

Seed 1a

Arise Arjun

Awaken my Hindu Nation

Maanoj Rakhit

Author Maanoj Rakhit
Email maanojrakhit@live.in
SMS +919869809012
Website <http://maanojrakhit.com>

Published 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009
ISBN-10 81-89746-01-4
ISBN-13 978-81-89746-01-8
Category Research & Analysis
Subject History (India)

Modified 10 July 2009

Prayers

वक्रतुण्ड महाकाय सूर्यकोटि समप्रभ।
निर्विघ्नं कुरु मे देव शुभकार्येषु सर्वदा॥

या कुन्देन्दुतुषारहारधवला या शुभ्रवस्त्रावृता,
या वीणावरदण्डमण्डितकरा या श्वेतपद्मासना।
या ब्रह्माच्युतशंकरप्रभृतिभिर् देवैस्सदावन्दिता,
सा माम् पातु सरस्वती भगवती निःशेषजाड्यापहा॥

या देवी सर्वभूतेषु शक्तिरूपेण संस्थिता।
नमस्तस्यै नमस्तस्यै नमस्तस्यै नमो नमः॥

Dedication

कायेन वाचा मनसेन्द्रिऐवा बुध्यात्मना वा प्रकृते स्वभावात्।
करोमि यद् यद् सकलं परस्मै नारायणायेति समर्पयामि॥

Contents

Part 1 Journey of Hindu Society.....	10
Hindu Society before Islam.....	11
Journey through the Inferno.....	20
Journey through Saintly Duplicity	47
Journey through dishonest Secularism.....	64
Part 2 Frauds on Hindu Society	75
On Raam Temple at Ayodhya.....	76
On Blackening history of Hinduism.....	100
On Vedic time Hindus eating Beef	111
On Church splitting the Nation	123
Bibliography	163

Prologue

You would notice that I have titled my book as *Arise Arjun* not as *Arise Arjuna*. Many of you are used to seeing *Arjuna* in print, and therefore, you might think that the name has been misspelt. No, it has not been.

Popular spelling *Arjuna* has given rise to the popular pronunciation अर्जुना which is totally incorrect pronunciation. Though it is true that vast majority of learned people, including those who may give you the impression that they are experts in Sanskrit pronounce it as अर्जुना, on account of 'herd mentality'. For, they dare not deviate from a set path.

That legendary character after whose name I have set the title of this book was known as अर्जुन. I hope you are able to see the difference between अर्जुन and अर्जुना. One may or may not know exactly how the last alphabet न should be pronounced in Sanskrit but that does not justify pronouncing न as ना.

You may not be able to perfectly pronounce अर्जुन as it is supposed to be pronounced in Sanskrit but it is certain that if you look at it in print as *Arjun* the pronunciation that will come out of your vocal cord will sound closer to अर्जुन but if you look at it in print as *Arjuna* you are bound to pronounce it अर्जुना. Therefore, to me, distorting the name of legendary character अर्जुन by pronouncing it as अर्जुना, which is direct fallout of misguided action of spelling it as *Arjuna*, is an intellectual crime.

As for my own name I want it pronounced as मानोज रखित very much the way it appears in print. My name begins with मा which is indicative of my surrender to नारायणी माँ भव तारिणी. As for अर्जुन he never expressed the desire to be called अर्जुना and therefore, you must not do so.

Arise Arjun

Arjun has seen injustice. Injustice is *Adharm*. If Arjun remains indifferent, the Society will disintegrate.

Arjun must rise to fight against this continuing injustice, *Adharm*. Today, Arjun can be you; Arjun can be anyone and everyone who cares for justice.

The time will come when no one will be able to remain indifferent; everyone will have to choose one side or the other; as in MahaaBhaarat some chose the side of *Dharm* and many chose the side of *Adharm*. If that had not happened then the battle of MahaaBhaarat would have never been fought.

A battle to re-establish *Dharm*¹ is not an evil but a fundamental necessity for preserving the rhythm of this Creation Cycle!

Battle, however, does NOT necessarily mean that it has to be fought with arms and ammunitions; depending on the need of time it can also be fought with the growing awareness of the need to resist and oppose injustice! Our life, in itself, is a battleground of a kind.

¹ Popular spelling is *Dharma*. Looking at *Dharma* in print people tend to pronounce it as धर्मा which is distorted form of original Sanskrit term धर्म, and therefore, I consider it a lesser evil to print it as *Dharm* which will give rise to a pronunciation closer to that as it should be pronounced in Sanskrit.

What amazes me is that those who consider themselves knowledgeable in Sanskrit also look at the spelling *Dharma* and pronounce it as धर्मा knowing it fully well that it must not be pronounced as धर्मा - or, do they not know how it should be pronounce in Sanskrit while rattling out *Shloks* श्लोक after *Shloks* just like parrot humanoids? 2009-07-03

Hinduism

Hinduism had never been a missionary religion desirous of increasing the number of its followers through conversion from other religions. Therefore, there had been no vested interest in propagating Hinduism.

Hinduism had neither been a prophetic religion, founded by a prophet, who would be the only link between man and God, whereby preventing man from direct access to God.

For Hinduism, the Journey to the Supreme Soul is every man's own quest! Everyone will reach it, but only at his or her own time.

In our heart we may feel like a Hindu but we would not be expected to adopt Hinduism formally and give up our birth religion unless we ourselves want to do so, and that has to be essentially a deep-seated desire emanating from within our self. Coercing or tempting others to give up one's own birth religion is inspired by gross selfishness of one kind or other, and that is not a divine characteristic!

Hinduism shares with others whatever it knows. It does not seek anything in return. It does not try to capitalize on the weaknesses of other religions.

Hinduism encouraged open debates and experiments on individual experiencing and understanding of God. Unlike Christianity and Islam, it did not formulate a hypothesis on God and made it mandatory for all seekers to accept it. This process over thousands of years allowed true seekers to experience God in their own respective ways and then share with others. This helped enrich the understanding about God better amongst all seekers.

The collective knowledge gathered by the ancients who were in closer communion with the Supreme Soul and the Mother Nature has come to be known as Hinduism.

Need of the Hour

Hindus have been battered through centuries. Plenty of Hindus have written enough in the name of their love for cleaning Hinduism and their burning desire for social reform within Hindu society. They all have sat on judgment of Hindu society and Hindu practices.

Few have realized their duty to raise the morale of centuries-worn Hindu society. Few have realized historical reasons for wrong practices having seeped in the system. Few have actually felt pride in their heart to say it publicly in presence of other nationalities that *I am a Hindu.*

Enough has been done to criticize, and it has not helped except that it has killed Hindu morale further. As Carnegie had once said any fool can criticize; what we need is to give the soothing support to Hinduism that has been oppressed for centuries by Islamic zeal, Christian missionary manipulations, Pseudo-Secularist-Marxist conspiracies and brought to this state that Hindus are today, and the decorative topping is spread by the social critics.

The need of the hour is to recognize this enemy within: the tendency to finding faults more than bringing any direct contribution in. Hindus had been put in slumber for too long by these faultfinding techniques branding them a worthless lot. Now the giant is waking up, taking a turn. Give it the support it needs and do not demoralize it.

Hindus need a platform that is utilized to promote the morale of Hindus. *A strong Hinduism, a secured Hinduism is in itself the anti-dote for most its ailments.*

Give Hindus the voice that they can say in public with pride that we are Hindus without a trace of hesitation in their voice. That voice itself will deal with the rest of the issues.

Unity amongst Hindus

Hindus were never united. It was good and it was bad.

It was good because Hindus never united as Muslims did and united they attempted to eliminate non-Muslims from the earth. It was good because Hindus never united as Christians did, and having been united they worked very hard to convert rest of the humanity into Christianity and tortured those (story of Inquisition not known to Indians in general) who would not want to convert. It was good because they did not choke the humanity as the other two did getting united.

It was bad because not-united Hindus became easy prey to Muslim and Christian endeavours that were not noble ones. It is bad because even today Hindus are unable to protect themselves against clever manipulations in-action, which popular English media in India carefully avoids exposing.

Hindus were never united probably because Hinduism itself did not attempt to bind people within restrictions. It allowed hundreds of paths and individual freedom to follow his/her own choice of path to seeking God.

Hinduism hardened and closed itself after centuries of inhumane abuse by Islam followed by Christianity. What we see today is the hardened and weakened version.

Hindu society needs to be restored to the position it was once in (Chapter 1 *From the pages of History - Testimonies of Foreign Visitors*). The word must be reached to every Hindu wherever he may be living. Those who have the resources to do so do not have the heart to use their resources. Those who have in their heart the desire to carry the message do not have the mind to express it to the masses rightly. Those who have the heart and mind both do not have the resources to reach it to all. Thus, the Hindu Society today is caught up in a vicious circle.

Part 1 Journey of Hindu Society

Hindu Society before Islam

Truth from the pages of History

I never knew humanity could have seen such wonderful days in the past as is described below by people coming from different nations, seeing Hindu society through their eyes, over a period of more than 2,000 years. I never knew this because not much of it has remained now to be seen often, and the history that I was taught in school did not care to mention any of these. Yet they happen to be well-documented facts and not creation of fiction. A careful reading can make us wonder many things. Let me first submit ample testimony in other peoples' words before venturing to say what I want to say in my own words because then only my words will have some credibility.

We will see that foreign travellers, businessmen, writers, educationists, diplomats and conquerors, who visited भारतवर्ष BhaaratVarsh (now known as India) during a period of 2,300 years as to what they have to say about the Hindu Society in their own words. We will see that these people came during different centuries, from different continents, different nations, different cultures, different societies, different backgrounds, different mental makeup, different expectations but all of them invariably documented the same qualities about Hindu society. We will see that these people visited different parts of BhaaratVarsh and lived in different sections of Hindu Society and they all came to the same conclusions. This cannot happen by coincidence. *This can happen only if it had been a constant and consistent truth about Hindu Society through ages.*

We will also see what these people have to say about Braahmans whose image has been much maligned on purpose by later day writers using propaganda driven mechanism. By and large Braahmans have been very poor and they kept themselves to priesthood and teaching. Christian and Muslim clergy have controlled national politics and governance of the State administration. Popes have done that for centuries and Khomeini, Taliban do it even today. Hindu priests did not assume the role of their Christian and Islamic counterparts yet they have been made to look like them, on purpose, to divide the Hindu Society into factions. Politicized scholarship of this kind has weakened the Hindu society in modern days by dividing and politicizing it. It may not be out of place to add that I am not a Braahman² to have a reason to defend them except for my desire to dig the truth out and my distaste for fabrications.

Testimonies of Foreign Visitors

“Ktesias, the famous Greek physician of Artaxerxes Mnemon (present at the battle of Cunaxa, 404 BC), the first Greek writer who tells us anything about the character of the Indians, such as he heard it described at the Persian court, has a special chapter ‘On the justice of the Indians’. Megasthenes, the ambassador of Selucus Nicator at the court of Sandrocottus in Palibothra (Paataliputr, the modern Patna), states that thefts were extremely

² Can you see the obvious difference between ब्राह्मण and ब्राह्मिन? You pronounce ब्राह्मण when you look at Braahman in print. You pronounce as ब्राह्मिन or ब्रह्मिन when you look at Brahmin in print. Comfortably oblivious of this anomaly our so-called learned keep writing as Brahmin and also keep pronouncing it as ब्राह्मिन. Does it ever occur to them as to who gives them the right to corrupt our heritage language Sanskrit? 2009-07-03

rare, and they honoured truth as virtue. Arrian (in the 2nd century, the pupil of Epictetus), when speaking of the public overseers or superintendents in India, says 'They oversee what goes on in the country or towns, and report everything to the king, where the people have a king, and to the magistrates, where the people are self-governed, and it is against use and wont for these to give in a false report; but indeed no Indian is accused of lying'. The Chinese, who come next in order of time, bear the same, believe, unanimous testimony in favour of the honesty and veracity of the Hindus. Let me quote Hiouen-thsang, the most famous of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims, who visited India in 7th century. 'Though the Indians,' he writes, 'are of a light temperament, they are distinguished by the straightforwardness and honesty of their character. With regard to riches, they never take anything unjustly; with regard to justice, they make even excessive concessions...Straightforwardness is the distinguishing feature of their administration.' If we turn to the accounts given by the Mohammedan conquerors of India, we find Idrisi, in his Geography (written in the 11th century), summing up their opinion of the Indians in the following words: 'The Indians are naturally inclined to justice, and never depart from it in their actions. Their good faith, honesty, and fidelity to their engagements are well known, and they are so famous for these qualities that people flock to their country from every side'. In the 13th century we have the testimony of Marco Polo, who thus speaks of Abraiaman, a name by which he seems to mean the Braahmans who, though not traders by profession, might have been employed for great commercial transactions by the king. This was particularly the case during times which the Braahmans would call times of distress, when many things were allowed which at other times were forbidden by the laws. 'You must know,' Marco Polo says, 'that these Abraiaman are the best merchants in the world, and the most truthful, for they would not tell a lie for anything on earth.' In the 14th century we have Friar Jordanus, who goes out of his way to tell us that the people of Lesser India (South and Western India) are true in speech and eminent in justice. In the 15th century

Kamal-eddin Abd-errazak Samarkandi (1413-82), who went as ambassador of the Khakan to the prince of Kalikut and to the king of Vidyanagara (about 1440-45), bears testimony to the perfect security, which merchants enjoy in that country. In the 16th century, Abul Fazl, the minister of the Emperor Akbar, says in his Ayin Akbari: 'The Hindus are religious, affable, cheerful, lovers of justice, given to retirement, able in business, admirers of truth, grateful and of unbounded fidelity; and their soldiers know not what it is to fly from the field of battle.' And given in quite modern times the Mohammedans seem willing to admit that the Hindus, at all events in their dealings with Hindus, are more straightforward than Mohammedans in their dealings with Mohammedans." Speaking as above, at Cambridge University in 1882, Max Muller³ continued his lecture: "So I could go on quoting from book after book, and again and again we should see how it was the love of truth that struck all the people who came in contact with India, as the prominent feature in the national character of its inhabitants.

³ Max Muller (1823-1900) has long been regarded as the 'Western Indologist par excellence'. He was born on 6 December, 1823 in Dessau, the capital of the German Duchy of Anhalt-Dessau. His father Wilhelm Muller (1794-1827), a famous poet and teacher, died leaving his wife and two young children in dire poverty, supported only by a modest pension. After his early years in Dessau, he was sent at the age of twelve to Leipzig to finish his schooling, receiving a thorough grounding in Greek and Latin. As a student at Leipzig University, he fought duels and left with a doctorate before he was twenty. After his *wanderjahre* spent in Berlin, Paris and London, he arrived in Oxford in 1848, where he settled. He became Taylorian Professor of Modern European Languages (1854), a Fellow of All Souls College (1858) and Professor of Comparative Philology (1868). Max Muller's oeuvre was marked by encyclopaedic range and scholarship. His edition of the *Rig Veda* (1849-73), and the forty-nine volumes of the *Sacred Books of the East*, made Max Muller pre-eminent among interpreters of Indian thought in the West. His work on Vedic literature, Sanskrit, philology, mythology and comparative religion aroused wide interest. He was an important influence not only on his Western contemporaries, but also on Indian thinkers. Max Muller died on 28 October, 1900. Penguin Book, ISBN 0-14-100437-1

No one ever accused them of falsehood. There must surely be some ground for this, for it is not a remark that is frequently made by travellers in foreign countries, even in our time, that their inhabitants invariably speak the indeed, very little intercourse between any class of Europeans and Hindu scholars, and it is not wonderful, therefore, that mutual misapprehension should prevail.’ Speaking, lastly, of the higher classes in Calcutta and elsewhere, Professor Wilson says that he witnessed amongst them ‘polished manners, clearness and comprehensiveness of understanding, liberality of feeling and independence of principle that would have stamped them gentlemen in any country in the world.’ ‘With some of this class,’ he adds, ‘I formed friendship which I trust to enjoy through life.’ I have often heard Professor Wilson speak in the same, and in even stronger terms of his old friends in India, and his correspondence with Ram Komal Sen, the grandfather of Keshab Chandr Sen, a most orthodox, not to say bigoted, Hindu, which has lately been published, shows on what intimate terms Englishmen and Hindus may be, if only the advances are made on the English side. There is another Professor of Sanskrit, of whom your University may well be proud, and who could speak on this subject with far greater authority than I can. He too will tell you, and I have no doubt has often told you, that if only you look out for friends among the Hindus, you will find them, and you may trust them.” “Colonel Sleeman saw India, where alone the true India can be seen, namely, in the village-communities... Now what Colonel Sleeman continually, insists on is that no one knows the Indians who does not know them in their village-communities – what we shall now call their communes. It is that village-life which in India has given its peculiar impress to the Indian character, more so than in any other country we know. When in Indian history we hear so much of kings and emperors, of rajahs and maharajahs, we are apt to think of India as an Eastern monarchy, ruled by a central power, and without any trace of that self-government which forms the pride of England. But those who have most carefully studied the political life of India tell you the very opposite...In their panchaayats [village self-governance], Sleeman

tells us, men adhere habitually and religiously to the truth, and 'I have had before me hundreds of cases,' he says, 'in which a man's property, liberty, and life depended upon his telling a lie, and he has refused to tell it.' Could many an English judge say the same? When you read the atrocities committed by the Mohammedan conquerors of India from that time to the time when England stepped in and, whatever may be said by her envious critics, made, at all events, the broad principles of our common humanity respected once more in India, to my mind, is how any nation could have survived such an inferno, without being turned into devils themselves." Max Muller continues, "Now, it is quite true that during the two thousand years which precede the time of Mahmud of Gazni, India has had but few foreign visitors, and few foreign critics; still it is extremely strange that whenever, either in Greek, or in Chinese, or in Persian, or in Arab writings, we meet any attempts at describing the distinguishing features in the national character of the Indians, regard for truth and justice should always be mentioned first. Let me add that I have been repeatedly told by English merchants that commercial honour stands higher in India than in any other country, and that a dishonoured bill is hardly known there. I have left to the last of the witness who might otherwise have been suspected – I mean the Hindus themselves. The whole of their literature from one end to the other is pervaded by expressions of love and reverence for truth. I doubt whether in any other of the ancient literatures of the world you will find traces of that extreme sensitiveness of conscience which despairs of our ever speaking the truth, and which declares silence as gold, and speech silver, though in a much higher sense than our proverb. What I should wish to impress on those who will soon find themselves the rulers of the millions of human beings in India, is the duty to shake off the national prejudices, which are apt to degenerate into a kind of madness. I have known people with a brown skin whom I could look up to as my betters. If you approach the Hindus with such feelings, you will teach them neither rectitude, nor science, nor literature. Nay, they might appeal to their own literature, even to their law-books, to teach us at least

one lesson of truthfulness, truthfulness to ourselves, or, in other words, - humility."⁴

Comments

The battle of MahaaBhaarat was fought about 3138 BC to re-establish *Dharm*. Foreign visitors' accounts of what they witnessed, which we read above, are testimony that *Dharm*, indeed, was re-established.

These visitors came from different lands, they had different backgrounds, they came from different centuries, and they had different value system. They visited different segments of Hindu society, placed in different parts of India. They witnessed Hindu society over a vast period of more than two thousand years. In their own ways they each evaluated Hindu society and invariably came to similar conclusions.

What does this say? There must have been something inherent in Hinduism that would have inculcated such fine qualities amongst Hindu men, women and children. These values must have been so deep that they lasted for so long (almost 5000 years) and uniformly, since the time they were re-instituted following the battle of MahaaBhaarat.

These accounts are dated 404 BC onwards. Similar conditions must have prevailed after MahaaBhaarat until this time because suddenly such strong social fabric could not have developed overnight. The structure must have evolved from the time battle of MahaaBhaarat ended and Dharm was re-established.

⁴ *INDIA what can it teach us?* F. Max Muller, Penguin Book, ISBN 0-14-100437-1

In contrast, let us look at the social structures evolved by Christian societies, Islamic societies, Marxist societies, and modern secular societies. We see them disintegrating already. The base unit 'family' is fast eroding the social fabric of modern society. Look at the number of years they have withstood the test of time.

The test of time is the best test; it tells us what works in practice. It has worked for Hindu society; it has not worked for Christian societies, Islamic societies, Marxist societies, and modern secular societies long enough to stand the test of time. It may be worth recapitulating at this point, how badly Christian missionaries, English educated Indian Englishmen, and Marxist intellectuals tried to tarnish the image of Hinduism and Hindu society.

Day ends and night takes over. That is natural. Max Muller spoke of the *inferno* and now we will proceed to look at the testimony of Islamic historians as to what that inferno was like. As we walk through that account we might want to visualize placing the Hindu society through that inferno for a period of thousand years and then try to imagine in our mind what disastrous blow it could have had on the social fabric of Hindu society. After that we might want to revisit the testimonies of European visitors as late as eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as given above, and wonder how could so much virtue have survived?

Finally, we may want to ask ourselves few questions: whatever held Hindu society together through such ordeal, could it have been of small value? *For once, we may want to be honest to ourselves and start thinking if we need to look back and study*

the value system that ancient sages of India had evolved with due respect that it deserves. For this, we may have to first set aside our ego that we have advanced over our predecessors.

Let us understand one thing very clearly. *Hindu society without Hinduism would be non-existent.* The foundation of Hindu society lies in spiritualism of Hinduism. That is where its soul is and that is where its life support system has been. *Therefore, Hindu society cannot be viewed without Hinduism.*

No nation can prosper dwelling upon borrowed values particularly those, which have not stood the test of time. It is important that we Hindus realize that we did have a glorious past and we recognize our roots. It is important that we Hindus examine in-depth what lay behind our glorious past that gave us such enviable character as a society and as a nation? *Then only, and then alone, we will be able to recreate our past once again and see its reflection in our present; or else, we will keep drifting like one who knows not his roots.*

If it existed once before as is evident from the testimonies of so many people coming from such diverse background and if it existed for such a long time period as evident from these accounts, and if it had stood the 'test of time' *then it must be capable of recreating itself in today's context provided we have the desire and the determination.*

Journey through the Inferno

Inferno that Max Muller spoke of

Now I realize that I knew practically nothing of Islam for 50 years of my life. I went inside the mosque at Sharjah and sat for prayer with my driver Malik (a Pakistani national) and I ate in the same huge plate with Hamoud (a Tanzanian-Omani national) at Sohar with his friends and relatives after attending his relative's death ceremony and a visit to mosque with them. I did all this with due respect to another religion.

Until recently I had remained under the mistaken belief that all religions are equal, they all advocate love and peace, and I thought, if there were any deviations, it were because people did not follow their religion properly. I was in for real-time surprise when I learnt that truth could be very opposite, that a religion teaches hatred and enmity, and if there is any deviation it is because people did not follow its hatred filled teachings properly. We will not speak empty words; we will quote from scriptures of Islam and from records maintained by historians of Islam and let you be the judge.

Lecturing at Cambridge University in 1882 Max Muller had said: "When you read the atrocities committed by the Mohammedan conquerors of India ... to my mind, is how any nation could have survived such an inferno, without being turned into devils themselves. As to modern times, and I date them from about 1000 after Christ, I can only say that, after reading the accounts of the terrors and horrors of Mohammedan rule, my wonder is that so much of native virtue and truthfulness should have survived. You might as well expect a mouse to speak the truth before a cat, as a

Hindu before a Mohammedan judge. If you frighten a child, that child will tell a lie – if you terrorize millions, you must not be surprised if they try to escape from your fangs. Truthfulness is a luxury, perhaps the greatest, and let me assure you, the most expensive luxury in our life – and happy the man who has been able to enjoy it from his very childhood. It may be easy enough in our days, and in a free country, like England, never to tell a lie – but the older we grow, the harder we find it to be always true, to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.”⁵

Islamic Evidence of Suppressed Historical Facts

Suppressed Historical Facts - Islamic Evidence presented below is from the book of Arun Shourie⁶. He presented these and much more exposing history rewriting, on purpose, by Prof. Satish Chandra (and others) who assures Grade 11 students that “Despite the pressure of a section of the orthodox theologians this policy of broad toleration was maintained during the Sultanate.”

⁵ *INDIA what can it teach us?* F. Max Muller, Penguin Book, ISBN 0-14-100437-1

⁶ Arun Shourie, among India's best known commentators on current and political affairs, backs his distinctive writing, his conscientiously independent perspective with rigorous analysis and meticulous research. Born in Jalandhar in 1941, he studied at Modern School and St. Stephen's College in Delhi, and obtained his Doctorate in Economics from the University of Syracuse, USA. He has been an economist with the World Bank, a consultant to the Planning Commission and Editor of *The Indian Express*. His writings have gained him vast following across the country as well as several national and international honours. Among these are *Padma Bhushan*, the *Magsaysay Award*, the *Dadabhai Naoroji Award*, the *Astor Award*, the *K. S. Hegde Award*, and the *International Editor of the Year Award*. The Federation of Indian Publishers recently conferred *The Freedom to Publish Award* on him. At present Arun Shourie is a member of the Rajya Sabha. This is his fifteenth book. *Voice of India* ISBN 8190019988

Let us see a few examples of what Prof. Satish Chandra hides under beautifully worded “Broad Policy of Toleration”. This is a live example of their attempt to whitewash Islamic history and with that as we will see later, their attempt to blacken Hindu history on purpose. Throughout this book we will see ample evidence of politicized scholarship and academic frauds of different kinds and of different magnitude carried out by these eminent historians of close-knit Marxist-Muslim combine.

1. Sultan Shamsu'd-Din Altutmish (AD 1210-1236)

“...He uprooted the statue of Bikramajit together with all other statues and images...and brought them to the capital where they were laid before the Jami’ Masjid for being trodden under foot by the people.” [Source: Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi of Yahya bin Ahmad bin Abdu’llah Sirhindi with reports to the same effect in Tabqat-i-Akbari, in Muntakhabu’t-Tawarikh and in Tarikh-I-Firuz Shahi]

2. Sultan Jalalu'd-Din Khalji (AD 1290-1296)

Jhain (North-Western State of Rajasthan): “In the year AH 689 (AD 1290), the Sultan led an army to Ranthambhor...He took... Jhain destroyed the idol-temples and broke and burned the idols...Vidisha (Central State of Madhya Pradesh): “...The idols were laid before the Badaaun gate for true believers to tread upon...” [Source: Tarikh-I-Firuz Shahi of Ziau’d-Din Barani (b.1285-86) with reports to the same effect in Nizamud-Din Ahmad bin Muhammad Muquim al-Harbi and in Tabaquat-I-Akbari]

3. Sultan Alau'd-Din Khalji (AD 1296-1316)

Somnath (Mid-Western State of Gujarat): “...And the idol...was carried to Delhi where it was laid for people to tread upon” [Source: Tarikh-I-Firuz Shahi With reports to the same effect in

Tabaquat-I-Akbari and Mulla Abdul Quadir Badauni's Muntakhabu't-Tawarikh, the latter also mentions that at the site of the temple a mosque was constructed]

As we see above they all considered it a matter of pride that Hindu gods must be walked over by Muslims. *These are not the accounts of hostile historians of later years.* These are the documented records of those days and by their own historians. They also do not fail to mention that Hindu temples were broken and Muslim mosques were raised in their place. Today there is so much attempt by these Marxist-Muslim combine that there existed no Raam Temple at Ayodhya before Babri Mosque despite huge amount of archaeological evidences available, which our elite Courts of Justice refuse to look at. We will present evidence of all those in this book itself.

4. Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq (AD 1351-1388)

Puri (Mid-Eastern State of Orissa): "...There was a stone idol which infidels called Jagannaath.... Sultan Firoz, in emulation of Mahmud Subuktigin, having rooted up the idol, carried it away to Delhi where he placed it in an ignominious position..." Jajnaragar (Mid-Eastern State of Orissa): "...Victorious standards set out...destruction of idols, slaughter of the enemies of Islam...wherever there were temples and idols in that area; they were trampled under the hoofs of the horses of Mussalmaan..." [Source: Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi of Shamsu'd-Din bin Siraju'd-Din, a courtier of Firuz Shah]

"Allah, who is the only true God and has no other emanation, endowed the king of Islam with the strength to destroy this ancient shrine on the eastern seacoast and to plunge it into the sea and after its destruction, he ordered the nose of Jagannaath to be perforated and disgraced it by casting it down to the ground. They dug out other idols...for being laid in front of the mosques...and

stretched them in front of the portals of every mosque, so that the body and the side of images may be trampled at the time of ascent and descent, entrance and exit, by the shoes on the feet of the Muslims.” [Source: Sirat-Firuz Shahi]

Now let us see what Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq *himself* writes about his noble deeds. *These are from his memoirs not from another historian’s records.* There is so much evidence around and these eminent historians of Marxist-Muslim combine want to ignore them and fabricate their own version of history.

