

GREAT MEN OF THE WORLD

Shri Krishna¹

By

Lala Lajpat Rai

¹ Here are printed extracts—the preface, Introduction and Teaching of Shri Krishna—from Lajpat Rai, *Yogiraj Shri Krishna* (Lahore, 1900). (Original in Urdu)

Preface²

Thanks to God that at last I have been able to fulfill my promise and can now place this book before the people.

Dear readers, In 1896 in the introduction to the biography of Shivaji I have promised to write a biography of Shri Krishna. Soon after that the terrible famine of 1896-97 engulfed the country and the relief work became so pressing that I could get no time even to consult the reference material for writing this book. Then in September 1897 I suffered from illness which kept me bedridden right up to April 1898. Besides that, because of several other problems also I could get no opportunity to read any books for a long time. However, in September 1898 I completed writing *Maharshi Swamin Dayanand and His Teaching* and offered it to you. Immediately after that I began writing this book and now I present to you the outcome of my two and a half years' labour. I don't know whether it befits you and the exalted position of that great man whose name is printed on the title page of the book. I shall consider my time and labour well rewarded if this book creates in you the desire to know more about Shri Krishna and induces you to carry out further research into the happenings of his life. And I shall consider myself fortunate if by reading this book some Aryans come to realize that all the vile and vulgar allegations made against Shri Krishna are wholly unfounded and false.

In the introduction to this book I have mentioned the titles of the books from which I have gathered information about the incidents narrated in this book. Besides these, I have made use of the books of two Bengali authors also. These books are – (1) *Krishna and Krishnaism* by Babu Balram Malik, and (2) *Life of Shri Krishna* by Babu Dhirendranath Pal. I have also gone through F.S. Brouse's *Mathura Memoir*. The first chapter of my book, which deals with the birthplace of Shri Krishna, is to a great extent based on the material borrowed from the last mentioned source. Though I have taken much help from Babu Dhirendranath's book, I have neither followed his style nor relied wholly on his description of the various events. Generally I have checked all the events with the *Vishnu Purana*, *Mahabharata* and *Bhagwat* before writing about them. Wherever I have referred to someone's view or belief I have mentioned his name in a footnote. In interpreting the *shlokas* of the *Bhagavad Gita* I have generally relied on Mrs. Annie Besant's commentary. Still I have checked the interpretation of each and every *shloka* with the original text and wherever needed I have made changes.

I think I should also say something about the style of my writing and language. I have often heard the complaint that the Urdu used by the followers of the Arya Samaj generally and especially by me is a hotchpotch of several languages. A Muslim friend of mine says that we

² This preface was written at Lahore on 6 November 1900

have made Urdu a mixed language. The fact is that before the foundation of the Arya Samaj there were very few books on Hinduism written in Urdu, the reason being that the Sanskrit knowing or Hindi knowing Hindus never bothered to write Hindu religious books in Urdu, and if they ever did so they of course used the Persian script but that alone did not make the language Urdu. It was the Arya Samaj which realized the need for bringing out Hindu religious books in the Urdu language written in the Persian script for the benefits of the educated class of the Punjab and the United provinces. The Urdu used by Muslim writers was loaded with Arabic and Persian words, as they were quite familiar with those languages and such terminology suited them for writing about the religious views of the Muslims. But after the British introduced Urdu written in the Persian script in courts and educational institutions, the need was felt by the Urdu-knowing Hindus for books were written by those persons who had learnt Urdu and Persian in Government schools. As they studied religious books written in Hindi and Sanskrit, their language tended to have a preponderance of Hindi and Sanskrit that their Urdu assumed a special form which contained, besides Arabic and Persian words, Hindi and Sanskrit words too. Thus I cannot understand why anybody should object this kind of Urdu. In fact Urdu is the name of the language spoken by Indians and sometimes the words Urdu and Hindustani are used in the same sense. During the Muslim rule the Muslim literature was dominant and so there was a preponderance of Arabic and Persian words in the language of educated Indians. While dealing with serious subjects whenever they felt the need for special words they took the help of the Muslim literature. With the advent of the British rule English words began to be used in the Hindustani language and the use of Hindi and Sanskrit words also began to increase. Hence there seems to be no reason why Hindus should express their religious ideas in the language of the Muslim literature and substitute Arabic and Persian words for Hindi and Sanskrit words. A language should be such as is spoken by the people. As with the changing times English, Hindi and Sanskrit words began to be used in the language spoken by Hindus; there was no reason why they should not have written also in the same language. However, British rulers prefer to use the Persian script to write Hindustani and in schools too Hindustani is taught in the Persian script. Therefore for writers there is no option but to use the Persian script. We can find instances of Hindi words being used in the writings of Urdu scholars. The fact is that for dealing with Hindu religious themes the use of Hindi words is unavoidable. (See Maulana Altaf Husain 'Hali', *Manajate Bewa*.) Indeed, in the opinion of some scholars real Urdu should have the fewest possible Arabic and Persian words. If the Arabic and Persian words be removed from Urdu then what will remain will be pure Hindi. The only difficulty is that Muslims do not like those words which are not commonly used as they consider only those words as Urdu which are commonly used. Therefore the use of Hindi and Sanskrit words by Hindus in the books relating to the Hindu religious, society or institutions written for their co-religionists cannot be considered improper. Why should a Hindu, while writing for Hindus the dialogues of Krishna, Yudhishtira and Arjuna and expressing series and complicated religious ideas in Urdu, look for difficult Arabic and Persian words? The use of Arabic and Persian words while translating women's dialogue is too bad. Because of these reasons I do not consider the charge leveled against my language as justified. If I try I can express my thoughts in the Muslim Urdu but I do not think it necessary to do so. If I do so many of the Hindus will not be able to benefit from my writings. Besides this, I also want to make it clear that writing books for monetary gains or merely for showing the beauty of language is neither my profession nor my object. In my leisure time I express my ideas with the view that those who cannot be approached through speeches should be apprised of my ideas through writings. If I use that time, which is always short, to demonstrate the beauty of the

Urdu language and to show off my learning, then perhaps I will not be able to do anything worthwhile.

The fact is that presently all the vernaculars of India are undergoing changes as for expressing new ideas the help of different languages is necessary. It is not possible for the people to give up their facile way of expression and check the natural growth of the national language merely to maintain the purity of the Urdu and Persian languages.

