', knew little or nothing about the real nature of the socio-economic problems of an overwhelmingly large section of the human society, i.e., the world-peasantry. The Communist Manifesto bracketed the peasants with handicraftsmen and small traders all of whom had no right to survive. Politically, peasants lacked the unity of a class, being rather an agglomeration of individuals, which Marx compared to a 'sack of potatoes'. He praised

capitalism for having saved a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. He never concealed his contempt for the peasant. The logical consequence of his theory of economic determinism was the expropriation of the peasants. It was useless, he thought, to worry about the fate of the peasant. He was interested in production, not in the producers.

The fact is, Marx did not study seriously the peasant problems of any country. In England, where he spent the latter part of his life, capitalist farming was making rapid progress. It justified the generalisation that peasant farming was doomed. "Are you speaking of the petty bourgeois, of the small peasant property which was before the bourgeois property? We do not need to do away with it. The evolution of industry has done, and is daily doing away with it."

#### **Marxian View of Peasant Problem**

Marx believed in the superiority of large-scale production. Since it was superior, it was also inevitable. There could be no doubt about the fact that even in agriculture the large producer would in the long run replace the petty peasants. Sooner, rather than later, agriculture was to be put on a factory basis. Ever-increasing concentration of wealth was inevitable in agriculture also. Parallelism between agriculture and industry was quite 'scientific'.

What the forces of progressivism were called upon to face in rural areas was the 'land problem', not the 'peasant problem'; it was merely a problem of production - not of social organisation. On socio-economic level the peasant was already doomed because he was a peasant. The existence of peasantry indicated lack of progress. Progress was inevitable; equally inevitable, therefore, was the utter extinction of the peasantry.

### The 'Reactionary' Peasant

All talk of 'inevitability' by one leaning heavily upon his hypothesis smacks of arrogance, and arrogance – not accuracy – was the special characteristic of Marx's 'scientific' attitude.

After all, what was the position of a peasant in the Marxian scheme of things? He was neither capitalist nor proletariat. And, according to Marx, the entire mankind was divided only into these two hostile camps. Since he belonged to neither of these classes it was unscientific to presume that he was in existence at all. But the peasant continued to exist in spite of the Marxian class-concept.

Marx passed mercilessly the sentence of decay and death upon the peasants. He expected them to be obliterated, as a class. But the peasant was in no mood to oblige the prophet. Perhaps being illiterate, he could not appreciate the academic dialecticism. Consequently, he refused to commit suicide. Yet another proof of his reactionary character!

### Leftist Strategy of Betrayal

This was not all. While the peasant could not be allotted a place of his own in the rank and file of the revolutionaries, no revolution could ever be possible without his sincere cooperation. The peasant against whom the decree was already passed 'must somehow be won over for the time being'. This necessitated a change of strategy. The characteristically communist technique of united fronts was to be followed. But were the angels of communist paradise to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the devils of reaction, for all times to come?

"The community of interest", observed Kantsky, "may at times weigh heavier than the opposition of interests and

favour the working together of peasants and proletariats. But no matter how often they may be fighting the same battle, as a rule, they will have to march separately, and the ally of today may become the opponent of tomorrow."

After the victory, Lenin wrote, "It would be ridiculous to speak of the unity of will of the proletariat and of the peasantry, of domestic rule...Then we shall have to think of the Socialist, of the proletarian dictatorship." After the victory, the innocent comrades-in-arms must be betrayed. Progressivism without treachery is inconceivable!

### **Peasant Outwits Marx!**

Before Marxism could allure peasants into the process of self-elimination, 'peasantism' had begun to spread ideological confusion in the ranks of Marxists. Whatever Marx said could not be incorrect, for it was none but Marx himself who said it. Neither could it be correct, for it did not conform with realistics. Marxists from East European countries strove hard to reconcile Marxism with realism. But they could not succeed. Every new interpretation only added to the confusion on ideological plane. Realities had flung a challenge which could not be met with by academic pre-determinism.

In the last analysis peasants overpowered Marx. Had he been alive today he would have been shocked to note that the much condemned peasantry is still very much alive and kicking — even under communist regimes.

The Bharatiya Kisans will be following a suicidal policy if they do not recognise, before it is too late, that leftists of all varieties are their worst enemies.

What are the pre-requisites of successful leadership in the labour field ?

Are 'Hindu culturists' competent enough to handle industrial problems ?

Few of us seem to have realised the significance of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherji's role in the famous tram-strike of Calcutta.

Facts concerning the strike are fairly well-known. All leftist forces in the labour field of that great city had forged a united front for the industrial battle. But none of their leaders could be entrusted with the responsibilities of generalship. For, the struggle had certain unique features. This was a rare occasion when even communist trade unionists had to choose 'success' as the goal of the agitation. Usually, they are determined to see that the workers' movements end in failure.

If workers succeed, communists would fail. Prosperity of the former is the adversity of the latter. If citizens become healthy, medical practitioners would lose their health. Failures of the proletariat are the pillars of communist success.

Their trade union leadership is, therefore, trained in the strategy of engineering workers' failure. But this time they were forced to accept success as the immediate object. This was clearly a departure from the orthodox communist technique. But they were not trained in the strategy and psychology of successful labour movement. Leadership was, consequently, to be located outside the camp of the leftist unionists. Workers wanted a leader, well-versed in the art of success.

At that critical moment all eyes turned to Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherji. The progressive unfoldment of his characteristically Hindu cultural personality had endeared him to all sections of the population. As a Hindu he combined in himself the constructive, creative genius with the indomitable will to victory. So long as the failure of the toiling masses continued to be the object, communists were best suited to lead. But what was being sought now was 'success'.

The leftist leaders requested this so-called 'rightist reactionary' to lead their forces. Dr. Mukherji proved himself to be more than equal to the task, in matters of internal coordination as well as external tactics. He commanded the confidence of the travelling public also. Under his able guidance the workers marched with firm steps to the final victory.