In Futuhat-i-Firuz Shahi written by Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq himself, he records how he decreed that...idol-temples had been demolished and mosques and pulpit built and exalted...On the steps he took for erasing idolatry in Delhi and its surroundings, Sultan Firuz Shah records: “The Hindus and idol-worshippers had agreed to pay the money for toleration (zar-i-zimmiya) and had consented to the poll tax (jizya) in return for which they and their families enjoyed security... [Note: It sounds like Hindus lived in a Mafia State governed by Muslims!] Under divine guidance I destroyed these edifices and I killed those leaders of infidelity...until this abuse was entirely abolished. Their women and children also went out in palanquins and carts. There they assembled in thousands and performed idol-worship...when intelligence of this came to my ears my religious feelings prompted me at once to put a stop to this scandal and offence to the religion of Islam. On the day of the assembly I went there in person and I ordered...put to death...I destroyed their idol-temples and instead thereof raised mosques...where infidels and idolaters worshipped idols, Mussalmaan now, by God’s mercy, perform their devotions to the true God...I sent some persons there to destroy the idol temple and put a stop to their pernicious incitements to error.”About neighbouring Gohana, Firuz Shah narrates: Gohana (Northern State of Haryana): “Some Hindus had erected a new idol-temple in the village of Kohana...I ordered that...put to death... I also ordered that the infidel books, the idols...publicly

burnt...no zimmi could follow such wicked practices in a Mussalmaan country.”

The point may be noted here that Sultan Firoz Shah himself records that he considered it a matter of religious dictate that he should destroy Hindu places of worship and kill Hindus for the documents that he did it all under divine guidance. *This is all about Jihad but today they have fabricated a new definition of Jihad, which is to fight against inner evils.* But as we will proceed through the pages of this book we will see that those who are promoting this new-found definition have no real desire to follow it, instead they are busy in engaging themselves in more of evil. *Adharm*, indeed, manifests itself in many ways and being aware of the need to recognize and resist such *Adharm* is the need of hour for which Arjun must rise to the occasion.

In his Tarikh-i-Firishta, Muhammad Qasim Hindu Shah Firishta gives an account of Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq at Nagarkot, Kangra in Himachal Pradesh: “...Name of Nagarkot...changed to that of Mahomedabad...broke the idols of Nagarkot, and mixing the fragments with pieces of cow’s flesh, filled bags with them and caused them to be tied round the necks of Braahmans...he sent the image of Nowshaba to Mecca, to be thrown on the road, that it might be trodden under foot by pilgrims...”

They knew it very well the reverence amongst Hindus for cow and yet they did it because they wanted to humiliate Hindus and Hinduism. They were not here to conquer the nation; they were here to eliminate Hinduism from the face of the earth. The same thing these Marxist-Muslim combine eminent historians have been doing for past many years but in a very subtle and cunning manner that will gradually open up as we reach the chapter on Vedic time Hindus eating Beef towards the end of this book.

We also see that they took Hindu god images to Mecca in Saudi Arabia and threw them on road so that Muslim pilgrims for Hajj can crush them under their foot. *This is not human civilization that we are speaking of but Aasuric culture.*

5. Sultan Alau'd-Din Mujahid Shah Bahmani (AD 1375-1378)

Vijay Nagar (South-Western State of Karnataka): "...He broke down many temples of idolaters and laid waste the country...after which he hastened to Beejanuggur...on which stood a temple...it was much venerated by the Hindoos...the King considering its destruction a religious obligation ascended to the hill and having razed the edifice..." [Source: Tarikh-i-Firishta]

As the historian records, the Sultan considered it his religious obligation. *This is not fiction.* We will see later in this book what Quran says about it and what live examples Prophet Mohammed himself left to his followers.

6. Sultan Nasiru'd-Din Mahmud Shah Tughlaq (AD 1389-1412)

"...Got founded a city named Muhammadabad...at a place known as Kalpi which was a home of accursed infidels and he got mosques raised in place of temples for the worship of Allah. [Source: Tarikh-i-Muhammadi of Muhammad Bihamad Khani]

7. Sultan Ahmad Shah I Wali Bahmani (AD 1422-1435)

Vijay Nagar (South-Western State of Karnataka): "...Wherever he went put to death men, women and children, without mercy, contrary to the contract made between his uncle and predecessor Mahomed Shah and the Rays of Beejanuggur. Whenever the number of slain amounted to twenty thousand he halted three days and made a festival celebration of the bloody event. He broke

down, also, the idolatrous temples and destroyed the colleges of Braahmans. During these operations, a body of five thousand Hindoos, urged by desperation at the destruction of their religious buildings and at the insults offered to their deities, united in taking an oath to sacrifice their lives in an attempt to kill the king, as the author of all their sufferings” [Source: Tarikh-i-Firishta]

Look at the religious fanaticism where a contract has no value and where human lives have none at all. They were not killing Hindu soldiers but Hindu civilians, old men, women, children, and they were celebrating the occasion as the count reached 20,000. This is Prof. Satish Chandra’s “policy of broad toleration”. Academicians can also turn liars, is something we must learn from these exemplary historians of eminence and we will see enough examples as we proceed. The beauty is that these are the people whom we respected. *We must not forget that when we worship false virtues we turn to adopt those false virtues and imbibe them in our life, thoughts and action.*

8. Sultan Mahmud Khalji of Malwa (AD 1436-1469)

Chittaurgarh (North-Western State of Rajasthan): “...He started laying waste the country...he started constructing mosques after demolishing temples... [Source: Tabqat-i-Akbari]

9. Sultan Mahmud bin Ibrahim Sharqi (AD 1440-1457)

“...To Orissa with intention of jihad...and laid them waste, and destroyed the temples after demolishing them... [Source: Tabqat-i-Akbari]

10. Sultan Muhammad Shah II Bahmani (AD 1463-1482)

Komdapalli (South-Eastern State of Andhra Pradesh): “The king having gone to view the fort broke down the idolatrous temple and killed some Braahmans, who officiated at it, with his own hands, as

a point of religion. He then gave orders for a mosque to be erected on the foundation of the temple... Khwaja Mahmood Gawan now represented, that as his majesty had slain some infidels with his own hands, he might fairly assume the title of Ghazy, an appellation of which he was very proud. Mahmood Shah was the first of his race who had slain a Braahman... [Source: *Tarikh-i-Firishta*]

Here we see the incentive to sultans for slaying Hindu priests with his own hands for it entitles them the honourable Islamic title of Ghazy. *For 50 years of my life I have never known that a religion can ask humans to become barbarians.*

11. Sultan Sikandar Lodi (AD 1489-1517)

“Sultan Sikandar led a very pious life...Islam was regarded very highly in his reign. The infidels could not muster the courage to worship idols or bathe in the (sacred) streams. During his holy reigns idols were hidden underground. The stone (idol) of Nagarkot, which had misled the (whole) world, was brought and handed over to butchers so that they might weigh meat with it.” [Source: *Ahmad Yadgar’s Tarikh-i-Shahi*]

So now we learn a new definition of religious piousness. A person is pious if he uses Hindu god images for weighing animal meat. How much more examples do we need for *Aasuric* culture?

Mathura, the birthplace of Shri Krishn: “He got the temples of infidels destroyed. No trace of infidelity was left at the place in Mathura where the infidels used to take bath...if a Hindu went there for bathing even by mistake he was made to lose his limbs and punished severely.” [Source: *Shykh Rizqu’llah Mushtaqi’s Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi*]

Mandrail (Central State of Madhya Pradesh): “The Sultan got the temples demolished and mosques erected in their stead...and

then...he led an expedition towards the fort of Udit Nagar...he got the temples demolished and mosques constructed in their stead...”
[Source: *Tabqat-i-Akbari*]

Mathura (Birthplace of Shri Krishn) Mathura (Northern State of Uttar Pradesh): “He was so zealous a Mussalman that he utterly destroyed diverse places of worship of the infidels and left not a vestige remaining of them. He entirely ruined the shrines of Mathura, the mine of heathenism...their stone images were given to the butchers to serve them as meat-weight, and all the Hindus in Mathura were strictly prohibited from shaving their heads and beards, and performing their ablutions... And then at Dholpur (Madhya Pradesh): ...Erected a mosque on the site of an idol-temple...” [Source: *Abu'llah's Tarikh-i-Da'udi*]

Oxford Dictionary describes, “Heathen as a chiefly derogatory term, a person who does not belong to a widely held religion (especially one who is not a Christian, Jew, or Muslim) as regarded by those who do.” This means at one side we have heathens like Hindus and on the other side we have great religions like Christianity, Judaism and Islam. Thus, on one side we have *Surs* and on the other side we have *Asurs* for, if we know about Christianity's barbaric activities in the name of Inquisition we will understand well of their character hidden to Indians. As for Judaism I read extreme hatred filled teachings of Moses in *Deuteronomy* 12.2; 13.6, 8, 9; 32.24-25.

12. Babur, Ghazi (AD 1525-30)

“For Islam's sake, I wandered in the wild, prepared for war with unbelievers and Hindus, resolved myself to meet a martyr's death, Thanks be to Allah! A ghazi I became.” [Source: *Mrs. A. S. Beveridge reproduces from Tarikh-i-Babari in her book Babar Nama, Delhi 1970 reprint, and p.574-575, as reproduced by Koenraad Elst*]

Here we see Babur documenting in his memoir that he did it for Islam's sake and he became Ghazi that has the same meaning as Mujahid, though it is often used in the more precise sense of one who has effectively killed infidels with his own hands. Oxford Dictionary describes "Babur (1483-1530), first Mogul emperor of India c.1525-30, descendant of Tamerlane; born Zahir ad-Din Muhammad. He invaded India c.1525 and conquered the territory from Oxus to Patna."

13. *Akbar Jalalu'd-Din Muhammad Akbar Padshah Ghazi (AD 1556-1605)*

"And black cows, to the number of 200, to which they pay boundless respect, and actually worship, and present to the temple, which they look upon as an asylum, and let loose there, were killed by the Mussalman...through their zeal and intense hatred of idolatry they filled their shoes full of blood and threw it on the doors and walls of the temple..." [Source: Muntakhabu't-Tawarikh]

Is it not interesting that Akbar of whom we read so many laurels in our history books happened to have carried the honourable Islamic title of Ghazy, which he could only have acquired by slaying Hindus with his own hands and particularly Hindu priests? As his historian records he got 200 cows killed and had cow blood filled shoes thrown at Hindu temples. Oxford Dictionary describes "Akbar Jalaludin Muhammad (1542-1605), Mogul Emperor of India 1556-1605, known as *Akbar the Great*. Akbar expanded the Mogul empire to incorporate northern India and established an efficient but enlightened administration." So we now know how great people work.

*Sita Ram Goel*⁷ records: “Mahmud of Ghazni robbed and burnt 1,000 temples at Mathura and 10,000 in and around Kannauj. One of his successors, Ibrahim, demolished 1,000 temples each in Hindustan (Ganga-Yamuna Doab) and Malwa. Muhammad Ghuri destroyed another 1,000 at Varanasi. Qutbu’d-Din Aibak employed elephants for pulling down 1,000 temples in Delhi. Ali I Adil Shah of Bijapur destroyed 200 to 300 temples in Karnataka. A Sufi, Qayim Shah, destroyed 12 temples at Tiruchirapalli. Such exact or approximate counts, however, available only in few cases. Most of the time we are informed: Many strong temples which would have remained unshaken even by the trumpets blown on the Day of Judgment were levelled with the ground when swept by the winds of Islam.”

Having presented voluminous evidence about the destruction of temples, Sita Ram Goel remarks: “Starting with Al-Biladhuri who wrote in Arabic in the second half of the ninth century, and coming

⁷ Born in 1921, Sita Ram Goel took his M.A. in History in 1944, from the University of Delhi. He won scholarships and distinctions in school as well as college. Well-versed in several languages, he studied literature, philosophy, religion, history and sociology of several cultures - ancient, medieval, and modern. For his judgments and evaluations, however, he draws his inspiration from the *Mahabharata* the *Suttapitaka*, Plato and Aurobindo. He has written several documented studies on Communism, Soviet Russia, Red China, Christianity and Islam. Author of eight novels, he has translated into Hindi quite a few books from English, including some dialogues of Plato and a biography of Shivaji. His other works include compilations from the *Mahabharata* and the *Suttapitaka*. Having become a convinced Communist by the time he came out of college, he turned against this criminal ideology in 1949 when he came to know what was happening inside Soviet Russia. From 1950, onwards he participated in a movement for informing the Indian people about the theory as well as the practice of Communism in Stalin’s Russia and Mao’s China. The numerous studies published by the movement in the fifties exist in cold print in many libraries, and can be consulted for finding out how the movement had anticipated, many years before, the recent revelations about Communist regimes. Voice of India ISBN 8185990034

down to Syed Mahmudul Hasan who wrote in English in the fourth decade of the twentieth, we have cited from 80 histories spanning a period of more than 1,200 years. Our citations mention 61 kings, 63 military commanders and 14 Sufis who destroyed Hindu temples in 154 localities, big and small, spread from Khurasan in the West to Tripura in the East, and from Transoxiana in the North to Tamil Nadu in the South, over a period of 1,100 years. In most cases the destruction of temples was followed by erection of mosques, madrasas and khanquahs, etc., on the temple sites and, frequently, with temple materials. Allah was thanked every time for enabling the iconoclast concerned to render service to the religion of Muhammad by means of this pious performance.”

“In an entire chapter – Chapter 16 of his book – Goel recalls instances after instances set out with great pride by the biographers of the Prophet, describing the destruction of temples by the Prophet himself. What the Prophet did, is by definition the Sunnah – along with Quran, it is one of the two principal sources in accordance with which every believer must order his conduct... In a word, what was done was no fortuitous ‘error’,” writes Shourie.

Oxford Dictionary describes Sunna as the traditional portion of the Muslim law based on Muhammad’s words and acts, accepted (together with the Koran) as authoritative by Muslims.

“Allah had decreed that the houses of worship of other religions be destroyed. The Prophet had carried out the command at every occasion on which it had been necessary and prudent to do so. And, what the Prophet did is the Sunnah, which, along with the Quran, is the model on which believers are to order their conduct. That is what these rulers, invaders, and ‘saints’ did. That is what they and their historians said they were doing. And that is precisely what our eminent historians conceal,” writes Shourie.

Examples presented above happen to be only the proverbial *tip of the iceberg*. Aurangzeb and his deeds will need

many more pages and there are other notorious ones whose names have not featured here. Shourie exposes large-scale history rewriting by a close-knit group of several eminent historians on purpose. We will later see what the game plan of these historians was. Shourie picks-up factual data from the meticulous and unimpeachable study by Sita Ram Goel presented in *Hindu Temples, What happened to them, Volume II, The Islamic Evidence, 1991, 2000*. Goel well versed in several languages, painfully collected the data as recorded through centuries by many Mohammedan historians and few Sultans themselves wherever he was allowed access to such records.

What happened to Hindu Society?

These are glimpses only. The total story is much more frightening. We have seen a constant and consistent behaviour pattern, not driven by whims and fancies of few individuals intoxicated by their power, but a mission called Jihad driven by an ideology, which sprang from the teachings of a religion.

We may recollect that *Ktesias* the famous Greek physician (404 BC) dedicated a whole chapter “On the justice of the Indians”. And now these very Indian Hindus saw themselves being subjected to inhumane abuse of justice.

We may recollect that *Hiouen-thsang*, the most famous of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims, who visited India in 7th century, wrote about Hindus: “With regard to riches, they never take anything unjustly.” Now these very Hindus saw their property, wealth, women and children, their right to worship and observe religious rites, all taken away from them unjustly.

If we turn to the accounts given by the Mohammedan conquerors of India, we find *Idrisi*, in his Geography (written in the 11th century), summing up their opinion of the Indians in the following words: "The Indians are naturally inclined to justice, and never depart from it in their actions." These very Indians now found them constantly and consistently subjected to actions of those who had no inclination towards human justice.

In the 14th century we have *Friar Jordanus*, who goes out of his way to tell us that the people of Lesser India (South and Western India) are true in speech and eminent in justice. These people of South and Western India found themselves abused constantly and consistently by human injustice.

In the 15th century *Kamal-eddin Abd-errazak Samarkandi* (1413-82), who went as ambassador of the Khakan to the prince of Kalikut and to the king of Vidyanagara (about 1440-45), bears testimony to the perfect security, which merchants enjoy in that country but now these very Hindus who ensured security of all foreigners found themselves totally insecure.

We have known of atrocities over Jews by Nazis in an intense manner within a relatively shorter time frame. We can now see here the replay of the same in slow motion spread over a much larger time frame. The objective of this work is only to give indications of what kind of an *inferno* that Hindus were placed in and therefore, we have chosen to present only a few glimpses thereof; we have avoided giving complete account thereof. However, these indications may be adequate to reflect at the kind of torture Hindus were subjected to on physical and psychological level.

A journey of this kind over a prolonged period of thousand years can easily destroy the morale of any race, erode their moral values, denigrate their self-esteem, and corrupt their social structure, if not eliminate them totally.

It was not so much their lack of military strength but more so their magnanimity that eventually caused the fall of Hindu States. Legends of Prithvi Raaj Chauhaan, Somnaath Temple and many others are testimony to that. Hindus were described in words of 7th century Chinese traveller *Hiouen-thsang*: “*they make even excessive concessions*”...in words of *Abul Fazl*, 16th century Minister of Emperor Akbar: “*their soldiers know not what it is to fly from the field of battle*”...in words of subsequent British *Warren Hastings*: “*less prompted to vengeance for wrongs inflicted than any people on the face of the earth*”.

There was another reason. India was very prosperous and the people were happy (impoverished and unhappy people cannot present the picture drawn by all those foreign visitors over the centuries). Being happy and prosperous they did not need to pursue warfare with a vengeance. They were only concerned about protecting themselves. *Once the invaders were defeated they were allowed to go away*. They came back with renewed zeal and vengeance. One of them continued seventeen times, seventeen invasions, finally to win; and another took Prithvi Raaj Chauhaan captive on second invasion, I vaguely recollect. That loss was disastrous for the Hindu state. May be it was not farsighted of those who allowed repeated invasions; one might argue that invaders ought to have been crushed and totally destroyed after defeat not leaving the invader capable of return.

On the other hand armies of Islam were not only at war with armies of Hindus, they were at war with all non-Muslims. After they defeated Hindu armies they slaughtered Hindu civilians disregard men-women-children, forcibly captured women, enslaved men and children, they destroyed their culture, heritage, looted their wealth; *they were at war with the Hindu society as whole.*

What happened to Hindu Women?

Hindu society hardened and made itself rigid enough to survive. In Hindu society, women were respected and they had enjoyed freedom but now it became necessary to place them under *purda* system as followed by Muslims except for use of *burqua*. It came out of necessity to protect their women folk from Mohammedan conquerors who were at liberty to take Hindu women by force and convert them into Islam and then marry them as four wives were allowed to each Muslim, and use of force for such purposes was endorsed by their religion.

We have the legend of *Padmini*, the beginning of *Jauhar*, which was a voluntary act by *Padmini* to save herself from Sultan Alau'd-Din Khalji. Later this assumed the shape of an involuntary Hindu custom *Sati Prathaa* to protect Hindu widows from forcible capture by Muslim powerful ones.

Few months ago I was told of a European impression that *Hinduism* had been oppressive of its women folk. Sure, this image would have been created by interest groups, who were either hostile to Hinduism or those who had to benefit by tarnishing the image of Hinduism, for *Sir Thomas Munro* wrote: *“and above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect, and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a*

civilized people - then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe, and if civilization is to become an article of trade between England and India, I am convinced that England will gain by the import cargo."

Quotes from Quran and Hadis

Oxford Dictionary describes *Akbar as Great*. In schools we had been taught that *he was great* but what we had not been told that he too held the title of *Ghazi*. When someone titled as *Great* could not resist the temptation to kill Hindu priests with his own hands only to earn the title of *Ghazi*, an honour in Islam, then what would be the case with lesser mortals than someone titled as *Great*? Such has been the *extraordinary compulsion* of religious dictates of Islam! Let us see what could have ignited such fervour.

Presented from the works of Koenraad Elst: "Make war on them until idolatry is no more and Allah's religion reigns supreme". [Qur'an 2:193 and 8:39] "Those who follow Mohammed are merciless to the unbelievers but kind to one another". [Qur'an 48:29] "Enmity and hate shall reign between us until ye believe in Allah alone". [Qur'an 60:4]

Presented from the works of N. S. Rajaram: "Surely the worst beasts in God's sight are the unbelievers. O ye who believe! Fight those of the unbelievers and let them find in you harshness. Humiliate the non-Muslims to such an extent that they surrender and pay tribute. Then, when the sacred months are drawn away, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them and confine them, and lie in wait for them at every place of ambush." [Quran 9.123, 29, 5]

Presented from the works of Arun Shourie: "Then, if they turn their backs take them and slay them wherever you find them."

[Quran 4.91] This verse is in relation to those persons who, having accepted Islam went back to their traditional observances. “Whosoever changes his Islamic religion kill him.” [Sahih Bukhari 84.57] “The Prophet had them caught. He then ordered [Note: Prophet Mohammed commanded thus in respect of the members of the tribe Ukl, some of whom embraced Islam and then left Islam] their hands and legs to be cut off, their eyes to be branded with heated pieces of iron. He ordered that the cut hands and legs should not be cauterized so that they bleed to death. ‘And when they asked for water to drink’, records the Hadis, ‘they were not given water.’” [Sahih Bukhari 82.794-7 and Sahih Muslim 4130-7]

A Religion teaches Hatred and Enmity

This was most unfortunate revelation for until now I believed in the myth ‘*mazhab nahi sikhaataa aapas me bair karnaa*’ the popular song that I heard from my childhood days which meant ‘religion does not teach to hate each other’ and now I learnt that the very basis, the very foundation of this religion lied on hatred and enmity. Now I understand why in Muslim nations so often a person acquires power by killing the earlier one; we need not go far but look at our neighbours Bangladesh and Pakistan and simply peep into the history of Mohammedan rulers in India during medieval period. May be Quran preaches, “Those who follow Mohammed are merciless to the unbelievers but kind to one another” [Qur’an 48:29] but we cannot make the same individual inhumane and kind at the same time. Once the hatred goes into the psyche it is reflected all the time against unbelievers but it also instigates to kill believers in course of power struggle. Power struggle has been in the very essence of Islam where it promises after death the *hoors of zannat* (beautiful

women of heaven) and before death the loot of war booty as reward to those who kill unbelievers.

It is then when I realized what Aasuric culture was in Hindu mythology. *Asurs* did not need to have horns on their head; all they needed was to have hatred in their heart, love for unjustly acquired power, passion for capturing other people's women by force, and obsession for total destruction of those who were not one of them. Our thoughts and habits often reflect in the kind of company we keep. *Hindu society could not have remained unaffected by constant company of a totally alien, hostile and inhumane ideology that enveloped this society for thousand years, not out of choice but out of compulsion.* This was the most unfortunate period in the history of Hinduism; added by subsequent torturous Christian Inquisition in Goa, and after independence Marxist masterly manipulations in such a subtle manner that it is truly difficult to believe until exposed threadbare. Similarly, Muslims in India could not have remained unaffected by constant company of a highly tolerant and lovable Hindu culture of which non-fictional testimonies are available from foreign visitors to India through the course of 404 BC to as late as 18th-19th century as given in chapter 1 of this book. This is how we come to see many kind-hearted Muslims amongst us but somehow their clergy has such an obsessive hold on them that these kind-hearted people also succumb to hatred filled ideology of Islam.

Rise of Islam

Koenraad Elst writes: "When Prophet Mohammed appeared on the scene, Arabia was a multicultural country endowed with pagan shrines, churches, synagogues and Zoroastrian fire-temples. When

he died all the non-Muslims had been converted, expelled or killed and their places of worship laid waste or turned into mosques. As he had ordered before his death, only one religion remained in Arabia. The truly crucial event was Prophet's entry into the Kaaba, the central shrine of Arabia's native religion, where he and his nephew Ali smashed the 360 idols with their own hands. The Islamic account itself establishes that the model man Prophet Mohammed desecrated the Kaaba and forcibly turned it into a mosque, setting an example, particularly, for Mahmud Ghaznavi, Aurangzeb and the Taliban to emulate. In reality, Mohammed's conduct is the definitional standard of what it is to be a good Muslim. It is the contents of their religion, which makes them cross the line between their own goodness and the evil of their terrorist acts. The problem is not Muslims the problem is Islam. One of the best-documented defects of any religion is the role of Islamic doctrine in the destruction of other people's cultural treasures, rivalled only by Christianity in some of its phases, and surpassed only in the 20th century by communism." These comments of Dr. Koenraad Elst are worth taking note of.

Sita Ram Goel critically looks into the belief system that gave rise to such behaviour pattern: "The evidence presented in this volume, from purely Islamic sources, show that the destruction of Hindu temples at the hands of Islamized invaders continued for more than eleven hundred years, from the middle of the seventh century to the end of the eighteenth. It took place all over the vast cradle of Hindu culture, from Sin Kiang in the North to Tamil Nadu in the South, and from Seistan in the West to Assam in the East. All along, the iconoclasts⁸ remained convinced that they were putting into practice the highest tenets of their religion. They also saw to it that the record was kept of what they prized as a pious

⁸ Oxford Dictionary describes Iconoclast as a destroyer of images in religious worship in particular; in historical context a supporter of the 8th and the 9th century movement in the Byzantine Church, which sought to abolish the veneration of icons and other religious images - A puritan of the 16th or 17th century.

performance. The language of the record speaks for itself. It leaves no doubt that they took considerable pride in what they did. It is inconceivable that a constant and consistent behaviour pattern, witnessed for a long time and over a vast area, can be explained except in terms of a settled system of belief, which leaves no scope for second thought. Looking at the very large number of temples, big and small, destroyed or desecrated or plundered or converted into Muslim monuments, economic or political explanations can be only a futile, if not fraudulent, exercise. The explanations are not even plausible. In fact, it is not at all difficult to locate the system of belief, which inspired the behaviour pattern. We have only to turn to the scriptures of Islam – the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the Prophet – and we run straight into what we are looking for. The principles and the pious precedents, which were practiced and followed by the subsequent swordsmen of Islam are, all of them, there. The scriptures of Islam do not merely record what happened in the past; they also prescribe that what is recorded should be imitated by the faithful in the future, till the end of the time. That is why the swordsmen of Islam who functioned in times much later than that of the Qur'an and the Sunnah, did what they did. It is the very nature of the scriptures that they make permanent what can otherwise be dated and dismissed as temporary aberrations. Those scriptures are still being taught in hundreds of maktabs and madrasas-s spread over the length and breadth of India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. Missionaries of Islam that are turned out by these institutions, year after year, are never told by their teachers that the prescription regarding other people's places of worship stand abrogated or out of date. At the same time, the swordsmen who destroyed innumerable temples and monasteries all over the vast cradle of Hindu culture retain their halos as the heroes of Islam. That alone can explain why Hindu temples become the first targets of attack whenever Muslim mobs are incited against the Hindus by the mullahs and politicians in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Kashmir. ...On the other hand, the movement for the restoration of Hindu temples has got bogged down round the Raam JanmBhoomi at Ayodhya. The more important question, namely, why Hindu

temples met the fate they did at the hands of Islamic invaders, has not been whispered. Hindu leaders have endorsed the Muslim propagandists in proclaiming that Islam does not permit the construction of mosque at other people's places of worship. One wonder whether this kowtowing to Islam is prompted by ignorance, or cowardice, or calculation, or a combination of them all. The Islam of which Hindu leaders are talking exists neither in the Qur'an nor in the Sunnah of the Prophet. It is hoped that this volume will help in clearing the confusion."

It is truly unfortunate that many Hindu leaders have also been responsible for supporting the untruth and denying the truth. They have their vested interest. In a kind of parliamentary system that India has, politicians find it in their interest to woo Muslim votes by denying the truth and by perpetrating untruth.

The values that Hindu society once enjoyed in 'The Past' are lost in its antiquity. Adharm has seeped in our system so deeply that it has eroded national values and corrupted the nation. Today, more than any other time, it has become necessary to recognize, resist and eliminate Adharm or else, it will drown the entire society in it.

Understanding Islam through Hadis and Sunna

Here are the excerpts presented from the Web version of the works of Ram Swarup⁹. His latest book, Understanding Islam

⁹ Ram Swarup graduated from the University of Delhi and has been an original writer and thinker ever since. His Gandhism and Communism stressed the need to raise the struggle against communism from a military to a moral and ideological level. The brochure caught the attention of several US Congressmen and some of its ideas were adopted by the Eisenhower administration in its agenda for the Geneva Conference in 1955. Around 1957, he took to a life of meditation and spiritual reflection and since then he has made a deep study of the scriptures of

through Hadis: Religious Faith or Fanaticism [Exposition Press, Smithtown, New York] has played an important role in opening up Islam for discussion, hitherto a tabooed subject in India.

