India: An Incomplete Civilization

Until the Restoration of Buddhism to its Former Glory

Vol. 1

by

K. D. Prithipaul

Illustrations By

Ciara Havishya

AMAZON BOOKS, USA
in association with
Indian Foundation for Vedic Science
1051, Sector-1, Rohtak, Haryana, India
Contact Nos. 9313033917; 9650183260
Email:vedicscience@rediffmail.com; vedicscience@gmail.com
https://vedic-sciences.com

First Edition

Kali era: 5126 (c. 2024)

Kalpa era: 1,97,29,49,126

Brahma era: 15,55,21,97,29,49,126

ISBN: 9789394724167 (Vol. 1)

9789394724150 (Complete Set of 2 Vols.)

© Author

All rights are reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means without written permission from the Author

Printed by

Indian Foundation for Vedic Science, 1051, Sector-1, Rohtak-124001, Haryana

For Anuva

CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Preface	xv
Introduction	1
Brahmanism in Comparision with the Revealed Faiths	48
The Kaffir	274
The Search for Roots	350
The Quran: Part I	443
The Quran: Part II	551
Index	668

F O R E W O R D

"I was ordered to fight all men
Until they say: "There is no god but Allah"
Prophet Muhammad's farewell address, March 632

"I shall cross this sea to their islands
and pursue them until there remains no one
On the face of the earth who does not acknowledge Allah."
Saladin, January, 1189

"We will export our revolution throughout
the world … until the calls there is no god but Allah
and Muhammad is the messenger of Allah"
are echoed all over the world".
Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, 1979

"I was ordered to fight the people until they say
There is no god but Allah and his prophet Muhammad."
Osama bin Laden, November 2001.[1]

"The power to rule over the earth has been
promised to *the whole community of believers*"
Abul Ala Mauwdudi (1903-79)[2]

Before the first Islamic hordes descended upon the fields of the sub-continent, India had everything. India had Urban Planning, Architecture, Laws, a Well-Organized Society, Universities, the Fine Arts, Music, a varied Sophisticated Literary Tradition, Philosophies, Yoga Philosophy and Practice, Religions, Tolerance, and Knowledge with Mystical-Ontological Experience as the centrality of her civilization. The hordes came without a cultural baggage of their own. They rushed in with their sword with which they wrote the language and the history of their conquest.

Of all the differences which Mohamed Ali Jinnah listed between the Muslim and the Hindu communities, he failed to mention one important, if not the most important one: the Muslim does not have an antiquity. With a critical, insuperable difference, the Hindu has an antiquity enhanced with a highly elevated lore. Islam begins with the first communication which, on behalf of Allah, the Angel Gabriel murmured into the ear of Muhammad at the beginning of the last twenty-two year period of his life: it begins with Allah. Consequently the Past for the Muslim does *not* stretch out *behind* him. The Past is vertically *above*

[1] Vide Efraim Karsh, *Islamic Imperialisn: A History*, Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 2007;p, 1.

[2] Ibid. p. 212

him, in Allah. Immediately, for the Muslim the Past begins with Allah *above* him. His Past is contiguous with Allah in His ever being Present. The Brahmanist[3] has his glorious civilizational past *behind* him. The Hindu nurtures his past throughout the vast distance *behind* him. Śrī Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna: "Never was there a time when I was not, nor thou, nor those lords of men, nor will there ever be a time hereafter when we all shall cease to be."[4]

It is important to bear in mind that the Muslim does not own the Past to be *behind*. For it is for this reason that he refuses to recognize the innumerable past devastations which he deemed necessary, as an obligatory sacred duty, as the proof of the vitality of his submission to the Revelation as the Quran. The denial of the past being *behind* him is innocently claimed by the Believer using the Islamic *reason* constituted of the unitive association of Thought with the Body of the Submitter. It is different from the Socratic *reason* which undergirds the English language. Socrates unites Thought with the Mind. The Hindu unites Thought with the totality of his vital impulse, with the *prāna,* felt as *man* in Hindi.

The relevance of the Minar-e-Pakistan. The fundamental difference between these two "pasts" or "antiquities" - that is, the Brahmanist and the Islamic - constitutes the unbridgeable, permanent chasm between the two Kaums. It is concretely symbolized by the Minar-e-Pakistan, which historically is the Islamic Lakṣmaṇa Rekha, which Hindus are not expected to cross under the delusion of such fomulas as *sarva dharma sama bhāva,* or such unrealistic slogans as *bhai-bhaiism* or *allah-īśvar terā nām,* however nice they may have been thought to be by the mass followers of mainly the Congress Party, till very recently. The Minar represents, for all time, for all Muslims, for all Hindus, the resolution voted by the large majority of the pre-Partition Indian Muslims for a separate Muslim state. Hindus need to remind themselves that the central theme of the Two-Nation doctrine sponsored by the majority of the sub-continental Muslims was best expressed by M. A. Jinnah's declaration that Muslims do not want to live together with non-Muslims: it was a definition of the will and the sensitivity of the

---

[3] Borrowed from the Aupaniṣad *mahāvākya: sarvam idam khalu brahman,* Brahmanist is a less controversial term than 'Hindu', or 'Hindutva' and their '…isms'. The use of 'Brahmanism' avoids the interminable discussion of what Savarkar and Others mean without producing any universally agreed conclusion stating what it actually means. Brāhmaṇa: with the diacritical signs, designates the Varṇa or Caste. Throughout the text both "Brahmanism" and "Hinduism" are used according to the demands of the related context.