The significance of this episode is quite obvious. It indicates the shape of things to come - provided the nationalists concentrate their energies on the labour field.

“The world would be divided into two hostile camps, no doubt. But these would be the camps of the Believers and the Non-believers — not of the Haves and the Have-nots, as communists would have us believe”, remarked a Muslim League M. P. from Kerala in the course of an informal discussion recently in the Central Hall of the Parliament.

Continuing, he observed that ultimately followers of all faiths would have to realise this ‘basic truth’.

This casual talk set me thinking seriously — particularly in view of the recent political alliances in his home-state.

What is the nature of the relationship between Islam and Communism? Occasional strange bed-fellowship in politics apart, these two creeds are essentially incompatible with each other.

### Islam and the State

According to Islam, sovereignty belongs to Allah only. No human being can claim that supreme position. “There is no *ilah* (object of worship) except *Allah*.” “Unto *Allah* belongeth the Sovereignty of the Heavens and the Earth and whatsoever is therein” (Quran: V-120). “Say: O *Allah*,

Owner of Sovereignty, Thou givest authority unto whom Thou wilt, and Thou withdrawest authority from whom Thou wilt" (III-26).

His Sovereignty is now being challenged by the totalitarian communist state which arrogates to itself the divine attributes of omnipotence and sovereignty. Authoritarianism of the State has been aptly described by a dictator in the following words: "Everything for the State, nothing against the State, nothing outside the State." This concept leads to the encroachment by dictators upon the sovereignty of God.

The dictatorship of the communist party thus seeks to dethrone *Allah* who alone is the Lord and who again cannot be suffered to share His authority with an organisation or individual—even if the latter be the secretary-general of the communist party. In the communist state, members of the political bureau of the party are the *ilahs* and *rabs* (lords and masters) of the people. Man's overlordship (*ilahiyat*) and domination (*rabubiyyat*) over man—which is the peculiar characteristic of the dictatorship of the party—is incompatible with the spirit of Islam. While the Holy Quran explicitly declares that "We shall ascribe no partner unto Him and none of us shall take others for Lords beside *Allah*", the communists all over the world accept the overlordship of the Red dictators of Russia or China and would not suffer even *Allah* to share their totalitarian authority.

Islam can be described as 'totalitarian' since it comprises within its fold all the various departments of individual and social life. But the basis for such authoritarianism is the universality of the 'Divine Law' which is binding upon the State also. The sphere of the State domination cannot be co-extensive with the entire human life. "They ask, 'Have we also got some authority?' Say: 'All authority belongs to God alone'" (III).



True, western parliamentary democracy also is not quite in keeping with the tenets of Islam. According to the authority of Islam, moral chaos may result from the western type of democracy since men are usually more susceptible to their untutored instincts and unbridled passions. It is dangerous to confer ultimate authority on individuals who are not learned, balanced, farsighted and elevated enough to be invariably in conformity with the Divine Will. It has, therefore, been stated that even if all the Muslims put together pass any piece of legislation which is not in keeping with the dictates of the Holy Quran, that enactment will have no validity at all in the view of Islam.

From this point of view, the Islamic State is theocratic. It is democratic in so far as the consensus of opinion among Muslims can decide any issue about which explicit command of God or His Prophet does not already exist. Even the unanimous resolution of the National Parliament would be treated as null and void if it is in any way in contravention of the injunctions of the *Shariat*. Muslims enjoy limited popular sovereignty under the Suzerainty of God. Since full sovereignty belongs to God alone, one who rules in accordance with His Law would be His vice-regent authorised to exercise such powers as are delegated to him by the Sovereign.

The right to govern has been conferred upon the entire community of Muslims, and not upon any single individual or party. Party system can have no place in the Islamic Society. All believers are repositories of the Caliphate which is popular vice-regency. "Everyone of you is a ruler, and everyone answerable for his subjects. And one Caliph is in no way inferior to another." Within the framework of Divine Law everyone has full scope for personal development, full freedom to develop his faculties in any direction that suits his temperament.

Even the State is not authorised to curtail this individual freedom for the convenience of its totalitarian plans. No regimentation by the State is permissible. There is no room for dictatorship since everyone is a Caliph, though, for administrative purposes, all Caliphs concentrate their Caliphate in anyone of them who becomes responsible to God as well as to those other Caliphs who have delegated their authority to him. Dictatorship is the negation of such popular vice-regency. Islam does not vest in *Ameer* the dictatorial powers. The vice-regency vests in the entire community of believers. Neither the membership of the Politbureau nor the key position in the administrative apparatus can entitle one to superiority over his fellow-beings. "No one is superior to another, except in point of faith and piety."

The dictatorship of the Party virtually puts an end to the concept of the Caliphate of every Muslim. It is a direct anti-thesis of the Islamic concept of popular vice-regency. The Prophet wanted to demolish man's supremacy over man. The State deserves to be obeyed only if it functions as an agency set up to enforce the Law of Allah which forms the very basis of the Islamic State. The administration can be run properly only by those who have implicit faith in the injunctions of God as revealed in the Holy Quran and the *Sunnah* (practice) of the Prophet. The non-believers have no right to participate in the administration of the State or in the shaping of its policies.

Endless tussle for power inside the communist party and State is too well-known a phenomenon. History has witnessed ruthless, inhuman beings, fired with the lust for power, reaching the top of the communist hierarchy through pools of blood. But Islam lays down the criterion for the selection of the leader (*Ameer*) thus: "The most respectable among you is he who is the most pious." (The most pious is not likely

to accept the communist principle which states that end justifies the means.) Again, no person should be elected to leadership if he is himself hankering after it. The Prophet has commanded that no candidate should be given his coveted post. How many of the communist rulers in the world can successfully pass this test of desirelessness ?