“In the language of the Muslim theologians, Islam is a ‘complete’ and ‘completed’ religion. It is equally political and military. It has much to do with statecraft and it has a very specific view of the world peopled by infidels. Since most of the world is still infidel, it is very important for those who are not Muslims to understand Islam. The sources of Islam are two: the QurAn and the HadIs (Sayings or Traditions) usually called the Sunnah (customs), both having their centre in Muhammad. The QurAn contains the Prophet’s ‘revelations’ (wahy); the HadIs, all that he did or said, or enjoined, forbade or did not forbid, approved or disapproved. Muslim theologians make no distinction between the QurAn and the HadIs. ...To them, the HadIs is the QurAn in action, revelation made concrete in the life of the Prophet. In the QurAn, Allah speaks through Muhammad; in the Sunnah, He acts through him. Muhammad’s life is a visible expression of Allah’s utterances in the QurAn. God provides the divine principle, Muhammad the living pattern. According to the QurAn, when Allah and His Apostle have decided a matter, the believer does not have his or her own choice in the matter (33:36). The subjects that the HadIs treats are multiple and diverse. It gives the Prophet’s views of Allah, of the here and the hereafter, of hell and heaven, of the Last Day of Judgment, of ImAn (faith), salAt (prayer), zakAt (poor tax),

different religious traditions. His magnum opus, The Word As Revelation: Names of Gods is on linguistics, philosophy, Vedic exegesis and Yog. It shows how a religion of ‘many Gods’ represents authentic spirituality. Mr. Swarup’s latest book, Understanding Islam through Hadis: Religious Faith or Fanaticism has played an important role in opening up Islam for discussion, hitherto a tabooed subject in India. Mr. Swarup is a distinguished spokesman of renascent Hinduism, which he believes, can also help other nations to rediscover their spiritual roots. Voice of India ISBN 8185990662

sawm (fast), and hajj (pilgrimage), popularly known as religious subjects; but it also includes his pronouncements on jihAd (holy war), al-anfAl (war booty), and khums (the holy fifth); as well as on crime and punishment, on food, drink, clothing, and personal decoration, on hunting and sacrifices, on poets and soothsayers, on women and slaves, on gifts, inheritances, and dowries, on toilet, ablution, and bathing; on dreams, christening, and medicine, on vows and oaths and testaments, on images and pictures, on dogs, lizards, and ants. Though the non-Muslim world is not as familiar with the Sunnah, or HadIs, as with the QurAn, the former even more than the latter is the most important single source of Islamic laws, precepts and practices. Ever since the lifetime of the Prophet, millions of Muslims have tried to imitate him in their dress, diet, hairstyle, sartorial fashions, toilet mores, and sexual and marital habits. Whether one visits Arabia or Central Asia, India or Malaysia, one meets certain conformities, such as the veil, polygamy, ablution, and istinjA (abstersion of the private parts). These derive from the Sunnah, reinforced by the QurAn. All are accepted not as changing social usages but as divinely ordained forms, as categorical moral imperatives. Islam claims to have defined human thought and behaviour for all time to come; it resists any change and it feels justified in imposing its beliefs and behaviour patterns on others. This we find the HadIs literature most fitted to do. It gives a living picture of Islam at its source and of Islam in the making, providing an intimate view of the elements that constitute orthodox Islam in their pristine purity. Indeed, it is these very elements of Islam that Muslims find most fascinating and thus, motivated by a compulsive atavism they repeatedly appeal to them and revert to them... We have chosen as our guide the SahIh Muslim, which has the advantage of being available in an English translation. Since most HadIs collections contain the same core material, this self-limitation is no great disadvantage. On the other hand, it fruitfully defines the field of our study and inquiry. In the long 'Book of Pilgrimage' (KitAb al-Hajj), containing 583 traditions, there is not a single one that remotely suggests the idea of the 'inner pilgrimage' about which

mystics speak so much. Similarly, in the 'Book of JihAd and Campaigns,' comprising 180 traditions, there is hardly anything that would suggest the sentiment of jihAd'l-akbar, 'the greater warfare' directed against one's own lower nature (nafs). Most of the discussion lacks inwardness. The SahIh Muslim, like other HadIs collections, also gives very intimate glimpses of the life of the Prophet, an impressionistic view that makes him seem more a living, breathing person than the portrayals given in his more formal biographies. Here one comes to know him, not through his pompous deeds and thoughts, but through his more workaday ideas and actions. There is no makeup, no cosmetics, no posturing for posterity. The Prophet is caught as it were in the ordinary acts of his life - sleeping, eating, mating, praying, hating, and dispensing justice, planning expeditions and revenge against his enemies. The picture that emerges is hardly flattering and one is left wondering why in the first instance it was reported at all, and whether, it was done by his admirers or enemies. One is also left to wonder how the believers, generation after generation, could have found this story so inspiring. The answer is that the believers are conditioned to look at the whole thing through the eyes of faith. An infidel in his fundamental misguidance may find the Prophet rather sensual and cruel - and certainly many of the things he did do not conform to ordinary ideas of morality-but the believers look at the whole thing differently. To them, morality derives from the Prophet's actions. The moral is whatever he did. Morality does not determine the Prophet's actions, but his actions determine and define morality. Muhammad's acts were not ordinary acts; they were Allah's own acts. It was in this way and by this logic that Muhammad's opinions became the dogmas of Islam and his personal habits and idiosyncrasies became moral imperatives: Allah's commands for all believers in all ages and climes to follow."

It is being followed till today. We have known what happened in Iran and then in Afghanistan. Now let us see what is happening in Kashmir, India. Here is a report by Times of India

25 December 2002 “Undersigned by an outfit called the Lashkar-e-Jabbar, the posters had appeared in a college in Rajouri town directing women to wear burquas and men to wear caps and grow beards in keeping with Islamic traditions. Muslim women were asked to desist from going to school and college, to have a male escort when leaving their homes and to sit apart from men in buses. The outfit...warned people against defying its diktat.”

Christian Inquisition

Besides Muslim atrocities, Christian Inquisition also played its role in torture of Hindus in Goa when Portuguese arrived in India. The torture story is very painful and it will occupy large space. *Most Indians are unaware of it because school textbooks on history ignore it.*

In India Christianity has been given a face-lift with considerable propaganda as a ‘religion of peace’. Certain section of media that has major presence laboriously works to promote this image. I had not known of inhumane tortures until I visited Italy last year and then located research work on Goa Inquisition.

The Inquisition has been described by New Oxford Dictionary as an ecclesiastical (church) tribunal established by Pope Gregory IX c.1232 for the suppression of heresy (dissent). It was active chiefly in northern Italy and southern France, becoming notorious for the use of torture. In 1542 the papal Inquisition was re-instituted to combat Protestantism, eventually becoming an organ of papal government. The same dictionary describes Heresy as the belief or opinion contrary to orthodox religious (especially Christian) doctrine.

Journey through Sainly Duplicity

The Image we carry

Oxford Dictionary describes Gandhi as Mahatma (a great soul), country's *supreme political and spiritual* leader...

After seeing *Gandhi* (1982 movie by Richard Attenborough) I turned a strong admirer of Gandhi. I saw his strength in being able to exercise immense control over himself, keep his emotions under check, presenting the image of a man who was in total control of himself; in mobilizing the masses and keeping them non-violent despite all injustice that may have been inflicted on them.

Only now, I learnt that many of us admire Gandhi primarily because we have been shown only that much of Gandhi, on purpose, as much suited those, who have been in power. It has served our main political party 'Congress' well to enhance the image of Gandhi beyond proportion and reap rich dividend in terms of votes from the masses by portraying that Congress was Gandhi's legacy and Jawaharlal Nehru was Gandhi's choice. It served well Nehru dynasty to rule India for half-century after British left. *For politicians all are tools to climb the ladder, be it Gandhi or anyone else.*

Historical Facts, Suppressed on Purpose

"In September 1947, at the height of bloodbath of the Partition, Gandhi offered advice to Hindu and Sikh victims of West Punjab – the part that had gone to Pakistan. In response to desperate appeals for help to their kith and kin left behind by Hindu and Sikh

refugees, Gandhi told them to pray. Quote Gandhi: I advise them to remain calm. After all God is great. There is no place where God does not exist, meditate on Him and take His name; everything will be all right. They asked me what about those who still remain in Pakistan. I asked them [refugees] why they all come here [to Delhi]. Why did they not die there? ... Even if our men [sic. Women and children also] are killed, why should we feel angry with anybody, you should realize that even if they are killed they have had a good and proper end. ...I will advise you...should go there...and meet the Sikh and Hindu refugees, tell them politely to return to their places in Pakistan unaided either by the Police or the Military. Not one of those who died in Punjab is going to return. In the end we too have to go there. It is true they were murdered but then some others die of cholera or due to other causes. He who is born must die. Unquote Gandhi. Such appeals coming from anyone but Gandhiji would have seemed extraordinary to say the least. One also wonders why he did not advise the Muslims of India also to die with prayer on their lips without protection from the army or the police; in fact he went out of his way to force the Indian government to protect them. It was not only Muslim lives he was concerned about protecting. When Hindu and Sikh refugees had taken temporary shelter in some abandoned mosques in Delhi, Gandhi insisted that they be evacuated. In January 1948, hundreds of refugee families – including women and children – were driven out of their makeshift shelters into cold winter rain and forced to spend their nights in the open. There is much about the conduct of the Congress and its leaders that remains to be written. One hopes, a revisionist history of India, covering the period from about 1920 to the present will be written by scholars not beholden to the Congress Party or the Nehru-Gandhi family clique. Gandhi did not see, or chose not to see that his moral relativism relieved the aggressors of all responsibility for their acts, while simultaneously removing the shield of self-protection from potential victims. Self-defence is the right of every living being. It is not easy to justify his stand on rational or humanistic grounds. The only alternative is to regard it

as 'revealed truth' coming from the Prophet of Nonviolence. But this was a selective principle that applied only to the victims and not to the tormentors." NS Rajaram¹⁰

What do we learn from this?

Why Gandhi valued the lives of people based on their religion? Hindu lives to him were of no consequence. Muslim lives were of value to him, to be protected. *What signals had he been giving to Hindus?* He was called Father of the Nation, and he seems to have regarded Hindus as his stepchildren and Muslims as his loved ones. Why this disparity?

Partiality, duplicity is not expected of someone of Gandhi's stature. Besides, it is an injustice of a kind in itself. It is gross *Adharm*. We may want to appear saintly by offering our lives but do we have the right to earn sainthood by offering the lives of masses in the manner he did or suggested?

¹⁰ Navaratna S. Rajaram is a mathematician, computer scientist, linguist and historian of science. He has more than twenty years of experience in teaching and research at several universities in the United States. Since 1984, he has been an advisor to the National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA). His most recent interest is in the Study of the scientific foundations of ancient history, particularly the history of ancient India. He has worked on the connections between Vedic mathematics and the mathematics of ancient Egypt and old Babylonia. His other books published by Voice of India, are *The Politics of History: Aryan Invasion Theory and The Subversion of Scholarship* (1995), *Secularism: The New Mask of Fundamentalism* (1995), and *Vedic Aryans and The Origins of Civilization: A Literary and Scientific Perspective* (1997) written in collaboration with David Frawley. Voice of India ISBN 8185990522

More Historical Facts, Suppressed on Purpose

“History books in India, controlled by the Congress and the ‘Secularist’ establishment, rarely mention the Khilaafat disaster. As a result most Indians today have little idea of its enormous impact on modern Indian history. The Khilaafat movement fed Muslim separatism and fanaticism, which the British went on to exploit to the full. This was to lead eventually to the tragedy of the Partition [of India]. It [Khilaafat movement] was an agitation by Indian Muslims for the restoration of the Ottoman Sultan after Turkey’s defeat in the First World War. Muslims outside India did not recognize the Sultan as Caliph. The Mongol Hulegu Khan (grandson of Genghis Khan 1162-1227) had put an end to the Abbasid Caliphate in 1258. Following the sack of Baghdad, Hulegu had the last legitimate Caliph Al-Mustasim and his sons kicked to death by Mongolian horses. That was the end of Caliphate. The Turks themselves had no use for either the Sultan or the pseudo-Caliph. Led by Mustafa Kemal, they went on to abolish the Sultanate and exile the Sultan. His restoration, even had the British been prepared for it, had no takers in Turkey. In the light of all this, the Indian Khilaafat movement for restoration of the Caliphate (and the Sultan), bordered on the preposterous. In spite of this well-known history, Gandhi and the Congress took the plunge to support the Khilaafat movement. Gandhi’s first major campaign in support of the Khilaafat movement bears interesting similarities to the Fourth Crusade. The goal of the Crusades was to defend Christianity in the Holy Land. Even this cause was sacrificed in the Fourth Crusade when the Crusader armies sacked the Christian city of Constantinople. It was a case of political ambitions of the Crusader chiefs getting the better of the main goal of establishing Christian rule in Jerusalem. So the one state – the Byzantine Empire – that for centuries had stood as a bulwark against the expansion of Islam was severely weakened by the Fourth Crusade. After this disaster it was no longer in a position to check the Turkish expansion. The Congress had declared full independence (Swaraaj) as its goal in the Amritsar session 1920; it

was repeated at Naagpur the following year. But, the goal of Swaraaj was sacrificed by Gandhi... The Swaraaj resolution was suspended in favour of the Khilaafat. Gandhi was unequivocal on this point asserting that support for the Khilaafat was more important than the Swaraaj. He declared: *Quote Gandhi: To the Mussalmaan Swaraaj (full independence) means, as it must, India's ability to deal effectively with the Khilaafat question. ...It is impossible not to sympathize with this attitude. ...I would gladly ask for the postponement of the Swaraaj activity if we could advance the interest of the Khilaafat. Unquote Gandhi.* The results were catastrophic. In support of Khilaafat movement, Gandhi placed his authority and trusts in the hands of two unscrupulous Muslim clergymen/adventurers – the notorious and fanatical Ali Brothers. He provided them also funds from the Tilak Swaraaj Fund. They were even implicated in plans to invite the Aamir of Afghanistan to invade India in support of Islam. It is not commonly known that following the Jaliaanaawaala Bag massacre in 1919, guided by the Mullahs, Muslim masses in the villages of Punjab denounced British high handedness while simultaneously swearing loyalty to the Aamir of Afghanistan. Apparently none of this shook Gandhi. He was willing to tolerate and even defend such conduct. This was to have lasting negative impact on the modern history of India. Through his support of the Khilaafat movement and sponsorship of religious leaders like the Ali Brothers, Gandhi gave legitimacy and respectability to the most reactionary elements of the Muslim community. It was a godsend for the Mullahs and Maulvees; Gandhi pulled them out of ghettos to which progress had consigned them, and gave them an honoured place on the national scene. His ultimate weapon of non-cooperation against the British was used for the first time not for Swaraaj, but the Khilaafat. He even returned his military honours and decorations as a gesture of his support to the Khilaafat. Not many Indians today know that Gandhi had served in the British Army in the South Africa as a non-commissioned officer. He had even supported the British in the First World War. (He was a recruiting sergeant though no longer on active duty). Gandhi had received

several honours from the British for his service in the Boer War, including the prestigious Kaiser-e-Hind medal. Quote Gandhi: In returning these decorations Gandhi declared: Valuable as these honours have been to me, I cannot wear them with an easy conscience so long as my Mussalmaan countrymen have to labour under the wrong done to their religious sentiment. Unquote Gandhi He did all this for the Khilaafat, placing his trust in the Ali Brothers – the Maulaanaa Shaukat Ali and Maulaanaa Mohammed Ali. The whole affair is murky, and the full details do not concern us here. What is important is that the Jihad¹¹ – or an Islamic holy war – declared by the Ali Brothers against the British with the wholehearted support of Gandhi and the Congress failed to bring about the desired result. The British crushed it. Now the fury of the Muslims – and the jihad – was turned against innocent Hindus. There were riots all over India instigated by the Mullahs. It was particularly virulent in Kerala where thousands were killed, women kidnapped and many Hindus forcibly converted. This is known as the Moplah Rebellion. It raged for several months before it could be put down. History books seldom mention it. The nationalism of Amritsar and Naagpur was hijacked by communalism, and it was not until 1929 that the Congress returned to the theme of Swaraaj. In the process, the communal poison had been injected doing irreparable damage to the nationalist cause. Much time had also been lost. Indian history books carefully leave out the Khilaafat fiasco, or if they present it at all it is presented as a unifier of Hindus and Muslims. To make the matters worse, Maulaanaa Mohammed Ali, whom Gandhi had called ‘brother’, publicly humiliated him. He said that any Muslim regardless of his character was better than Gandhi because of his faith. His exact words were: Quote Maulaanaa Mohammed Ali: However pure Mr. Gandhi’s character may be, he must appear to me from the point of view of religion inferior to any Mussalmaan,

¹¹ Oxford Dictionary describes Jihad as a holy war undertaken by Muslims against unbelievers (non-Muslims), a single-minded or obsessive campaign.

even though he be without any character. Yes, according to my religion and creed, I do hold an adulterous and fallen Mussalmaan to be better than Mr. Gandhi. Unquote Ali. And yet Gandhi refused to condemn him or the violence – hard to understand in a man so passionately attached to nonviolence. But he was not always consistent with regard to nonviolence. When Swami Shraddhaanand was, assassinated by a Muslim fanatic, Gandhi referred to the assassin as his ‘brother’ and appealed to the Viceroy to pardon him! And yet, when the great patriot Bhagat Singh was condemned to be hanged for killing a British, Gandhi called him ‘misguided’ and refused to sign an appeal signed by many other notable figures.” NS Rajaram

Sowing invisible Seeds of Separatism

Let us analyze the salient features of the Khilaafat movement.

“To the Mussalmaan Swaraaj (full independence) means, as it must, India’s ability to deal effectively with the Khilaafat question. ...It is impossible not to sympathize with this attitude. ...I would gladly ask for the postponement of the Swaraaj activity if we could advance the interest of the Khilaafat.”

Gandhi had to make a choice: (a) Whether to mobilize Indian masses for attaining full independence from the British, or (b) Whether to mobilize the nation to reinstate the exiled Sultan of Turkey in Turkey.

Full independence from British was the realistic need of the nation disregard whether people of the nation were Hindu or Muslim. Indian Hindus and Indian Muslims both needed independence from the British.

Reinstatement of exiled Sultan of Turkey to the throne of Turkey was the sentimental need of Indian Muslims though Muslims of other countries were not agitating for it.

Gandhi made his choice on behalf of his nation. He gave his decision to the nation. He had the charisma to make the nation abide by his choice.

He did not choose for the nation what the nation needed. He chose for the nation what a section of people needed.

He favoured the few and their unreasonable demand and sacrificed the entire nation's interest to appease the few.

Oxford Dictionary describes him as the supreme political leader of the country and that is how the world has come to know him, rightly or wrongly.

“In returning these decorations Gandhi declared: Valuable as these honours have been to me, I cannot wear them with an easy conscience so long as my Mussalmaan countrymen have to labour under the wrong done to their religious sentiment.”

Gandhi respected the religious sentiment of Indian Muslims. Indian Muslims wanted reinstatement of exiled Sultan of Turkey with which India had no ties except that some ancestors of Indian Muslims may have come from Turkey about thousand years ago to invade and loot India and they made India their occupied territory and decided to live here besides playing havoc on the lives of those who had already been living here.

At the same time Hindus' religious sentiments were of no significant consequence to Gandhi. From time immemorial Hindus did not kill cow and did not eat beef. Islamic religious dictums do not prescribe that cow and cow *alone* must be slaughtered (some other animal could do), but *cow slaughter had become symbolic to humiliating religious sentiments of Hindus* since the very inception when Muslim invaders first made their way into Indian sub-continent. The tradition continued through thousand years of

Islamic imperialism in India. By Gandhi's time those days were over. There was no need to have continued that practice hurting Hindus. Gandhi himself was born as a Hindu and hopefully did not enjoy eating beef.

But then when Hindus wanted that cow slaughter must stop Gandhi (unwillingly) supported Muslims. Here he was not protecting Muslim religious sentiments because religion did not insist that Muslims must slaughter cow and cow alone. Hindu sentiments were being abused for thousand years. Gandhi agreed to let it continue for Hindu sentiments were not a threat to his popularity.

Thus, as for religious sentiments Gandhi chose duplicity: one treatment to Muslim religious sentiments and the other to Hindu religious sentiments.

“When Swami Shraddhaanand was, assassinated by a Muslim fanatic, Gandhi referred to the assassin as his ‘brother’ and appealed to the Viceroy to pardon him! And yet, when the great patriot Bhagat Singh was condemned to be hanged for killing a British, Gandhi called him ‘misguided’ and refused to sign an appeal signed by many other notable figures.”

So we see that when Muslim assassins a Hindu Swami Gandhi calls him his ‘brother’ and appeals to Viceroy to pardon him. In doing so he upholds the following tenets of Islam because these ask Muslims to kill non-Muslims and it is religiously justified and honourable act in Islam. *Gandhi discovered a brother in him because his religion asked him to kill a non-Muslim.*

“Surely the worst beasts in God’s sight are the unbelievers. O ye who believe! Fight those of the unbelievers and let them find in you harshness. Humiliate the non-Muslims to such an extent that they surrender and pay tribute. Then, when the sacred months are

drawn away, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them and confine them, and lie in wait for them at every place of ambush.” [Quran 9.123, 29, 5] Make war on them until idolatry is no more and Allah’s religion reigns supreme [Qur’an 2:193 and 8:39] those who follow Mohammed are merciless to the unbelievers but kind to one another.” [Qur’an 48:29] Enmity and hate shall reign between us until ye believe in Allah alone.” [Qur’an 60:4]”

We also see that when an acknowledged patriot of Bhagat Singh’s repute who happens to be a Hindu kills a British, such person in Gandhi’s view is essentially a misguided man and should be hanged.

[See the movie: Richard Attenborough, Gandhi, 1982. British were not angels. One of them had committed cold-blooded massacre of innocent old men, women, and children in their arms by closing the gate of the place [Jaliaanaawaala bag] and then by ordering police to start firing at unarmed people who had assembled there peacefully. There is exact count given in the movie of the number of bullets he poured into the bodies of helpless old and young men, women and children]

Here again we see Gandhi’s different scales for weighing Hindus and Muslims. What was the message he was giving to the Hindus?

Hindus who gave him their total loyalty, Hindus who gave him the title of Mahaatma (a great soul), what was Gandhi giving to them in return? Gandhi took Hindus for granted.

Let us look back at the earlier episode on value of Hindu Lives in comparison to Value of Muslim lives; it speaks of how he valued the lives of people based on their religion during partition of India in 1947.

What kind of invisible scars was he leaving on Hindu minds?

Why was he sowing invisible seeds of separatism by such unequal treatment? Unfair treatment is in itself an injustice.

Duplicity is Adharm. Dharm calls for equity.

Fairness and impartiality is what is sought from someone titled as a great soul and the supreme spiritual and political leader of the country. Saints have no place in national politics, they can only spoil it; what we need is people of integrity, and integrity does not include duplicity, though it may be saintly duplicity of Gandhi brand.

Legacy of the Father of the Nation

Let us proceed with other salient features Khilaafat movement.

“However pure Mr. Gandhi’s character may be he must appear to me from the point of view of religion inferior to any Mussalmaan, even though he be without any character. Yes, according to my religion and creed, I do hold an adulterous and fallen Mussalmaan to be better than Mr. Gandhi. Unquote Ali. And yet Gandhi refused to condemn him or the violence – hard to understand in a man so passionately attached to nonviolence”.

Though I have once admired Gandhi, I cannot but ask myself few questions: Whom was he trying to pamper and to what end?

On the face of it, his commitment to nonviolence appeared to me an expression of his strength that arose from his self-control. Now I wonder was it actually a well-modulated expression of his gross cowardice, which may have led him to please the wrongdoer at any cost?

When he called Maulaana Mohammed Ali as his 'brother', who in turn called Gandhi worse than an adulterous fallen Mussalman - where was his self-respect? Or, had he none?

Gandhi was later called, as the Father of the Nation. If he were the father of the nation, the people of India would be his children. If that was the kind of self-respect the father had, what kind of self-respect could he possibly pass on to his children?

And if that kind of duplicity he had, always weighing Hindu and Muslim interests, their sentiments and their lives on different scales, thereby sowing the invisible seeds of separatism, what kind of character would he pass on to his children, the future politicians of the nation (he having been dubbed as the supreme one, refer Oxford Dictionary)?

From Jawaharlal Nehru onwards, have the politicians of India not shown the same kind of duplicity, consistently, only to woo Muslim votes? Have they not demonstrated the same kind of duplicity throughout under the cover of pseudo-secularism?

Gandhi had shown them the way and they have glorified Gandhi, and using his name as the shield they continued his practices on a much wider scale.

When Gandhi called an assassin as his 'brother' what was he actually implying? Truly, he had called the assassin as his 'brother'. For, he himself behaved like his assassin brother, in assassinating the self-respect and the uprightness of the people who had placed their blind trust in him. Gandhi's saintly duplicity has done great harm to the nation that was later born as independent India.

“Instead of liberating the dogmatic Islam and freeing the Muslims, [he] went on to shackle the Hindus by imprisoning them

in a dogma of non-violence. At the same time, this new dogma of non-violence had no takers amongst the Muslims who refused to yield an inch. This was appeasement pure and simple, and like all appeasements it failed. This relieved the Muslim leadership of all responsibility by allowing them to set their own standards and rules; this was a heaven-sent opportunity for unscrupulous operators like the Ali Brothers who exploited it to the full. Gandhi's moral relativism derived from the fact that he allowed a different standard of behaviour for Muslims because their religion sanctioned it. ...His version of Hinduism held that Hindus had to practice nonviolence no matter what the cost to them. He also seemed to believe that he could get Muslims to reform by appeals to their own religion; repeated failures did nothing to change him. Shri Aurobindo was under no such illusion. He observed: Quote Shri Aurobindo: You can live amicably with a religion whose principle is toleration. But how is it possible to live with a religion whose principle is 'I will not tolerate you'? How are you going to have unity with these people? Unquote Aurobindo" NS Rajaram

More of Suppressed Historical Facts

"In 1947, Gandhiji threatened fast forcing the Indian Government to release Rs. 55 Crores [Note: roughly US\$ 5.5 billion in 2002 values] to Pakistan at a time when it was at war with India. This money allowed Pakistan to equip its soldiers better while the Indian army was facing severe shortage in weapons and other equipment. It might have helped Gandhiji enhance his reputation as a saint, but only at the cost of the lives of thousands of Indian soldiers and civilians. One can only speculate as to what might have been the fate of a lesser mortal than Gandhiji, had he worked to transfer a large part of national treasury to a hostile country in a time of war. These are some privileges of sainthood. It is enough to make one wonder whether the world is not better off with sinners than saints." NS Rajaram

His Religious Beliefs

“A more penetrating analysis of Gandhi’s religious beliefs will probably never be written. Here then is a little known fact about Gandhi: he drew his inspiration not from ancient Indian sources, but the Bible and Western pacifists like Thoreau and Tolstoy. When we examine the list of references given at the end of his most important work (Hind Swaraj = Indian Independence), we find not a single reference to any major Indian work. Much is made of the fact that Nehru was a Westerner, a believer in Marx above all others. The fact is – so was Gandhi. His Hinduism was an idealized Christian world – at the one preached by Christian missionaries though seldom practiced by them. Once he arrived at it, he went about re-interpreting the one Hindu scripture, which he probably read – the BhagavadGita – to accord with his view of the Hindu world. He turned the Gita into a gospel of nonviolence, distorting its central message. Krishn’s dynamic message that evil must be resisted was turned by Gandhi into a Sermon on the Mount, emphasizing that evil must be met with passivity. This became the central theme of his active life – even a dogma. More seriously, where did Gandhi get his idea of love as the basis of religion, and nonviolence as a creed? Certainly not from pluralistic Hinduism, which permits different pathways, and recognizes that different circumstances call for different methods. The Gita exemplifies this plurality. The surprising answer is: Gandhi drew his inspiration not from Vedas and Vedanta, but the Christian exaltation of weakness, suffering and passivity. He took to heart Biblical statements like ‘The meek shall inherit the earth’ and ‘my strength is made perfect in weakness’. Sri Aurobindo with his usual penetration saw through it. Writing in 1926 he observed: ...Gandhi is a European – truly a Russian Christian in an Indian body. ...When Europeans say that he is more Christian than many Christians (some even say he is ‘Christ of our times’) they are perfectly right. All his preaching is derived from Christianity, and though the grab is Indian the essential spirit is Christian. He may not be Christ, but in any rate he comes in continuation of the same

impulsion in him. He is largely influenced by Tolstoy, the Bible and has a strong Jain tinge in his teachings, at any rate more than by the Indian scriptures – the Upanishads or the Gita, which he interprets in the light of his own ideas”. Unquote” NS Rajaram

The Mother Nature gave Gandhi a Hindu body! McCauley’s education system gave him the thought process. In McCauley own words: ‘We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, *Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect.*’

Retaining the essential flavours of McCauley’s education system, Gandhi wanted an identity beyond that, and also beyond Hinduism with which he had truly little contact. He chose to present Hinduism with a Christian flavour, thus, uprooting the soul of Hinduism. My great admiration for Gandhi died its natural death when other hidden face of Gandhi got exposed.

Was he not glorified beyond Proportion?

“The depth of his conviction can be gauged from the following letter he addressed to the British people during the Second World War (1940), at a time when Britain was reeling under the Nazi air raids: Quote Gandhi: I appeal for cessation of hostilities...because war is bad in essence. You want to kill Nazism. Your soldiers are doing the same work of destruction as the Germans. ...The only difference is that perhaps you are not as thorough as the Germans. ...I venture to present you with a nobler and braver way, worthy of the bravest soldiers. I want you to fight Nazism without arms or...with nonviolent arms. I would like you to lay down the arms you have as being useless for saving you or humanity...Invite Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini to take what they want of the countries you call your possessions. Let them take possession of your

beautiful island with your many beautiful buildings. You will give all these but not your souls nor your minds... Unquote NS Rajaram

Gandhi and Marx had one thing in common. Both conceived utopian ideas, which appealed to the masses for their novelty. In the long run, when applied in practice, both failed miserably. *For, they are against the very Nature itself, from which all this Creation originates.*

Once having conceived their ideas and having fallen blindly in love with them, both refused to see any other opposing possibilities that may even have stared at their face.