[4] Bhagavad Gītā, Chapter 2, verse 12.

Indian Muslim which has not been disallowed or proscribed by the elite of the Islamic community. In the Indian Republic, the preservation of the Sharia, under the protection of the Constitution, validates the effectiveness of this exclusivist religious sentiment. It behooves Hindus to acknowledge the Islamic reality which asseverates Islam as the only Truth: "He it is Who hath sent his messenger with the guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions, however much the idolaters may be averse." **(Quran. 9. 33).**

What the moderate Muslim expects from the Hindu Kaffir. Muslims, including those who claim to be moderate and express a certain social amicability especially when it is expressed by the use of the English medium, expect Hindus to recognize the fact that Islam is the only Truth and is superior to any of the unrevealed Dharmas: "He it is Who has sent His messenger with the guidance and the religion of truth, that he may cause it to prevail over all religion. And Allah sufficeth as a witness." (**Q. 49. 28).** For Allah is the only God: "Set not up with Allah any other God (O man) lest thou sit down reproved, forsaken.(**Q. 47. 22).** [5]

The Hindus may hence understand why even Moderate Muslims never sang : *allah īśvar terā nām* for it would be blasphemous for them to do so. That the highly educated Brahmanist leaders seemed not to have been aware of the Muslim indifference to this theme is, with hindsight, quite astonishing. Moreover it teases the mind that, Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad and all the Muslim luminaries who gravitated around the Hindu leaders of the Congress Party, would not have intimated to the Mahatma that this lead phrase of his regular afternoon prayer struck no resonance in the Muslim's heart! Can it really be that no one told the Mahatma that it would have been blasphemous for a Muslim, for even a Congress Party Muslim, to postulate Allah being equal to Rāma or Śiva or Kṛṣṇa? And today it may be asked if indeed the entire Brahmanist majority has fully internalized the fact that the Muslims do believe, at least in the secrecy of their private belief, that, contrary to the Constitutional pronouncement of the equality of all religions, only Islam is Truth. They further believe that in comparison to all other religions, slam is the ultimate, purest version of the original Revelation which the Only God once gave to the Jews, according to the Book of Genesis of the Old Testament. Nor is there in the whole History of the world another example of a revised copy of a doctrine acquiring such preeminence as Muhammad's Islam does. By claiming himself to be the last Prophet, His

[5] The subsequent chapter on the Choleric Verses further refers to the many revealed verses hostile to the Disbeliever.

Revelation is presented for the last time as the genuinely pure original. This meant that as the last Revelation, Islam was infinitely superior to the debased version of what the Jews were negligently practicing. Muhammad, as an Arab, advanced an incomparable boldness in proclaiming himself to be the last Prophet, in contradiction to the Biblical line of Jewish prophecy.

Confirmation of the originality of Islam in the daily prayer. The Fatiha, which, as the first Sirah of the Quran, is the equivalent of the prayer said by Jesus, the "Pater Noster", negatively refers to the Jews and the Christians for their neglect of the first and second revelations. Five times every day the Muslims have, during the past fourteen centuries, been reciting, in their prayers, words detrimental to the Jews and the Christians: "…. Show us the straight path, the path of those whom Thou hast favoured; not (the path) of those who earn Thy anger nor of those who go astray." (**Q, 1. 5-7)**

It is an ignoble irony that, in obedience to an electoral imperative, these negative sentiments of the Fatiha are broadcast, by means of loud-speakers, over the whole space of Vārāṇasī, sacred for all Brahmanists and Buddhists. However much it is important that a religious doctrine be an embodiment of a Truth, its reality is invariably expressed in the individual's sitting, in his walking, in his speaking. That is what Arjuna asks his divine friend to describe: that is, how does the Truth-ful *individual* manifest himself, by his own, independent initiative, in the banality of his ordinary behaviour.[6] For the Muslim, Truth pertains to Islam, to the Revelation, to Allah. Whatever the Believer does, in submission, while following the Straight Path is in reality carried out with the *Taqdīr* (Measure) of Allah and under His *Rubūbiyat* (Sovereignty). The Muslim's submission is an act of conformity; it does not arise and flow from the depths of his conscious personality. Accordingly his action is not independent, because it has its source in the Revelation and not from the totality of his responsible, autonomous self. Moreover, as a submission the action of the Believer is attached to a reward, a factor which denies his action any moral authenticity. On a universal scale, the genuine moral act is performed without the expectation or desire for a reward.