Under communist regime, the judiciary is subservient to the State. Under Islam, it is independent of the Executive. The Judiciary represents not the State but the Almighty God.

### **Social System**

While communism in its pure form seeks to destroy family organism and set up 'communes' as primary units of society, the Prophet gave recognition to the former and strived in many ways to give stability to it. For this purpose, he prescribed man's guardianship of woman; defined the rights and responsibilities of husband, wife and children; set forth the laws of divorce, separation and conditional polygamy; and prescribed penalties for fornication and false accusation of adultery.

Islam does not conceive of class-system within the community of Muslims. All Muslims together constitute one brotherhood. While as a community they are distinct and different from the non-Muslims, there can be no class-distinction or class-conflict among themselves.

### **Economic Order in Islam**

Islam resents compartmentalisation of thinking. Economic problem is, according to Islam, a part of the larger problem of human life. It should not be separated from the whole and looked at as if it were an isolated problem by itself. To treat economic problem as the sole problem of life is wrong. Economics should not be segregated from the

totality of life. Man is not merely an economic animal, devoid of moral and spiritual aspirations.

The divine limits consisting of certain principles, checks and restrictions are applicable to the economic sphere also. The right to private property has been recognised ; but it is subject to certain restrictions imposed by God—not by the State. Everyone has a right to seek the means of livelihood according to one's capacity and natural endowments.

Economic disparity on account of varying abilities of different individuals is also conceded to a limited extent i.e., to an extent to which it is in accordance with nature. But no one is allowed to adopt such means for the acquisition of wealth as would lead to his own moral degradation and cause moral or material loss to the society. Hence the distinction between the lawful (*halal*) and the unlawful (*haram*) means of earning wealth, and the ban on the latter.

A similar ban is imposed upon the methods of expenditure that are declared unlawful because of their potentiality to cause moral and social injury. Hoarding or money-lending on interest is prohibited. It is lawful to invest money in one's own trade, or in providing capital to others, or in participating in the profits and losses of the joint undertaking.

Apart from other details, such as removal of all tariff restrictions on exports and imports, abolition of octrois, cesses, and tolls on the movement of commodities, maximum possible reduction in the expenditure on administration and army, complete abolition of the stamp duty on judicial proceedings, provisions regarding the methods of management of land, settlement of trade disputes and formation of capital for trade and industry, the two other significant features of Islamic Law deserving special reference are its law of inheritance ensuring to a great extent the distribution

of wealth within certain degrees of relationships and the system of *Zakat* which formed virtually the Islamic institution of social insurance against sickness, disability, old age, poverty and unemployment.

It is worth noting that the economic order of Islam is based upon the restrictions imposed by 'Divine Law'. The State is not empowered to give its own economic order. In regulating economic relationships within the society, emphasis is laid upon the subjective change of heart rather than the objective regulations or interference by the State. Whether it is *wakf*, the legal obligation of *Zakat* or the voluntary gift of *Sadakāt*, the stress is on self-discipline — not on regimentation by the State.

The Prophet asked his followers to refrain from two vices, miserliness and bad disposition. "He is not a *Momin*", the Prophet declared, "who eats his fill while his neighbour lies hungry by his side." "He who works for the welfare of poor widows and the poor", he observed on yet another occasion, "is like him who strives in the cause of God, or like him who fasts all day and stands up to pray all night." And, again, "Whosoever receives an orphan hospitably, entertaining him with his food and his drink, God will certainly give him paradise..." "Hast thou considered him who belies religion? That is the one who treats the orphan with harshness and does not urge others to feed the poor."

In matters economic, the Prophet appeals to the heart, the conscience. He does not rely upon coercion by the Almighty State. Under the peculiar conditions obtaining in his contemporary Arabia, he was not called upon to define the details of the ideal employer-employee relationship. He has, however, given the broad guide-lines. "Your servants are your brothers and your stewards; God has placed them under your charge; whosoever then has a brother under his

charge, let him feed him out of what he eats himself, and let him clothe him out of what he clothes himself with; and compel them not to do a work which will overpower them, and if you do compel them to do such work, then assist them in accomplishing the same”, and again, “when anyone of your servants comes to one of you with food, if he does not make him sit to dine with him, let him at least give him a mouthful or two thereof; for, verily, he has stood by its heat and its management.”

Obviously, the approach of Islam to economic problems is entirely different from that of communism.

This difference in the approaches is not accidental. It flows from a still more basic difference between the two.

#### **Differing Outlooks and Goals**

As is well known, communism is thoroughly materialistic. Islam believes not only in the existence of God but also in His sovereignty. God is not only the Creator, but also the Nourisher, the Sustainer, the Law-Giver, the Guide and the End of the world, “He is the First and the Last and the Outward and the Inward” (LVII-3). Communism wants ‘matter’ to usurp the throne of the Almighty. But according to an Arabian writer, “Allah offered him (the Prophet) the keys of all the treasuries of the earth, but he refused to accept them.” Four days before his death, giving the last sermon of his life, the Prophet said, “God had allowed His servant to choose either the gifts of this world or the things which belonged to Him, but he chose for himself the latter.” To be sure, the Prophet was not a materialist.

According to communists, the goal of human life and action is highest material prosperity. According to Islam, it is the enforcement of Divine Law.

The points enumerated above are only illustrative. The fact is that Islam is as much at variance with and opposed to communism as any other spiritualistic religion can be. Basically, the two are thoroughly incompatible. And the conflict between the Believers and the Non-believers has been going on on global plane for a long while. The Non-believers are comparatively better organised in the process. Will the Believers all over the world realise what my friend described as the 'basic truth'?

-26-1-1971

'Islam' is an Arabic word and connotes submission, surrender and obedience to God. The word also means 'peace'. One can achieve real peace only through submission to Him. 'Islam' is an attributive title. A religious Muslim believes that whosoever possesses this attribute, whatever his race, community, country or clan, should be presumed to be a Muslim. The Quran states that among every people and in all ages there have been good and righteous people who possessed this attribute.