Marx misunderstood religion; he only saw its negative aspect and equated it with opium. He looked at Christianity and Islam to form his views about religion, perhaps! *He did not realize that an enlightened religion could be liberating.*

Gandhi misunderstood violence; he only saw its use by negative energies and equated it with an evil. He forgot there is something like self-defence, and it has its own needs for the mankind. He also forgot that there is something like self-respect, and it has its use for the humanity. He also forgot, most of all, *Adharm*, which must be resisted and neutralized.

He advised British: Invite Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini to take what they want of the countries you call your possessions. What a wonderful idea. So long British ruled India now let Hitler and Mussolini do that! How farsighted of Gandhi! How compassionate!

What a brilliant Statesman, brilliant national leader and hero, whom Nehru further glorified as father of the Nation; *this is one thing we must be cautious of, that we should not worship false gods.*

Hindus glorified Gandhi beyond proportion. The result: it is the people who now pay the price. *We keep paying the price until we wake up, shed our apathy and find ourselves ready to face the unpleasant truth.* We can, nevertheless, continue to sleep as long as we wish to, but one day we have to wake up and maybe it is too late by then.

Journey through dishonest Secularism

Jawaharlal Nehru has been called the 'Architect of modern India'. We need to understand the mind-set of the 'architect' to get an idea of what the building should be like.

Architect of Modern India

"In a letter to [President] Dr. Raajendr Prasaad (November 17, 1953) Nehru wrote: 'The Hindu is certainly not tolerant and is certainly more narrow-minded than almost any person in any other country except the Jew.' This was the man in whom the overwhelming majority of people in India reposed their trust! It is not just Hindus that he despised, but also the Jews. No wonder his foreign policy was pro-Arab and anti-Israel – a policy that ill-served the nation. But more seriously, India was led by a man who was irrationally hostile to the beliefs and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of her people. How can there be any nationalism under such a negative mindset? Even the rulers of East India Company [British] were not so hostile. Nehru of course camouflaged this hostility under what he called 'secularism'. Secularism means separation of religion from government. But neither Nehru nor any of his successors dared separate religion and government. This would mean the end of government subsidies to minority religious institutions, the Hajj and other purely religious entities." NS Rajaram

Hindus gave Nehru (for Muslims gave Pakistan to Jinnah) the reigns to rule the independent India and with that they gave him the title of Pundit, meaning the learned man! He was learned of course, but learned in the Western style and McCauley education system had done a thorough job on him. As McCauley had wanted "We must at present do our best to form a class

who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; *a class of persons, Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect*", Jawaharlal born of a super-rich barrister Motilal, had taken perfect shape. Being intellectually inclined to the theories of Marx, he promoted his own version of 'secularism' and he practiced it with his own meaning attributed to it. *Uprooted from his own roots, he also did his best to uproot rest of the Hindu society from its roots* - Jawaharlal 1947-64, Indira 1966-77 & 1980-84, and Rajiv 1984-89 - the family ruled India for 50 years after British left. Result of this has been unfortunate for the Hindu society, which remains in its slumber till today.

A Fraud on Secularism

"Somnath is a holy place to the natives of India since time immemorial. In addition to the famous Jyotirling temple, Prabhaas (the site of Somnath) is also the place where Shri Krishn left this world. And for this reason, Muslim invaders like Mahmud Ghaznavi as well as Muslim rulers like Aurangzeb destroyed it, seeing it as the symbol of the ancient civilization they wanted to uproot from the soil of India. (Ayodhya is another). The Late Sardar Patel who was then the Home Minister of India decided to restore the great temple of Somnath. Gandhiji advised the Sardar not to use government funds, but to do the restoration entirely with private donations. So when the restoration was complete, it had been funded entirely by the devotees. This was a wise decision and strictly according to secular principles. But even this was too much for Pundit Nehru. ...When it was announced that [President] Raajendr Prasaad was attending the inauguration of the Somnath Temple, Jawaharlal vehemently protested against going to Somnath [Quoting K. M. Munshi, Chairman of the Advisory Committee]. But the very same 'secular' Jawaharlal Nehru, who

objected to Raajendr Prasaad attending the inauguration ceremony of the restored temple done entirely at private expense, introduced the Hajj Bill in 1959 to facilitate subsidize Muslim pilgrims visiting Mecca! It has now grown into a monster costing the government Rs. 93 Crores [Note: roughly US\$ 30 million in 2002 values] this year alone (1997). And this does not include heavy losses incurred by the government owned Air India for diverting its planes to Mecca from its highly profitable European and other routes just when the vacation season is beginning. The public is by and large is not aware of the magnitude of the government subsidy for the Hajj. In addition to the Central Government, many State Governments and even large cities like Mumbai and Bangalore run Hajj centres at taxpayers' expenses. This is a bonanza for various operators, entrepreneurs and middlemen – all in all what Americans call a 'boondoggle' run in the name of Hajj pilgrimage. This is still not the full story. The Andaman and numerous other smaller islands are served by only two ships – Akbar and Nankowri – that ply regularly from the mainland; these bring essential supplies to those living on the islands including servicemen and their families of the strategically important army and the navy bases. Akbar, much the larger of the two ships is also diverted for Hajj service. This results in acute shortages lasting months for those living on the islands including servicemen and their families. Prices skyrocket and it often costs as much as five rupees [note: ten times] or more for a single matchbox! In addition, those living on the islands that cannot afford plane travel are completely cut off from the mainland. As a result, many poor workers including army men are helpless when they have to attend any emergencies that require them to go to the mainland. This has often resulted in suicides. The suicide rate in the Andaman is among the highest in the world, especially during the period when shipping is not available due to Hajj. The British encouraged Hajj but did not provide subsidies. ... The British motive in encouraging Hajj was profits for her shipping companies. But the 'secular' Nehru, like modern Aurangzeb reintroduced his own version of Jizya (tax on non-Muslims) in the

form of Hajj subsidies to be paid for by taxpayers. Munshi, probably India's foremost constitutional lawyer had told Nehru in a famous letter written more than forty years ago: In its [secularism's] name again politicians in power adopt a strange attitude which, while it condones the susceptibilities, religious and social of the minority communities, is too ready to brand similar susceptibilities in the majority community as communalistic and reactionary. Actually Munshi had predicted episodes like the Ayodhya demolition also. In the same letter he told Nehru: These unfortunate postures [in the name of secularism] have been creating a sense of frustration in the majority community. ... While the majority exercises patience and tolerance, the minorities should learn to adjust themselves to the majority. Otherwise the future is uncertain and an explosion cannot be avoided." NS Rajaram

Legacy of the Architect of Modern India

Sometimes in January 2003 Asian Age carried a news item that one of the Muslim councillors had sanctioned a large amount for renovation of a mosque. Wonder why we do not see such news items about sanctioning any such amount to Hindu temple from government funds? Instead we read the news that government takes away the income of several large Hindu temples. Is this what secularism means, different treatments based on different religion? *Or is this all politicized secularism for protecting vote banks?*

Another question arises as to what happens to the earnings of mosques? Where do they go? Government would not dare touch them. Do these monies go to support madrasas; madrasas that teach Muslim children from their very child to hate *kefirs* non-Muslims; madrasas that focus on Islamic scriptures and *Jihad*? Do these monies go to produce potential terrorists of future? The Free Press Journal of 12 February 2003 carried a

news item on page 3 columns 1-5 that only 120 out of an estimated 20,000 (less than 1%) madrasas in Uttar Pradesh have agreed to take the financial help from the Central Government. With that they have refused to introduce regular curriculum with Science, Mathematics, etc that is followed by other schools. *Are these madrasas a law unto themselves that they should have their own curriculum focused on hate-oriented religious teachings?* Is this the meaning of democracy? Is this the meaning of secularism? The best part is that the number of such madrasas is not small, that in a single state of U. P. alone we have currently 20,000 madrasas. Wonder what would be the total number of madrasas in the whole country and how many children would be graduating from them with anti-nationalistic feelings imbibed in them? One wonders how Congress government could keep its eyes closed for 50 years that it ran the country after British left? Has the Congress government been working in national interest in all these years or, have they been planting all over the country numerous 'human bombs producing machinery'? *Is nationalism the last thing that such governments put on their agenda?* They have given the nation the legacy of an evil that cannot be eliminated now.

So much in love with Self-Image

“When India became independent on August 15, 1947 the proper thing would have been to have an Indian as the head of state. Instead Nehru begged Mountbatten to continue as Governor General. And this after Mountbatten had botched the Partition of India on a monumental scale. It showed a profound lack of confidence in himself, and in his people to run the country. This was only the beginning. During the Pakistani invasion of Kashmir, General Thimmayya was on the verge of driving the invaders out.

But under a delusion that he would be admired for his magnanimity, Nehru called a halt to the operation and brought in the United Nations on the advice of Mountbatten; this was against the advice of Sardar Patel and others in his cabinet. It was again a monumental failure of leadership: he placed his wish for personal grandeur above the nation's interest. ...When the Chinese attacked in 1962... Instead, just as he had turned to Mountbatten during Kashmir crisis, Nehru turned to the U.S. Ambassador John Galbraith for advice! ...This is a little known fact about the Chinese invasion of 1962: its forces were highly vulnerable to air attacks. The Chinese Air Force was pinned down on its western front, fearful of an attack from the Soviet Union. Logistically also China was in no position to launch air operations against the IAF flying over the Himalayas.” NS Rajaram

Rise of Secularism in Europe

NS Rajaram has beautifully described secularism and its abuse by our leaders, academics and media. Let us see what he has to say: “Secular simply means unrelated to religion. This arose in Europe as a reaction to the theocratic authority of the Catholic Church. In the context of a state or government it means that law of the land does not discriminate on the basis of religion. That is to say, the law is the same for everyone regardless of religion. This is not such a profound principle. The importance of this arises because of peculiar history of Europe. Unlike Hinduism, which recognized religious and secular functions as separate from the earliest times, Christianity and Islam see worldly power as simply the ‘Secular arm’ of religious authority. In medieval Europe for example, the popes claimed that there was no activity of the state, or even of individuals, that did not come under the control of the Church and its agents. Seven hundred years ago, Pope Boniface VIII asserted: ‘both swords, the spiritual and the secular, are in the power of the Church. The spiritual is wielded by the Church; the secular for the Church. The one by the hand of the priest; the other by the hands of kings and knights at the will and sufferance of the priest.’ Even

the greatest scientists and thinkers felt the pressure of religious authority. Galileo was put in confinement for life for his discoveries, which contradicted Church doctrine. Giordano Bruno, another scientific thinker, was burned at the stake for ideas that were in violation of Church doctrine. This was the climate that gave rise to secularism in Europe. The people and the rulers of Europe had to carry on a thousand year struggle to free themselves from this theocratic hold of the Church over non-religious (secular) institutions and activities. This is the historical and social milieu in which secularism evolved in Europe. Secularism therefore essentially means negation of theocracy [a system of government in which priests rule in the name of God or a god], breaking the hold of the priesthood on the affairs of the state. In particular it means: denial of the role of religion or any religious scripture in the affairs of the government.

Secularism in India - The Opposite in Practice

“In India, the situation as claimed by self-styled Secularists is the exact opposite of this. Interest groups are demanding religious law and religious practices to be enforced by the government in the name of secularism. Even worse, those demanding a form of government or a legal code that disregards religions are denounced as ‘communal’ and ‘anti-secular’. Thus, groups that want to hold on to a religious code and other theocratic practices claim to be ‘secular’, while those who would disregard the role of religion in government affairs are derided as ‘communal’. One can appreciate that politicians don’t take the trouble to fully understand the words they use. What is unforgivable is the conduct of a prominent group of intellectuals calling themselves Secularists: they have used the word secularism to deliberately confuse the issues, and as a stick to beat the tolerant Hindus with while whitewashing the conduct of Muslims. When we see such deception and evasion carried on by these Secularists, a reaction like the Ayodhya demolition is inevitable. In many ways, Pundit Nehru was the Indian leader most responsible for this dishonest

distortion of the meaning of the word secularism. ...Just as the meaning of the word has been distorted to gain political advantages, history itself is being distorted to serve some special interests over Ayodhya. The one thing that the dominant Congress and other Left parties seem to stress above everything is what they call 'Secularism'; this is puzzling to an outsider, for the Indian government is emphatically NOT secular. It does not separate government from religion. The law is different for different religions. Muslim and Christian women have far fewer rights than Hindu women. Syrian Christian women in Kerala [Note: State that boasted highest literacy rate in India] can be deprived of their property rights by their male relatives with the connivance of the Church. Muslim women can be divorced with no support provided. It is shocking that such uncivilized practices are being defended in the name of 'secularism'. The Indian brand of secularism is a living lie that penalizes the weakest segment of the society – the minority women". NS Rajaram

The result: Today Hindus pilgrims visiting Kailaash and MaanSarovar need Chinese Government's permission. Dalai Lama has to live in India! And Pakistan continues to encourage and support terrorist acts in Kashmir with killings everyday of innocent Hindu civilians. Total number has crossed 40,000 as per a report I read. *These Hindu lives seem to have no value apparently for those who are so vocal on other issues.* And now we read about Bangladesh increasing its terrorist infiltration activities from Eastern borders of India, again with Hindu killing motives.

Gravity of the Situation

"This brings up another serious problem with the Indian political scene: such unprincipled and even dishonest slogan mongering is used to build up vote banks by appealing to narrow communal feelings. It should be obvious to anyone that this fraudulent version of secularism has only one goal – to wit, to preserve minority vote

banks by appeasing reactionary power brokers like the clergy. In order to preserve this disgraceful state of affairs, serious debate on issues is avoided. Anyone questioning such practices is dubbed 'communal'. This is nothing more than a crude tactic for avoiding honest debate on serious issues. The press is no better. The newspapers analyze and interpret political scenarios strictly in terms of caste and communal feelings. What is interesting is that the people are not so casteist or communal as the politicians and the media make them out to be. It appears that the politicians and the media cannot think beyond stereotypes of their own making. But the people can". NS Rajaram

Uprooting the Soul of Hinduism

"Nehru's brand of nationalism, based on this Big Lie called secularism, sought to exclude the overwhelming majority of the Indian population. It is in fact viscerally hostile to the hopes and aspirations of the majority. If the politicians of the ruling parties are behaving like the feudal lords of the Mogul Empire, the intellectual scene, the bureaucracy and the media are in the hands of the alienated products of Macaulayite education. The one thing that these two disparate groups have in common is their aversion to India's ancient heritage and culture. In the name of 'secularism' they are bent on uprooting Hinduism and its heritage from the soil of India. It has now become institutionalized as part of education of these 'elite' group created by McCauley to serve the East India Company. Its [India's] prestigious institutions produce an elite that not only has no national awareness, but also is even hostile to any traces of nationalism rooted in Indian tradition and culture. Its goal is to uproot all traces of the Hindu tradition. This elite is so hostile to nationalism that it does not even acknowledge the legitimacy of Hindu nationalistic aspirations. This hostility to nationalism rooted in the soil is what has brought Muslim separatists and the 'Secularists' together despite their very great difference in social and intellectual backgrounds. Thus we see a coming together of the interest of the Islamic and the Secularist

groups – calling themselves ‘Secular Forces’. Islam of course regards secularism – which entails separation of religion and government – as a great evil. The highest goal of Islam is to establish a world empire governed according to the rules of Islam, in other words, for the whole world to be brought under Islamic theocratic rule. This is what is being made part of ‘secularism’ in India, and this is the group that is now partner of the Macaulayite elite! This came to the fore during the dispute over Ayodhya. The great fear of these two groups is the same: that Ayodhya could serve as a focal point in the rise of Hindu historical awareness, which might result in the loss of privileged existence for these two alienated elites. The common ground for these two groups is hostility to Hinduism – or anything that is rooted in the native soil. As far as the Macaulayite elite is concerned, it is the fear of the rise of the nationalism, which has brought it into the arms of the Muslim Fundamentalist forces. It defends vociferously M. F. Hussein’s ‘artistic’ right to desecrate Hindu icons, but remains tongue tied when Salman Rushdie and Taslima Nasreen are threatened with death for blasphemy. It holds on to discredited history like the Aryan invasion of India because rejecting it would make India the home of a great and ancient civilization. It attacks Natwar Jha and this writer for providing a solution to the puzzle of the Indus script because it means going to the Vedic sources to find the answer. All this, testimony to the greatness of India’s past, this elite finds intolerable. This record of behaviour bears eloquent testimony to the influence of the Macaulayite education system as a denationalizing and devastating force. It produced a class that served British interests well, but one inherently incapable of independent thinking or leadership. Recognizing the failure of Indian education system, the great scholar of Indian art and culture, the late Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy observed: A single generation of English education suffices to break the threads of tradition and create a non-descript and superficial being deprived of all roots – a sort of intellectual pariah who does not belong to the East or the West, the past or the future. Of all Indian problems the educational is the most difficult and most tragic. It was a

system meant to produce faithful servants – not leaders or visionaries. Such an education also destroys all self-confidence with the result they will never feel strong enough to challenge anything coming from their Western masters and hold their own; having been taught only to imitate and worship alien impositions, they carry with them the attitude that they can never be as good as those whom they seek to copy. They compensate for this feeling of inferiority by trying to look down upon their countrymen, and clinging to status symbols of the colonial era. These status symbols are the only link with the past that has now disappeared. How can any nationalism come out of such a mindset, let alone national leadership?” NS Rajaram

A National Tragedy

“But here is the real tragedy: it is this effete and decadent elite that dominates much of national life today. And like all insecure people its members react with irrational fear to any new knowledge that it perceives as threatening to its life of privilege. For example, a battle is now on to discredit new discoveries about ancient India that go to prove the Harappan Civilization to be Vedic, which shatters the version of history that this elite holds dear. In the special issue of India Today devoted to the fiftieth anniversary of Indian independence, the Marxist, anti-Hindu historian Romila Thapar has openly expressed her wish that the efforts of ‘Hindu revivalists’ to show that the Harappan Civilization was Vedic must be resisted. (Like all ideologues, she does not acknowledge the existence of objective truth; truth exists only to serve the dogma.) How is this to be reconciled with nationalism?” NS Rajaram

Part 2 Frauds on Hindu Society

On Raam Temple at Ayodhya

We will use, throughout these pages, *Raam* instead of *Rama* or *Ram*. Looking at *Rama* in print people tend to pronounce it as रामा. In Sanskrit रामा means¹² (a) a beautiful woman, a charming young woman (b) a beloved, wife, mistress (c) a woman in general (d) a woman of low origin (e) vermilion (f) Asa Foetida. A woman of low origin - this will not be a proper address for a person whom Hindus worship as an incarnation of Lord *Vishnu*. English word *Ram* is pronounced as रैम which means 'male sheep'. These undesirable distortions can be avoided by use of spelling *Raam* which can only be pronounced as राम. I see no reason why we should use any spelling other than *Raam*.¹³

NOT a Place of Muslim Worship since 1936

On December 6, 1992 the Babri Mosque was demolished. 10 years later, many people believe that Hindus demolished a place of Muslim worship.

“A court ruling of 1951 cites testimony of local Muslims that the mosque had not been used since 1936, which means that in 1949 the Hindus took over an unused building... On March 3, 1951, the Civil Judge of Faizabad observed: It further appears from a number of affidavits of certain Muslim residents of Ayodhya that at least from 1936 onwards the Muslims have neither used the site as

¹² Sanskrit English Dictionary, Vaman Shivram Apte, 1890-2000, p.468

¹³ However, I do understand that many learned people will continue to use *Rama* and keep pronouncing रामा because they have elevated themselves above the common man, and while doing so they have left behind their common sense.

a mosque nor offered prayers there...nothing has been pointed to discredit these affidavits. Prof. B. P. Sinha claims to know how this disuse of the Masjid came about: As early as 1936-37, a bill was introduced in the legislative council of U. P. to transfer the site to the Hindus (...) the bill was withdrawn on an unwritten understanding that no namaaz performed. Since 1949, the building is effectively in use as a Hindu temple, but many Hindus, and especially the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP), want to explicate the Hindu function of the place with proper Hindu temple architecture, which implied removing the existing structure.” Koenraad Elst¹⁴

What does this tell us? That it was not a place of worship for Muslims at least for past 56 years when the structure was pulled down in 1992. That the building was in use as a Hindu temple for past 43 years and the structure was pulled down in 1992 to replace it with formal Hindu temple architecture.

Were these facts insignificant? Was the media right in not giving them deserved publicity? What were the results? It divided Hindus with a feeling of guilt. It antagonized Muslims that Hindus destroyed their place of worship. It created a wrong world opinion of Hindus destroying other peoples' place of worship. It served

¹⁴ Koenraad Elst was born in Leuven, Belgium, on 7 August 1959, into a Flemish (i.e. Dutch-speaking Belgian) Catholic family. He graduated in Philosophy, Chinese Studies and Indo-Iranian Studies at the Catholic University of Leuven. During a stay at the Benares Hindu University, he discovered India's communal problem and wrote his first book about the budding Ayodhya conflict. While establishing himself as a columnist for a number of Belgian and Indian papers, he frequently returned to India to study various aspects of its ethno-religio-political configuration and interview Hindu and other leaders and thinkers. His research on the ideological development of Hindu revivalism earned him his Ph.D. in Leuven in 1998. He has also published about multiculturalism, language policy issues, ancient Chinese history and philosophy, comparative religion, and the Aryan invasion debate. Voice of India ISBN 8185990751

the purpose well for anti-Hindu elite who have remained determined to subvert Hinduism in every possible way they could.

Did the popular media act in the larger interest of the nation? The media is the opinion-maker for the nation and the world at large. Did they discharge their responsibility fully?

Supreme Court Decided Not to Decide

Often we see politicians making public statement on Raam Temple issue: 'we should abide by Supreme Court decision'. Impression it creates that Supreme Court gave a decision on Raam Temple issue. No one cares to elaborate what that decision was. Not even media. *Politicians do not because they have vested interest but why not popular media? Do they also have vested interest?*

Justice M. Rama Jois was the Chief Justice of Punjab and Haryana High Court. Here is his commentary on the Supreme Court judgment: "‘Decide not to decide’ the crucial question referred for its opinion by the President of India under Article 143 of the Constitution, is the sum and substance of the judgment of the Supreme Court in Special Reference No. 1/1993 made under Article 143(1) of the Constitution in which the President sought the opinion of the Supreme Court on the following question: Whether a Hindu Temple or any Hindu religious structure existed prior to the construction of the Raam JanmBhoomi-Babri Masjid (including the premises of the inner and outer courtyards of such structure) in the areas on which the structure stood?"

I looked at the complete text of the Supreme Court judgment. There were two judgments, a majority judgment and a minority judgment. Here is the majority judgment and the minority judgment:

Chief Justice of India M. N. Venkatachaliah, Justice J. S. Verma and Justice G. N. Ray together signed this judgment on October 24, 1994 at New Delhi. Para 100(11) of the Judgment reads: “We very respectfully decline to answer it and return the same”.

Justice A.M. Ahmadi and Justice S. P. Bharucha signed it on the same day October 24, 1994 at New Delhi. Para 165 of the Judgment read: “The Presidential Reference is returned respectfully, unanswered.”¹⁵

What does this say? That they decided nothing! So what are the politicians and the media telling the public? *Are they telling the public the whole truth? Are they telling that much of the truth as much suits their purpose?*

Misuse of the Courts for Political Games

Babri Mosque structure was in use as Hindu temple since 1949. Hindus wanted it to have proper Hindu temple architecture and they had approached the Courts of Law for necessary permission. What did Courts do with it? In what manner did the Courts manage the nationally sensitive issue?

“It is very desirable that a suit of this kind is decided as soon as possible, and it is regretted that it remains undecided after four years.” “That was the Allahabad High Court speaking in 1955 about the Raam JanmBhoomi cases, which had by then been pending already for four years...” Arun Shourie

Let us compare this comment of Allahabad High Court with its own conduct for next 37 years:

“Even in July 1992 the hearings were still going on. When the KarSeva began in July 1992 the Supreme Court said that if the UP Government could stop the KarSeva the Supreme Court would

¹⁵ *The Ayodhya Reference: Supreme Court Judgement and Commentaries*

transfer the acquisition cases to itself and decide them all together. The KarSeva was stopped. But the Supreme Court eventually decided not to take over the cases ...it stressed however that the High Court should expedite the hearings and decides the case expeditiously. KarSeva was set for December 6, 1992. The High Court concluded its hearings on November 4, 1992. The UP Government and others repeatedly requested it to deliver its judgment, one-way or the other. To no avail; instead, one of the judges proceeded on leave. The structure was demolished on December 6, 1992. The High Court delivered its judgment on December 11, 1992...” Arun Shourie

Let us now look at how Muslim leaders stood by their word and how Supreme Court dealt with the matter:

“As Muslim leaders had said that if it could be shown that a temple had existed at the site before the mosque was built, they would themselves advise Muslims to hand over the site to the Hindus, Mr. Chandra Shekhar’s Government identified this as the ‘core question’ to be settled: Was there a Hindu structure at the site before the mosque was built? Barring holidays and the summer vacation, five judges of the Supreme Court heard the case three days a week from February to September 1994. And, alas! In the end they decided not to answer the Reference at all... Several questions hit one at once. Evidence of various kinds and of unanswerable authenticity showed that the question that the President had referred to the Supreme Court deserved but one answer: Yes, there was a temple at the site. Would the Court have returned the question unanswered had the evidence weighed as heavily on the other side – if it was as clear from it that there had been no temple at the site? Is it really the case that ... the judges, not being specialists in these fields, could not adjudge the evidence? Do they not routinely weigh evidence on matters on which they are not specialists – they are not surgeons, yet they decide whether a surgeon has been negligent; they are not experts in aviation, yet they affix responsibility for a crash; they are not irrigation engineers, yet they apportion river waters between the

states; they are not technologists, yet they determine what effects some change in the location or technology of a refinery shall have, on its economics, its throughput, on the environment. Similarly, courts – the Supreme Court in particular – routinely ask experts to assist them. Could the judges not have sought the assistance of experts this time round? In any case, was the evidence all that complicated? What sort of evidence would the Court have encountered had it examined the question? The case got nowhere after being knocked about the courts for 42 years. Will the decision to send them back to the same courts help solve the problem, or does it amount to planting a time bomb for the future?” A Shourie

What does this tell us? *Justice delayed Justice denied!* Why did one of the judges have to proceed on leave at crucial juncture without delivering the judgment though the hearings had been concluded? *Was this done on purpose?*

“Considering the foolish haughtiness with which the Allahabad High Court had just decided, days before gathering scheduled for December 6, to postpone once more their verdict on the acquisition of some of the Ayodhya land by the UP Government (intended as part of a strategy towards a peaceful solution), after a full 42 years of endless litigation, it is not fair to accuse the over-enthusiastic Raam devotees of disrespect towards the judicial process and the democratic order which it is supposed to uphold. Rather, they have shown disrespect towards the misuse of the courts for political games, and they have rightly revolted against the judges’ contempt for Hindu society, which was evident from their unwillingness to settle the dispute brought before them, concerning no less a site than the Raam JanmBhoomi” K Elst

Think of an outsider like Dr. Koenraad Elst, who has no personal religious sentimental attachments to the issue, but who has studied the scenario himself, on site, says so. *Then think of those who had been victim of all this game. How would you expect them to react?*

10 years have passed since then and courts have not found time to decide on the issue. Finally, VHP gave its ultimatum and gave February 23, 2003 deadline for resolving the Ayodhya issue, and on February 22 The Free Press Journal reported on its front page that the Supreme Court has once again fixed the date as March 6 for hearing on the plea of the government to vacate its interim order banning all religious activities in the 67 acres of acquired land around the disputed site.

Isn't it incredible that they all had to wait until one day before the deadline and then declare that they would start looking at it a week later? In any case, whenever they start looking at it how many decades more will they take to keep postponing the nationally sensitive crucial issue?

Is it that they are saying: we are Supreme as our name itself suggests and we care not of national sentiments and the sentiments of 80% of Indian population for we happen to be the judiciary placed above all! We have already taken over 50 years to think about the matter, so what, it is our prerogative because it is we that have to deliver the decision and we can take hundreds of years if we wish.

Look at this wonderfully secular and Macaulayite educated elite judiciary system and then compare it with what foreigners have documented about Hindu sense of justice right from 404 BC till 18th-19th century (see first chapter on Hinduism). *Don't you think that today's modern judiciary has lot to learn from the old Hindu judiciary system?* No wonder Koenraad Elst calls it 'misuse of the courts for political games'. How long can humans hold their

patience when everyone seems to have been conspiring in one way or other against the Hindus who had been tolerant for ages?

Professor and major News Paper together promote Untruth

Times of India December 24, 2002 reports (page 2): “Ten years after the demolition of the Babri Masjid, many archaeological experts have remained mum instead of critically looking at the issue, said Shereen Ratnagar, prominent Mumbai-based archaeologist and former professor of Archaeology at the Centre for Historical Research, Jawaharlal Nehru University...” let us see how much of this claim is true.