When I began writing this book first I thought I should use idiomatic Urdu. But then I realized that I could not claim to have the knowledge of such Urdu and that I would have to try hard to avoid the use of Hindi words which would also take a lot of time. Therefore I gave up that idea and used those very words which came naturally to my mind.

Now, a word about the price of the book. Many of my friends have this grouse that I sell my books at very high prices. I would like to tell them that my books are not as highly priced as the books published in the English, Bengali or Urdu languages. I would also like to mention that even the best of my books sold at a loss. Even the money invested by me was not recovered. Though I am told that thousands of people have read my books, the fact is that even a single edition of any of my books has not been fully sold out, which indicates how much interest the general public takes in them. In view of this it is not proper to expect that besides spending time and doing mental labour I should also spend money on the publication of my books. In this matter the Hindus of the Punjab should learn something from the people of Bengal and educated Muslims.

At the close of the nineteenth century I humbly offer this book in the service of my countrymen.

Introduction

1. Tendency of Hero-Worship

Which community in the world has not worshipped its heroes as gods and even realizing it well that they were ordinary mortals, did not give them the high position of the creator of the universe? Man has the tendency to bow before the superior strength and ability. When he finds some man being more capable than himself and is unable to understand its reason he is drawn to him. He begins to believe that the man with the superior capability is the primeval man having unique qualities and powers the like of whom no one can ever create nor can he be ever destroyed by anyone. However, the educated and spiritually advanced communities, even though their adulation of their heroes borders on worship, do not forget the distinction between the heroes and their maker, but the communities which are caught in the net of darkness because of the lack of education cannot make such a distinction. However loudly people may denounce hero-worship, the fact remains that no community is free from this failing. There is no system of education which does not promote hero worship. The people proudly say that they worship only one God also have their own heroes whom they worship. The great British writer Thomas Carlyle, in his well-known book *Heroes and Hero Worship*, says that the great men of the world, sustain the earth, vegetarian, man and animal, showers mercy through its warmth and fills the man's heart with joy and happiness.

2. Vedic Heroes

What this nineteenth-century British author said was expressed by the Aryan seers of Aryavarta in their books written thousands of years ago. In the Vedic Sanskrit the word *agni* has been used for one Supreme God and in the ancient Sanskrit literature in general it has been used for scholars, *seers*, *mahatmas* and enlightened souls. The word *deva* or *devatas* means God in Sanskrit, though it is also used for a great man. The English word 'God' stands for the Supreme being, but into plural form it is used for gods in general. The followers of Islam call Prophet Mohammed Noor-e-Illahi (Light of God), Jesus Christ is regarded by Christians as the Son of God and Buddhists use the word 'Lord' while referring to Buddha. Similarly, Aryans regard Shri Ram and Shri Krishna as incarnations of God. Adoration and worship of enlightened souls, learned men and seers has been the practice among the Hindus since the Vedic times. The Vedic mantras again and again enjoin us to reverse and worship saintly persons and enlightened souls. This is prescribed as an essential part of the daily religious rituals for Aryans and is a must on festival days. The Brahmanas, Upanishads and other sacred books of Aryans deal with this subject in great detail. But there is no Vedic religious book which identifies any saint or enlightened person with God.

3. Truth about incarnations

In Aryavarta Buddhists were the first to express doubts about the existence of God and it was the Buddhist teaching which was responsible for the worship of God being replaced by the

worship of man among the people of this sacred land. This pernicious doctrine became so fashionable throughout the length and breadth of the country that even the preachers of the Vedic faith considered it advantageous to embrace Buddhism. Brahmins substituted Shri Rama and Shri Krishna for Buddha and described them as incarnations of God. The idea of incarnation spread like the forest fire. The Puranas also dealt with this theme and their pages were filled with stories of incarnations. The idea of incarnation began to pervade all religious thinking. The immortal works of great poets praising the deeds of heroes and admiring the beauty of nature were adopted by the authors of Puranas with some changes to suit the doctrine of incarnation.

Scholars and experts in metaphysical speculation so manipulated that all the prevailing religious doctrine, whether good or bad, were attributed to God and the common people became so confused that they lost all sense of distinction between the cause and effect. The accounts of the lives of great men were so moulded that the people of other communities and countries began to treat them as false, artificial and profane.

4. Shri Krishna

The injustice that has been done to Shri Krishna by the excessive enthusiasm of the poets for him does not find a parallel in the literature of any other country. They created all kinds of misconceptions in the minds of the people about him. Tulsidas also waxed eloquent in the praise of Shri Rama but he did not raise him to the level to which the devotees of Shri Krishna did, the reason perhaps being that Shri Rama was not given like Shri Krishna the title of preceptor. Shri Rama was turned into tragic hero by the malice of his stepmother Kaikeyi and the poets placed on his head the crown of filial and fraternal love. But such a crown best adorns the head of a person who leads a completely religious life. In other words, his total personality should be such that crown should be fit him fully and should also have a good effect on the people. Although Shri Rama's life was exemplary, there was a great difference between him and Shri Krishna. Shri Krishna is not only considered as the ideal of true love, romance and bravery but also as an ideal preceptor. He was born at a time when the boat of the Vedic religious was getting sucked into the whirlpool of barren metaphysical speculations and the doctrine of renunciation and religion seemed to have lost their moorings. At such a time Shri Krishna had to give a discourse on religion. He was therefore looked upon as a great preceptor and there is hardly anyone among our countrymen who has not been influenced in a greater or lesser degree by his discourse. Everyone swears by Shri Krishna, cites his utterances and quotes him as an authority. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the religious firmament of India is even today radiant with the teachings of Shri Krishna.

5. What did the People Think about Shri Krishna Twenty years Ago?

Hardly twenty years have passed when we were studying in Government schools and when Shri Krishna was considered as the doer of all those unsacred things which are shown in *Krishnalila* or *Rasalila*. Shri Krishna then was perceived by us as being prone to self-indulgence, craving for sensual pleasures and crooked. We were led to believe that the debility of the contemporary Indian society was the result of such immoral teachings. Enemies of the Aryans religious has

spread such misinformation about Shri Krishna that instead of harboring feelings of love and devotion for him in our hearts, we felt a sense of shame on his account in the presence of others, and developed nothing but hatred for him. But when I left school and became free from the clutches of mullahs and came out from the dark cell into the open air and light of knowledge, my ideas underwent a change.