The reason for the belief chasm remaining unbridgeable: the importance of the recognition of the different cultural rationalities. In order to think of the possibility of a definitive, well-entrenched mutual tolerance between the two Kaums, it is necessary for the Brahmanist to

[6] B. G. 2. 54-72

understand the difference between the two "rationalities" which undergird their inter-communal relationship. The recurrent misunderstandings and the failures of most agreements which have marked the cultural or the diplomatic engagements of India and Pakistan have been due to the use of the English language which is based on the Socratic rationality. On both sides of the fence the diplomats failed to realize that both the Brahmanist and the Muslim have, each in regard to his specific language, always been operating with each using his respective cultural "rationality", as described above. The Socratic reality is based on the unitiveness of Thought and the Mind. The Brahmanist uses a cultural rationality consisting of the unitiveness of Thought with the Vital Impulse, popularly expressed as the total feeling characterized as "*man*"[7], derived from *manas* of the Sānkhya Darśana. As the result of the establishment of the Nicene Creed of the Triune Deity, comprising the concept of the Father loving the faithful follower as a child, with the relationship firmly set in the traditional prayer of the "Our Father which is in Heaven", first enunciated by Jesus and has traditionally been maintained by all Christians as a sacred renewal of filial love of the Supreme Being. Hence the Christian's *reason* is a blend of Thought with Sentiment. The Muslim thinks and acts with a "rationality" composed of the unitiveness of Thought and the Body. That is, the Muslim executes the revealed laws, the rules, the principles, by his active *submission* to them, in conjunction with Allah's *Taqdīr* (Measure) and His Sovereignty (*Rububiyat).*

It is important to bear in mind these fundamental distinctions in the comparison of the different religiosities in this essay.

The rational chasm between the Muslim and the Brahmanist. The common, mutual use of the English language levels these three "rationalities" and projects the illusion that both Pakistani and Indian, or the Muslim and the Native Indian, are using the same Socratic language.[8] In the case of Islam, "Individuality" is the attribute solely of Allah and anyone claiming, as a responsible individual, originality and independence in the interpretation of the revealed verse is viewed as being rebellious and deserving of Hell. The Prophet, however, did assume the privilege of using *Taqiyya* as a gesture to avoid any profanation of the esoteric meaning of the revelation, especially in

[7] Pronounced "mun" as in 'mandate', 'manifold', 'manufacture'.

[8] Otherwise there can be no explanation of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto getting a lot more for Pakistan than Indira Gandhi would have thought possible during their talk, after the East Wing of Pakistan had morphed into Bangladesh with the help of the Indian army in December 1971.

dealing with anyone opposed to him; it is used to protect the hidden sacred knowledge (*bātin*) of the Quran. It provides the freedom to use the diversion of a falsehood if it helps to preserve the fidelity to the divine pronouncement. During the immediate period before the proclamation of the Direct Action (*Jihad)* in September 1946 Jinnah would confuse his opponents by frequently changing his opinions in regard to the contents of his demands for a separate nation. No one said he was using the art of the *Taqiyya* as a moral mode of confusing his enemies. Both Jinnah and Nehru had acquired the principles of British Law with the difference that Nehru was not equipped with the availability of *Taqiyya,* a concept with does exist neither in the *Mahābhārata* nor in the *Rāmāyana*. In the war, as the main action in each of the two epics, the ruse used to overcome an opponent was always a "lie", fully recognized as such. The lie is the unbearable, intolerable sin in the face of Truth which, as the absolute virtue, does not tolerate any exception. But as an exception it was deliberately used when Yudhiṣṭhira felt compelled to let Droṇa believe that his son Aśwatthāma had been killed. It was not a *Taqiyya.* Droṇa rightly believed the lie which instantly caused the chariot of Yudhiṣṭhira, which till then had been floating at a height of the measure of the palm of the hand, dropped to the ground. One does not find any *Taqiyya* in the language and behavior of the Congress Leaders. It was abundantly used by the Muslim League leaders on the other side of the fence separating the two Kaums.

The question of the repair work necessitated by the ravages of the two alien minorities. Two distinct mutually exclusive aspects of the British Minority's mode of conquest are specific to India: they distinguish its Indian mode of operation from what obtains as British rule in the other colonies of the Empire. India has remained grateful to the freely undertaken inquisitive activity of the elite leaders of the East India Company dedicating themselves, by the sheer élan of being fascinated and enchanted by the discovery of the superlative profundity of the Sanskrit lore. They immediately set about transmitting its magnificence to the British intellectual elite and, with stunning effect, to other renowned academic institutions of Europe. They unveiled the preeminence of Sanskrit from the darkness into which Muslim iconoclastic sub-cultural intolerance and ignorance had driven it to the extent of the near obliteration and forgetfulness of a native civilization adorned with an immense wealth of aesthetic and intellectual achievements which the ignorant sword holders had managed to keep under the leaden sheet consisting of 6348 Arabic verses. In addition to their pioneering work in the unveiling of the sophisticated beauty of the

Sanskrit language, the early British exploring curiosity fueled their interest in developing the science of Archeology. It culminated in the discovery of the Harappan Civilization, to the immense joy and lasting pride of the native population.