Dr. S. P. Gupta, a former Director of Allahabad Museum, writes in his commentaries: “It is indeed a great pity that the Supreme Court had declined to examine the evidence on the question which had been referred to it by the President. Had it deigned to study it, it would have found it conclusive, and its imprimatur would have gone a long way towards quieting the claptrap of ‘secular’ ‘academics’. In brief, the position is as follows. From 1975 through 1980, the Archaeological Survey of India under the Directorship of Prof. B. B. Lal, a former Director General of the Survey, undertook an extensive program of excavation at Ayodhya, including the very mound of the Raam JanmBhoomi [Shri Raam’s birth place] on which the so-called ‘JanmSthaan Masjid [Birth place Mosque]’ or Babri mosque once stood and later demolished on 6th December 1992. At Ayodhya Prof. Lal took as many as 14 trenches at different places in order to ascertain the antiquity of the site. It was then found that the history of the township was at least 3000 (three thousand) years old, if not more, and that at Raam JanmBhoomi there stood a huge structure on a parallel series of square pillar-bases built of several courses of bricks and stones...He also found a door-jamb carved with Hindu icons and

decorative motifs of yaksh, yakshi, kirtimukh, poornaghatt, double lotus flowers etc...Lal's excavations also established that the pillared structure underwent repeated repairs, at least three times...Lal's excavations also showed the existence of a huge fortification wall at the back of Raam JanmBhoomi, built of burnt bricks, and going as far back in time as 3rd century BC...It is a common knowledge that in archaeology there is always an element of luck – one may just miss a treasure by inches. Prof. Lal had a hard luck at Raam JanmBhoomi. His southern trenches missed a huge pit with 40 and odd sculptures just by 10 to 12 feet. But he did get the pillar-bases of the pre-16th century demolished-temple, which others did not get. On the 2nd of July 1992 another team of archaeologists, consisting of Dr. Y. D. Sharma, a former Deputy Director General of the Survey, Dr. S. P. Gupta, a former Director of Allahabad Museum, and several other senior archaeologists went to the site of Raam JanmBhoomi. This team went to examine the 40 and odd art and architectural fragments of an ancient Hindu temple which had been found there in an ancient pit by the officials of the Government of Uttar Pradesh who were engaged in levelling the ground on the eastern and the southern flanks of the Raam JanmBhoomi, and which had been reported widely in the newspapers from the 18th June 1992. The team found that the objects were datable to the period ranging from the 10th through the 12th century AD, i.e., the period of the Late Pratihars and Early Gadhvaals. The kings of these two dynasties hailing from Kannauj had ruled over Avadh [Ayodhya] and eastern Uttar Pradesh successively during that period. These objects included a number of amalakas, i.e., the cogged-wheel type architectural element which crown the Bhoomi Shikhars or spires of subsidiary shrines, as well as the top of the spire of the main shikhar or pyramidal structure built over the garbh-grih or sanctum sanctorum in which the image of the principal deity is kept and worshipped. This is characteristic feature of all north Indian temples of the early medieval period and no one can ever miss it – it is there in the Orissa temples, such as Konark, in the temples of Madhya Pradesh such as Khajuraho and in the temples of

Rajasthan such as Osian. Nearly a month after the demolition of the disputed structure, on 1st January 1993 to be exact, an identical Aamalaka was found in a pit dug by the U. P. officials in the presence of the S. S. P. [Note: Senior Superintendent of Police] Faizabad when they were engaged in erecting a fresh barricade round the temple...The images of ChakrPurush, ParashuRaam, MaitriDevi, Shiv and Paarvati, etc. provide further proof to their being members of a 10th-12th century Hindu temple-complex. The team of archaeologists at a subsequent date undertook a couple of exploratory trenches at the eastern periphery of the JanmBhoomi site, and also scraped more than 10 ft. thick eastern and southern sections which had been cut across the JanmBhoomi mound by the Government officials. It located a huge deep pit in which...it also found the remains of at least three rammed floors datable to three different phases of the time-bracket between 10th and 16th centuries, and one floor of the Kushaan period (1st-3rd centuries). Two walls built of several courses of burnt-bricks belonging to the Kushaan period also came to light. A huge and sprawling flooring of burnt bricks was located by Prof. B. R. Grover. The discovery of a number of Kushaan period terracotta images of gods and goddesses earlier made it clear, first, that at the JanmBhoomi site Hindu temples were built several times during the last 2000 years with the interval of only about 450 years, from 1528 through 1992, when the Muslims destroyed the temple and occupied the site and also built a new structure they called 'JanmSthaaan Masjid' in their own records [JanmSthaaan Masjid = Place of Birth Mosque]; secondly, that the last time a huge stone temple was built at the site is to be dated between 11th and 12th centuries on the basis of the art and the style of sculptures, even though on the basis of the style of some weathered sculptures, it can safely be said that a stone temple of the 9th-10th century, belonging to the Pratihhaar style, must have been present at this very place when during the Gadhvaal period a new and magnificent temple was attempted. In fact, it was, in a sense, jirnoddhaar [renovation, facelift]. And finally, that the temple was destroyed sometimes after 13th century AD, in every likelihood in the early 16th century, as is fully borne

out by the inscriptions of Mir Baqi found fixed in the disputed structure far back in time, during British days as is clear from the accounts given by Mrs. A. Beveridge in her translation of Babur-Nama published in 1926. Now what do the archaeologists say? In order to seek the opinion of leading archaeologists of the country on all these issues and also to give them an opportunity to see and handle the objects for themselves as well as to explore and locate more archaeological facts at the site, the Indian History and Culture Society arranged a three-day (10th October 1992 through 13th October 1992) all-India workshop and seminar on 'Archaeology and History of Ayodhya' in the main hall of the Tulsi Smaarak Bhavan at Ayodhya. The conference was attended by as many as 40 delegates, coming from Madras (Prof. KV Raman), Dhaarwaar (Prof. A Sundara), Bangalore (Dr. SR Rao), Ahmedabad (Prof. RN Mehta), Jaipur (Shri RC Agrawal), Saagar (Dr. SK Pandey), Naagpur (Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri), Varanasi (Dr. TP Verma), Faizabad (Prof. KP Nautial), Patna (Prof. BP Sinha), Bhopal (Dr. Sudha Malaiya), Delhi (Prof. KS Lal and Davendra Swaroop), Allahabad (Prof. VD Mishra), Rewa (Prof. RK Verma) and several others including YD Sharma, KM Srivastava and SP Gupta, the excavators and explorers of Ayodhya. They not only came to the same conclusions as we had arrived earlier but added at least two more and most vital pieces of archaeological evidence – one, Epigraphical and second, architectural...The seminar proved to be a landmark in the history of Indian archaeology as never before had Indian archaeologists been called upon to examine for themselves archaeological evidence on a subject which was so very vital for the political future of the country and which had shaken other countries also including Pakistan, Bangladesh, the two immediate Islamic countries where even legally erected temples, including the new ones, were destroyed”

Navaratna S. Rajaram writes: “Archaeologists have noted at least two temple destructions at Raam JanmBhoomi – the first in the 13th century after which it was rebuilt, to be followed by second

destruction in the 16th century; the first to be attributed to the successors of Ghurids, and the second to Babar.”

The very next day I wrote to Times of India in response to its report quoting some of these archaeological findings. They however, chose to completely ignore it. The question is: *What role do the opinion-makers to the nation have? What responsibility do they have? Is it to present both sides of the story or, one side of the story that suits their specific agenda?*

Why did the former Professor of JNU made such an allegation against archaeologist? She would have known all this and plenty more that is covered in the next episode, and yet she chose to avoid mention any of these? *Was she trying to make the public wiser or was she trying to wilfully misguide them? Was she playing the role of an honest academician whose objective would be to explore the truth or, did she have an agenda to promote a vested interest? Adharm has many faces indeed!*

Archaeological Evidence of Hari-Vishnu Inscription

Dr. S. P. Gupta continues: “And then, in less than two months, came the doomsday – on 6th December 1992, the structure disputed for over four centuries was demolished by the furious mass of those very Hindus whom recent history had written off as the ‘most docile race’ on the face of the earth. From the huge debris, the few ‘karsevaks’ or the volunteers of Vishwa Hindu Parishad, who had learnt from the publications and the news-items published in the national dailies from almost January 1991 about the historical importance of every bit of archaeological remains at the Raam JanmBhoomi site, picked up in the evening and the night of 6th December at random those stone pieces, around 250 and odd, which had some carving over them and then dumped them in

between the two rows of semi-pucca houses, built by VHP for their offices some 200 meters away, towards the south from the JanmBhoomi mound; the VHP called it 'Raam Katha Kunj'. Not all were ancient; since scores of them, generally rectangular marble tiles, bore the dedicatory inscriptions in DevNaagri script of the 20th century. However, at least three dozens of them were certainly ancient, belonging to the period bracketed between 10th and 12th century AD. Two of these are fragmentary and datable palaeographically to a period fifty years later than the third inscription...The third inscription is, however, the most important one for historians, archaeologists, epigraphists, saints, politicians, activist and even the masses of this country and beyond since it provides the most clinching evidence in favour of the Reference that the President of India had made to the Supreme Court...This inscription, running in as many 20 lines, is found engraved on a 5 feet long, 2 feet broad and 2.5 inches thick slab of buff sandstone, apparently a very heavy tablet which must have required the hands and shoulders of at least four karsevaks to get it shifted from the Raam JanmBhoomi. One can imagine their peril. By the time they reached the dumping ground they seem to have completely lost their balance. They practically threw it on the ground and against one of the several stones already brought and dumped there. In the process, the stone tablet got broken obliquely on the left proper – a few letters at the point of breakage are, therefore, found missing; a couple of them were found by us fallen on the ground. Three-fourths of the first line is found obliterated anciently. The last line is also not complete since it was anciently subjected to chipping off. A portion of the central part is found battered; maybe someone tried to deface it anciently. The patination is, however, uniform all over the surface, even in those areas where once there were inscriptions. About this inscription, Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri, has said the following, as published in Puratattva, the official journal of the Indian Archaeological Society, No. 23 (1992-1993): "The inscription is composed in high-flown Sanskrit verse, except for a very small portion in prose, and is engraved in the chaste and classical Naagari script of the eleventh-twelfth century AD...It was

evidently put up on the wall of the temple, the construction of which is recorded in the text inscribed on it. Line 15 of this of this inscription, for example, clearly tells us that a beautiful temple of Vishnu-Hari, built with heaps of stone, and beautified with a golden spire unparalleled by any other temple built by earlier kings was constructed. This wonderful temple was built in the temple-city of Ayodhya situated in SaaketMandal (line 17) showing that Ayodhya and Saaket were closely connected, Saaket being the district of which Ayodhya was a part. Line 19 describes god Vishnu as destroying king Bali (apparently the Vaaman manifestation) and the ten-headed personage (DashAanan, i.e., Raawan). Line 20 contains an allusion to serious threat from the West, apparently posed by Sultan Subuktigin and his son Mahmud of Gazni, and its destruction by the king. ...The inscription certainly proves the building of a magnificent temple of Hari-Vishnu, the killer of Raawan, i.e., Raam.” During the talks held between two groups of historians, representing the All India Babri Masjid Action Committee and the other Vishwa Hindu Parishad, Profs. R. S. Sharma and Athar Ali of the former group once asked the members of the latter group if they had any contemporary written document to prove that there was a Raam Temple at the site of Raam Janm Bhoomi prior to the coming up of the Babri Masjid built by Mir Baqi in 1528 AD since without that they were not fully convinced that there was indeed a Hindu temple at the site, let alone the Raam Temple. Well, my dear learned professors, what have you to say now, except for the usual Marxist alibi that it may have been forged and then planted here? – If so, we will stand by our old offer: the Reward of Rupees Two Lakhs to anyone in the world who can forge it on a similar piece of stone and have the experts in the world take it as genuine as the present one has been accepted. History cannot be falsified the way it is being attempted by Sharmas and Athar Alis.”

Koenraad Elst writes: “The same counts for the inscription found during the demolition, which clearly mentions that the site was considered Raam’s birthplace. At the time, many academics

declared without any examination that the inscription, presented by scholars of no lesser stature than themselves, was a forgery. Thus, according to 'a group of historians and scholars' including Kapil Kumar, B. D. Chattopadhyaya, K. M. Shrimali, Suvira Jaiswal and S. C. Sharma, the 'so-called discoveries of artefacts' during and after demolition were 'a planned fabrication and a fraud perpetrated to further fundamentalist designs'. If the secularists had really believed this, they would have requested access to the findings, which would readily have been granted by the Minister in charge, the militant secularist Arjun Singh. They would have invited international scholars as witnesses, and curtly demonstrated its falseness for all to see. Instead, just like B. B. Lal's report, this inscription became a skeleton in their closet, which they have to keep from public view as long as possible."

Politicized scholarship like this can only be a curse to the nation and soon the people get rid of these, better it is for them.

Plenty of Circumstantial Evidences

Encyclopaedia Britannica states in its 1989 edition under entry Ayodhya: "Raam's birthplace is marked by a mosque, erected by the Mogul emperor Babur, in 1528 on the site of an earlier temple." Koenraad Elst writes: "All the British sources, such as Edward Balfour in 1858 and archaeological Survey of India's field explorer A. Fuhrer in 1891, confirm the tradition that the Babri Masjid had replaced a Raam temple. A wealth of documents from the 17th century onwards, by European travellers and by local Muslims, confirms unanimously that the Babri Masjid was considered to have been built in forcible replacement of a Raam temple. These witnesses also describe first-hand how the place was revered by the Hindus as Raam's birth site, and that Hindus always came back to worship as closely as possible to the original temple site: they would not reasonably have done this except in continuation of a tradition dating back to before the Babri Masjid. The VHP (Vishva Hindu Parishad) evidence bundle also contained

a large number of quotes from ancient literature to prove that the Raam cult is not a recent development, and that the status of Ayodhya as a sacred city has been uninterrupted since at least 2000 years. The same counts for the inscription found during the demolition, which clearly mentions that the site was considered Raam's birthplace."

Mrs. A. S. Beveridge writes in Babar Nama: "The contemporary Tarikh-i-Babari describes how Babar's troops demolished many Hindu temples at Chanderi when they occupied it. Some tough jihad rhetoric has been preserved from Babar's war against the Rajputs, such as the quatrain: For Islam's sake, I wandered in the wild, prepared for war with unbelievers and Hindus, resolved myself to meet a martyr's death, Thanks be to Allah! A ghazi I became."

NS Rajaram writes: "Until very recently, Muslim chroniclers made no efforts to conceal their record of temple destructions; far from it, they took pride in it. Here is just one example from the 19th century, written by Mirza Jaan, the author of a historical work known as Hadiqah-i-Shuhada that appeared in 1856: '...Wherever they found magnificent temples of the Hindus...the Muslim rulers in India built mosques, monasteries, and inns, appointed mu'azzins, teachers and store-stewards, spread Islam vigorously, and vanquished the Kefirs. Likewise they cleared up Faizabad and Avadh [Ayodhya], too from the filth of reprobation (infidelity), because it was a great centre of worship and capital of Raam's father. Where there stood a great temple (of Raam JanmSthaan), there they built a big mosque...what a lofty mosque was built there by king Babar! Some of the old sources used by Mirza Jaan have yet to be unearthed, but one, which he quotes from, a Persian work known as Sahifah-i-Chihal Nasa'ih Bahadurshahi written in 1707 by a granddaughter of the Mogul emperor Aurangzeb is particularly interesting. The Mogul princess declares: ...keeping the triumph of Islam in view, devout Muslim rulers should keep all idolaters in subjection to Islam, brook no laxity in realization of Jizya [religious tax on Hindus], grant no exception to Hindu Rajas

from dancing attendance on Id days and waiting on foot outside mosques till end of prayer...and keep in constant use for Friday and congregational prayer the mosques built up after demolishing the temples of the idolatrous Hindus situated at Mathura, Banaras and Avadh [Ayodhya] ...”

Question arises: Why prominent media, politicians, historians have chosen to ignore highlighting any of these to public?

BMAC Employed Historians Falsely Claimed that they were Independent Historians

“In December 1990 and January 1991, at the request of the ChandrShekhar Government, the BMAC (Babri Masjid Action Committee) and the VHP (Vishva Hindu Parishad) exchanged historical evidence for their respective cases. Prof. Harsh Narain, Prof. B. P. Sinha, Dr. S. P. Gupta, Dr. B. R. Grover and Mr. A. K. Chatterji represented VHP. None of them formally associated with VHP except Gupta”. Koenraad Elst

BMAC approached Prof. Irfan Habib of ICSR (Indian Council of Historical Research) who in turn collected a team of genuine historians for them, led by Prof. R. S. Sharma to represent them. These historians tried to project themselves as ‘independent historians’ through media coverage and BMAC also endorsed that publicity. Public would naturally give them greater credence when they project themselves as ‘independent historians’ having no personal interest in the matter. Later it was found that from the very beginning these historians had been engaged as paid ‘employees’ to represent BMAC.

Using such tactic based on a lie speaks volumes about the character of these eminent historians. Thapar and Sharma

have been quoted as representative of Indian Marxism in Tom Bottomore's History of Marxist Thought, Oxford 1988, entry 'Hinduism'. Habib has subtitled his recent book Essays in Indian History (Tulika, Delhi 1995) as Towards a Marxist Perception.

42 Historians Knowingly Signed False Public Declaration

“On January 24 the parties met in order to discuss the evidence. But the BMAC team leader, Prof. R. S. Sharma, well-known Marxist historian, said that he and his colleagues had not yet studied the VHP material (to which the BMAC had agreed to reply by January 10, i.e. 2 weeks prior to scheduled meeting date January 24). This is most remarkable, because the week before, he had led 42 academics in signing a much-publicized statement, saying that there was definitely absolutely no proof whatsoever at all for the pre-existing Raam Temple. He had issued more statements on the matter, and even published a small book on it (title: Communal History and Rama’s Ayodhya).” Koenraad Elst

What does it say? Prof. Sharma had signed and led others to do so making categorical statement that there was 'definitely absolutely no proof whatsoever' and a week later he says he had not studied the facts. Without studying the facts that were already available to him, how could he have made public statement that there was 'definitely absolutely no proof whatsoever'?

That means he was lying to public wilfully to misguide them. What about other historians? They too had no conscience? They also simply joined him and lied? What is their profession: to convey the truth about the history, or to lie about the history? One wonders if for some people the profession of history and

profession of lying has same meaning. *The higher they rise lower they fall it seems!*

He had much-publicized that statement signed by him and others. So the public had believed him considering his eminence as a historian. Why did these 42 do so? The publicity did what they wanted. *They broadcasted the lie and it was believed and it left its desired impression on the public memory.* The popular media, in any case, does not care to expose these lies.

This is abuse of position and trusts that people place on them. *This speaks lot more about their character. Characters built upon lie. Careers built upon lie.* As we will see through the forthcoming episodes that these eminences had individually specialized in lies in their respective fields of expertise, and based on these lies they had gained national and international recognition of being eminent historians. The world has now come to know how the communists of USSR operated. *We are gradually learning how communist intellectuals in India have been operating.*

“The next meeting was scheduled for the next day, January 25. But there, the BMAC scholars simply did not show up. They had not presented written evidence worth the name, they had not given a written refutation of the VHP scholars’ arguments, they had wriggled out of a face-to-face discussion on the accumulated evidence, and finally they had just stayed away. Thus ended the first attempt by the Government of India to find an amicable solution on the basis of genuine historical facts.” Koenraad Elst

“They represented it at the meetings Mr. ChandrShekhar’s Government had convened for settling the matter by evidence. That was an outstanding initiative of Mr. ChandrShekhar: for such contentious issue ought to be dissolved in the acid of evidence. These leftist ‘historians’ had attended the initial meetings. They

had put together for and on behalf of the Committee (BMAC) 'documents'. It had been a miscellaneous pile. And it had become immediately evident that this pile was no counter to the mass of archaeological, historical and literary evidence which the VHP had furnished, that in fact the 'documents' these guides of the Babri Committee had piled up further substantiated the VHP's case. These 'historians' having undertaken to attend the meeting to consider the evidence presented by the two sides, just did not show up! It was this withdrawal, which aborted the initiative that Government had taken of bringing the two sides together, of introducing evidence and discourse into the issue. Nothing but nothing paved the way for the demolition, as did this running away by these 'historians'. It was the last nail: no one could be persuaded thereafter that evidence or reason would be allowed anywhere near the issue." Arun Shourie

Historians Caught Destroying Documentary Evidence

"In fact, BMAC and secularist side has frequently opposed archaeological research at the site, while the Hindu side wanted more of it. It is not unfair to conclude that some of the pro-BMAC authors have committed serious breaches of academic deontology [academic duty and obligation]. For me personally, seeing this shameless overruling of historical evidence with a high-handed use of academic and media power, was the immediate reason to involve myself in this controversial question...Before concluding, we want to register a remark in a minor but quite significant chapter in the exchange of evidence: the VHP-mandate scholars have, in their argumentation, pointed out no less than four attempts where scholars belonging to the anti-temple party have tried to conceal or destroy documentary evidence. Those are of course cases where the attempt failed because it was noticed in time, but the question must be asked how many similar attempts have succeeded. At any rate, there has not been attempt from the

anti-temple side to counter or even deny these four specific allegations. They have also not been able to point out any similar attempt by the pro-temple party to tamper with the record...”
Koenraad Elst

They call themselves historians of repute, and they indulge in cheating by concealing or destroying evidence! Amazing character they possess. What is their credibility? But the media promotes them, and public opinion depends on media exposure. The voice of truth is suffocated.

Academic Fraud and Politicized Scholarship

“Foreign scholars might have played the role, which the Supreme Court judges rejected: that of independent arbitrators. But as it turned out, the established Western academics, to the extent that they cared to look into the Ayodhya debate at all, have only looked through the glasses which the India’s Marxist-Muslim combine has put on their noses...It is not reassuring to watch the ease with which foreign scholars have absorbed or adopted the non-temple thesis from their Indian colleagues (whom they assume to be neutral observers) even without being shown any positive evidence. Future historians will include the no-temple argument of the 1990s as a remarkable case study in their surveys of academic fraud and politicized scholarship. With academic, institutional and media power, a new academic-journalistic consensus has been manufactured denying the well-established history of temple demolition by Islamic iconoclasm to the Babri Masjid-Raam Janm Bhoomi site, at least among people with prestige and influence but no first-hand knowledge of the issue. But the facts will remain the facts, and their ongoing suppression is bound to give way as new generations of scholars take a fresh look at the idea.” K Elst

“What the Ayodhya debate has done is raise historical awareness among the Hindus. So it is only a matter of time before the record of falsification of history by Secularist historians is exposed. Their

careers and reputations are at stake. Thanks to years of patronage by political and dynastic interests, these men and women have enjoyed recognition, positions and privileges out of all proportions to their true worth. Even worse, in the name of Secularism, they have indulged in large-scale falsification of history to advance their political agendas (and careers). That is what is really at stake here: careers and reputations of these men and women not only as scholars, but even as ordinary human beings. It is hard enough to admit that one has been wrong, but to admit that one has built a career on a foundation of lies is to live in infamy.” NS Rajaram

Present Generation Lacked Moral Strength to Face the Truth

“An unfortunate aspect of Ayodhya debate has been a tendency to focus solely on the demolition of December 6, 1992 to the exclusion of thousand years of history enveloping it. ...By no stretch of the imagination can a mosque like Babri Masjid be called a place of worship. It was never intended as such by Babar when he built it in 1528, and even today it is not seen as such by the Islamic clergy. It was intended as a mark of conquest – a continuing reminder of the defeat and humiliation of the people of India and their culture by the Muslim invader. This may not be how some Muslims want to view it today, but this is exactly how it seems to the Hindus. It would be in the interest of the Muslims to recognize this...Shortly after the demolition of the disputed structure at Ayodhya, the well-known British writer V. S. Naipaul expressed the view that it marked the beginning of a new historical awareness on the part of the Hindus... Those holding one point of view tell us that we must expose the facts of history and learn the truth about our past; the opposite faction claims that we must ignore the whole thing for it would amount to reopening the wounds of history which we must avoid at all costs. Negationism, however, is never a viable option in dealing with problems. We must be prepared to face the truth about our past if we wish to

solve the problems of the present. I feel this is necessary because I find that many educated and well-intentioned Indians are still confused about the true historical facts...In this we can draw a lesson from European history. The record of Christianity in Europe – with its wars of religion, the Crusades, the Inquisition, witch-hunts and so forth – is no less blood soaked than the record of Islam in India. But Europeans have come to terms with their history. There are no ‘Crusade Negationists’ or ‘Inquisition Negationists’ in Europe comparable to the Jihad Negationists in India. Germans also have acknowledged the Nazi atrocities. This has allowed communal harmony to prevail in Europe. This message has meaning for Indians also: Indians too will have to come to terms with their history. This holds doubly for the Muslims of India... No one is asking that the Muslims today should be made to pay for the crimes of the past. All one is saying that the true version of history should not be suppressed. This is in the interests of the Muslims themselves. There is also a deeper issue at stake here – a profoundly moral one: what is the message that we wish to leave for the future generations? Are we telling them that the present generation lacked the moral strength to face the truth about its history, and chose instead to fabricate a version that it is more comfortable with? Is this to be our legacy?” NS Rajaram

Indian Muslims need to realize

It is important that Indian Muslims understand what Ayodhya issue is truly all about. They need to realize that it is high time that they come forward and oppose their own leaders who have been unjustly politicizing the issue. It is the place where Muslims offered no namaaz since 1936. It is the place that had been in use as Hindu temple since 1949. It is the place where stood Raam temple for centuries and it were these Muslim invaders who destroyed the Hindu temple and forcibly built mosque on it.

Indian Muslims need to realize that most of them were Hindus originally. Their forefathers were inhabitants of India and were Hindus. Their forefathers were converted to Islam at the point of sword, at the cost of inhumane tortures, at the cost of capturing and enslaving Hindu women and children who were their ancestors.

Indian Muslims need to realize that BMAC politicians and pseudo-secularist politicized scholars are using them as their pawns. These politically guided people are loyal to none except to their own immediate agenda. Common Muslims must realize that injustice of this kind prolonged for too long can only hurt them.

Indian Muslims need to realize that it is the time they must unite and oppose these leaders of their own who are essentially working against their true interests.