6. Change in Mental Attitude

Soon after coming out of the narrow confines of school life I found a great mental change in myself. I became more and more interested in pondering over metaphysical subjects. Then I heard my inner voice saying, "How is it that while some people associate Shri Krishna with frivolity and vulgarity, others hail him as the author of such a great work as the Gita? As regards the seriousness of the subject, quality of teachings, simplicity or language, and message of love and devotion, the Gita is par excellence and its language and style are unique." The moment I heard this I further thought: "One who expounded morality and taught the lesson of *Gita* how could he be indulgent, wanton and sensual as depicted in *Krishnalila*? Was it not likely that those who attributed such undesirable acts to him might have been misled by the crude symbolism of poets? It could not be believed that Shri Krishna could be such as he had been depicted. It was evident that the poets had taken liberty and depicted Shri Krishna in whatever manner they wanted and in course of time they fell completely under his spell.

Now of course no educated person believes that Shri Krishna was such as he is depicted in *Krishnalilas*. However much people may differ in their religious beliefs, no educated person now associates Shri Krishna with those shameless and obscene antics with which ignorant masses associate him. Old-fashioned adherents of the *Puranas* too now try to draw out from the crude accounts of Shri Krishna in the *Bhagavata* the essence of love and devotion.

Several persons are today delving into the *Pauranic* accounts of Shri Krishna in order to know about the real happenings of his life so that they may include them in his biography. We know that writing biography has never been part of the Indian literary tradition and this is why there is no biography of Shri Krishna in existence. In order to write an authoritative biography of his, one has to cull the facts about his life from the imaginary and hyperbolic accounts of different poets and present them in a form that can stand the test of common sense and be credible.

7. Antiquity of the "Puranas"

The source of all the legends about Shri Krishna current among the common people is the *Puranas* which are fully relied upon by the Hindus. Therefore if we want to get at the truth the first thing to do is to examine to what extent the Puranas can be treated as historical works and how reliable are their contents.

a) Ancient Aryans were not devoid of historical knowledge

I do not agree with the view that ancient Aryans who were considered to be foremost in scholarship, culture, philosophical knowledge and all kinds of artistic skills, as mentioned in all

the extant Sanskrit literature, had no conception of history at all and that they had neither any interest in studying history nor was there any tradition of writing history among them.

My contention is that though the literature of those days tells us about the things that existed and enumerates the arts and sciences that the ancient Aryans had mastered, it cannot thereby be concluded that if no ancient books dealing with any particular subject are available, the Aryans were quite ignorant about that subject. The ancient Aryan civilization is so old that saying anything about it with certainty is extremely difficult if not impossible. During the long period of its existence, the Aryan civilization underwent so many changes that merely the non-availability of books relating to any particular branch of learning cannot be a valid ground for concluding that that branch of learning was unknown at that time. Who knows how many literary gems are buried under the debris of ancient ruins! Some have disappeared into the bowels of earth, even the traces of which cannot be retrieved now, and some must be mouldering away in the papers in the possession of Brahmins who, it seems, have no notion of the value of the literary treasure that is thus rotting, and for procuring which scholars of the world are today willing to spend huge amounts of money. The research work on the ancient Aryan civilization has now been earnestly started and scholars are digging out all such gems. At this point of time, therefore, it cannot be definitely said that ancient Aryans were deficient in such-and-such a branch of learning. I maintain that it is not possible in the light of the existing literature to assume that ancient Aryans were ignorant of the art of historiography. There is rather some evidence to indicate that in ancient times reading and writing of history was considered quite respectable. There used to be learned men among the members of royal courts to record and narrate the happenings in their kingdoms.

There are numerous references to historical events in the ancient literature especially in the *Brahmanas*, *Upanishads*, *Ramayana*, *Mahabharata* and sacred books of the *Pauranic* age. In the Vedic literature too while enumerating the different subjects of study the words *itihasa* and *Purana* have been used which indicates that *itihasa* and *Purana* formed a separate literary discipline which is now called history...

b) Historical value of "Puranas"

I can say without hesitation that the *Puranas* cannot be treated as historical works. These *Puranas* contain several such things as make them unfit to be considered as history of those times. They in fact belong to later periods. Some of them belong to the period when the Aryans having lost their political freedom and forgotten their religion and duty were being disdainfully called Hindus, and in order to safeguard their identity, religion, self-respect and honour of their women, they were obliged to give up their old ways, with the result that their old religion and culture got so suppressed that they would have been irretrievably lost had the British not thrown light on them and had they (the Aryans) not got the opportunity to remove the rubbish accumulated on them.....

Lest you should ask what all this disputation concerning the *Puranas* has to do with the life story of Shri Krishna, I should hasten to explain that unfortunately almost all the information about Shri Krishna that is available has been drawn from the *Pauranic* literature, and that whatever the

Puranas have done to degrade and enervate the Aryan community centers round that great soul whose life story I am going to present before you.

What outrages have not been perpetrated by the *Puranas* on Shri Krishna?

They have so pierced him with the arrows of their petty and vulgar imaginations that his personality has totally changed and as a result most of the Aryans considering him impure and sensual have developed an aversion to him. It is the result of *Pauranic* literature that so many educated Aryans have fallen into the net of Muslims and Christians. Often even educated and well-meaning people are heard saying the Shri Krishna is at the root of all the misfortunes of this sacred land, and that it was he who by his perverse teachings caused the way of Mahabharata which proved utterly tragic for the country. I feel greatly hurt with when I find descendants of Aryans making such derogatory remarks about Shri Krishna. But why to blame anyone for this? The wild and fanciful stories of the *Puranas* have so befogged the minds of the people that it seems to be impossible for them to differentiate between the truth and untruth. I do not mean to say that there is no truth at all in the *Puranas*. There may be some material in them which can help us trace the history of the Aryans, but that is full of so many similes, concocted stories and illogical ideas propounded by different generations of *Purohits* that it is very difficult if not impossible to know about the real happenings of those days.

Although references to various events connected with Shri Krishna's life are found in almost all the *Puranas*, a systematic and detailed description of this life is contained in the *Brahma Vaivarta Prana*, *Bhagavata Purana*, *Vishnu Purana* and *Brahma Purana*. The *Mahabharata* and *Harivansha Purana* also contain a good amount of material relating to the life of Shri Krishna. According to scholars, generally speaking the *Mahabharata* and *Vishnu Purana* contain the earliest records about Shri Krishna. But it is difficult to decide which parts of these books are old and which parts were added later.....