**Islam Conceived as National Religion of Arabs**

What was the original attitude of Islam towards nationalism? Did Islam aim at wiping out the distinguishing marks of nations? Some Muslim theologians believe that it did not. On the contrary, they claim that it sought to preserve the nationality and national characteristics of nations and create amongst them such a concord of cultures and creeds that it may cut at the root of international misunderstandings.



A companion of the Prophet asked him as to what was meant by prejudice, and whether the act of loving one's nation was prejudice. The Prophet replied: "No. When one goes with one's nation even when it is wrong, it is prejudice."

*(Ibn-i-Majah)*

The 'Shariats' of God, these theologians further state, are not opposed to national self-preservation; they actually encourage it, because the collective progress of mankind is dependent on the fact that each nation should progress within its own sphere.

Actually Islam was developed by Prophet Mohammed to mould the warring Arab tribes into a single Arab nation on the pattern of the Jews. What was meant to be the national religion of Arabs has since become something which its author never intended it to be. Hence the problem.

Unfortunately, a majority of Muslims in India do not share this view. The priesthood everywhere has a tendency to monopolise all power. Politicians in every country have a knack of exploiting religious sentiments for the furtherance of their political ends. When priesthood makes common cause with a gang of politicians, the combination becomes too formidable for an average believer. He yields — without resistance on either the intellectual or the devotional plane.

#### **Mullah Attacks on Pre-Islamic Heroes**

Fanatical Muslims assert that Islam does not permit of any kind of nation-worship, that the spirit of nationalism is incompatible with the Law of God, i.e., the Shariat; that Islam and Nationalism are connected with two entirely and totally antagonistic mentalities which can never meet; that nationalism is a religion which stands as a rival to the Shariat; that a reasonable person has no other alternative to selecting one of those two claimants of heart and head,

body and soul; and that when a person has entered the fold of one he should not even so much as mention the name of the other. They believe that in sociology the nationalistic view-point stands in total contradiction to the Islamic view-point, and that if a Muslim is one who upholds the Islamic ideology in every aspect of life, it follows automatically that a Muslim, wherever and in whatever condition he happens to be, must fight against nationalism.

This fanatical approach has created troubles for nationalists all over the world. It would be wrong to think that the problem we are facing in India is peculiar to us. Nationalists in the so-called 'Muslim' countries were also forced to combat the same evil. Muslim fanaticism has done everything within its power to suppress the rising tide of nationalism even in 'Muslim' countries. There were systematic efforts to force pre-Islamic national heroes of all the peoples into oblivion. Were not Pharaohs of Egypt dubbed 'Kafirs'? They flourished before the Prophet was born. Were not Bahram or Rustum 'unbelievers'? They never had a chance even to dream of the Holy Quran. After the revival of nationalism in these countries, the memories of 'Kafirs' — pre-Islamic national heroes — were revived. In every matter people began to invoke their national traditions of the pre-Islamic period. Nationalists in Egypt, Iran, etc., found themselves at loggerheads with Muslim orthodoxy. Amanullah of Afghanistan and Mustafa Ghazi Kemal Pasha of Turkey led these forces of patriotism.

#### **Turkey Eschews 'Foreign' Arab Influences**

Fired by the spirit of patriotism, the Turks ousted Arabic influence from their language, literature, and indeed from every sphere of their national life. Nationalist Turks dissociated themselves from that period of their history during which Turkey had come under 'foreign influence', by

which they meant the domination of Turkish life by the Arabic culture through the instrumentality of Islam. See, for example, the following passage from an article, entitled 'The Turkish Woman In History' by the Director General of Publicity, Ankara :

"Before we begin to study the high and honourable place our young republic has chosen to give to Turkish womanhood it will be necessary to review the consecutive periods of the Turkish woman's life in history. This little study will show that the equality of rights which Turkish men and women enjoy today is not an unusual event in our national history. We shall also see that so long as the Turkish family and Turkish social organisations were free from foreign influences the Turkish woman was always an active participant in every social movement. The subject was well-studied by our famous socialist Ziya Gok Alp and his investigations produced many proofs of the rights which women enjoyed in the old Turkish civilisation. Some of these proofs will help to elucidate the matter and to show an intimate connection between the early Turkish woman and the modern woman of today with her social and political emancipation."

#### **Does God Understand Only Arabic ?**

Thus the patriotic Turks accepted as standard that past during which their nation was free of 'foreign influence'. Ziya Gok Alp, who was the inspirer of modern Turkey, wanted "to build a new Turkey which would remove the gulf between Ottoman Turks and their Turanian ancestors...He wanted to lay down a new cultural foundation with the material he had collected about cultural and political institutions from the pre-Islamic period of Turkish History. He believed that the Islam which was established by the Arabs would not suit our purpose. If we wish not to return to our

age of ignorance we at present need a religious reform which may conform with our temperaments.”

(Incidentally, is this scientific approach of Turkish patriots ideologically different from that of the Hindu Nationalists?)

The Nationalists in Turkey were not prepared to read Quran in Arabic. Can Allah understand prayer only in Arabic? Will he turn a deaf ear if it was conducted in Turkish? The Turkish rendering of the Holy Quran raised furious, violent controversy. The day on which the Quran was first read out in mosques in Turkish, there were riots between orthodox Muslims and nationalist Turks throughout the country.

When Hindu leaders of Hindustan were intensely agitated over the problem of the revival of the ‘Khilafat’, Turkish nationalists were determined not to allow such revival within their own territory, which happened to be the traditional seat of the ‘Khilafat’. Paradoxical, indeed!

Nationalists would care more for their national interest than for the imaginary glory of their religion which is essentially an individual affair. That is why the Indian Mussalmans, carried away by the ideal of Pan-Islamism have so often received rebuffs from their co-religionists outside India, who are patriotic.