The succeeding period of the British rule of India as a colony, following the 1857 Mutiny, or the First War of Independence, is marked by the aggressive rule of a master race using the whip as the instrument of government and of control of the large land mass, inhabited by a numerically large prosperous population which got very quickly impoverished. During the ninety years of their rule India became a nation of paupers, physically disabled, and she produced all the wealth which the British took as the transmutation of the sweat and the blood of the natives.[9] In *The Case for India,* the American historian Will Durant gives a graphic description of the bestial reduction to the utmost abject depravity of the Indian population which the British Raj had considered necessary for the prosperity and the good life of the upper classes of Great Britain.

It was the frequent man-made famines which were the consequence of the stern means for the production of the wealth needed for the Industrial Revolution. In answer to all this, Independent India, with its majority Brahmanist community, evinced friendship and reconciliation to the former exploiters in joining the Commonwealth. It was a gesture corresponding to the humaneness of a civilization which had its roots in the forest culture of the *vānaprastha*s who provided the favourable environment and the inspiration for men and women to strive for the ultimate knowledge which elevated the status of the householders who provided for their sustenance! Of those sages, Gautama was the supreme, the most exalted representative.

The obligation to remember and regain a lost wealth. There can be no doubt that Gautama Buddha is the most beneficent personality who ever came out of the untold generations of forest-dwellers. The Dharma which he founded and led during forty-five years of his active teaching and missionary work all over India, is the purest and most humane gift which he bestowed upon the population of the sub-continent and upon all Humanity. The Dharma which he initiated is alive among all the Asian peoples. The life and the teaching of Buddha evoke similarities in the fundamental features of the Roman Catholic tradition although most Christians unfortunately are dogmatically unwilling to acknowledge these extensions of the Buddhist lore being beneficially alive in their

[9] Will Durant, *The Case for India,* Simon and Schuster, New York; 1930.

exclusivist theology and history. Buddha's concept of the mystical finality of *Nirvāṇa* was, and is, the first ever pronouncement of universal salvation. The transcendental experience of the extinction of individual Life as Suffering understood to be identical with Time universally experienced as Impermanence or as Becoming, is limited neither to the history nor to the geography of India. The attainment of the individual mystical state of the Arhat (worthy) is available to all sentient beings.

The cultural dimension of the Umma and of the Ecclesia. All other religions, especially the major revealed ones, are limited each to its respective collectivity, to the Umma of Muslims, or to the Ecclesia of Christians. They are devoid of any universalist appeal. Consequently they are culturally limited whatever be the exaltation of theirheologies and their corresponding histories. Limited to their territories, with their respective distinctiveness consisting of the use of force they have never been able to attract due respect and admiration due to the narrowness of their ideologies. In a time when there were no well built roads such as those in ancient Rome, for example, Buddhism spread all over Asia by the action of Monks using the attractiveness of persuasion enhanced with the elevated humanity of Gautama's example and the way of his simple living guided by the truths which he had discovered in the sylvan silence. Nothing proves the dynamism of the spread of the Buddhism more than its beauty and beneficence testified by the free act of the Japanese receiving it from the Chinese missionary monks. The Bauddha Dharma IS universal, based, for its practice, on the graceful, elegant literature of its Doctrine and on the peaceful mode of living which it inspires. Its universality enabled Buddhism to conform to the imperatives of the specific culture and tradition of every Asian people. In addition Buddhism served as the means of transporting the contemplative practice of the equally universal prescription of Patañjali's Yoga Sūtras. Yoga practice has accompanied the Middle Way (*Madhyama Pratipad*) of Buddhism among all the Asian cultures where shines the radiance of the peaceful smile on the face of Gautama Buddha suffused with the bliss of *nirvāṇa.*

The reason of the appeal. It is for the restoration of the Beauty and the Beneficence of the sereneness of the high culture, which only Buddhism can spread all over what remains of the ancient sub-continent, that this essay appeals to all the academic and intellectual institutions, as well as to the Central Government. Furthermore there is one overriding concern which motivates this appeal: the Dharma prescribed by Gautama Buddha was disseminated over all Asia without the least use of force, particularly without the prop of sword or musket. Buddhism advanced all

over Asia with the attractiveness of Gautama's smile! In a post-World-War II-world transformed into an armed camp, as a spiritually debilitating form of universal materialism, the recovery of the Indian Buddhism will contribute to be a source of peaceful benefaction for all Humanity.