On Blackening history of Hinduism

Massive False Propaganda alleging Hindu Persecution of Buddhism

Koenraad Elst writes: "One of the diversionary tactic employed by the 'eminent historians' in order to shield Islamic iconoclasm from the public eye is to allege that Hinduism itself is the guilty religion, viz. of persecuting minority religions such as Buddhism. So much this accusation now taken for granted, that any attempt to stick to the historical records fills the secularists with exasperation at such Hindu fanatical blindness. Thus, Tavleen Singh challenges us: 'Try, for instance, to get a BJP leader to admit that Hindus did to Buddhist shrines pretty much what Muslims were later to do with Hindu temples and you will find that it is nearly impossible.' Sadly, some Buddhists have taken the bait and interiorized this line of anti-Hindu polemic, which also ties in neatly with the pro-Buddhist bias in Nehruvian and Western Indology. How painfully ungrateful! While Hinduism has received from Islam nothing but murder and destruction, Buddhism owes a lot to Hinduism. Apart from its very existence, it has received from Hinduism toleration, alms by Hindu laymen, sons and daughters of Hindus to fill its monasteries and nunneries, land grants and funding by Hindu rulers, protection by Hindu rulers against lawlessness and against Islamic invaders between the mid-7th and the late 12th century. In many cases, Buddhist temples formed part of large pluralist temple-complexes, and Hindu codes of art and architecture dealt with Buddha on a par with Shiva and other objects of depiction and worship. E.g. VarahaMihir: BrihatSamhita, ch. 57, 59. Whatever the facts, we are now faced with a massive propaganda alleging Hindu persecution of Buddhism. Let us study one example: the story of alleged Hindu persecution of Buddhism by

PushyaMitr¹⁶, a general in the service of Maurya dynasty, who founded the Shung dynasty after a coup d'etat. This story provides the standard secularist 'refutation' of the 'myth' that Hinduism has always been tolerant...The story is in fact given in two near contemporaneous (2nd century A.D.) Buddhist histories, the Ashoka¹⁷avadaan¹⁸ and Divyaavadaan¹⁹, the two narratives are almost verbatim the same and obviously have a common origin. This non-contemporary story (which surfaces more than three centuries after the alleged facts) about PushyaMitr's offering money for the heads of Buddhist monks is rendered improbable by external evidence: the well-attested historical fact that he allowed and patronized the construction of monasteries and Buddhist universities in his domains, as well as the still-extant 'stup' of Saanchi. The famous historian of Buddhism Etienne Lamotte has observed: 'To judge from the documents, PushyaMitr must be acquitted through lack of proof.' E. Lamotte: History of Indian Buddhism, Institut Orientaliste, Louvain-la-Neuve 1988 (1958), page 109. In consulting the source texts I noticed a significant literary fact, which I have not seen mentioned in the scholarly literature (e.g. Lamotte, just quoted), and which I want to put on record. First of all, a look at the critical edition of the Ashokaavadaan ('Illustrious Acts of Ashok') tells a story of its own concerning the idealization of Buddhism in modern India... 'At that time, an incident occurred which greatly enraged the king. A follower of the Nirgranth (Mahaavir) painted a picture, showing Buddh prostrating himself at the feet of the Nirgranth. Ashok ordered all the Ajivikas of Pundravardhana (North Bengal) to be killed. In one day, eighteen thousand Ajivikas lost their lives. A similar kind of incidence took place in the town of Paataliputr. A man who painted such a picture was burnt alive with his family. It

¹⁶ PushyaMitr the Hindu king

¹⁷ Ashok the Buddhist king

¹⁸ Avadaan means 'narrative'; Avadaan is Buddhist equivalent of Puraan पुराण

¹⁹ Divyaavadaan means divine narrative

was announced that whoever would bring to the king the head of a Nirgranth would be rewarded with a dinar (gold coin). As a result of this, thousands of Nirgranth lost their lives. Only when Vitashok, Ashok's favourite Arhat (an enlightened monk, a Theravada-Buddhist saint), was mistaken for a Nirgranth and killed by a man desirous of the reward, did Ashok revoke the order.' It is at the end of Ashokaavadaan that we find the oft-quoted story that PushyaMitr offered one dinar for every ShramanShirah, 'head of Buddhist monk'. Not that he got many monks killed, for, according to the account given, one powerful Arhat created monks' heads by magic and gave these to the people to bring to PushyaMitr's court, so that they could collect the award without cutting off any real monk's head. So, even according to the only story cited as source for PushyaMitr's persecution, the Hindu villain is a ridiculous failure at killing Buddhists. At any rate, the striking fact, so far not mentioned in the PushyaMitr controversy, is that the main line of the narrative making the allegation against PushyaMitr is a carbon copy of the just-quoted account of Ashok's own offer to pay for every head of a monk from rivalling sect. Hagiographies are notorious for competitive copying (e.g. appropriating the miracle of another saint, multiplied by two or more, for one's own hero); in this case, it may have taken the form of attributing a negative feat of the hero onto his enemy. But there are two differences. Firstly, in the account concerning PushyaMitr, a miracle episode forms a crucial element, and this does not add to the credibility of the whole. And secondly, Ashok belongs to the writer's own Buddhist camp, whereas PushyaMitr is described as the enemy of Buddhism. When something negative is said about an enemy (i.e. PushyaMitr), it is wise to reserve one's acceptance of the allegation until independent confirmation is forthcoming; by contrast, when a writer alleges that his own hero has committed a crime, there is much more reason to expect the allegation to be correct. In the absence of external evidence, the best thing we can do for now is to draw the logical conclusion from the internal evidence: the allegation against PushyaMitr is much less credible than the

allegation against Ashok. [Sujitkumar] Mukhopadhyaya can only save Ashok's secular reputation by accusing the Ashokaavadaan author a lie, viz. of the false allegation that Ashok had persecuted Nirgranth. Unfortunately, a lie would not enhance the author's credibility as a witness against PushyaMitr, nor as a witness for the laudable acts of Ashok, which make up a large part of the text. The cruelty of Ashok's conquest of Kaling was exaggerated by scribes in order to highlight the violence-renouncing effect of Ashok's subsequent conversion to Buddhism. But in this passage, Buddhism plays no role in Ashok's change of heart: it is only the sight of his own friend, killed by mistake, which makes him revoke the order. And it is his commitment to Buddhism, which prompts Ashok to persecute the irreverent Nirgranth in the first place."

Question arises: Why would Marxist historians want to promote yet another lie? What is their game plan? We will discuss that in detail towards the end of this book after giving you some more evidence of their academic conspiracies.

Japanese Monk Bhadant Arya Nagarjuna Surai Sasai Joins the Game

Koenraad Elst writes: "When anti-Hindu lobbies unite, they often manage to get the contemporary form of Indian Buddhism on their side, viz. Ambedkarite neo-Buddhism. Because of its political background, the conversion of Scheduled Caste leader Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar and many of his Mahar caste-men to Buddhism (1956), in effect contributed to the genesis of what one might call Buddhist communalism. The anti-Hindu bias of Ambedkarite Buddhism was strengthened by the parallel Buddhist animus against Tamil Hindus in Sri Lanka and Burma/Myanmar, as well as the tendency amongst Nehruvian intellectuals to construe Buddhism historically as an anti-Hindu revolt. As a materialization of this anti-Hindu animus, the neo-Buddhist movement has tried to create controversies over certain temples in

imitation of the Ayodhya temple/mosque controversy. In particular, the Ambedkarite neo-Buddhists have started a movement for the 'liberation of the MahaBodhi shrine' in Bodh-Gaya. Its aim is to remove the statutory four Hindu members of the eight-member temple management committee, and to prohibit worship of ShivLingam [symbol of Shiv] in the temple. Quite in contrast with the secularist calls for 'composite culture' and for multi-religious worship at the Raam Janm Bhoomi site, this is a demand to free the MahaBodhi site from multi-religious worship and particularly from the 'taint' of Hinduism. The agitation has been marked by petty vandalism, as when the neo-Buddhists desecrated their own holiest site, or at least the ShivLingam standing there, in October 1992. One of the strange things about this agitation is that it revives a conflict, which had been solved several decades earlier. Since 1590, Shaiv [worshipper of Shiv] monks had taken care of the temple, which had been abandoned by Buddhists after the massacre of the Buddhist monks by Muslim invaders in ca. A.D. 1192. In 1890-92, Edwin Arnold, author of the Buddh Romance 'The Light of Asia', appealed to the British-Indian Government to hand over the temple to the Buddhists, and even went to Japan to plead for diplomatic support to this demand. A court case ensued which the Buddhists ultimately lost. Negotiations dragged on, involving Swami Vivekananda (1901) and Hindu Mahasabha leader Bhai Parmanand (1935), among others. A compromise proposal by Rajendra Prasad (1924), later on President of India, was thwarted several times but finally became law in 1949: the Bodh-Gaya temple Act, which gives both Hindus and Buddhists the right to worship and an equal representation in the management committee. So, the goal of the Bodh-Gaya temple movement is not to get the Buddhists in (they are in since 1949), only to get the Hindus out. Given the existing compromise and the Hindu record in tending the building after the Buddhists had abandoned it, Hindus consider this Buddhist campaign graceless and ungrateful. The movement for the 'liberation' of the MahaBodhi temple was formally launched by a Japanese monk, Bhadant Arya Nagarjuna Surai Sasai. His involvement provides a typical example of how

people spoiling for a fight tend to attack the meek rather than dangerous adversaries. Buddhism had been eclipsed by Christianity in South Korea and among the Indonesian Chinese. In Bangladesh, the Buddhist Chakmas of Chittagong Hill Tracts have been driven out by the Muslim settlers and the Government of Bangladesh. Buddhist is oppressed by Communism in China, North Korea, Tibet and Vietnam. If Sasai had started a similar agitation in those countries, it would not have lasted a single day, and he would have been lucky to get expelled rather than locked up or killed. By contrast, Buddhism is not oppressed or endangered in India. It is not obstructed in worshipping at its traditional sacred sites, including the MahaBodhi temple, which Hindus have made available for Buddha worship. India provides shelter to Dalai Lama, and has sanctioned the creation of a network of Buddhist monasteries and institutes, including a Tibetan-Buddhist university (in Sarnath near Varanasi) and the nerve centres of several Buddhist international organizations...It is, moreover, one of the few countries where even most non-Buddhists have a sincere respect for the Buddha and his Dharma. And yet, of all places, India is the one where Arya Sasai has to 'liberate' Buddhism from Hindu 'oppression'. Arya Sasai reported thus on the high point of his campaign: 'On October 14 [1992], a big rally was held at the Boat Club, New Delhi, and over 3 lakh [3 hundred thousand] Buddhists of India and foreign countries attended it...The equation of Ayodhya with Bodh-Gaya, commonly made in the press, is not tenable at all. Hindus never destroyed the MahaBodhi temple, they never took it from the Buddhists, they have handed it over for Buddhists worship in a settlement piloted by the Hindu Mahasabha, and they are not interfering nor claiming a right to interfere with Buddhist practices there. More than that, a Buddhist member of the Bodh-Gaya temple management committee has admitted that 'the laudable work of the construction of the MahaBodhi temple' was 'undertaken by a Braahman minister of Shaivite [worshipper of Shiv] persuasion'. The local RSS leader explains: "the earliest and most authentic record is of course by Hiuen Tsang [=Xuan Zang] who visited Bodh-Gaya in A.D. 637.

He says that two Braahman brothers prayed to Lord Maheshwar [Shiv] in the Himaalay to grant their wishes, upon which Maheshwar instructed them to carry out the meritorious task of erecting a large temple and excavate a large tank and devote all kinds of religious offerings near the most sanctified Bodhi-tree for attaining 'the fruit of a Buddha'. The elder Braahman devotee accordingly built a large temple," etc. Not only did Hindus refrain from demolishing the temple, but also they actually built it. Now find us a Hindu temple built by Babar. Studying the backgrounds of this quarrel throws a new light on the now-common allegation that Buddhism was persecuted by the Braahmanical reaction under the imperial Gupt dynasty. In Bodh-Gaya, the Chinese pilgrim Xuan Zang stayed in the MahaBodhi Sangharama, a 'splendid monastery' with '1000 monks', which had been built, at the auspices of SamudrGupt, the Gupt Emperor. Bodh-Gaya has a large number of dated sculptures from the Gupt period, which was in fact one of the most fruitful periods in Buddhist art. Reported in Abdul Quddoos Ansari: Archeological remains of Bodh-Gaya, Ramanand Vidya Bhavan, Delhi, 1990, p.15. ...It may therefore be noted that the Buddhist membership of the Bodh-Gaya temple management board does not altogether share the anti-Hindu animus of the neo-Buddhists and their secularist manipulators...Whether the Braahman control of the MahaBodhi area since 16th century up to 1949 was similar in nature to the Muslim control of Raam Janm Bhoomi site during the same period, can perhaps best be decided after considering this statement by a Muslim scholar, Dr. Abdul Quddoos Ansari: 'The iconoclastic fury of Islam must have [had] a terrible effect on the shrines of Gaya region, and particularly on Buddhism, with the result that a time came when, there being no Buddhist to look after their own shrines and worship at Bodh-Gaya, the Braahmans had to do their work even by going [outside] their jurisdiction.' Dr. Ansari's testimony against Islam rather than against Braahmanism as being the destroyer of Buddhism in India is doubly strong because otherwise he is a subscriber to the now-popular theory of an intense Buddhist-Braahmanical antagonism. 'According to [the famous

Tibetan monk] Dharma swami [1234-36 in that area], the Bodh-Gaya establishment had been deserted by all except for [some] monks, on account of repeated Turkish conquests.’ A. Q. Ansari: Archeological Remains, p.26. The popular support base and training grounds for Buddhist monks were being destroyed in all of North India, and Bodh-Gaya was dying as a Buddhist centre along with all those other establishments that were being physically eliminated by the Turks. Not Hinduism but Islam destroyed Buddhism in India.”

One of my learned readers SY wrote to me “Apparently you do not know of the incidents in history when Brahmins poured hot metal into the ears of Jains who were listening to, or wanted to listen to Veds; and other such nice episodes.” *I wonder if my learned reader had been reading such historical conspiracies by politicized scholars.* Considering numerous accounts given by contemporary visitors to India over a period of 2,300 years documenting essentially the same characteristics about Hindus as compared to totally opposing views presented by people who did not witness such events and who have done repeatedly various attempts to paint Hindus as intolerant and Muslims as tolerant. *Question must be asked: are their accounts creditworthy and why they had been doing all this on purpose?* As we proceed we will certainly seek answers to all these questions.

Know the Enemy Within

Shourie writes in the introduction to his well-researched and unchallenged book ‘Eminent Historians: Their Technology, Their Line, Their Fraud’: “In June-July, 1998, progressives kicked up quite a racket. The Government has packed the Indian Council of Historical Research with pro-Raam Mandir historians, they shouted. It has surreptitiously altered the aims and objectives of

the Council, they shouted. As is their wont, they had sparked the commotion by giving wind to a concoction. As is their wont too, they were charging others with planning to do in some unidentified future what they had themselves been actually doing for decades – that is, write history to a purpose. The commotion led me to look into their record – to look at what they had made of an institution like the Indian Council of Historical Research, and to read the textbooks they had authored. Small scandals turned up too. So accustomed have we become to Crores [10s of millions] being raked off that the amounts mentioned in this narrative will seem less than pilfering of pick-pockets. That is so in part because our standards have become so lax. And in part because the real crime of these eminences does not lie in the loss they have inflicted in terms of money. It lies in the condition to which they have reduced these institutions. It lies in their dereliction – because of which Projects that were important for our country have languished. It lies even more in the use to which they have put those institutions. They have used them to have a comfortable time, of course. They have used them to puff up each other's reputations, of course. But the worst of it is that they have used their control of these institutions to pervert public discourse, and thereby derail public policy. They have made India out to have been an empty land – filled by successive invaders. They have made present-day India, and Hinduism even more so, out to be a zoo – an agglomeration of assorted, disparate specimens. No such thing as 'India', just a geographical expression, just a construct of British; no such thing as Hinduism, just a word used by Arabs to describe the assortment they encountered, just an invention of the communalists to impose a uniformity – that has been their stance. For this they have blackened the Hindu period of our history, and, as we shall see strained to whitewash the Islamic period. They have denounced ancient India's social system as the epitome of oppression, and made totalitarian ideologies out to be egalitarian and just. They have belittled our ancient culture and exaggerated syncretistic elements, which survived and made them out to be an entire 'culture', the 'composite culture' as they call it. Which culture

isn't? And all the while they have taken care to hide the central facts about these common elements in the life of our people: that they had survived in spite of the most strenuous efforts spread over a thousand years of Islamic rulers and the ulema to erase them, that they had survived in spite of the sustained efforts during the last hundred and fifty years of the Missionaries and British rulers to make us forget and shed these elements, that the elements had survived their efforts to instead inflame each section to see its 'identity' and essence in factors which, if internalized, would set apart. Most of all these intellectuals and the like have completely diverted public view from the activities in our own day of organizations like the Tablighi Jamaat and the Church which are exerting every nerve, and deploying uncounted resources to get their adherents to discard every practice and belief which they share with their Hindu neighbours. These intellectuals and their patrons have worked a diabolic inversion: the inclusive religion, the pluralist spiritual search of our people and land, they have projected as intolerant, narrow-minded, obscurantist; and the exclusivist, totalitarian, revelatory religions and ideologies – Islam, Christianity, Marxism-Leninism – they have made out to be the epitomes of tolerance, open-mindedness, democracy, secularism! This has been their real crime. It has also been a bit of a feat. For they have been just a few: during the Ayodhya controversy, for instance, every other week a press statement would appear in favour of the stand of Babri Masjid Action Committee – one week over the names of 'eminent historians', the next over the signatures of 'distinguished social scientists', and the week after that in the name of 'leading intellectuals'! But they would always be the same lot. Always the same lot: six in one statement, eight in the next; their high was 42. Once. But what commotion they have been able to create, and what mischief. They had been able to do so because what they were advancing – for instance, the Marxist 'thesis' they were parroting in their textbooks – was in accord with the temper of the time. Because their kind were in critical positions in professions like journalism and universities. And because the rulers reckoned that to garner votes

it would be politic to dress up in progressive plumes: patronizing persons who had taken out a copyright, so to say, on the progressive hue was accordingly useful. Most of all, they were able to work their mischief because of the control they came to acquire over institutions. Times have changed: the committed progressive of yesterday is the unthinking conservative of today. The needs of the rulers have changed: who can fool the masses today by nationalizing banks and parading certificates from progressives? The Theory in which progressives preened about had been shown decades ago to be without basis. At that time no one listened. But today no one invokes it! For it has floundered on the one test the progressives had said alone mattered: the test of practice. Whatever the theoretical imperfections, whatever empirical evidence, the one thing that counts is that it has worked in practice – in the Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe, in China: that was their argument. And as only those facts about these countries were the facts, which they certified, the argument could scarcely be countered. Today that very argument works to the opposite effect: whatever the logical coherence you can claim for it, whatever scraps of empirical evidence you adduce in its favour, the one thing that counts is that it has failed in practice! So, the fashions are changing, the patronage of rulers is evaporating, their Holy Books have been repudiated in their Meccas. All that remains is their hold over governmental institutions. The remedy is two-fold. Enable a multitude of other institutions to come up: for this, a few changes in laws, some marginal incentives for setting up and running foundations, and faith in other – that persons outside the State also are eager to do good by the country – are all we need. Second, loosen the hold over existing institutions of eminences of the kind surveyed here: for this all that is needed is to document what they have made of those institutions.”

On Vedic time Hindus eating Beef

Glaring Example of Deliberate Academic Fraud

Arun Shourie writes: "By late June-early July 1998...Manoj Raghuvanshi, who runs the popular program Aap ki Adaalat, Aap ka Faisla on ZEE TV, invited one of these eminences, K. M. Shrimali and me to discuss the matter. With much righteousness Shrimali remarked that he was full of apprehensions because the sorts of persons who were now taking over the ICHR [Indian Council of Historical Research] were persons who had been distorting history, and suppressing facts. 'For example?' asked Manoj Raghuvanshi. Beef was eaten in ancient India, said Shrimali, and these people suppress this fact. And what is the evidence for that? Asked Raghuvanshi. There are hundreds of writings to that effect, Shrimali said loftily. In which Ved, in which text, which verse in which text? Asked Raghuvanshi. I have not brought the books with me, said Shrimali, but the evidence is all over. But name one text name one verse Raghuvanshi persisted. Shrimali could not or did not name a single text, to say nothing of any verse or passage from it. Someone from the audience interjected. Here are four Veds, he said; handing over the books, read us a single passage from any of them, which supports what you are saying. Raghuvanshi took the books from the person and took them over to Shrimali. Shrimali refused to look at them. Indeed, he recoiled. Raghuvanshi then went to his table and began reading out passages after passages from the Veds in which there were strongest possible commands to not to eat beef. At my request he asked Shrimali to read the verses himself. Shrimali refused to do that. Instead, he became even more aggressive. So what if I cannot recall a text or recite a verse? He said. But you are an expert on Ancient India, Raghuvanshi said. What has my not being able to recall a verse had to do with my being an expert? Shrimali answered. Even if you

produce scores of verses against eating beef, that will not prove that beef was not eaten, Shrimali now maintained. But when the Veds lay down that the cow is not to be killed, how do you keep saying that there was no prohibition against eating beef? Raghuvanshi asked. I did not say the Veds, he said, I said 'Vedic literature.' All right. Name a single book from 'Vedic literature', which supports your position. He did not do so. The exchange went on – with Raghuvanshi and the audience asking for a single passage, for the name of a single book, and Shrimali refusing – failing is the correct word – to furnish either. The program was broadcasted in the third week of July. Clearly Shrimali had come out in poor light. He therefore started writing critiques of the program in newspapers – or rather that he started writing the same critique in different newspapers. The following statements of Shrimali are taken from The Hindu, 10 September 1998. 'Blatant editing of the program,' he charged. 'Mr. Raghuvanshi combined the role of both the prosecutor and the judge,' he wrote. 'I am less bothered about highly personalized and somewhat uncivilized attack on me in the context of the question on beef eating,' he said. Personalized attack? Uncivilized attack? Everyone was polite. All that the audience asked for, the only thing I asked for in the single interjection I made, the only thing that Raghuvanshi asked for a dozen of times, was that Shrimali name a book, a single passage in that single book which would substantiate what he was saying. How do those requests become a 'highly personalized attack'? How does asking for substantiation become an 'uncivilized attack'?"

On reading this episode several questions hit me at once. Why would someone, who had been acknowledged as an expert on ancient history of India, want to spread something that he knew to be untrue? Or did he not know that it was untrue? If he did not, then why would he want to retain his credits as the expert? For sake of argument let us say that an expert too can make a mistake, but then why would he not want to admit it?

Was it at all a 'mistake' to start with considering the way he started the whole debate accusing others?

Why would he hurl accusations against those who were now taking over ICHR (Indian Council of Historical Research, Delhi)? Sometimes ago I had seen English media headlines that history was being re-written, was being saffronized. What was behind all that?

My memory rushed back to what I had read several months ago on the front page (bottom half) of a prominent English daily. The headlines stated that in Vedic times Hindus slaughtered cow and ate beef. It was now more than 3 years after Zee TV telecast that someone was reviving the lie. The news reporter quoted a politician saying so but s/he made no reference that this happened to be untruth. I had not yet read about the Zee TV telecast and many others would have missed that episode. All those who read the leading English daily would have believed what it reported. *So we see that the lie lives on even after the eminent historian was exposed at 'Aap ki Adaalat, Aap ka Faisla' on Zee TV telecast.*

Few decades ago during my youth I had read that Hindus ate beef during Vedic times and I had thought it must be true for I read it in a prominent magazine. *The lie had already been living for few decades; it was not a new found one...it was only being reinstated now lest people forget it.*

How would it have originated? Some expert on ancient history of India would have had spread the lie using (or abusing?) the mass media or else no one would have believed in it for, most Hindus do not touch beef till today but they give credence

to acknowledged experts. *It had to be an expert job to make it stick.*

Questions that surfaced: Why would an eminent historian want to spread the lie? Why would other eminent historians support the big lie or maintain quiet letting the lie go unchallenged and let it assume the shape of truth with time and repetition? What could be their motive?

Who are these eminent historians whose close-knit network controlled NCERT [National Council of Educational Research & Training, Delhi] and ICHR [Indian Council of Historical Research, Delhi] until recently before they were thrown out? Who are these intellectuals who retained this unchallenged control on these central organizations; maintained their presence and influence on the mass media; for almost 50 years, during Nehru dynasty, after India's independence? What did they gain by controlling these apex bodies?

Was their interest limited to systematic diversion of large financial resources allocated for historical research towards their personal gains that have now come to light after which the new government started taking initiative about their removal from key positions? Facts published in *Eminent Historians: Their Technology, Their Line, Their Fraud*, ASA, 1998 have remained unchallenged for, well documented truth could not be denied.

Was their interest limited to controlling appointments of new aspirants in the faculty and thereby control subsequent generations of historians? Was their interest limited to retaining their representative influence on mass media and on elite circles that controlled India's bureaucracy?

Was it to control the selection of history books that were to be taught in central schools in India? Was it to take control of writing history textbooks for schools? Was it to control the contents of those textbooks of history that would be taught to future generations of India? Was it to manage the funds allocated for such purposes as well as to manage the contents that should and that should not find place in those history books?

What was their common background and philosophy? What was their common belief system? What was their common objective and common agenda?

Their Game Plan: Why they did it all?

What was the big deal about beef eating that an eminent historian would want to make an issue of? Hindus do not slaughter cows and do not eat beef. Period. It does not harm anybody. *Why would one want to turn a non-issue into an issue?* Why would the expert want to tell Hindus 'no your ancestors did it'? Even if they did, so what? What would he gain by telling this today? If it were a truth, one could argue that he was only trying to re-establish the truth. When it was not a truth why would he want to clothe it as a truth? Why would he not support the truth? *Why would he want to plant a lie?*

There has to be a vested interest, or else he would not take all this trouble. What could that vested interest be? *There has to be a much deeper reason that is probably not visible on the surface.* There has to be some calculated methodology behind this. What could that be? Was it only one eminent historian who did it, an isolated case? Were there many more such eminent

historians who indulged in planting different kinds of lies about Hinduism over a period of five decades?

Why would a European historian Dr. Koenraad Elst, who stayed on-site and investigated the entire scenario, describe their acts as 'academic fraud and politicized scholarship'? Before going into all those complexities we need to first understand their background and their motivation. Who they really are?

We may be familiar with the ways that Marxists adopt. They teach children from school age theories that these children are supposed to grow up with. Children are brainwashed right from the beginning of their educational career through their formative years so that they learn to close the windows of their mind and do not let light come in from any other direction and thus, they grow up to become the subjects of a State like 'the horses in a cart with blinkers on their eyes'. *The system relies on building up successive generations with a new belief system altogether.*

Is such system devised and monitored by ordinary people? Or, is it a section of intellectuals who drive such an engine? Do the driver(s) of such engine(s) remain out of common view behind the smoke screen? *If the life were a game of Chess they would be the master players and the masses would be the pawns!*

Why is it that Marxist ideology has flourished in India at the educational institutions of repute, like Presidency College of Calcutta, and Jawaharlal Nehru University of Delhi? They work on an ideological level because they are mostly intellectually inclined people.

They have best known the value of media, its love for sensationalism and its lack of interest for investigative journalism.

They have also known media's awesome ability to report what is superficially seen and heard, and then let it percolate down through the minds and thought process of the masses. *They have known best that the mass media has an enormous capacity to change the way people think by systematic and periodical repetition of a particular thought process.* They had understood that Hinduism had been 'inwardly inclined' and it has failed to appreciate the significance of media in today's world. This lack of appreciation has imbibed in them, apathy towards countering adverse publicity or incorrect publicity hurting them.

They have observed the Hindu psyche that it harbours tolerance to the level of absurdity and then lets the steam off in a volcanic attempt.

They have known well that a lie repeated over and again through the media can soon assume the form of truth and these intellectual strategists have exploited it to the core. They have known well that media have assumed significant ability of becoming the opinion makers in communication driven world of today.

Post-British India's first Prime Minister Nehru's known affinity towards Marxism and well-funded JNU (Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi) provided them a respected and stable forum for growth and propagation of their belief system. India with its newfound independence, low-level literacy and high-level poverty created an ideal breeding ground for this ideology. They drew their political backing from the Nehru dynasty, which ruled India for 50 years after British left and with that they had access to adequate funding for their projects.

Why would this close-knit network of Marxist historians with a base at JNU and in close association with AMU (Aligarh Muslim University) would want to work in a specific direction, supporting each other, through their work and continued media presence? What was that specific direction and with what intent? What could have been their goal? What would have they wanted to achieve by it? Before getting into this let us see what they were up against. Their strategy had to be designed to meet that challenge.

They are the historians who could draw the lessons from history better than anyone else could. They did not fail to recognize the fact that all pagan civilizations had practically disappeared from the earth with the spread of Islamic and Christian imperialism. They carried no illusion either that one and only one of those major pagan civilizations that survived was Hinduism. Though Hindu States one-by-one surrendered after considerable resistance to Islam's single-minded obsessive campaign against non-Muslims (Jihad) yet the Hindu society held together.

They have understood it well that there remains at the root a different kind of value system that has given extraordinary strength to the foundation of Hinduism and that has supported the structure of Hinduism through the ages immemorial.

Being historians they have understood better than anyone else that such a structure could be demolished only if the foundation could be substantially weakened. They have already seen how difficult a task it had been, given that with all its might and backing Islamic and Christian imperialism could make only major dents into Hinduism but could not wipe it out, given more

than one thousand years to work on one objective. Being intellectual strategists they have known that Marxism could make its way through educated mass of Hindus in a large way only when they start distrusting the fundamentals of their own belief system.

What could be the significance of choosing cow and beef as one of the target issues in this context? Forced conversion of Hindus into Islam and Christian Inquisition in Goa made it a point to make Hindus eat beef as a measure of their change in faith. Why Islamic imperialists chose to make cow as the target? It was symbolic, an attempt to cut the strong bond. Use of sword helped but did not succeed fully.

Marxists have learnt the lesson from this. Besides they were not swordsmen, they were men and women who used their 'pen' as their sword. They knew it works better in today's world! So they planted the lie that Hindus ate beef in Vedic times. *This was designed to uproot the faith among the English educated Hindus that their faith was unfounded.* Marxists chose to hit at the very base of the value system. For they knew, that is the way to cut people off their roots.

Question arises what is the relevance of this value system in today's world and why was it instituted since time immemorial? *Has it been simply a matter of religious faith? Or was there a much deeper cause?* The seers of ancient India who instituted such prohibitions, did they have any firmer grounds? Were they working towards the larger interest of the humanity in a farsighted manner? *Were there any such grounds that could re-enforce faith of masses into the doctrines of yesteryears with renewed commitment than ever before?*

Why would Hindu Seers forbid Cow Slaughter?

Dr. Dean Ornish has received considerable popularity in recent days. Newsweek wrote: “Dr. Ornish’s work could change the lives of millions...at the end of the year most patients reported that their chest pains had virtually disappeared: For 82% of the patients arterial clogging had reversed. They started to feel better almost immediately, and today they feel great. Dr. Ornish’s patients are thrilled with their new lives. By the standards of conventional medicine, the impossible has happened.”

The same very Dr. Ornish writes: But when I first began conducting research in 1977, the idea that coronary heart disease could be reversed was thought to be impossible. Equally impossible was the idea that everyday people living in the real world could make and maintain comprehensive changes in diet and lifestyle. “Even if heart disease could be reversed, *you have an unstable theory-because no one can follow your diet,*” said many foundations and government agencies that we asked to help fund our study at that time. Similarly, many cardiologists told me, “*We can’t get our patients to eat less red meat or even to take their medications. You expect them to give up meat completely? And start exercising? And practice stress management techniques? And quit smoking? And come to regular group support meetings? It’s too hard. Impossible. Forget it. No way.*”

They were cardiologists speaking from their years of experience with many patients. They were talking of patients in a communication age where all kinds of information were readily available. They were speaking of American patients of modern days, the literate patients, and the well-informed patients, the scientifically inclined or at least scientifically conscious patients!