#### **When Kemal Pasha Put Indian Muslims in their Place**

In pursuance of a resolution of the All-India Khilafat Conference, which met along with the Congress Session at Kakinada in December 1923, a deputation consisting of Amir Ali, a Shia and H.H. the Aga Khan, a Khoja, was sent to Turkey to win Kemal Pasha over to the cause of Khilafat. “The Turkish Ghazi”, Cantwell Smith informs us, “was irate to see men like Amir Ali and H. H. the Aga Khan

approaching him on the subject of the Turkish and the Islamic Constitutions; he pointed out with some scorn their intimate and friendly relations with British Imperialism, even during the recent war against the Ottoman Empire, and their heresy. It really was rather ludicrous to have a Shia and a Khoja, themselves heretical Muslims, telling the Turkish Muslims how to behave as Muslims. It was also fanciful for men who were pillars of British rule in India to advise Turkish Nationalism. On March 23, 1924, the people of Turkey exiled Abdul Majid and abolished the Khilafat altogether."

The disillusionment of the Indian Muslims who could not find an asylum in Afghanistan — where some of them had migrated during the Khilafat days to coalesce themselves with co-religionists in the country — is well-known. Afghan nationals refused to welcome their co-religionists from India whose stay in their country could only disturb its national economy.

The Islamic Congress at Jerusalem, in December 1931, thoroughly disappointed Maulana Shaukat Ali who said that the Congress had turned out to be more Arab in complexion than Islamic in approach to the problems of Muslims wherever they were to be found. Nationalist Arabs were qualitatively different from the pan-Islamic Shaukat Ali.

#### **Hindu - Muslim Problem Properly Understood**

Correct statement of any problem is the first pre-requisite of its solution. Diagnosis, they say, is half the cure. Political leaders of pre-transfer-of-power-days failed to present the so-called 'Hindu-Muslim problem' in a proper perspective. Partition was the direct consequence of this error. To err is human, but to persist in error is hardly creditable. Failures can become the pillars of success, provided we learn promptly the lessons taught by them. The problem is not,

as some of our 'internationalists' would have us believe, a communal one. 'The Position of Religion vis-a-vis Nationalism'—this is what the problem adds up to. Mustafa Kemal Pasha and others have shown the way. It is quite logical to expect that relations of Islam with Hindu Nationalism in Hindustan should be similar to its relations with Turkish Nationalism in Turkey. This is the stand of Hindu nationalists whom the so-called 'secularists' are condemning as 'communalists'.

— 15-4-1963

Sri M. A. Kureshi, the noted Urdu, Persian and Arabic scholar of Bombay has rendered signal service to the cause of Nationalism by urging Dr. Zakir Husain to help educate Indian Muslims in Indian nationalism (Vide 'Organiser' dated April 29, 1963).

While congratulating Dr. Zakir Husain on his being elected the Vice-President of India, Sri Kureshi says in his letter, among other things :

"...About 30 years ago I went to Arabia to study Arabs and ancient Arabic books at first hand. As I was fortunate enough to be educated in Christian schools and colleges I developed an open mind towards all politics, Jewish, Christian and Muslim, which I studied there very closely. From my childhood I have been preaching toleration and patriotism to my co-religionists. But I am compelled to admit defeat in this mission.

"Whenever my talk veers round to nationalism or patriotism, Muslims retort with 'Islam is our country and we are quite loyal to it. We won't compare our divine

dispensation with any other religion, polity or country. We can't be loyal to two polities at the same time.'

"Whenever I start the nationalist topic in mosques after Juma prayers they bluntly command me to shut up as according to them none can talk about idol worshippers in such sacred precincts.

"In my talks with Muslims in non-religious meetings I warn them that those hordes of sleepy Hindoos who were easily defeated by Muslims in the past are dead and gone and the new generations that are springing up today hotly resent the exceptionally provoking Indian histories written by Muslims and translated by Europeans. Now tables are reversed. Muslims are sleeping and Hindoos are waking up. Even now Pakistani Muslims are living in the 7th Century A. D.

"During the time of their domination over Hindoos, Muslims believed that Hindoos would remain as their slaves for all time. With this belief they wrote their histories, condemning Hindoos in every way, both politically and ethically. Also they maltreated the Hindoos to their hearts' content as they considered themselves safe from retaliation for centuries to come.

"Your ex-cathedra talks to the Muslims even now can induce them to help Hindoos in rewriting the histories which are the veritable gall and wormwood to the upping Hindoo-nationalists of today. Their perusal makes their blood boil with righteous indignation. No sensible person can ever believe that the Hindoos who taught Plato, Pythagoras, numerals etc., did not write histories of their own country. They did write but both the writers and their books were destroyed by Muslim dictators who ruled in Delhi.

"To prove our sincerity in the matter, we must first remove Aurangzeb Mosque built on the Luxmi Temple in



Benares. Lord Jesus Christ, the kindest man who ever lived in the world, says, 'Do as you would be done by.' How would we tolerate a Hindoo temple on top of Kaaba in Mecca?...

"My Hindoo friends tell me that they can forget the past inhuman barbarities perpetrated by Muslims against their men and women only when the latter desist from daily provoking their feelings by cow slaughter and other ways. Muslims don't know the well-known proverb: "When in Rome do as the Romans do." Why should they insist, Hindoos say, on slaughtering their goddess when God has created millions of other things that can be used for food. Cheapness of beef is a false if not provocative excuse. Hundreds of other things are much cheaper..."