The other victims of intolerance. The pre-Islamic sub-continent was the only one which, for some inexplicable reason, had evinced the collective sensitivity of establishing Knowledge coupled with the eminence of Renunciation, as the centrality of individual living and of its well-ordered civilization. The exact opposite is central to the Muslim's religiosity: he is duty bound to wage war until the whole world becomes the *Dar-ul-Islam.* There can be no two more divergent religious or spiritual purposes as the substance of the infinite abyss which separates the two world views.

The particularity of the appeal. To the appeal of this text and to the purpose of the restoration of the Indian Buddhism to its former glory, it is relevant to summon the recognition that India had produced, long before Europe, magnificent, flourishing centres of high learning. All these Universities: Takshashila, Nalanda, Mithila, Valabhi, Sharada Peeth, Pushpagiri Vihara, Odantapuri, Vikramshila, Somapura Mahavihara, Vikrampur Vihara, Jagaddala Mahavihara, were centres of high learning, of secular knowledges and of the subtlest metaphysics, with a few of their works having survived iconoclastic devastation to continue to enlighten and to give proof of the highest thought ever achieved. They all disappeared. And their disappearance coincided with the presence, on the soil of the sub-continent, of an armed might disseminating the hot simoom of an Arabic version of Jehovah's Revelation to the Jews, but revised with an extremely fierce enhancement of Jehovah's merciless intolerance equipped with the lusty zeal of genocidal iconoclasm. A subsequent chapter refers to Charles Allen's cogent, heart-rending description of the destruction of the Nalanda Centre of Buddhist Studies, as an archetypal model of the treatment which was inflicted on the other centers of learning. [10]

The irony of the Islamic destruction of the Indian Buddhism. The obliteration of the dynamic, flourishing centers of sophisticated high knowledge, as a necessity for their replacement by the Revelation pronounced in Mosques, provides its own inbred denunciation of the

[10] The reader may look at a world map and measure the extent of the cultural diminution of the world by the regions which were once Buddhist and fatefully got replaced by an intolerant Islam: Indonesia, India, Afghanistan, Gandhara, Central Asia, North-Western China (Den Huang).

divine injunctions. After the Revelation inspiring and motivating the mortiferous demolition and ravaging, with genocidal frenzies, *all* the indigenous institutions of high learning, the Kaum, a few centuries later, in defeat, sought the help of the British conqueror to establish, in 1875, the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, which became the Aligarh Muslim University in 1920. In History no vandal's instrument has wreaked more destruction of the products of high civilization than the Sword of Islam. And the monstrosity of desecrating and despoiling was carried out as sacrificial offering to Allah-Jehovah's lust for genocides.

The fateful rejection of Pagan knowledge. During the first millennium of the history of the Church, the followers of Jesus Christ were obliged to read only the Gospel, for all other literatures were derided as pagan untruths. A similar religious fundamentalism gave to the Muslim invaders the infernal reason for the genocidal replacement of the centers of native Indian learning by the acquaintance with the contents of the Holy Book. Indeed, apart from the Quran, the Muslim hegemony did not bring any body of knowledge to the sub-continent, from which the Muslim Kaum today can claim any unqualified inspiration. Both Pakistan and Bangladesh have been engaged in seeking for resources in the revealed Quranic verses for use in what they define under the rubric of "Democracy", modelled upon the Westminster archetype. By so doing they further substantiate their unacknowledged memory of the evil indulgence in the iconoclasms initiated by their forbears. For it was due to the inspiration of those very revealed verses that they justified their "rational" or "legitimate" obliteration of all those distinguished, indigenous academic institutions of high learning, each of which was hallowed by centuries of a vibrant existence.

The diminution of India as an injury to all Humanity. Indeed today there is no need for the Brahmanist Kaffir to measure or evaluate the stupendous, genocidal enormity of the diminution of the Indian Civilization. Further there is no reason for the Hindu to continue to be bedeviled, on that account, by self-righteous Believers fondly claiming that the contribution of their Islamic revelation was an august promotion of India. It was not. It never could be. By a mysterious turn of fate it is the Believers of the two theocratic Islamic Pakistan and Bangladesh who, these days, with the collaboration of Allah's *Taqdīr* (measure), do reveal, as a matter of fact, for all the world to see, the inadequacy of the Islamic Revelation in the desired functioning of its corresponding theocracy. It is further absurd that they do not evince the clarity of justice to *measure* the prodigious enormity of their own cultural diminution due

to their self-alienation from amicable co-existence with the only universalist civilization which has ever existed.[11]