Professor Wilson, who has translated the *Vishnu Purana* into English, believed that it contains some material relating to a period as late as the 10th century A.D. Nevertheless, the *Vishnu Purana* is older than the *Bhagavata* and some other *Puranas*. But as regards the *Bhagavata*, there is a controversy as to which of the two *Bhagavatas*- *Shrimad Bhagavata* and *Devi Bhagavata*-deserves to be included among the eighteen *Puranas*. A dialogue on this issue is still continuing between the Vaishnavas and the Shaktas. European scholars however believe that *Shrimad Bhagavata* was written in the 13th century. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that *Vishnu Purana* is older than the *Bhagavata*, and as it contains less adulation it is more reliable....

8. How to know What is fact and What is Fiction?

We all assume that Buddhism came into existence after Shri Krishna. Hindus believe that Shri Krishna was born during the age of *Dwapara* and that the battle of Mahabharata was the beginning of *Kaliyuga*. European scholars believe that Shri Krishna lived around 1000 B.C. , and as regards Buddha it has been found by research that he was there around 500 B.C. Hence the conclusion is that wherever traces of Buddhist teachings are found in the *Vishnu Purana* and *Mahabharata* those portions belong to the post-Buddhist period and hence cannot be considered

authentic. Similarly, according to the Sanskrit literature before the spread of Buddhism idol worship did not exist in India, nor was there any tradition of constructing temples for idols.

It is therefore right to say that those portions of the *Vishnu Purana* and *Mahabharata* which contain references to idol worship were added later. I am quite certain that the pre-Buddhist Sanskrit literature contains no references to incarnations nor any evidence of the worship of *Trimurti* – Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh. Caste distinctions too at that time were not so rigid as they came to be afterwards. Keeping in mind their limitations we can know a great deal about Shri Krishna from the above two books. As regards the caste distinctions, I may mention that Maharashi Vyas, the author of *Mahabharata*, was a *Shudra*, which shows that one's caste was not considered as something very important. However, it is clear that Shri Krishna was born at a time when the Vedic religion existed in its pristine purity. The caste was determined by vocation and not by birth. A human being was not worshipped as God. The doctrine of incarnation had no place. Idol worship had not come into vogue and the *Trimurti*- Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh – had not taken shape to be worshipped. The Vedic rituals or the *karmakandas* were universally practiced. Buddhism had not come into existence but a multiplicity of philosophical schools had weakened the foundations of faith and the people had begun to ignore religion. If we keep this background and the liberty taken by the poets in mind we can draw a good deal of relevant material concerning Shri Krishna's life from the *Mahabharata* and *Vishnu Purana*. However, it should be remembered that the facts about Shri Krishna's life can be known only by working hard for it, otherwise it is impossible to know them.

9. The Period of Shri Krishna and "Mahabharata"

It is a bit difficult to determine the period of Mahabharata as no systematic history of that period is available. However, whatever has come to light by the researches done so far I am mentioning it here for the information of readers. There is a belief among the Hindus that the war of Mahabharata marks the beginning of Kaliyuga and the Krishna was born in the Dwapara age. It is also believed that the Kaliyuga commenced some 5000 years ago and according to the computation of astrologers the Kaliyuga started 4996 years ago.

Kalhana, the author of the history of Kashmir, *Rajatarangini*, states that in the 653rd year of *Kaliyuga*, a king named Gauda was ruling Kashmir, while Yudhishtira and Kauravas were living in a forest. Gauda ruled for about 65 years, so Yudhishtira must have been there around 2400 B.C., that is to say, about 4300 years ago.

It is learnt from the *Vishnu Purana* that King *Parikshita*, the grandson of *Yudhishtira*, ruled 1015 years before king Nanda. And the first ruler of the Nanda dynasty ruled 100 years before Chandragupta who had ascended the throne of *Magadh* in 315 B.C. at another place the *Vishnu Purana* fixed the period of *Parikshita* as 1200 Kaliyugi year, that is 1900 B.C.

It is learnt from the Mahabharata that in those days the winter solstice occurred in the months of Magha because Bhishma died when the sun moved southward. But nowadays winter solstice occurs on 24 December. According to astrologers this shifting of the winter solstice day took

place at least 3426 years ago, which means that the Mahabharata was took place at least 3426 years ago if not more.

Commenting on this view of astrologers, Bal Gangadhar Tilak³, in his book Orion, says that the period when the winter solstice fell in the month of Magha must have been quite ancient period. Besides this, the old Sanskrit literature contains references to almost all the heroes of the Mahabharata on the basis of which European scholars believe that the war of Mahabharata took place much before the creation of all this literature.

The *Ashtadhyayi* of Panini mentions the names Yudhishtira, kunti, Arjuna and Vasudeva. Preofessor Goldstucker holds that Panini live much before the *Brahmanas* and *Upnishads* were written. Swami Dayaynand agrees with him on this....

However, it is generally accepted that the war of Mahabharata occurred a long time back, and that the original *Mahabharata* was written sometime after that. But changes continued to be made for a long period. Today it is very difficult to determine when the war of Mahabharata took place, when the book Mahabharata was written and which Vyasa wrote it.

If the Mahabharata war and the composition of the book Mahabharata took place before the *Upanishads* and the *Sutra* then there is no doubt that whatever is there in the present-day version of the Mahabharata which is not in conformity with the religion of that period was added to it later on and that it was not written by the original author.

10. Is This Story Imaginary?

Some scholars are of the opinion that the whole story of the Mahabharata is imaginary and that all the events mentioned in it are unreal. Some other scholars consider the Mahabharata war as a fact but its heroes as imaginary. In my opinion both these views are wrong, the reasons for which are as follows:

1. The genealogies of both Krishna and Arjuna are fully known. Several persons belonging to their families ruled over the kingdoms mentioned in history
2. The entire corpus of Sanskrit literature refutes both of the above mentioned views.
3. The story of the Mahabharata and the names of its characters are well known to the masses for centuries and even in those areas where there has been no literacy at all. Several places also bear the same names as those of the characters of the story. This had not been possible this had not been possible if the names were imaginary.