#### **Mohammed Commended Patriotism**

The original tenets of Islam are quite compatible with the spirit of patriotism. Mohammed the Prophet encouraged all virtues and noble sentiments including patriotism. Even on the religious plane, he did not declare war against the old and the contemporary religions. The Holy Quran did not repeal the essential truths established by the religions that had gone before. God has blessed every nation with its own prophets. "For every people there is a Guide" (Quran XXIII:3). "There is no distinct group of men amid whom never arose a warner" (XXXV: 23). Consequently, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmed wrote that teachers, to whatever land they belonged, whose teachings have been operative for a good length of time and have been accepted by large sections of the human race, must be held to be God-sent, for Allah never decrees that false prophets should flourish. He consequently declared that the teachings of Lord Buddha, Shri Krishna and Shri Ramachandra were undoubtedly of divine origin, though "later tamperings or

interpolations might have clouded, or even garbled, the original teachings of these great teachers.”

It would be ridiculous to presume that Mohammed the Prophet could ever require his followers to betray their respective nations.

Today the nationalists have lost their self-confidence. They doubt whether it would be possible for their national culture to assimilate the Hindu nationals who have embraced the Mohammedan faith.

As stated earlier, there is no incompatibility between the Hindu national culture and the individual faith of the Muslims. Our culture welcomes all religions, all prophets. Again, the Indian Muslims are not aliens ethnically. They are the flesh of our flesh and the blood of our blood. We had absorbed even the Sakas and the Huns who were aliens. Why should it be difficult for us to own those who are actually ours? History records that even the aliens were being acculturated.

#### **How Islam in India Became Hinduised**

After all, the process of cultural assimilation must begin with the cream of the social group concerned. Often the rulers possessing inferior cultural level are themselves won over by the superior culture of the subdued nation. Hinduism had been influencing the Muslim elite since the days of Alberuni. Abul Fazl translated the elements of the ‘Shad-Darshanas’ for the benefit of the Muslims. During Akbar’s reign Muslims began to take greater interest in Sanskrit literature and the Hindu religions. During that period the Mahabharata, the Ramayana and the Atharva Veda were made accessible to Muslims. Akbar realised that with the help of Islam alone he would not be able to subjugate his Hindu subjects intellectually. Hence his

attempt to evolve a new religion, i.e., *Din-i-Ilahi*, Divine Faith. Dara presented the spiritual thrust of Hinduism to the Muslim intellectuals by translating into Persian the Bhagwad Gita, the Upanishads, Prabodha Chandrodaya, Yoga Vasishtha and other scriptures. The following poem of Dara is indicative of the influence of our national culture on his mind :

*Thou art in the Kaaba as well as in the Somnath Temple,  
In the convent as well in the tavern,  
Thou art the same time the light and the moth,  
The wine, and the wife, the sage,  
And, the fool, the friend and the stranger.*

Students of *Advaitavāda* would be able to trace the source of Dara's inspiration. There are reasons to believe that what irritated and perturbed Aurangzeb most was the susceptibility of the high ranking Muslim minds to the influence of the national culture. Even Karl Marx, a foreigner, could not fail to discover these significant facts. On July 22, 1853, he wrote from London, "Arabs, Turks, Tartars, Moguls, who had successively overrun India, soon became Hinduised, the barbarian conquerors by an eternal law of history, being conquered themselves by the superior civilisation of their subjects."

#### 'An Arabic Version of Sanatana Dharma !'

But for certain accidents of history, this process of the acculturation of the Muslims, without disturbing in any way their holy religion, would have been further accelerated. Nevertheless, the process did continue though imperceptibly.

As late as in 1944, Dr. Shaukat Ullah Ansari expressed grave doubt about the willingness of the entire Muslim population to welcome Pakistan. "Since religion is the main reason for demanding Pakistan", wrote Dr. Ansari in his thought-provoking book 'Pakistan - The Problem of India',

“presumably Pakistan will be a theocratic State. It is for the Muslims of the North-West to ask if they would like to live in a theocratic state. Would they be prepared to be ruled by Islamic Law? Would they be ready to be purged of un-Islamic influence?...Would they be prepared to give up customary law? Would they be prepared to establish Bait-ul-Mal and regularly pay Zakaat? Would the Muslims of Sind, i.e., Khojas and Kuchh Menons, give up Hindu Law?... Would the Muslim landlords of the Punjab follow Shariat and share inheritance with their sisters, rather than follow the existing infidels’ system?...”

Dr. Ansari further says, “Inasmuch as racial differences exist in India, racially Hindus and Muslims of one province have greater affinity than Muslims of two provinces... Awans of the Punjab, though Muslims, retain Hindu names and keep their geneologies in the Brahmanic fashion...In the matter of marriages, certain Muslims follow Hindu customs and forms, and among some Muslims the Hindu law of marriage, guardianship and inheritance is applied...If Hindus bow down before an image of deity, Muslims bow down before the graves of Saints and Pirs. Music and dance are prohibited by Islam, but in some Khanqahs you hear sweet music and see elegant dancing...Islam in India is an Arabic version of Sanatana Dharma, just as Sikhism and Arya Samaj are more or less Gurumukhi and Hindi editions of Islam.”

#### **Communalists Incensed by this Acculturation**

This fact of the cultural influence was recognised by most of the Muslim thinkers — nationalists as well as communalists, though their reactions to it were different. The Muslim communalists were naturally restless over this state of affairs. Their resentment as well as acknowledgement of this fact can be clearly noticed from their statements

in pre-partition days. Allama Iqbal, for example, expresses his feelings in this respect in his 'Jawab-i-Shikwa' in the following words :

*Unto a nation faith is life, You lost your faith and fell ;  
When gravitation fails, must cease, Concourse celestial.*  
(IX-2)

*From Christians you have learnt your style,  
Your culture from Hindus ;  
How can a race as Muslims pass,  
Who shame even the Jews ?*  
(XVII-2)

*Upon your nation's sky you rose,  
Like stars of brilliant hue,  
The lure of India's idols made,  
Even Brahmans out of you.*  
(XXIII-1)

To be sure, this is a case of exaggeration and deliberate misrepresentation calculated to provoke the innocent and patriotic Muslims into the mass-frenzy of anti-nationalism. It is a shrewd attempt to use man's allegiance to religion as an instrument against his allegiance to nationhood. Still more provocative is the following stanza by Hali :

*The entire caravan of Islamic heroes—  
Which could not be obstructed by sea or shore,  
Though crossed in a stride the seven seas,  
Was drowned in the Ganges, to be seen no more.*

This is again a desperate bid to denationalise Muslims by deliberate provocation. But the very fact that such attempts were deemed to be necessary to win over the Muslims to the ideal of Pakistan proves beyond doubt that the

process of their acculturation was already going on in natural course and that but for the political propaganda of interested parties, the process would have reached its culmination in due course.