The 'inferiorization' of India by a Minority.[12] Extracting from the politics of the Congress Party during the decades of its political ascendancy and from the reports in the English dailies of the Anglo-Saxon press, as well as from those which regularly appear in the large circulation Indian dailies, one becomes convinced that the Anglophone component of the Indian Middle Class has not yet internalized the glaring fact of India having endured the ruinous experience, during a long period of a millennium, of being '*inferiorized'* by two alien hegemonies: the Islamic using the Quran and the Sword and the British using the Law and the Whip. The mind is bewildered to witness the well-settled indifference to the horror of the *modus operandi* of the Partition coinciding with the concession of the Vote Banks which, accepted and used, did not produce any reciprocity of political generosity or amicability. On the contrary, the Minar-e-Pakistan pillar still inspires the Indian Muslim *Minority* to express, with physical demonstrations of public anger against the CAA law[13] which, belatedly, asserts the moral desire to attenuate the sufferings of Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs, Parsis wishing to leave their secondary citizenship and its contingent inferiority endured in Pakistan and in Bangladesh and seek a decent mode of living in India. The violent protesting by the Muslim minority reacting to the moral, humane sentiment animating the spirit of the CAA law testifies to the fertility of the womb which gives birth to *'inferiorizing'* assaults on the soul of Hindustan!

The loss of Indian Buddhism. Today the several hundreds of universities have more than replaced the ancient Universities and the Centres of high Learning which got obliterated by the sword-handlers submitting with effusive passion dear to the Sole God. But the destruction of the Indian Buddhism was of a different order of violence. It was thorough. It was a reduction to zero. It was a reduction to drive down under, far below zero, for there is not a single *vihāra*, nor a single,

[11] It goes with the simultaneous acknowledgement of Confucianism and Taoism.

[12] I borrow the verb "inferiorize" from the French "infériorisер" in the *Le Mal Français* (The French Sickness) by Alain Peyrefitte, the Home Minister in the first General de Gaulle's government during the early 1960s. In the comparison of his examination of Protestant Germany benefitting from the technological initiatives of French technocrats, he compares the history of the majority of the Francophone Catholic people of Québec having been, during three centuries, been "*infériorisé*" (diminished) by the Anglo *minority* settled mostly in Montreal and exercizing its economic and cultural predominance over the *majority* Francophone community.

[13] CAA = Citizenship Amendment Act. I was enacted into law in 2021.

symbolic *sangha* standing for memory's sake. That is why it requires a deserving effort for its rebuilding and for the restoration of its splendor.

There is nothing in the history of India which would foster in the Brahmanist's mind the expectation of the Muslim Minority willing, with its own faith in Allah, to come forward with eagerness to share in the restoration of the noble Bauddha Dharma. Nearly eight decades after Partition, the laws, the rules, the principles revealed by Allah to the Messenger prove to be of no avail for the comfort of the two Kaums who built the Minar to remind them of their tryst with destiny as *Dar-ul-Islam.*[14]

The mongrel mix of their electoral politics superseding the theology of Belief is sufficient criticism and condemnation of the prodigious sin of the awe-inspiring devastation of the noble Indian Baudha Dharma. In silence one wonders whether there is at least one Believer who, among the two Kaums, would have the sagacity to ask himself: "What did we gain by destroying their Buddhism?" Or, can the ignorance of the knowledge borne by the Indian Buddhism happily be the security of their not questioning? Or will they ever acknowledge the psychological fact of Revelation being the incentive to close the mind to the merit or virtue of the Other? And how does the closed-mindedness last a lifetime with undiminished ease?

Let the reconstruction proceed. After Partition the Indian Muslim Kaum has deemed it to be decent to free themselves from any possible contaminating co-existence with an inferior Kaffir Kaum by clinging to the constitutional proviso for the Sharia. Accordingly they are expected to consider the morality of allowing the DisBelieving Hindu Kaum to recover what it has lost under the hegemony of Allah's proxies.

The appeal for building the cultural integrity of the Indian civilization is legitimate. It is necessary for the restoration of the integral Indian civilization and culture, as a matter of pride and as a duty for the welfare of Humanity. The present Muslim Kaum ought to feel gratified with their having, as a minority, extracted two Islamic theocracies, and therefore have ample reason not to be the Dog in the Kaffir manger. Brahmanists are pleased and satisfied with being lesser beings according to the Muslims and to the contents of their thought. The Hindus simply ask to work and strive to recover what they lost in those times when they happened to be militarily weak to the extent that they did almost never use the world "iconoclasm" as the almost natural occurrence during

[14] The two Kaums : Pakistan and Bangladesh

centuries. It is safe to believe that there is not a single study, in any of the twenty-one Indian languages, on the theme of Islamic iconoclasm. Was the fear within the Hindu majority so deep-seated that the entire people sought survival in universal cowering? For example, Warren Hastings (1732-1818) had to use enormous, patient assurance in regard to the Bengal Pandits, to come out of their silent reclusion to provide help, in 1785, to Charles Wilkins translating the Bhagavad Gītā. It was the first translation in a European language; it proved to be a sensation in academic circles in Europe.