³ (1856-1920); educated at Poona and taught at Fergusson College; outstanding politician and leader of the Congress belonging to the extremist school; founder-editor of kesari (Marathi) and Mahratta (English); sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment in July 1897 and deported to Burma for six years in July 1908 for sedition; founded Home Rule League in 1916; works include Bhagwadagita Rahasya (karma Yoga Shashtra), The Article home in the Vedas, Orion and several other scholarly books on Indian history and Philosophy

4. Various writings relating to the Mahabharata found in the Sanskrit literature also confirm many of the events mentioned in it.
5. If the story of the Mahabharata is considered to be true, then there seems to be no reason to suppose that the names of its characters are imaginary. However, if these names are imaginary then the question arises – what were the names of the real characters of the story?
6. The fact that Krishna is considered an incarnation of God also confirms that Krishna was not the name of any imaginary person.
7. Those opposed to our viewpoints do not furnish any proof in support of their contention. Some writers argue that since the system of polyandry was not there in the Aryans society at that time, the story of Draupadi marrying the five Pandavas is a concoction and has no truth in it. But those who have read the Mahabharata know that this incident has been mentioned as an exception with some purpose.

Thus in the face of such strong evidence the opinion held by some persons that the story of the Mahabharata is imaginary cannot be accepted, nor can it be believed that Krishna and Arjuna were imaginary characters.

11. Was Krishna an Incarnation of God?

By reading the events connected with the life of Shri Krishna mentioned by me in this book the readers can realize how far it is correct to the Krishna Maharaja as an incarnation of God. In my view he himself never made any such claim, nor anyone during his times gave him such a title. These are creative projections of imagination which came in vogue after the Buddhist period.

The entire Vedic literature is opposed to the doctrine of incarnation. The Vedas loudly say that God never assumes a physical form. The European Scholars such as Max Weber and Monier-Williams and Romesh Chandra Dutt also agree with the view that the doctrine of incarnation came into vogue after the Buddhist period, and that before that nobody in India believed in idol worship or in the doctrine of incarnation. In the last part of this book I will deal with as to what extent the events of the life of Krishna Maharaja confirm my view and then readers too will be able to form a correct opinion on the issue.

Dear readers, I present to you in the following pages the life story of a hero. Even though Shri Krishna was not an incarnation of God but only a human being, he was a model human being. He was a great teacher, a great warrior and man of great learning. His life is an ideal for us. We can derive much advantage from his teachings. In my view students should make a careful study of the life of Shri Krishna as atheism of Europe is upsetting the minds of the younger generation and waning them away from the fundamental truths of Hinduism and leading them towards the Western way of life. According to them the air of life is nothing but to eat delicious foods, wear fashionable clothes, travel in luxury vehicles and live in comfort. They do not care to think about the soul and hate the religion which they think to be the root cause of all the sorrow of the world. They think that good of India lies doing away with the religion altogether and setting up a democratic state and forming a commonwealth in which nobody shall ask anyone what is his religion. If they have their way all the religious literature will be dumped into the sea and all

religious organizations banished from the country. They think that this alone can bring about the salvation of India that India's political interest lies in this, that no one should have the right to question anyone's conduct, and that everyone should be free to eat, drink and behave as he pleases. They only want that they should be given a share in the administration of the country, that they should hold important posts in the government, that they should be consulted when taxes are to be imposed or lifted, and that they should bear no social and religious responsibilities. A section of the Hindu youth today holds this very view. On the other hand, those people who think about spiritual development and do not hate religious philosophy or education consider *vairagya Vedanta*, *yoga* and *sannyasa* as their only objectives. For them the world is unreal like a dream and all worldly pleasures are contemptible. They do not care for material progress and seem to be interested only in becoming a perfect *Brahma* or *yogi*. They think that the persons who neglect the pursuit of self-realization and run after worldly pleasures are foolish. The country's young men are today broadly divided into these two categories.

But there is a third category too which is looked down upon by the above two categories. This category is of such individuals as believe that Hindus should firmly adhere to their ancient religion and try to make progress according to its teaching. They try to save Hindus from the neo-Vedanta and the dogma of renunciation and also warn them against European materialism. But the trouble with man is that he is always attracted towards extremes which in Sanskrit is called *atidosh*. At present this weakness is quite prominent in the Hindu community because of which our educated young men cannot adopt a middle course. To such people the life and teachings of Shri Krishna will be very useful and beneficial. But unfortunately the people reading the Mahabharata and the Gita misconstrue the ideas of Shri Krishna and while trying to follow the principles of renunciation, yoga and neo-Vedanta discard worldly things, desert their children and put on the ochre-coloured dress. Alas, they do not realize how can Shri Krishna's teachings be interpreted to mean that our interest lies in deserting our parents and children, retiring to the forest without discharging our worldly duties, and starting practicing yoga when we know that he inspired Arjuna to stand up and fight? When the war was over he persuaded Yudhishtira, against the latter's wishes, to rule over the kingdom. He himself married, begot children and spent a great part of his life participating in worldly activities. He also took revenge against his enemies, destroyed the wicked, helped the poor and while living in the world discharged all his duties and yet he attained the highest spiritual goal. Thus the only conclusion of Shri Krishna's teachings is that man should discharge his duty, whether worldly or religious, honestly, sincerely and steadfastly. Only then can he gain true knowledge and attain moksha. In the battlefield Krishna told Arjuna that his supreme duty as a warrior was to wield arms and kill others, if need be even his own kith and kin. On occasions Krishna himself used weapons, fought numerous enemies and shed blood. How could such a person teach the Hindus of the twentieth century, who are by action neither Brahmins nor Kshatriyas, to abandon their families and children, discard their social duties and without leading the life of a *brahmachari* or a householder and without studying the Vedas start practicing yoga and retire to the forest with the object of becoming Brahma themselves? According to Krishna's teachings, it is the duty of a Kshatriya, until he earns the right to be called a Brahmin, to fight against his enemies, and if in order to uphold religion, righteousness and truth, he has to take up arms and risk his life he should not hesitate to do so.