Thus it is neither Islam nor the average Muslim mind that is to be blamed for the unfortunate denationalisation. The confused thinking of our own political leaders, who sacrificed the truth for the sake of immediate expediency, set the wheels of communalism in motion ; the sectarian Muslim politicians sought the opportunity to accelerate the process.

— 20.5.1963

*"The Saviour is the messenger of God. He is like the viceroy of a mighty monarch. As when there is some disturbance in a far off province the king sends his viceroy to quell it; so wherever there is a decline of religion in any part of the World, God sends his Saviour there. It is one and the same Saviour that, having plunged into the ocean of life, rises up in one place and is known as Krishna, and diving down again rises in another place and is known as Christ."*

--Bhagawan Sri Ramakrishna

Christ is being systematically misrepresented in India by his followers. An impression is being created that he was a sectarian leader with exclusive outlook, intolerant of all natural allegiances of human mind to different social organisms or ideologies. Ignoring deliberately the spirit of his sound advice, 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's', some of his so-called disciples are trying to depict him as an enemy of all the social systems and philosophies. Justice demands that this great World Teacher should be saved from his self-styled followers who are bringing his fair name into disrepute.

### Materialists, Not Real Christians

The materialistic West is incompetent to understand the message of Christ. As Swami Vivekananda puts it : "The voice of Asia has been the voice of religion ; the voice of Europe is the voice of politics." And the great prophet of Nazareth was an Oriental of Orientals. Generally, Westerners are materialists. But this Teacher of Humanity declared : "Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." "It is written that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." How many of modern Christians would prefer the ideal of Christ who said about himself, "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air nests but the son of man hath not where to lay his head." How many of the Western Christians would follow the advice of the Master if he were to reappear and say, "Go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven ; and come, take up thy cross, and follow me"?

### Way to Nazareth

The fact is, Bharatiya Christians must study Christ through the seers and sages of this Dharmabhoomi if they aspire to understand him correctly and completely. The way to Nazareth lies through the spiritualistic East—not through the materialistic West. In this context there is one significant fact which the religious Christians will do well to remember.

Authentic physical description of Jesus is nowhere available, not even in the New Testament. That is why Carlyle offered a third of everything he had for an accurate representation of Jesus' physical appearance. In modern times the only individual who is known to have visualised Christ is Sri Ramakrishna who, like a time-machine, could roll himself back the centuries and stand face to face with the Anointed One.



### Christian Ethics

Ethics is an integral part of religion. Christian ethics is in no way different from the ethics of the Hindu sages. There is no teaching of Jesus that cannot be found in the Hindu scriptures. After all, the ethics cannot but be one and the same for all. And, therefore, it is possible for any one to live Christian life without being formally baptised, or even without ever hearing the name of the Son of God. "Those who are hampered by invincible ignorance about our Holy Religion", observed Pope Pius IX, "and, keeping the natural law, with its commands that are written by God in every human heart, and being ready to obey him, live honourably and uprightly, can, with the power of Divine Light and Grace helping them, attain eternal life. For God, who clearly sees, searches out, and knows the minds, hearts, thoughts, and dispositions of all, in His great goodness and mercy does not by any means suffer a man to be punished with eternal torments, who is not guilty of voluntary faults." All religionists know that what is described as 'Hinduism' is nothing but this "natural law, with its commands that are written by God in every human heart." Formal baptism is not important by itself. In any case it is not indispensable. What really matters is the actual way of life and not merely mechanical repetition of sacraments. "Not every one that saith unto me, 'Lord, Lord', shall enter unto the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Consequently, Mahatmaji was a better Christian than many a materialist professing that faith—not in spite of but because of the fact that he was a *Vaishnava Jana*. A true Hindu is automatically a true Christian, and a true Christian is already a true Hindu.

### Christian Metaphysics

The late Jagadguru Shankaracharya Swami Shri Bharati

Krishna Teertha observed, "We may note with interest that the Bible does not devote much space to this question (of metaphysics); and we are compelled to infer that this is because the persons, to whom the Biblical teachings were given were *Adhikāris*, not for metaphysical disquisitions but only for elementary ethical precepts and were consequently given only the latter. But, in those rare passages where the Bible does touch hereon, we find it too, preaching, in reality, the same doctrine, i.e., of *Advaita* (Monism); for example, we see Christ Himself saying :

'The Kingdom of God is within you' !

'Ye are Gods' !

"There are some other similar passages, especially in St. John's 'Gospel', his 'Epistles' and his 'Revelation' that clearly show, what a lot of Greek and Roman historical records too prove, that it was India's *Advaita Vedanta* which Christ carried from India and preached in Palestine..... It is interesting to note that it was only his favourite disciple St. John who could assimilate such philosophical teachings."

### Cosmology

Regarding the story of creation, the late Jagadguru Shankaracharya states, "There is a slight difference but no contradiction between our Upanishads and the Bible. The latter begins the first verse of the first chapter of its first Book (viz. Genesis) thus: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.' An analytical study of this text will also lead us to the same conclusion as our Upanishadic study has already led us to. The very statement that God created the heaven and the earth means that before He brought them into existence, He alone existed and nothing else. If so, when He created them, out of what material did He create them?.....Before the universe could be created, there

must have been not merely God to create it but also the material to create it out of.....But if at the time of creation—as the Vedas and the Bible agree in telling us—God alone existed and there was absolutely nothing else in existence, what could He have created it all out of ?.....So, when God alone existed and nothing else and He created the world, the only thing He created it out of must necessarily have been the only thing which then existed, i.e., Himself and no other (because there was really no other thing in actual existence).”