Compare these with patients thousands of years ago when literacy in the society would not be as common as it is today in America. We are speaking of the age when scientific information would not travel from one place to other at the drop of an eyelid as it happens today with the help of electronic media!

Think of the difficulty, physicians of those olden days would be facing in convincing their patients to give up red meat totally!

Why did Vedic sages prohibit cow slaughter? Were they inspired only by religious sentiments or did they deliberately give it religious clothing? Why were they against cow slaughter to start with?

Were they aware of the undesirable effect of red meat consumption on our physiology? Did they want to stop people from consuming red meat totally?

Were they aware that everyone would not listen to medical advice? Did they realize that even if people heed to such advice there will be only few and they too would be inconsistent in their adherence to such caution?

Were they aware that such restrictions would soon be forgotten with time and place? Did they realize that such cautionary restrictions would not be remembered well and followed strictly generations after generations?

Were they aware that with passage of time each newer generation would consider itself more advanced than its prior generation and thus, there would be a tendency to undo the do's promulgated by earlier generation, a phenomenon that is quite common place today?

Were they aware that only way to unite all and make it abiding was to make it a matter of religious injunction? And in doing this, were they working in the larger interest of the community?

Were they aware that only way to effectively stop consumption of red meat was to prohibit cow slaughter altogether, the cow being the largest source of red meat called 'beef' today?

Were they aware that only a total religious injunction would be carried through ages beyond count, generations after generations, so long the civilization with that religious faith would survive?

In placing such religious injunctions, were they working in larger interest of the humanity?

These eminent historians were not planting a lie without a purpose. Indirectly they are telling us that we need have no inhibitions against consuming beef. What they were aiming at is that in time to come it would not matter to us when we too will start consuming beef.

Forced conversion of Hindus into Islam and Christian Inquisition in Goa made it a point to make Hindus eat beef as a measure of their change in faith. These eminent historians wanted to achieve that goal through conviction not torture.

On Church splitting the Nation

On the issue of Conversion

Here we have the statement issued by the Pope 'The Coming of the Third Millennium' as quoted by David Frawley in his book:

"The Asia Synod will deal with the challenge for evangelization posed by the encounter with ancient religions such as Buddhism and Hinduism. While expressing esteem for the elements of truth in these religions, the Church must make it clear that Christ is the one mediator between God and man and the sole Redeemer of humanity."

Thus, we see Pope speaking of evangelization, which means convert or seek to convert (someone) to Christianity. He says so with reference to Hinduism and Buddhism, which means conversion of Hindus and Buddhists to Christianity is his focus.

He also emphasizes that Christ is the 'one' mediator between 'God' and 'man' and the 'sole' Redeemer of the humanity.

It sounds to me as if God had not been granting salvation for thousands of years through which the humanity survived!

It seems from what Pope says that God simply started this new practice of granting salvation only after he gave birth to Jesus!

Curiously, he claims so, when the very historicity of Jesus is in question after exposition of Dead Sea Scrolls (Qumran texts), which Vatican tried extremely hard to keep under wraps for 45 years after they had been discovered in 1947, for these scrolls

confirmed centuries old statement of Pope Leo X (1513-21): “It has served us well, this myth of Christ.”

Therefore a few questions arise in my mind as Pope claims that only his product ‘Christianity’ works, none other do as if religion was a product for marketing!

The question that surfaces in light of such a claim: Does Pope has the direct experience of God?

If he does then he would have known the truth better. How then could he have made a public statement of untruth in the name of God?

If he does not have the direct experience of God then he would not have known the truth in any case.

How then could he have made such a categorical statement in the name of God that Christ is the only mediator between God and man, and the sole redeemer of the humanity?

Coercing or tempting others to give up one’s own birth religion is inspired by gross selfishness, which is not a divine characteristic! Hope Pope is aware of this.

There was one person who had the honesty to admit the truth and the courage to speak of it publicly. This was the Archbishop of Hyderabad. His name was Arulappa.

He, at the age of seventy-six, was the senior most Catholic monk in India, educated at Oxford, having much international experience in teaching and preaching.

He made a public statement during the question and answer period, in a public debate on the issue of conversion.

“Conversion has no meaning! Proselytisation has no meaning if you do not convert yourself to God and see what God has to tell you. Follow his will, his plan and that is real religion. So therefore, I personally do not believe at all in Proselytisation. That

there is no salvation outside of Christ is not fully true...”
...Salvation is from God, not from religion.”

Proselytize means convert or attempt to convert (someone) from one religion, belief, or opinion to another, describes the Oxford Dictionary.

I have reproduced the statement of the Archbishop of Hyderabad, as quoted by Dr. David Frawley in his book who adds further: “Unfortunately, no other Christian leaders in India, much less in the rest of the world echoed such statements, which are not part of Church policy.”

Today, it seems that the world is devoid of people with character who have the courage to speak the truth!

Fund raising techniques for Conversion

As we see that conversion of Hindus into Christianity is the business of church. Christianity is a product to be marketed and pope heads that marketing outfit.

We also see that it is a product that does not have a direct consumer demand and therefore, it becomes necessary to create a demand. And we all know that to create a demand we need money.

It leads to the next question how we get that money. When we sell a product it generates revenue. Here the style of generating revenue is bit different.

NS Rajaram tells us that some European countries, Germany in particular, levy a ‘church tax’ of about two percent on every wage earner and thus, the *believers* in Christianity are taxed for their faith. He also tells us the real reason as to why Pope Pius XII supported Hitler during Second World War.

“In 1944 alone the Nazi contribution to the Vatican amounted to over \$100 million – worth nearly a billion and half in today’s values. The Vatican managed also to get a large share of the Nazi gold looted from the Jews of Europe during the Second World War. This has now become a major scandal in Europe. While Swiss banks are opening up their records, the Vatican has maintained secrecy over its collaboration with the Nazis, including its participation in the looting of the Jews of Europe. Loss of revenue following Europe’s rejection of Christianity has led the Church to resort to extreme measures including collaboration with narcotics traffickers and drug money laundering. The Vatican Bank for years has been acting as a conduit for drug money. Its Chief, Archbishop Marcinkus is wanted by the police, in several countries. He has avoided arrest only by staying within the walls of the Vatican, which enjoys immunity as a sovereign state. Investigations in Britain, Germany, Switzerland and Italy have shown that the Vatican is deeply involved in the international drug trade. The following recent episode will go to show how deep must be the links between the Vatican and drug traffickers. In May 1993, Cardinal Posadas-Ocampo, the highest-ranking Church official in Mexico was assassinated in the Guadalajara airport. Later investigations showed that the Cardinal had been acting as an agent of the notorious Columbian drug lord Pablo Escobar... It is now known that the Cardinal had been trying to arrange safe asylum in Mexico for Escobar. Escobar himself was, later gunned down by the Columbian authorities assisted by the U.S. drug enforcement agents showing that he was badly in need of a safe asylum. ...There have been many such scandals, but this is enough to show how far removed the Church is from any spiritual concerns.” NS Rajaram

Reading this, a few questions come to my mind: How is it that Vatican Bank’s Chief Archbishop Marcinkus, wanted by the police in several countries, could avoid arrest by staying within the walls of the Vatican? Did this happen with the permission of

Pope? Was Vatican Bank's Chief Archbishop Marcinkus acting with explicit consent of Pope? Why did Pope approve Vatican's involvement in drug money laundering?

Is it because Vatican needed more money? Why would Vatican need more money? Is it to 'buy' more Christians from other religions, something that they name as 'evangelization' and 'Proselytisation' in modern civilized language?

What would be the effect of Vatican's involvement into drug money laundering? Would it be converting younger generations into drug addicts? How important is money? Is it so very important?

What would be the purpose of Vatican's sharing Nazi loot and Nazi gold? What use would it have been put to? Would it have been used for 'buying' new Christians?

What kind of moral value will they have whose re-birth into the new religion has been nourished by the blood of innocents who were tortured, burnt, and killed by Nazis or the younger generations who have been turned into drug addicts?

If we nourish the plant with poison, what would the grown up tree yield?

May be some day coming generations will ask these questions to pope?

Very Crude methods some adopt

Now, let us look at some very crude methods of raising funds for converting Hindus in particular. As David Frawley writes:

"They are very actively asking for donations in order to convert Hindus in India. We see this routinely in the various television channels that they have. Pat Robertson, one of their main leaders, has said that Hinduism is a demonic religion. They show Hindu

gods with animal heads and say, "Oh! Look at how primitive these people are." They look at the political and social problems of India and say: "These are all owing to Hinduism. Please donate money to our cause so we can go to India and convert these people from this horrible religion that they have."²⁰

Do we Hindus adopt any such cheap techniques to degrade Christianity? Do we say such things about Christians in India? What gives Christians right to treat Hindus as dirt?

Let us see how many Christians become vocal about such dirty publicity. Let us see how many major publishing houses become vocal about such cheap tactics. I remember front page of Times of India 26 December 2002 with a big photo and caption 'Men of War with Man of Peace'. It reminded readers of Christianity as a religion of Peace. The day before on 25 December 2002 the very front page of Times of India carried photo and caption 'Hindutv and Terror planks'. Well they boldly equated on one day Hindutv with Terror and the next day Christianity with Peace. Either they are not aware of Christianity's history of Crusades and horrors of Inquisition or, they have an agenda to suppress the facts and clothe untruth as truth. It also appears that they are not aware of Hinduism's history of tolerance towards all other religions or, they have an agenda to keep blackening Hinduism as did those Marxist-Muslim combine of eminent historians by fabricating Hindu persecution of Buddhism, etc.

Unfortunate part is that many Hindus take the bait. Very recently one VV (initials only, name withheld) aged 28, having

²⁰ *How I became a Hindu*, David Frawley, Voice of India

difficult times for past 10 years, having lost faith in God, wrote one page full to me somewhat similar things about Hinduism.

Coming back to Times of India laboriously projecting Christianity's image of Peace let us look at what Jesus of the New Testament says and then let us see how well informed these champions of Christianity are:

“Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foe shall be they of his own household. And he that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. Matthew 12.30, 34-37”

Now this is what the teachings of Jesus are, and we fools in India raise him to the sky, and it is many of us Hindus that do it. We do it because we have been kept in dark. Truth has been hidden from us. Untruth has been laboriously projected before us.

During British days they saw to it that our Hindu education system was replaced by Christian education system. Christian Missionary schools were well funded and patronized by most parents. Today also the same situation continues. So much money flows in to take care of the needs of these missionary schools. So little care was taken of government school funding by Congress Government during the formative years of independent India. As a result poorest of poor attended government schools and all those who could somehow afford or fully afford looked for Christian schools to send their children.

Parents wanted their children to get good education so they could later stand of their own in this predominantly English speaking commercial and administrative world of India. Parents

could not be blamed for they sought material prosperity of their children, least realizing that these Christian schools would do their best to remove their children as far away as possible from their Hindu roots. Thought process with which successive generations grew up was either for disrespect or for indifference towards their culture and Hinduism. Macaulay was a truly foresighted person and he succeeded very well in his designs and plans.

He had said: 'we must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect.'

Bureaucrats and political leaders who ran the nation after British left were true to their upbringing as Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. They also saw to it that the same system continued and received all support, and this was the national tragedy. This tragedy most affected Hindus for they formed the largest segment of the Indian population.

These people who write for all major newspapers and magazines have essentially similar breeding and they have been taught from childhood to respect Christianity and disrespect Hinduism. Through their writings, they reach English educated Hindus of successive generations, and cement these impressions on their psyche. The game goes on in a cyclic process.

On ShivLingam

We have seen what these Christian missionaries propagate for raising funds to 'buy' new Christians on India soil. Now let us see what other kind of propaganda we have against Hinduism.

As David Frawley tells us about New York Times citing Amaranth pilgrimage in India as “Hindus going to worship the sex organs of Shiva, the God of Destruction”.

This speaks a lot about their character. Societies dominated by the culture of Christianity are somehow obsessed with sex. They seem to see sex in everything. When Hindus look at the same symbol they think of God but when Christians look at the same symbol they see reflection of sex in it.

Thaakur Shri RaamKrishn Paramhans Dev explained it differently: “Do you know the significance of the Shiv emblem? It is the worship of fatherhood and motherhood. The devotee worshipping the image prays, ‘O Lord, please grant me that I may not be born into this world again; that I may not have to pass again through a mother’s womb.’”

In other words, this is about *Moksh*, which means freedom from cycle of birth and death that is attained by soul’s ultimate dissolution in the Supreme Soul. This is why we Hindus see reflection of God in ShivLingam but those whose level of thinking cannot attain those heights naturally see what is most near and dear to them, sex.

Coming to the portrayal as God of Destruction again it is the same story, those who can think only of getting rich by selling arms and ammunitions to poorer nations at high prices and help them fight, cannot do any better than perceiving him as God of Destruction. Some day when their thinking will graduate to higher levels they will come to understand that *Shiv in the role of the annihilator is the one who paves the way for yet another creation.*

In this creation something or other is changing every moment. The creation cannot be static, or else it would stagnate. Creation has noble and evil forces both. When evil propensities accumulate beyond limits, the creation has to cease and make a new beginning. It is like an old dilapidated building pulled down to raise a new one. But these are the philosophies that won't enter thick skulls of those who cannot see beyond their body and sex.

There is another side to it. I remember of a rare beautiful afternoon that we were lunching at an open restaurant under mild sun in Toronto (Canada) when an US lady PH (initials only, full name withheld) spoke that she recently read an Indian woman who wrote an English novel (I forget the name of that Indian woman) where she described Shiv Ling as penis. I wonder if this Indian woman novelist had any better thoughts than that of a penis, as she could see only a reflection of it in ShivLingam, when millions of other Indian ladies find the image of God in it. The point is that many of our own English educated brass are responsible for this nonsense.

Coming back to New York Times citing Amaranth pilgrimage in India as "Hindus going to worship the sex organs of Shiva, the God of Destruction". Vast Christian population of America is given an exposure to Hinduism in this manner. India has 80% Hindu population. Do Hindus say such lousy things about Christianity? Hinduism teaches tolerance towards other religions. Christianity teaches the opposite.

According to Jesus of the New Testament: *He that is not with me is against me* [Matthew 12.30]. This philosophy of one who is not with me is against me makes Christianity intolerant of any other religion. They did not try to understand Hinduism. They

sat on judgment based on what they saw superficially. They still do it not realizing that it only speaks volumes of their ignorance and their lack of spirituality. After all those who can go as low as drug money laundering what more can be expected of them?

Know the unknown Mother Teresa

It is very interesting that there is a common pattern amongst Christian missionaries. One that they manage to keep a beautiful face before masses. Two that they love to get crime money and hold to it for 'buying' new Christians. Three: hypocrisy seems to be in their blood. Let us see another extraordinary example.

We Hindus are rather excessively grateful to those who have been good to us. *Bishop Heber* wrote: 'The Hindus are ... more easily affected by kindness and attention to their wants and feelings than any people I ever met with.' *Warren Hastings* wrote: 'Hindus ... are more susceptible of gratitude for kindness shown to them...' ... in the 16th century, *Abul Fazl*, the minister of the Emperor Akbar, says in his *Ayin Akbari*: 'The Hindus are ... grateful and of unbounded fidelity...' and we have not changed much in that respect.

Interestingly, I was no better. I had learnt of Mother Teresa from her biography written after her death by a woman journalist (I forget the name but one of her chapters were titled as 'Poor on the Moon' that I remember vividly). I picked up this book from Flemingdon Park Library in Toronto and I was so impressed by whatever I read that I viewed her as the true KarmYogi of present day, and I also periodically sent money to her organization. In receipt I would receive from her office a small

chit neatly typed with an old typewriter with blessings and a message from Mother Teresa. I would perceive how nice of them to be saving money on even such small things so that they could spend that money for the poor and the needy! Now I feel like such a fool when I learn the inner story as narrated by Rajaram.

*“To get at the truth behind the Teresa myth, we need to go to books written by non-Indians. Indian journalists, true to their character, have studiously avoided reporting the abuses taking place in her institution right under their noses. Fortunately, several Western writers have written honestly about Teresa and her mission. Two that merit notice are *The Missionary Position* by Christopher Hitchens and *Mother Teresa: Beyond the Image* by Anne Sebba. In her home for the dying, no medication or painkillers are allowed even to terminally ill patients. Even her childcare institution in Calcutta is a cheerless place where children have neither toys nor playgrounds. They are told only to pray.”*

Reading this I have wondered, whom they were supposed to pray? Would that be anyone other than Jesus Christ? In the disguise of prayer, would it be a clever ploy to convert the kids into Christianity from their very childhood? These kids may not even know the difference between two religions!

*Rajaram continues, “Her hospitals are in a highly unhygienic state. This happens to be the opinion not of a hostile reporter, but of Dr. Robin Cox, editor of the prestigious British publication *Lancet* – the foremost medical journal in the world. Mary Loudon, another English investigator found patients sleeping on the floor - as many as sixty in a single room. Even rudimentary health procedures were not being followed. Loudon saw un-sterilized needles being used and reused after being simply washed in cold water. Also, patients in need of simple surgery were allowed to die instead of being sent to other hospitals in Calcutta. It was not just*

patients that were treated under such appalling conditions; even health workers could not escape infections. Anne Sebba has pointed out that several of the nurses caught tuberculosis, and possibly AIDS. In all these, there is a single remedy offered to the inmates regardless their condition – prayer. This has greatly contributed to the image of Mother Teresa as a woman driven by faith and love for Jesus; it has contributed even more to her bank balance, for prayers costs nothing. But she did not display the same reserve – not to say piety – during her own illnesses. She was always careful to get treated at the best hospitals in the world like the Massachusetts General in Boston. When she was unable to travel, as during her final illness, she was treated by the specialist at the prestigious R. K. Birla Heart Research Centre in Calcutta – a Hindu charitable institution. So neither money, nor Christian faith, was allowed to come in the way, when her own health was involved. But for the poor it is different. Prayer is good for them. From the appalling condition of her institutions, one would be wrong to conclude that the Missionaries of Charity is only doing what its limited resources allow. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is one of the richest Catholic institutions in the world. Recently, a single current account in a bank in the Bronx (New York) showed a deposit of \$50 million! Among her special favourites were Charles Keating – now serving a ten-year sentence in a California prison – and Robert Maxwell who committed suicide when the Scotland Yard got too close to him. Both had swindled hundreds of millions of dollars from their depositors and investors. Paul W. Turley, the California Deputy District Attorney who prosecuted Keating stated that Keating stole more than \$900 million! Many individuals lost their life savings. Mr. Turley wrote: ‘the victims of Mr. Keating’s fraud come from a wide spectrum of society. ... Most were people of modest means and unfamiliar with high finance.’ Why did Keating give more than a million dollar to mother Teresa? When his case was being tried, she wrote to the trial judge Lance Ito asking him to show clemency towards Keating because ‘He has always been kind and generous to God’s poor.’ In addition, she appealed to the judge to ‘look into his heart

and do what Jesus would have done in those circumstances.’ Learning to this appeal, District Attorney Turley wrote back to Mother Teresa: ‘I submit the same challenge to you. Ask yourself what Jesus would have done if he were given the fruits of the crime, ...money that had been stolen. ...I submit that Jesus would promptly return the money to its rightful owners. ...Do not keep the money. Return it to the rightful owners.’ But Mother Teresa ignored his appeal and kept the stolen money. This was not the only such instance. She helped produce political propaganda films for the notorious dictator Duvalier of Haiti and his wife Michele who stole billions of dollars from their impoverished country before running away to Spain. [Oxford Dictionary, Haiti: From 1957 to 1986 the country was under the oppressive dictatorship of the Duvalier family]. Mother Teresa not only accepted millions from Dictator Duvalier (who was guilty of mass executions), but also honours and decorations from his bloody hands. What is it about Christian missionaries, from Mother Teresa to Pat Robertson, – that draws them to such thieves and mass murderers as Duvalier and Mobutu? As far as the poor are concerned, Mother Teresa’s successor Sister Nirmala put it in perspective: The poor are God’s gift, to us. Without the poor we would all be without jobs.”

Finally, let us see what personal diary of Mother Teresa says: Her letters and diaries present a completely different picture of the nun from her public image as a woman confident of her faith, The *Daily Telegraph* reported on Friday [Indian Express, 30 November 2002, PTI London 29 November]

‘...My smile is a great cloak [disguise, pretext] that hides a multitude of pains,’ wrote Mother Teresa... ‘In my own soul, I feel the terrible pain of this loss. I feel that God does not want me, that God is not God and that He does not really exist,’ she wrote. IL Messaggero said: ‘The real Mother Teresa was one who for one year had visions and who for the next 50 had doubts - up until her death.’

Is it not natural that she got into those doubts that God does not want her. How can God want a hypocrite and a patron of criminals? Sometime ago I had read something like this, that pope was putting Mother Teresa on fast track towards sainthood. Now that I think of it in this context I find myself amused. It sounds like a fast track on sports ground! Well Christian sainthood has to be truly a sport event, and you got to collect lot of points for that; for example, Nobel Prize, 50 million dollars in a single current account in a US bank, and perhaps much more that we do not know of as yet.

No wonder, Gandhi was another such saint whom we called Mahaatma. He was another, of whom I was a great admirer. Good many accounts of his saintly duplicity, you will find in a full chapter dedicated to him in this book. He too was deeply influenced by Christianity. Many Europeans did call him more Christian than many Christians, and they also called him Christ of our times! If you have read how Gandhi weighed Hindu lives and Muslim lives differently during partition of India and so many other things, you might start wondering if the influence of Christianity and hypocrisy go together hand in hand?

They told the Creator how to manage the Cosmos

I have often heard present day Hindus say that whatever we do, good or bad, we get the result of our actions in this life itself. I have also seen popular TV serials where the writer makes an important character of the play utter such sentiments. Millions of Indian homes view these popular serials and they are further influenced by such philosophy. I have come across English

educated Hindus strongly advocating this point of view. I have wondered of its origin. Let us see what Ram Swarup tells us:

“There was a time that the belief [birth after death], was held by Christianity too but it was given up at an early stage strangely enough first at the wishes of Empress Theodora. It was condemned at the Council of Constantinople (AD 543) as an Origenist²¹ error. “If any one says or thinks that human souls had a previous existence – anathema sit,” the Council declared. It had to do it. Following Plato, Basilides, Origen and many other early Christian writers believed that souls in their original purity pre-existed, that any punishment of hell was temporary, to be followed by the general restoration of all souls to their former state (apokatastasis). But this belief went completely against some of the most fundamental doctrines of Christianity: the doctrines of one life and one judgment, of pre-election, of some saved but many condemned to suffer eternal punishment in hell. Therefore, reincarnation had to be given up.”

What does this say? In effect, an Empress and Council of Humans attempted to direct the Creator of this Universe that the Creator must change His Management of Cosmos, because these handfuls of humans did not like the thought of rebirth!

Council also told rest of the humanity that if anybody said or thought of it, such person would be accursed (anathema²²).

Many people today do not believe in rebirth. Their disbelief may have been inspired this. Handful men engineered such

²¹ Oxford Dictionary describes, Origen (c.185-c.254) as Christian scholar and theologian, probably born in Alexandria. His most famous work was the Hexapla, an edition of Old Testament with six or more parallel versions. His Neo-Platonist theology was ultimately rejected by Church orthodoxy.

²² Oxford Dictionary describes, Anathema as a formal curse by a pope or by a council of the Church, excommunicating a person or denouncing a doctrine.

thinking centuries ago. Most people today have remained ignorant of this engineered fact. The fact may have remained out of circulation by efforts of those who did not want it known to the masses.

Dead Sea Scrolls/Qumran Texts

Most Indians believe that Jesus was a historical figure, meaning he was a real person, not a creation of fiction. Indian press, particularly the major English media, could not have been unaware of Dead Sea Scrolls but sure they must have been unwilling to give it due coverage.

Those interested in greater details may want to read Allegro, John Macro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal* (Second edition), Penguin Books, London, 1990; Eisenman, Robert and Michael Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, Penguin Books, New York, 1992; Vermes, Geza, *Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, Revised edition, S. C. M. Press, London, 1994; Rajaram, N. S., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Crisis of Christianity: An Eastern view of a Western Crisis*, Minerva Press, London, 1997. Let us hear the suppressed facts in the words of NS Rajaram:

“The media in India has been almost totally silent on one of the major international stories of our time – the release, of famous Dead Sea Scrolls by the Huntington Library and the breaking of what is known as the ‘Scrolls monopoly’. One of the most significant archaeological finds of this century took place in 1947, at a place not far from Jericho in the Qumran region of Palestine. These are now famous, as Dead Sea Scrolls...The Scrolls are known collectively as ‘Qumran texts’...Most of the Scrolls came to be deposited at the Dominican controlled institution known as the Ecole Biblique – short for Ecole Biblique et Archaeologique

Francaise de Jerusalem (French Biblical and Archeological School in Jerusalem). The expectation was that the task of collating, editing, and translating the scrolls would be carried out by the experts of Ecole Biblique assisted by a battery of visiting scholars. Around 1950, when no one had any inkling of what they might contain, a few Qumran texts were released. Biblical scholars soon began to notice that they indicated that...Then Andre Dupont-Sommer, a distinguished Biblical scholar from the Sorbonne in Paris noticed that some of the Scrolls included references to...others, notably John Allegro, agreed with him. In a widely reported radio talk, Allegro went on to observe...this received wide coverage in the press including such important newspapers as The New York Times. [Late John Marco Allegro, probably the foremost Biblical scholar of his time]. Unknowingly Dupont-Sommer (and Allegro later) had opened a hornet's nest. All this was too much for Church authorities. [Allegro had examined the scrolls in original]. They felt deeply threatened by the revelations of the Dead Sea Scrolls that went so far as to question the very existence of Jesus as a historical person. What then happens to Christianity – a creed that owes its legitimacy and authority as the teachings of Jesus Christ said to be God's only Begotten Son? They felt it would only be a matter of time before the whole foundation of Christianity would collapse– taking the Church with it. Fortunately for the Church, the Scrolls still remained firmly under its control, in the custody of Ecole Biblique – a Vatican controlled institution... Father de Vaux and other Catholic scholars made sure that no more texts were released. [Ecole Biblique head at that time was Father Ronald de Vaux, a French monk belonging to the Dominican order]. Both the public and the academics were unaware of the fact that the Ecole Biblique, and therefore the Scrolls were under the secret control of the Vatican...this monopoly situation - with no outsider permitted access - prevailed from 1947 until 1991. Then, suddenly, events took a dramatic turn. On 5 September 1991, American newspapers reported that Professor Ben-Zion Wacholder of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati and his doctoral student Martin Abegg had used the

secret concordance of Hebrew words prepared by the scholars of the Ecole Biblique (and leaked by someone) to recreate the texts with the help of computer analysis. They claimed 80% accuracy in their reconstruction. Less than three weeks later, there was a still more dramatic announcement. On 22 September 1991, the Huntington Library in California, which had photographs of all Dead Sea Scrolls, released them to the public. But the drama was only beginning...to the great surprise of everyone, within weeks of their release to the public by the Huntington Library, Eisenman and J. N. Robinson published, a two-volume edition containing photocopies of all the Scrolls manuscripts under the title A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls. [Robert Eisenman, a well-known Biblical historian from California State University]. Soon after, Eisenman and Michael Wise – the later an expert on Semitic languages from Chicago – published also translations of the 50 most important texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls with commentary under the title Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents withheld for over 45 years. Upon learning that Eisenman had contracted with E. J. Brill of Leiden (Holland) to publish his Facsimile Edition, the Vatican used its great influence to have the publisher back out at the last moment. Later, Biblical Archaeological Society of Washington published the two-volume Facsimile Edition. Less than a year later the Penguin edition of Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered also appeared. What Eisenman, Allegro, and other Biblical scholars found is that the picture of Christianity emerging from the Scrolls is the opposite of what has been presented by the Church. This means that the Church and its priesthood, for two thousand years, have been feeding as 'TRUTH' the exact opposite of the real truth. So, the Gospels, far from being a historical account of the life of Jesus, are nothing more than a fiction – even a pious fraud. But the Gospels distorted all this by blaming the Jews for killing their 'Son of God'! ...The Jews have been made to pay a terrible price for this fabrication. Its [Christianity's] scripture and its history owe more to forgery and plagiarism than any divine inspiration. It is the most massive

forgery and the greatest deception in all history. [Plagiarism: The practice of taking someone else's work and passing them off as one's own]. The Church has known all this, for Pope Leo X (1513-21) admitted centuries ago: 'It has served us well, this myth of Christ.' This is what they tried desperately to keep secret by suppressing the Dead Sea Scrolls."

We see that popes had already known that Jesus was a fabrication not a true historical character the way it is laboriously portrayed. We also see how hard Vatican tried to hide the archaeological findings from becoming known to public. For doing that they needed money and we know how money is earned by them through Nazi contributions, gold looted from Jews of Europe and stooping down to the level of drug money laundering. Now let us see what effect these great deeds of Christianity have on those who carry the message of Christianity to the masses, that is, the priests and seminarians.