In discharging our duties we should not let false pity or other worldliness comes in our way at all. If an aggrieved person adopts an attitude of indifference and false pity, then one day justice will disappear altogether from the world and such an attitude will also amount to cowardice. It is rightly said that when one is unable to take recourse to any other means he adopts this kind of attitude. Often people praise Christianity on account of its teaching that if someone slaps you on your cheek turn to him the other also. But you please ask them whether anybody has ever acted upon it or how far even the Christians themselves follow it. Nature teaches us something contrary to this. These things are only said. No capable man can be so coward. Those who make an undue criticism of Krishna's teachings and hold him responsible for the war of Mahabharat and the harm caused by it should at least think what is the meaning of his philosophy. If some thief or robber enters your house what will you do? Will you take pity on him and let him take away your valuables or will you try to safeguard them by causing him harm? Did dharma enjoin that Arjuna should have fled away from the battlefield and betrayed the confidence reposed in him by Yudhisthira and other kings who had joined him with their armies? And was it the duty of Krishna also to flee along with Arjuna? I cannot understand how the people who make such absurd criticisms of Shri Krishna can be called protectors or propagators of religion. They only talk about dharma but do not whether their dharma is beneficial to society or not. Their only concern is that their discourse should interest their audiences. I do believe that this very false sense of pity and other worldliness has ruined the Hindus, effaced their name and fame and rendered them completely misfit for this world. If even now the Hindus do not want to come out of the clutches of such beliefs in accordance with the modern Western education and the Gita, then any thought about their progress is meaningless and it can never be realized. Those believing in such things can make neither material progress nor spiritual, for in the spiritual world also that person alone can make his mark who puts his step on the spiritual ladder after achieving success in all the tests. Those people cannot enter the spiritual world who do not care about the tests and rules of the world. Spiritual success is attained only by those who, by performing their multifarious duties at the lotus feet of *Parabramha* or the Supreme Being.

In these pages I have penned the life story of a great soul who pursued dharma during his lifetime and following the rules of dharma destroyed the enemies of dharma and justice. As to whether Krishna expounded the philosophy of *dvaita* or *advaita* , that is, whether according to him *atma* and *paramatma* are identical or different, I will deal with it in the second part of this book.

Teachings of Shri Krishna

The term Krishnaism has been coined by those English-educated Hindus who, notwithstanding their English education, profess that part of the *Pauranic* Hinduism which is popularly known as *Vaishnavism*. Perhaps in the entire corpus of Sanskrit literature one would not find even a single word indicating Shri Krishna's association with any creed or religion as in the cases of Jesus Christ, Prophet Mahammad and Buddha. The English-educated devotees of Shri Krishna have tried to rectify this omission in the Sanskrit literature by inventing a new creed after the name of Shri Krishna which they call Krishnaism. Even by a little study of the Sanskrit literature one comes to know that Krishna neither ventured to found any new religion nor preached any such religion as could be known in the world after his name. Jesus Christ, Prophet Mahammad and Buddha each founded a new religion which came to be named after them. Although at

present there are numerous sects among the Hindus which are named after some great men, there is no evidence in the ancient Sanskrit literature to prove that such sects existed in ancient times. In the literature of Krishna's time there is not even a trace of such evidence. A special characteristic of the ancient Hindu religion is that its foundation had not been laid on the teachings of any human being.

Truly speaking, the early Hindu literature is the soul of the religious philosophy of the world. It is replete with precious religious thoughts the like of which are not found in any other literature of the world. Moreover, the exponents of these thoughts were expounded by whom. No one of our great men tried to initiate any new teachings; rather all of them described themselves as the followers of the supreme knowledge contained in the Vedas. No one tried even in the least to say that such and such an idea was his and that he had come in the world to propagate it. No one ever claimed to conceive any original idea, nor anyone ever thought of propagating any new religion. The entire series of the *Brahmanas* and *Upanishads* are a testimony to this. From the teachings of *Upanishads* it is not clear at all as to who were the originators of those teachings. At some places in the books of history and other subjects the names of rishis, seers and learned men are mentioned but by the manner in which they have been mentioned it is clear that several rishis bore identical names. As a result, it is impossible for us today to determine which Manu was the author of Manusmriti. The ancient Aryans considered God as the first guru and true preceptor, so they never try to found any religion in their own names. From their writings it seems that they considered it adharma and sinful to do so. Taking part in religious discussions was considered proper by them but propagating any new religion or preaching any new ideas in their own names was considered quite improper.

Whenever the ancient Hindu *rishis* and *seers* preached anything they said they were doing so as desired by their forebears or as enjoined by the Vedas and Shashtras. They never dared to expound anything new themselves. Only in recent times this trend has started. Now in someone's name a new religion or sect is started which in fact lessens that person's importance. This is true especially in the case of Shri Krishna who never tried to propagate any new religion. I have already observed in the preceding chapter that there is no evidence of Shri Krishna having ever tried to impart any religious teaching to the common man. Therefore it is futile to consider him as the founder of any religion. I want to state that it is not correct to attribute every *shloka* of the Bhagvad Gita to Shri Krishna. However, even if it is so accepted, the conclusion is only this that whatever he preached to inspire Arjuna to take part in the war is contained in the Gita. If only because of this Krishna Maharaja can be considered the founder of a certain religion, then why should Bhishma Maharaja also be not given the same credit as his teachings are in no way less profound and true than those of Krishna Maharaja? Can anyone tell me which such a teaching of the Bhagvad Gita is as is not there in the *Upanishads* or *brahmanas* or even in the *Vedas* written earlier than the *Bhagavad Gita*? Then what is it that we should propagate as Krishnaism excepting that which is contained in the *Shrimad Bhagavat* or *Brahma Vaivarta* and which casts a slur on the pious life of Krishna Maharaja? If the teachings of the *Shrimad Bhagavat* are called as Krishnaism it will do not credit to Krishna Maharaja. In my view to attribute the teachings of the *Shrimad Bhagavat* to Krishna maharaja is not at all proper because from the ancient books it no at all proved that Krishna Maharaja ever preached such things as are contained in the *Shrimad Bhagavat*.

In my view Krishna Maharaja did not found any religious creed which should be propagated in his name. Therefore the use of the term krishnaism is incorrect and improper. If krishnaism means only that message which Krishna Maharaja gave to Arjuna and his other relatives at the right time and which emphasizes selfless action, then there is no harm. There is no doubt that the message of selfless action has not been conveyed so effectively and lucidly by words of any rishis and seers as by the words of Krishna Maharaja. Although the different chapters of the Gita deal with different themes, the message of selfless action is there in the whole book. In the Mahabharata too Krishna's utterance on various occasions emphasizes only selfless action. As he dwells on the different aspects of dharma and enumerates the different ways and techniques of pursuing it, he invariably ends his discourses with an emphasis on non-attachment. Not only Krishna Maharaja's words but also his actions are an exposition of non-attachment. They refute the notions of false sacrifice and renunciation and uphold the philosophy of action without any desire for fruit. This was the objective for which Shri Krishna worked throughout his life. Whenever he was called upon to give guidance in regard to anything he emphasized the principle of selfless action. Every person who came in his contact on any occasion was inspired by him to act without desiring for the fruit. Whether He was in the company of friends or relatives, or was answering questions asked by his devotees or was sitting in a state assembly or was participating in *yajnas* and other religious ceremonies or was fighting with enemies, he always kept this principle in mind. Even he was wounded by the arrow of a hunter and was in the throes of death, it was this lesson that he gave to the hunter.