The time has changed. Today the Muslim Kaum is fortunately confronted with the obligation to share the same space as the Kaffir, in a Harbi India. The difference consists of India being a unified nation, administered by a central authority, with the aid of a unitary jurisprudence, under the protection of a well provided and well-trained army. Intellectually and spiritually India is poised to do best what she alone can do: to repeat the example set by the Emperor Ashoka. Metamorphosed into a Buddhist peace-maker the wise Emperor kept his strong army intact while campaigning for Peace over the vast territory covered by his influence and his prestige. With the restoration of the Indian Buddhism, India will have an additional strength to spread the universal eagerness, as international *realpolitik,* for the possibility of Humanity being elevated as a *vasudhaikam kuṭumbakam* (the world is in reality a family) earning universal cheering acceptance.

The Stockholm Syndrome as a debasement of the Indian heritage. The time has come when Brahmanists, in particular, may feel free to claim the splendor of a heritage which stores so many perfections attained and bequeathed by Ṛṣis, Ācāryas, Kings and Queens. It is sad that, due to the accident of the Islamic invasion, India lost one of its most accomplished contributions to Humanity viewed indeed as a family: the pacifist ideology of the Bauddha Dharma. Today it is no more appropriate to maintain, as a triumph of Hinduism, the disappearance of the native Buddhism. It would be the further extension of this shame if, with all the material and intellectual resources available in abundance, the Indian Buddhism were not restored to what it was and even more so. Indeed the obligatory reaffirmation of the past generates the objective, fearless recognition of the devastations of the indigenous institutions which got blown away by the hot simooms rushing in from a distant desert. With dignified courage Brahmanists owe it to themselves to own that the indigenous Buddhism disappeared at about the same time as all

the institutions of high learning of both the Hindu and the Buddhist ways of living. To flatter themselves with the pride of their Dharma having absorbed the *Madhyama Pratipad* of Gautama is a blatant adoption of a collective Stockholm Syndrome, as a homage to the abominable, intolerant iconoclasm as an obligatory *modus operandi* of the Indian Islam.

True it is that the Universities have today replaced those Brahmanist institutions which were obliterated. In addition, Brahmanists today have the unshackled opportunity to recall the paramount exertion of King Priyadarśī of Magadha and strive with zeal and fervor for the re-adornment of India with the splendor of the legacy bequeathed by the *ne plus ultra* Mahāpuruṣa of the *vānaprasthas* of yore.

The earnest hope. Today, the Brahmanist feels the inspiring challenge to respond to a great call, to atone for the loss of so beautiful a way of life, as the *Madhyama Pratipad* endowed with the wealth of profound thought. The Buddhist way is indeed consoling with its radiant message of the joy-filled experience of the Individual being essentially an Arhat. Above all, it does magnanimously advocate the supreme independence of the Individual to be a lamp unto himself in the search for the ultimate joy of *Nirvāṇa*! It may even be possible that the return of Buddhism to India could be a benefaction for the *Muslim Indian* discovering that indeed he is more than his having been hitherto the *Indian Muslim* since the beginning of the millennium! Who knows?

`

P R E F A C E

In the near future, possibly, the still unborn, accomplished Hindu historian would prevail in offering to interested readers of Indian History, a reliable, trust-worthy exposition of Islam and of the consequences of its clashing with the universalist civilisation of the sub-continent. In the meantime, the present essay represents an undertaking, timid at best, to grasp the essence of Indian Islam and of the influence of its uniqueness as proclaimed for all time to come by the Minar-e-Pakistan monument in Lahore. It is the reminder of the perennial distinction of the Muslim from the native Indian when, on 23 March 1940, the Muslim League, representing the vast majority of the Indian Muslims, enunciated, as the feeling and the will of the Islamic Kaum, the permanent chasm separating the totality of being a Muslim from the totality of being Hindu. With the Minar-e-Pakistan being, in eloquent silence, representative of the Islamic wholeness of the Muslims living in the three countries – Pakistan, India, Bangladesh – we have adopted the view that "Islam is Islam, Hinduism is Hinduism, the twain shall never meet." This shall be so, despite all the protestations, to the contrary, offered by blinkered Hindus and by blinkered Mussalmans. The latter include all those Mussalmans who claim a certain grace as the veneer of being "moderate", in particular, when they use the English language. For there has never been gradations of Muslimness, in the dutiful submission of the Believer. In reality, the Moderate Mussalman is a *jihadist* at Rest and the Jihadist is a *moderate* in Action. There is no difference between the moderate Muslim and the member of the Muslim Brotherhood. In reality, by indulging in a reverse *māyā* of seeing the snake and believing it is a rope, the Hindu easily succumbs to the futility of a rootless *bhai-bhaiism* conveyed by the self-deluded, intellectually sterile section of the mostly anglicized Kaffir community.