Western Christian Priests leaving Christianity

Despite considerable efforts by Vatican to keep archaeological findings of Dead Sea Scrolls a well-guarded secret, it seems to have taken its toll on those who professed Christianity. Those interested in greater details may want to read Peter De Rosa, *Vicars of Christ: The dark side of the Papacy*, Corgi Books, London, 1988. For the purpose of our readers it may be sufficient to quote some of it from the works of Rajaram.

Peter de Rosa, a former Catholic priest who had access to official Church documents, cites a secret Vatican study: "It revealed that from 1963 to 1969 over 8,000 priests had asked to be dispensed from their vows and nearly 3,000 others had left without waiting for permission. The study estimates that over the next five years 20,000 would leave. The estimate proved to be far too

conservative. Matters were worst in countries that pontiffs had relied on for providing missionaries. Holland, for example, used to produce over 300 priests a year. Now ordinations are almost as rare as mountains [in Holland]...the average age of those who remain is a startlingly high 54. The future, too, looks bleak. Over the last twenty years, the number of Seminarians in the States [America] has fallen from 50,000 to 12,000.”

Rajaram continues: “A loss of 76% in less than 2 decades! Even this understates the real loss because seminaries that do remain open have fewer students and teachers than they used to. Many of them have been kept alive only through a massive infusion from Third World countries like India and Philippines; even the United States Army has been reduced to employing these non-Americans as chaplains. And these men and women have been lured less by faith than by the attractions of a more comfortable life in the West. In this context it is worth noting that Mother Teresa’s Missionaries of Charity is a major source of these priests and nuns, especially the latter, for few are forthcoming from Western countries. The situation has grown steadily worse since that time. When Pope John Paul II visited the United States in October 1995, newspapers reported that the number of Seminarians in the country was only 3,500 in 1993! It is probably less than 3,000 today. It is not easy to see how it can survive without a clergy to lead its communal organizations. Like Islam, it must keep on expanding simply to survive. To this I may add a personal note. During a recent trip to Frankfurt, Germany, I ran into a young Indian Christian from Tamil Nadu. He told me he was on his way to Scotland to lecture to them about the Bible! How many Scots were able to follow his lectures in English delivered with a very pronounced Tamil accent, it would be interesting to learn. It would be no less interesting to learn the size of his audiences, especially after his first lecture. What is true of the losses in priesthood is true also of its age profile: the numbers understate the real loss. [Koenraad] Elst tells us that the average age of Catholic priests, in the world is 55, whereas in Netherlands (i.e. Holland) it is an astonishingly high 64

and still rising. And those that leave the priestly professions are invariably the younger members. All this is stark testimony to the bankruptcy of the institution. The simple fact is: the Church is imploding. Thus the condition of the Church is of far greater importance to its officials than to its devotees who are deserting it in droves....People of the West, now mired in deep spiritual crisis, have recognized that the Church cannot help them cope with problems in this world; it can only promise them salvation in the next while enriching itself. It is hardly surprising that they should be looking East in increasing numbers.”

Missionaries on Hindu Caste system

Very often we Hindus come across uncomfortable references to our caste system. It has been stigmatized to such an extent that I have seen references to caste system as if that is all in Hinduism; as if Hinduism stands for caste system, and caste system stands for Hinduism. Period.

I have also seen Hindus feeling helpless to answer the issue of caste system with a feeling that it has been a disease of Hinduism. It is necessary, therefore, that we understand it in proper context. Until we understand when and how this term caste system came about in existence, when and how this concept of caste system was developed, and how and by whom this stigmatic concept has been kept alive, and for what purpose; only when we understand all this, then alone we will be able to stand up and say with conviction, stop this non-sense, get yourself educated and then talk about it.

First, how the term caste came about in its existence on Indian scene. It were the Portuguese missionaries who introduced this term in a derogatory sense to describe Hindu society. In doing so, they made one fundamental mistake that they assumed,

Braahmans (Brahmins) in Hindu society commanded the same position, as did Christian clergy in Europe, in their own time.

This was a fundamental mistake because Braahmans did not control the economy, nor the army as did Christian clergy, in their times, in Europe. They did not realize, or did not want to realize, that the situation was opposite, Braahmans were economically dependent on other classes of people in the society, and they had no hold whatsoever on the army, which was an exclusive domain of Kshatriya (warrior/military) class.

“The people and the rulers of Europe had to carry on a thousand year struggle to free themselves from the theocratic hold of the Church over non-religious (secular) institutions and activities.”

Oxford Dictionary describes theocracy as a system of government in which priests rule in the name of God or a god. Braahmans in Hindu society did not enjoy that position.

I wish to clarify another thing in the beginning that I am no Braahman by birth and therefore, I have no vested interest in defending the issue. If I have any interest it is to support the truth and make Hindus aware of the big conspiracy that was launched centuries ago by one interest group and is being fully exploited till today by other interest groups. It is important that Hindus recognize these enemies within and take a stand against them, or else they would continue divide the Hindu society for their own ulterior ends.

Coming back to the main topic, Braahmans in Hindu society were entrusted with the responsibility of performing religious ceremonies and teaching children, as they were the most literate class of the society. They had nothing to do with the army, nor management of economy. Therefore, it was absurd for

the missionaries to have conceptualized them equivalent of Christian clergy of their own time as in Europe. This showed gross ignorance on their part about the structure of Hindu society. All they did was to impose over us what they understood of their own social structure.

Later day missionaries, who may have discovered this folly, had a strong reason for keeping alive the false notion that Braahmans, in their interest, divided the society into factions making caste system. Their reason was very simple. They needed to convert Hindus into Christianity. They knew well that they could only do so with the most illiterate segment of the society in good numbers and with substantial ease. It served their purpose well to convince these people that it were *Braahmans* who did it all to them, and it is these Braahmans that hold the reign to the Hindu society, and therefore, they had no future in Hindu society; their only recourse was to come to the folds of Christianity, which has no caste system at all.

On this ground they sold Christianity to these people and theoretically, they were assured no caste within Christian society. One wonders, why is it now that these very Christian missionaries in India are fanning another kind of agitation asking special government considerations for so-called *Dalit* Christians? If Christianity is a caste-less society where do these *Dalit* Christians spring up from?

Well the only answer could be found in classic duplicity of Christianity, of which we will see many examples scattered over here and after. The fundamental hypocrisy imbibed in Christianity did not spare the Christ of our times Gandhi. We have seen ample evidence of his saintly duplicity, and we have also seen

how close he was to Christian faith and why he was called by Europeans that 'he is more Christian than many Christians'.

Coming back to missionary conspiracy, it is this utopian theory of Braahmans ruling Hinduism and Hindu society that they sold to likes of *Jyotirao Phule* and such champions who fanned the idea further and it is now being politically exploited to the full extent by interest groups.

Those unaware may want to note that Dr. BR Ambedkar who is supposed to be the anchor of that segment of the society that is termed differently like untouchables, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, or whatever but generally understood as that of people who are under discussion here. He was a learned person and he says just the opposite:

“There was a continuous feud between the Shudr kings and the Braahmans in which the Braahmans were subjected to many tyrannies and indignities. As a result of the hatred towards the Shudrs generated by their tyrannies and oppressions, the Braahmans refused to perform the Upanayan of the Shudrs.”

As Ambedkar was understood to be a Shudr himself, his comments about Shudr tyrannies cannot be set aside lightly.

Koenraad Elst writes, “It is interesting, and embarrassing for contemporary Ambedkarites, that Babasaheb held the Shudrs guilty of their own status; but perhaps they can take some consolation from visualizing how the Braahmans were at one time ‘oppressed’ and ‘subjected to many tyrannies and indignities’.”

The beauty is that these missionaries sell the very opposite idea of Braahmans causing to Shudrs what the most learned man of 20th century amongst the Shudrs community saying that it were Shudrs who did it to Braahmans. So you see

how effective money and propaganda can be in creating images far from reality.

Whose purpose is served? Those who have to gain something from it. Whose interest suffer the most? Those who take the bait. Politics is such a thing that it has no loyalty to anyone except to self interest. *Christianity is a politicized religion, not a spiritual religion.*

So far about the missionaries, but why the others? Who those others are? One, Marxists academics. Two, Macaulayite elite. Three, politicians targeting vote banks. Thus, we have combined efforts and resources of academics, administration and power camps behind it. Let us look into their respective areas of interest in keeping the myth alive and keep fanning it.

Our readers are by now well aware of Marxist interest in subverting Hinduism, as we have dealt with it in great detail in earlier chapters. Therefore, we will avoid its repetition.

As for Macaulayite English educated elite, it is the way to remain the *super caste* where they pull most of the strings from behind the screen and hardly anyone noticing their deeds.

Politicians, of course, have no loyalties to the truth; they can only understand the language of votes.

Common people understand none of these except they play as the pawns in their hands that have acquired mastery in the game of chess employing humans as the cast.

I can write many more pages on the subject but I shall refrain from it for the time being leaving you with some food for thought. Do think about the following questions.

We have earlier given testimonies of many foreigners who visited India during 2,300 years from 404 BC to 19th century and

what they all recorded about Hindu society and its love for truth and justice. Do you think that a society so well acclaimed by all for its justice would be so unjust towards a vast segment of the society as is portrayed by the interest groups and those hostile to Hinduism?

Vast segment because as Koenraad Elst says, "Today, the Shudrs form the majority of the Hindu population even in North India, while in South India, they exceed the 90%. Even after subtracting the SC/STs (Schedule castes/Scheduled tribes), they form the bulk of the Hindu population in every part of India."

Think for a moment, could all those foreign visitors over those 2,300 years have missed such a gross injustice situation to such a vast segment of the Hindu society and spoken so highly for Hindu love of justice and truth? Don't you think something very significant is being withheld by those who have been all along propagating Braahman injustice towards Shudrs?

Go back to the first chapter and read carefully the whole of the account given by Indologist Max Muller. Those few pages were taken from his book of total 269 pages, published by Penguin under the title 'INDIA what can it teach us?' He speaks of so many things about Hindu society but not of caste system, which is today portrayed as the biggest disease of Hinduism. Now come to think of it, he delivered these lecture at Cambridge in 1882 to inform Indian Civil Service aspirants about Hindu society but he did not consider caste system worth mentioning though his lectures were not small considering the number of pages in the book now.

So, it was 1882 and after some 25-30 years Gandhi became very active on Indian scene. Nowadays, many interest groups spread the impression that Gandhi worked relentlessly to

get Hinduism rid of this disease. Here one wonders, if this were to be true, what then transpired during those 25-30 years that made it such a stigma to Hinduism? Or, was it true at all?

Sometimes before I read, when Kanshi Ram said in the Parliament that untouchability was not on the agenda of Gandhi, no one stood up to object this. Why? Was it true? It may be a different thing that Gandhi felt for untouchables, but then it is quite different that he worked relentlessly for getting Hindu society rid of this disease.

You see how things are blown up beyond proportion by media abuse and abuse of power and position by interest groups who have to benefit from it some way or other! But the best part is, many educated people and well-educated people take the bait and believe in it as it is shown to them without bothering to think more about it analytically. This is the awesome power of media in modern times, and its capability as opinion-makers is enormous. It is a different thing whether prominent media understands its responsibility towards the nation, or it simply toes the beaten path.

There is something else that bothers me. I have often heard the generalized impression, probably created by those who had to benefit by it, as if all Shudrs were untouchables. This term untouchable is very significant in this context because the kind of sentiment it generates amongst today's educated mass is something worth considering. Human untouchability is essentially viewed as a crime against humanity by many. Therefore, here are a few pertinent questions that you might want to brood over. I would not want to give you all the answers at this point. I would prefer you first come to the questioning stage, question all that

you have been told so far, question whether they all continue to sound the only truth and the whole truth. We will talk after that, in some other work, about the other side of the truth that has been kept under wraps, on purpose, by those whose interests will be in jeopardy if today's Hindus were to know and understand the whole of it.

Coming back to untouchables, as if all those were untouchables, let us start with the most startling example of Dr. BR Ambedkar himself who was the first one to lead his numerous followers to Buddhism. It was 2 October 1956 coinciding with Gandhi's birth date, that this conversion ceremony took place at Nagpur. Dr. Ambedkar repeated on this occasion what he has been saying for years: that only conversion could really change the social status of the lowest class. It is a different thing whether the test of time has proven it to be correct or not.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar was Gandhi's contemporary and he is said to be one of the victims of this cast system being *untouchable* in a Hindu society. At least this seems to be the impression amongst those who consider *untouchable*, scheduled caste, *dalit* all such terms interchangeable, effectively speaking of same and by and large untouchable among Hindus.

Now to the question, if Ambedkar was so-called untouchable, as many seem to believe then, how is it that the *untouchable* Ambedkar attended schools, colleges and universities in company of other Hindus? How the *untouchable* Ambedkar acquired his doctorate? How the *untouchable* became the Law Minister of India? How the *untouchable* tabled the Constitution of recently independent India, which was predominantly a Hindu nation? We are not talking of today. We are talking of those days

when these *untouchables* were said to be vastly oppressed section of the Hindu society. One needs to think, how much of the issue is politicized to a purpose?

Who all were to benefit by such politicized propaganda? Were Christian missionaries one of them whose prime objective was to add to the numbers by converting poor, illiterate Indians into Christianity often by lure of money and with propaganda hostile to Hinduism? Did the Macaulayite English educated elite have any interest in anti-Hindu propaganda? Did the Marxist group of historians and Marxists, in general, have any vested interest in promoting anti-Hindu feelings?

Before ending this discussion for the time being, let us see what a French journalist Francois Gautier has to say: "India has had an untouchable President. Has the USA ever had a Black president or vice-president?" Not for US alone to think about, but for all who champion themselves in human rights.

Splitting the Nation into pieces

We Hindus may be vaguely aware that Christian missionaries are active in tribal areas converting adivaasis (aboriginals) into Christianity but we may not be aware of the gravity of the situation. Let us walk you through the findings of Niyogi Committee, and its documented facts. Dr. Niyogi, retired Chief Justice of the Nagpur High Court published his findings way back in July 1956:

"The separatist tendency that has gripped the mind of the aboriginals under the Lutheran and Roman Catholic Missions is entirely due to the consistent policy pursued by the British Government and the Missionaries. The final segregation of the aborigines in the Census of 1931 from the main body of the Hindus

considered along with the recommendations of the Simon Commission which were incorporated in the Government of India Act, 1935 apparently set the stage for the demand of a separate State of Jharkhand on the lines of Pakistan.”

We know that finally we have a separate State of Jharkhand now, and it is an eye-opener that the manipulative process had started long before.

Let us see where all this manipulative process had been active and if we know more about the outcome. For quite some time we had been hearing about Nagas and currently it has become a political major in its own merit. We go back to 1956 report of Chief Justice Dr. Niyogi:

“This attempt of the Aadivaasis initiated by the Christian section thereof is a feature which is common to the developments in Burma, Assam and Indo-China among the Karens, Nagas and Amboynes. This is attributed to the spirit of religious nationalism awakened among the converted Christians as among the followers of other religions. But the idea of change of religion as bringing about change of nationality appears to have originated in the Missionary circles...thus, while the Census officer isolates certain sections of the people from the main bodies, the Missionaries by converting them give them a separate nationality so they may demand a separate State for themselves.”

One of the members of the Niyogi Committee was Mr. K.C. George, a Professor in the Commerce College at Wardha, he represented the Christian community. The Committee quoted Christian Post-war World Policy from several Christian sources.

The aim of the Policy in India was threefold: (1) To resist the progress of national unity...(2) To emphasize the difference in the attitude towards the principle of co-existence between India and America...(3) To take advantage of the freedom accorded by the Constitution of India to the propagation of a religion, and to create

a Christian party in the Indian democracy on the lines of the Muslim League ultimately to make out a claim for a separate State, or at least to create a 'militant minority'.”

How wonderful, come to think of it, the Constitution grants them the freedom to propagate their religion, and they make it political ammunition against the nation. In India, by and large, common man is unaware of Christianity's history in Europe. “The people and the rulers of Europe had to carry on a thousand year struggle to free themselves from the theocratic hold of the Church over non-religious (secular) institutions and activities.” Oxford Dictionary describes, theocracy as a system of government in which priests rule in the name of God or a god. Now that the church is more or less out of big business in Europe it is spreading its wings in Asia, and India in particular offers it the most promising ground on account of its unique historical background about which we have discussed earlier.

Let us see how church operates its multi-national business and how it does the funding. Niyogi Committee report gave the amount of money that was employed by church in India during 4 years, more precisely, from January 1950 to June 1954. Report gave country-wise contribution totalling to 29 Crores some 50 years ago, which would be equivalent 7,424 Crores (1.5 billion dollars) in today's values.

Look at the enormity of this amount used for 'buying' new Christians and cultivating a religious nationalism in them, which in effect is a separatist move and essentially an anti-national activity. The beauty is that when someone makes a noise about this, it gets branded as Hindu communalism and our major English media gladly obliges them denouncing such Hindu communalism.

Report indicated that most of this money was received in India in the name of maintaining educational and medical institutions but in reality spent on Proselytisation. Proselytize means convert or attempt to convert (someone) from one religion, belief, or opinion to another, describes the Oxford Dictionary.

Naturally, it serves Western media well to promote the poverty stricken image of India ignoring substantial growth it has had in various segments of national development because such image helps them collect more and more resources in the name of helping poor of India medically and educationally but finally using such collections for ulterior purposes, to gradually build a church regime which Europe has now rejected.

Niyogi Committee Report further provided how mission schools were used: (a) Harijan and Aadiwaasi students were given free hostel facilities, food and books provided, note provide, they attended Christian prayers; (b) If a student failed to attend the Bible class but attended rest of the classes, s/he would be treated as absent for the whole day; (c) School celebrations were used for showing the victory of the Cross over all other symbols; (d) Hospitals were used for putting pressure on poor class patients to embrace Christianity.

On how Mission Orphanages worked, it revealed that during famines and other natural calamities such as flood and earthquakes, orphans were collected to be raised as Christians.

On how Roman Catholic missions had specialized in money-lending business was also revealed, poor people often approached the missionaries for loans which were written off if the debtor became a convert; otherwise he had to repay it with interest which was often found difficult. Protestant missionaries

and others cited before the Committee instances of how this method worked.

One of the conditions for getting a loan, for instance, was that the recipient agreed to chop off the topknot (*choti*), the symbol of his being a Hindu. Some of the people who had received loans were minors and casual labourers.

When one member of a family had taken a loan, all the other members of that family were entered in the book as potential converts. Isn't it big business?

The rate of interest charged was 10% and in a large number of cases examined, one year's interest was deducted in advance.

The Committee questioned many, and on being questioned, the people without any hesitation, said that their only purpose in going to the Mission had been to get money; and all said that without the lure of money none would have sought to become Christian. Looking at these findings of the Niyogi Committee, wouldn't you agree that it is nothing but 'buying' new Christians with their money power? *Hope you appreciate why I do not call it conversion but I call it buying.*

Let us look at other innovative ways that these Missions adopted. The Committee found that new converts were employed as *pracharak* and their job would be to sell Christianity to others. This reminds me of an interesting personal episode. During year 2000, I moved to New Mumbai and initially I cooked for myself but due to sickness, employed a Shri Lankan woman Jennifer (earlier Zeenat) to cook for me. One day she brought some Jehovah's Witness booklet for me, and out of politeness I accepted it. Encouraged by my acceptance of the booklet, another

day she suggested that she would bring her superior *pracharak* one day to discuss with me. This time I told her, please do not. What amuses me that they stop at nothing, she even tried to convert her employer (me) knowing well that I was a devout Hindu and my house was full of Hindu deities.

The Committee also found that Christians working in various government departments were exhorted and expected to participate in the game. Those who did not help were cursed in missionary publications. Christians placed in higher positions and missionaries who became influential members of the *Janpad Sabhaas* put pressure on junior officers for influencing people in favour of Christianity. What we see here is that they worked on all fronts possible, they left no stone unturned.

The Committee also found that: (a) Missionary publications attacked idol worship in rather offensive terms; (b) Dramas in which idol worship was ridiculed were performed in schools and elsewhere; (c) Songs to the same effect were composed and sung. But, on the whole, the Committee noted that preference was given to vicious attacks on Hinduism, which was held up as a false religion.

Now let us stop for a moment and think, why did Indian Constitution give the freedom for propagating religion to all? Was it for this purpose?

Also, let us ask the Press, those with substantial resources and reach, the bigger ones who play the role of opinion-makers to the nation; what are they doing today? Are they doing any findings on their own? Are they serving the nation well when they have readily cooked material in form of the Niyogi Committee Report? Did they publicize it sufficiently enough to raise public awareness and by developing public opinion did they

force the administration to take corrective measure? What is the role of media in a democratic set up like ours? Or, did they find themselves helpless in front of enormous money power of these missions? Or, were they bought over by these missions?

Let us see what the Committee reported on mass Conversions. "Persons of varying ages from 60 years to 1 (one) year are shown as converts and the list includes women and children also. We have met many Uranos in the course of our tours and we were struck very much by their total absence of religious feelings."

This was with reference to the list of 4,000 converts made within 2 years in Surguja district as shown in Government records. Now let us look at the methodology. A child of 1 year is converted or 'bought' as a new Christian. Now this name goes into government records and in later years census details show vast number of Christian population in a district. Then different demands are put up for various kinds of benefits and privileges for that community being a minority community. Over a period of time it becomes a majority community in a particular area. Then the methodology changes; there comes the demand for a separate State for the people of that religion.

This all happens within the framework of democratic setup in a Secularist society. Here the meaning of secularism changes depending on the needs. First it is government support for minority religion. Then it is separate state for majority religion within one particular state. None of it is communalism. Communalism is anything that is said against it. And if by mistake something like this is done for Hindus then it is anti-secular. The beauty of the whole game plan is that all this happens with support of pseudo-secularist (Marxist and Congress party and academics with those loyalties) and popular media.

The Committee noted that Missions refused to produce Baptism records due to the fear of Truth being out...As a rule, groups have been converted, and we find 'individual conversion' has been an exception rather than rule. We have come across cases of individual conversion only of persons who are village leaders and they have invariably been followed by 'Mass conversions' of the entire village soon after.

Immediate prosperity of these converted village leaders were striking, and explanations were offered that it had nothing to do with the mass conversion of the whole village. Committee noted that they did not find such explanations acceptable.

So what we see here is that the village leader is approached and bribed to lead the whole village into mass conversion.

Let us look back at the first chapter where we have given documented records of many foreign visitors who came to India during last 2,300 years and recorded their individual observations about the qualities of Hindu society. And then let us compare it with present scenario. What a downfall. Reason: bad company. Influence of bad cultures that have worked on our society for past thousand years, and gradually eaten it up.

The Niyogi Committee Report expressed the view that conversions led directly to denationalization. Greetings such as 'Raam Raam' and 'Jai Hind' [Victory to India] were substituted with 'Jai Yeshu' [Victory to Jesus]. "The Supremacy of the Christian flag over the National flag of India was also depicted in the drama, which was staged in a school at Jabalpur," the Committee noted.

When Goa was liberated from Portuguese and merged with India, the Missionary paper *Nishkalank* [unblemished] strongly

propagated against it. They wanted Goa to remain part of Portugal. This is another example of anti-nationalism.

The Niyogi Committee found, “Evangelization in India appears to be part of uniform world policy to revive Christendom for re-establishing Western supremacy and is not prompted by spiritual motives. The objective is to disrupt the solidarity of the non-Christian societies, and the mass conversion of a considerable section of Aadivaasis with this ulterior motive is fraught with danger to the security of the state. The Christian Missions were making a deliberate and determined attempt to alienate Indian Christian Community from their nation. The Community was most likely to become a victim of foreign manipulations in times of crisis.”

The Report observed: “The history of the Christian missions provided ample proof that religion had been used for political purposes. Evangelization was not a religious philosophy but a force for politicization. The Church in India was not independent but accountable to those who paid their upkeep. The concept of ‘Partnership in Obedience’ that covered the flow of foreign finances to the Church was of a piece with the strategy of Subsidiary Alliances, which the East India Company had employed earlier for furthering and consolidating its conquests. And conversions were nothing but politics by other means.”

The missions found themselves at loss to challenge the findings and conclusions of the Niyogi Committee Report and therefore, they responded by branding it ‘*Hindu communalism*’ and they warned against the ‘*danger of Hindu Raaj*’.

The missions managed to get support from some persons of public standing in India like Dr. Hare Krishn Mahtab, then Governor of Bombay.

Two months later, in September 1956, the Minister of State for Home Affairs, B.N. Datar, came to their defence: “No steps would

be taken to check the work of foreign missionaries,” he declared in Parliament. Alas! All were sold out?

Years later, when Congress Government was toppled for some time, Om Prakash Tyagi, a Janata Party Member of Lok Sabha, who was elected in 1977 after the Emergency (1975-77), introduced a Bill in the Parliament on 2 December 1978. Few months later, Janata Party split and Morarji Government had to resign, Congress party came back to power. Tyagi's Bill could not even be discussed in the Parliament.

50 valuable years have been lost and nothing has been done to take corrective measures. Emboldened by this apathy on the part of our government, media, intelligentsia and public, I would not be surprised if Christian missionaries have stepped up their activities very substantially during these 50 years. *This is gross abuse of Constitutional freedom in democratic setup. It is not enough to have democracy; it is important that we have the will to enforce it and prevent its abuse.* I cannot withhold my desire to quote Sita Ram Goel here:

“The first Prime Minister of independent India became the leader of a Muslim-Christian-Communist combine for forcing Hindus and Hinduism first on the defensive and then on a run for shelter. Now on everything which Hindus held sacred could be questioned, ridiculed, despised and insulted. At the same time the darkest dogmas of Islam and Christianity were not only placed beyond the pale of discussion but also invested with divinity so that anyone who asked any inconvenient questions about them invited the attention of laws which were made more and more punitive.”

During 20 years (1951-71) the Christian growth in Nagaland was 252%, how? During the same period in Tripura we had 299% growth in 20 years; magic? North-East had 1% (1901)

of the whole; it grew to 8% (1951) and 13% (1971) of the whole; but by 1998 it became 40% of non-southern Christian population.

Shourie tells us, it costs 145 billion dollars to operate global Christianity, records a book on evangelization. The Church commands 4,000,000 full time Christian workers, it runs 13,000 major libraries, it publishes 22,000 periodicals, and it operates 1,800 Christian Radio and TV stations. It runs 1,500 universities and 930 research centres. It has 250,000 foreign missionaries and over 400 institutions to train them. These are 1989 numbers. No wonder Church needs Nazi gold looted from Jews of Europe and drug money to support this gigantic multi-national operation.

That all is the story of today but for a change let us see the Christian spirituality some 180 years ago. We refer to a chapter 'Spiritual Advantages of Famine and Cholera' in a Catholic publication 'India and its Missions' brought out in 1823; the chapter carries a report from the Archbishop of Pondicherry to his superiors in Europe which states:

"The famine has wrought miracles. The catechumenates are filling, baptismal water flows in streams, and starving little tots fly in masses to heaven...a hospital is a readymade congregation. There is no need to go into the highways and hedges and 'compel them to come in'. They send each other."

What a wonderful expression of spirituality from a high dignity of Catholic Church. This speaks lot about their character, if they had any.

All that we have seen happening so far, has been constantly and consistently reshaping Hindus and Hinduism. We have seen where we started 2,400 years ago, and where we have ended today; an extraordinary journey indeed, and what a downfall. Hope, we wake up now at least!

Bibliography

Apte, Vaman Shivram. *The Student's Sanskrit English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, 1890, 1970 reprint 2000.

Babar, Mogul Emperor. *Taarikh-i-Baabari (Autobiography)* . 1926, 1970. Translated by Mrs A S Beveridge.

Elst, Koenraad. *Dr Ambedkar - A True Aryan*. Delhi: Voice of India, 1993.

Elst, Koenrad. *Ayodhya: The Case against the Temple* . New Delhi: Voice of India, 2002.

Frawley, David (Vamadeva Shastri). *How I became a Hindu-my Discovery of the Vedic Dharma*. Delhi: Voice of India, 2000.

Goel, Sita Ram. *Hindu Temples: What happened to them*. Vol. II The Islamic Evidence. Delhi: Voice of India, 2000.

Goel, Sita Ram. *Pseudo-Secularism, Christian Missions and Hindu Resistance* . Delhi: Voice of India, 1998.

Holy Bible, King James Version . Athens, Georgia: Broadman & Holman Publishers) Pilot Books, 1996.

“Justice Niyogi Committee Report.” 1956.

Max Muller, Friedrich. *INDIA what can it teach us?* Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2000.

Ornish, Dr Dean. *Dr Dean Ornish's Program for Reversing Heart Disease*. 1996.

Rajaram, N S. *A Hindu View of the World - Essays in the intellectual Kshatriya Tradition*. New Delhi, Delhi: Voice of India, 1998.

Shourie, Arun. *Eminent Historians: Their Technology, Their Line, Their Fraud* . Delhi: Voice of India, 1998.

Swarup, Ram. *Hindu View of Christianity and Islam* . Delhi: Voice of India, 2000.

Swarup, Ram. "Understanding Islam through Hadis: Religious Faith or Fanaticism." *Exposition Press, Smithtown, New York*. www.bharatvani.org.

The Ayodhya Reference: Supreme Court Judgment and Commentaries. Delhi: Voice of India, 1995.

The New Oxford Dictionary of English. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001.