### Upanishadic Sankalpa Explains Biblical Account

Referring to the Biblical account, “God said, ‘Let there be light’ and there was light”, the late Jagadguru has also elucidated how the Upanishadic Sankalpa *Ekoham Bahusyām* (I am alone; let me multiply) explains the nature of relationship between God, the creator, and Light, the creation.

### Goal of Christianity

All religions lead to *Advaita Darshan*. One can climb a mountain from any side. But once the top is reached the pathways merge. In Hindusthan our seers started from the *Dvaita*, proceeded through the *Vishishtādvaita*, and reached ultimately the summit of the *Advaita*. The spiritual journey of Jesus has also been along the same path. The first stage, i.e., of *Dvaita*, is indicated by the prayer: “Our Father which are in Heaven, hallowed be thy name.” In the second stage he said, “I am in my Father; He in you and you in me.” Finally, after the Supreme Realisation, he declared: “I and my Father are one. I am the way, the truth and the life.” This is *Advaita*.

Unless this fact is properly recognised it would be difficult to establish that there is no inconsistency or self-contradiction in the various utterances of Jesus.

### Christian Church

The organised church did not originate from Jesus. It was St. Paul who organised it. His letters epitomise the concerns of the early Church; but he almost never quotes Jesus. The Saviour never described any Church which was the Mystical Body of Christ. No doubt, he metaphorically said: "I am the vine, you are the branches." But, obviously, this was a metaphor. Comparison of the Church with the human body was an intellectual feat of St. Paul. There is no evidence to show that the son of God ever thought of institutionalising religion. His was the Church invisible of which every religionist in the world is a natural member.

### Christian Theology

Christ did not father Christian theology. Of course, for the Hindus there is nothing unpalatable in the three basic tenets of Christian theology, i.e., the Incarnation, the Atonement and the Trinity. While Christian theologians have failed so far to furnish the logical explanation of these tenets, traditional Hinduism alone is capable of doing the needful in this respect. The 'Incarnation' cannot be properly understood except through the Hindu theory of *Avatār* (Incarnation). Progressive elimination of estrangement between God and man, and their perfect reconciliation must lead inevitably to the realisation of *Advaita* i.e., atonement (at-one-ment). The doctrine of Trinity is a mystery to the church itself — "true but beyond the reach of mind to fathom completely." The concept of Trinity is bound to remain obscure so long as the theory of *Vishishtādvaita* is not properly understood. Hinduism leads to correct and better understanding of Christian theological tenets. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Christian theology is not the creation of Christ. It is founded by St. Paul.

(Incidentally, the origin of the theory of Resurrection also cannot be traced to Jesus. Of course, to a Hindu mind there is nothing unusual in the account of Resurrection.)

### **The Dross and the Pure Gold**

For correct understanding of any religion it is necessary to separate chaff from the corn, or dross from the pure gold — though the chaff or the dross has its own utility — for those on the lower rung of spirituality. As Swami Vivekananda observes, we can catch but little glimpses here and there of the stray records that have been kept of Christ's sayings and doings, for it has been well said that the sayings and doings of that great soul would have filled the world, could they all have been written down. According to Huston Smith, "All the words of Jesus as reported in the New Testament can be spoken in two hours." And there is nothing un-Hindu about those teachings of Jesus. Of course, God's revelation takes "different facets and different forms according to the differences in nature of individual souls and the differences in character of local traditions and civilisations." The same spiritual experience must necessarily be expressed in different terms so as to suit the different levels of understanding of different persons in different times and climes. Had Shri Shankaracharya been required to address the Arab tribes of the sixth century he would not have delivered his message to them through the Shankara-Bhashya. The oft-quoted *Padmapatramivāmbhasi* (like a lotus in the water) is the most appropriate simile to illustrate the ideal of Detachment. But it would convey no sense to those who have seen neither lake nor lotus. To an average European mind strength is symbolised by Hercules—not by Hanuman. On the contrary, you would be talking Greek and Hebrew to an average Hindu if you advise him to worship the courage of Achilles or the wisdom of Ulysses.

Every Teacher has to express himself in the language of His taught. Even early Christian missionaries in Maharashtra thought it wiser to preach the gospel in the language of Dhyaneshwara and through the meter of the Dhyaneshwari. After the style of Ramayana they chose to compose 'Christayana'. How can any prophet bring home any truth to the minds of his contemporaries unless he has as the medium of his instruction the local surroundings, the local traditions, the local parables and anecdotes and the local historical background? Had Lord Buddha appeared in Palestine before nineteen centuries, his teachings would certainly have been clothed in different imagery, different similes and different metaphors. The scenes, the locations, the attitudes, the groups, the poetry and symbolism of contemporary Palestine would inevitably have found their way in his sermons on Dhamma. But such superficial differences in the form of expression notwithstanding, the Message would have remained essentially the same. As stated earlier, there is nothing un-Hindu in the teachings of Jesus, even as there is nothing unchristian in the Dharma of Hindus. True seekers care only for the gold; they do not indulge in superfluous controversies over the nature of the dross.

Fortunately, the distinction between Christianity and Paulity is already being realised by a number of our Christian compatriots. We hope they would be able to bring home this truth about Christianity to the minds of others also, so that consequent to such psychological change in the Christian community, every Bharatiya should be voluntarily inclined to repeat the memorable words of Swami Vivekananda: "If I am Oriental, am to worship Jesus of Nazareth, there is only one way left to me, that is to worship as God and nothing else."

(not published before)