Dear readers, in short I want to say that the entire teaching of Krishna Maharaja is contained in chapter II of the Bhagawad Gita and in some shlokas of the Mahabharata.....

X X X X

In chapters XVII and XVIII the philosophy of action has been dealt with in detail which is the sum and substance of the teachings of the Gita. When I think that the purpose of all these teachings was to induce Arjuna to take up arms, I feel convinced that this was the message which was given by Krishna Maharaja to Arjuna on the field of kurushetra. He might have dealt with some other aspects of dharma also in order to explain his message. But it is inconceivable that the entire philosophy of the Gita was propounded at the very time.

In the *Mahabharata* too Krishna Maharaja in his conversations emphasized the same teachings. After the end of the war when Yudhishtira expressed his desire to give up the kingdom and retire to the forest, Krishna Maharaja again, through his teachings, brought him round to the course of action and even encouraged him to perform *Ashwamedha yajna*. Counseling Yudhishtira, he said, "O Yudhishtira, you have defeated your external enemies and now it is the time for you to get ready for that battle which every human being has to fight alone. In this battle you yourself have to realize the unlimited power of the mind and use the weapons of action and meditation, as no weapon made of steel can be used in this kind of battle. If you do not become successful in this, then it will be ominous for you." He further said, "Renouncing the kingdom and other worldly things will not bring forth your liberation, rather you have to renounce all such as tie a person with his body. Let our enemies enjoy that happiness that is derived by giving up materialistic things while remaining entangled with inner desires and weaknesses. A man meets with his real death when he becomes a slave to worldly pleasures and

starts differentiating between himself and others. Such a man who while ruling over a vast kingdom does not harbor any worldly desires in his mind nor craves for worldly pleasures is not at all bothered about the opinion of others about him. On the other hand, a man who renounces the world and in the guise of a sage lives in a forest subsisting on fruits but craves for materialistic things wanders about with death hovering over his head all the time. Therefore it is not proper for you to think of renunciation without first discharging your duties. Renunciation in the real sense means that a person should have complete control over his mind and should subdue his desires. Such a person, though living in the world and ruling over a kingdom, is a true sannyasi and the monarch of his heart.”

How beautiful are these words! Are they pearls which shine so brightly that even the most sharp and powerful eyes cannot look at them? No, they are not pearls. Pearls are after all made of clay. They cannot appease one’s hunger or quench one’s thirst. They cannot relieve one’s sorrow and distress. Even by possessing the most precious pearls one cannot get rid of his troubles, pains and sorrow. Was there any dearth of pearls with Mahamud Ghaznavi? Has the Czar of Russia not got plenty of them? But can anyone say that despite having so much pearls Mahmud was happy or even the Czar is happy? In fact, the entire wealth of the world, including all the gold, silver, diamonds, pearls and jewels, is much less precious than the words and thoughts of Krishna Maharaja. They have that nectar in the search of which Alexander, who possessed a large amount of pearls, met with his death. This is that elixir for procuring which even the greatest of the kings and emperors lost their lives. This is that nectar by drinking which a man is liberated from the cycle of birth and death and by acquiring which pearls become like mud for him. This is that prescription by which all the sorrows, diseases of the sick, restlessness of the restless and troubles of the troubled soul disappear in the same manner as a wild deer runs away on getting the scent of man. This is that knowledge which transforms this sea of world which is full of sorrows into a pool of peace and a place of happiness and frees the man from all his bonds and leads him to the lotus-feet of God by touching which his soul is blessed with eternal peace and happiness. Dear reader, this is that teaching which tells us that duty must be performed for its own sake. This is what mirror which reflects the true form of religion. This is a divine ordinance which, being universally applicable, gives full freedom to all human beings to think about themselves.

O descendants of Aryans, can you really understand and follow these teachings? Have the iron chains of slavery, anxiety of livelihood, false sense of prestige, barren philosophy of meaningless renunciation and sacrifice, worship of the Mammon, education received in return for a few rupees and a plethora of false beliefs rendered your minds and hearts fit enough to understand this supreme truth which is the essence of all the philosophies of the world? Krishna Maharaja should be born again with the sweet melodious notes of his flute and should make the descendants of Aryans realize to what extent they have strayed from the path of dharma. The mother India should produce at least ten such sons as, keeping before them this paradigm of dharma, may try to ascend the ladder of dharma without bothering about the riches or poverty, friend or foe and life or death.

Their conviction should be so strong, their faith so unshakeable, their will so resolute and their intellect so incisive and brilliant that they should care neither for pleasure nor for sorrow, neither for comfort nor for discomfort, and neither for success nor for failure.

Is there not a dearth of such individuals in the country today and is it not a cause of the many ills afflicting us? Though these days there is so much talk about patriotism, love of the community and propagation of religion, I do not find even one individual who is totally dedicated to the service of the country and propagation of religion. Otherwise, how is it that despite there being so much hue and cry religion has not made any progress at all, nor the sorrow of the country have abated.

Yes, there is a great deal of talk about religion. There are also debates and discourses about it in plenty and donations are liberally given to promote the cause of religion. But the sad part of the whole thing is that our life is not guided by dharma. Dharma does not visit such people as do not invite it. Dharma is so jealous that it does not want its devotees to look at anybody else than itself. It does not stop them from eating or drinking or enjoying luxurious or earning money or producing children or having wives. What it wants is that whatever is done should be done for its sake, in its name, and that it should be dedicated to it. It does not say to its devotees that they should not love anybody nor serve their country or the community. Rather it says one may love people as much as one wants but it should be done so in its name, for its sake and should be dedicated to it.

Dharma does not make anyone its partner in its kingdom, nor does it give anyone a place equal to itself. It means that it wants to be all-powerful. It does not like anyone's company, nor does it want its devotees to feel hesitant in obeying its dictates. Hence only that person can follow dharma who is ready to follow it without caring about his physical comforts or riches. When such a person eats or drinks or gives charity or performs a yajna he does so because Sri Krishna wants him to do so. Unfortunately, now there is no dharma in this country. This is the reason why the people of this country are suffering so much. Everyone develops his own idea about dharma and a hope to achieve salvation by worshipping a god of his own imagination. Not only this. He even invite others to follow him and declares that whoever disagrees with him is a kafir. But if one goes through the writings of the religious people of ancient times, then one can realize that dharma is derived from the Vedas. At present it is very difficult to understand the Vedas because people do not know the meaning of the words used in them, and it is not possible for a dim-witted and parochial person to study them, let alone drink their nectar.

Question: is then our illness incurable and is there no remedy to it?

Answer: there is no other remedy except to concentrate on the fundamentals of religion.

Question: what are they?

Answer: See shlokas 1,2 and 3 in chapter XVI of the Bhagavad Gita according to which the fundamental of religion are as follows.

(1) Fearlessness (to fear no one except God), (2) purity of heart, (3) steadfastness of mind, (4) charity, (5) control over one's senses, (6) yajnas (religious performances), (7) self-study (study of the scriptures), (8) penance, (9) ahimsa (not to injure anyone), (10) truth, (11) subduing of anger, (12) sacrifice, (13) peace, (14) bravery, (15) firmness and (16) forgiveness.

If we want to get into the Divine Court, we should seek help of the spirituality advanced individuals and should by our actions make them favourably disposed towards us.

Pursuing religion for its own sake is the natural goal of every individual. There are many stages on the path to that goal. Every individual should select any one of them and make it his destination. One who has understood this has found the right path. Having selected the destination one should fully concentrate on reaching it, not allowing any obstacles to come in the way.

A European statesman writes that once he was so much overtaken by failure, despair and dejection that he began to suspect the correctness of the course he had adopted, and the result was that he in good faith and with the desire to do good to others changed his course which ultimately resulted in the death of hundreds of persons. He then became a prey to the feeling of guilt, which resulted in his losing his mental balance. For him life became a hell and many times he wanted to commit suicide. Several nights were spent by him in restlessness. Then one morning along with the rays of the sun the light of knowledge was also seen by him. He started thinking and said to himself that the course of action he had decided for himself had not been decided for any selfish reason and so there was no cause for self-condemnation. Further, he thought it was an error of judgement and so he need not despair or feel dejected. He then began to ponder over the object of human life which, he thought, was basic to all knowledge.

The same European statesman has written, "In ancient times Indian thought that meditation was the main object of life. The result was that they indulged in meditation so much and for so long that they could not do anything else, and thus the descendants of Aryans became wholly absorbed in the thought about God. On the other hand, Christianity regarded human life as a burden and preached that sorrows and pains of life should be serenely endured and that no effort should be made to escape them or mitigate them. Christianity therefore calls the world and abode of sorrows. According to it, one can achieve salvation by considering all worldly things as insignificant and not craving for them at all.

"The materialistic philosophy of the eighteenth century regarded life as meant for joys and pleasures. As a result, man's tendency to look at everything with selfish motives became so strong that he ignored all ethical rules. Today every man thinks only of his own gains and interests. The spirit of making sacrifice for the sake of some principle or cause has been so much weakened that people in the face of the slightest trouble or failure trample their principles under their feet, change their views and give up the work started by them to fulfill certain objectives.

"I realized that though I hated this kind of philosophy and did not believe in it at all my soul was becoming a prey to it, and that I had decided the goal of my life keeping in mind my own comforts and discomforts, possibilities of success and failure, likes and dislikes of other people and union with or separation from my near and dear ones. I felt sorry that by my own action I had given up my this belief that a man's body was ephemeral and that he, in his different lives, went on making progress as if he was climbing up a mountain with the conviction that God was sitting there whom he would be able to see on reaching there. Different lives of a man were in fact beads of the same string by the help of which he went on uplifting himself.

“Every life has some objective; otherwise it would have no meaning. Those who have no objective in life have strayed from the right path. A life without an objective or purpose is no life. A man decides the objective of his life according to his circumstances but in reality it is the same as that of every human being. The objective of some people may be to reform the conduct and behaviour of the people around them which means they should work for educational reforms.

“The better-off people may try to spread national awareness or may decide to work for the religious and political development of their country. However, it is an indisputable fact that life is a mission and that one’s duty or dharma is the best objective of one’s life. A man’s progress depends on his deciding his mission and acting accordingly, and on it depends what kind of life he will be granted in his after-life. Every man has got the right to shape his destiny by his own deeds. It is the duty of each one of us to act whole-heartedly for uplifting the soul, determine the goal of life and decide in what manner one can serve the country most. After deciding one’s goal one should work with full zeal for its realization without caring whether he gets success or not and whether others help him or not.”

Had this European gentleman possessed the Gita he would not have formed such a wrong idea about the religion of Aryans, nor had he faced so much difficulty in deciding about his own conduct and philosophy of life. Thousands of years before his birth a great Aryan had given the teaching mentioned above which provided him the light which was unexpected and unique. But in the ancient Aryan literature this teaching was not merely a link in the chain but he bedrock of the Vedic religion. This European gentleman also quotes a poem written by some European, the purport of which is as follows.

“Street shines before our eyes in a fearful manner and the danger awaits us at every step. Still the Lord says: ‘Go ahead, go ahead, and do not tarry.’ I ask Him whither we are going and He replies, O man after all, everyone has to die. Then why do you fear form death? Be ready to die. All troubles have to be faced. So come forward and face all the troubles.”

Dear reader, you have read or heard the Gita and you have also heard or read the Mahabharata, so you know that Krishna Maharaja says to Arjuna: “O Arjuna, remember that a man’s physical body is destined to die. Then why should one be afraid of dying or killing? Stand up and fight. Do not be afraid of dying or killing. Whatever your duty you must do it.”

The truth is that a truly religious man is he who in the discharge of his duty is neither afraid of dying nor of killing, and for whom all worldly considerations are insignificant before his duty. O my co-religionists, put your hands on your hearts and think how many people in our community are such as can be called religious in accordance with these principles, and also how many are such as are eager to become truly religious by following them.

Is not our religion today a religion of convenience? How many of us are prepared to bear troubles and hardships for the sake of religion? Do thousands or even lakhs of Hindus no sell their religion for such trifling things as money, women, jobs, etc? Can any one of us honestly say that he is ready to face all kinds of troubles for the sake of his religion? Alas, in this country today neither there is religion nor are there religious people. There are only empty talks. Our

religion, our patriotism, our love for the community and our altruism are like empty envelopes containing neither notes on our objectives nor letters dealing with our true desires. May be, someday some great man, by his life and actions will bring home to us the real aim of religion and holding the hand of this misguided community lead it onto the right path.