The insufficiency of the knowledge of Medieval Indian Islam. To a disconcerting extent the medieval history of India still remains unexplored.[1] It would have been interesting to know what reports did

[1] It is revealing that so much, critically essential aspects of Indian History would be written by such British Historians as Charles Allen, William Dalrymple, who explore seminal subjects to which local, native academics do not seem interested.

Christian Missionaries, maintly Catholic and Protestant, sent to their central authorities in London and in Rome, when the man-made genocidal famines were implemented, for example, by the administrators of the Raj in their service to the King (or Queen) as the Defender of the Faith. Indian academics would have to acquire the right knowledges of the languages, other than English, in order to explore the reports stocked in the Library of the Vatican, for example. The knowledge of Persian would be indispensable for the reading of the testimonies of the Muslim court historians describing the politics of the relentless affirmation of Islam in its iconoclastic intolerance exerted against the cultures of the native Kaffir cultures, their centres of high learning and of their specific aesthetic monuments. For example, no one, among the variety of professionals engaged in the Ayodhya-Babri imbroglio, which lasted for close to a century, ever referred to the Babri as an example of the Muslim asserting his might over a defeated Hindu reduced to '*dhimmitude'*. It was a sign illustrating the iconoclasms as the barbaric language written by the sword and the hammer of Islam in the elimination of the errors represented by Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism. A realistic description of the glorification of the Quran as the only Truth, revealed by the Only God who, initially in the Old Testament, was rabidly intolerant of anything being *differen*t, Historian K.M. Panikkar writes that, if a man were to ride a horse from Peshawar to Calcutta, he would not come across a single monument representing an indigenous religion. Yet there has not till today been a comprehensive history of Islamic iconoclasm, complete with the records of the Islamic historians proudly supporting their intolerant Caliphs, as the evidence of the extent of the devastation of the indigenous civilisation.

The reason underlying the fruitless belonging to the Commonwealth under the continued British preeminence. Few Indians, and still less Europeans, particularly the British people themselves, today dwell ignorant of the the humane magnanimity evinced by the Indian leadership, when it resolved to maintain the membership of the Republic in the British Commonwealth under the authority of the British Monarch. Belonging to the Commonwealth instituted as a prolongation of the prestige of the Empire, despite the extreme dehumanizing violence of its rule over the subdued peoples in all the continents, including islands in almost all the seas, has never won, for India, any sympathetic, civilized consideration in the realm of the r*ealpolitik* of Great Britain in conjunction with the other countries

which hold power in the Security Council of the United Nations. The continuance of the subaltern status of India in the British Commonwealth testifies to the particularity of the "reason" at the root of the Hindu's mode of thinking underlying the perception of both himself in relation to the Judeo-Christian or of the Islamic Man. Otherwise it is not possible to grasp the Hindu's inability to internalize, with the help of a sober reasonableness, the chasm which separates him, as an independent individual, submitting, without any compunction, to the effortless maintenance of a subordinate rank in the British Commonwealth. Nor would it be possible to contemplate the Hindu's insensitivity to the Muslim's assumption of an unproven superiority over him, despite the abundance of violences which culminated with the anti-Kaffir horror which distinguished the enactment of the Partition. Furthermore the Hindu still labours under the illusion of having secured permanent, amicable peacefulness with the Kaum being satisfied with its exclusivism assured with the Sharia functioning under the aegis of the Constitution. Nor has the Hindu fully internalized the fact that the Islamic *namaz* holds the potential of the explosion of a violent totalitarian ideology, even after the Jinnah-commanded *Jihad*, with its euphemism as "Direct Action", started with the Friday noon *namaz* in mid-September 1946.

The reality of the different "reasons". In order to navigate safely through the medley of mutually exclusive cultural viewpoints, it is necessary to take stock of the specificity of each Kaum resting on its respective foundational 'reason', a fact which has eluded most comparative studies of the antagonisms of the revealed regiosities arising from their clashing with the indigenous, Earth-bound, humane Dharmas.

The 'reason' of the British is an apanage of the Socratic reason consisting of the unitiveness of Thought and the Mind. The 'reason' of the Christian consists of the unitiveness of Thought with Feeling, reflecting the love of the Father in the Triune Deity for the faithful member of the Ecclesia (Church). The 'reason' of the Hindu consists of the unitiveness of Thought and the Vital Force (*prāṇa*), as *mana*, the totality of the feeling outlook. The 'reason' of the Muslim is the unitiveness of Thought with the Body, in his obligatory submission to the 'external' laws, rules, principles dictated by God in His revelations.

The specific feature of morality. An objective apperception of the reasons, on which the different cultures obtaining in the Indian sub-continent are based, is necessary for the right study and

undersanding of the permanent clashing of the revealed religions – Jewish, Christian, Islamic - with the indigenous ones: Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism. The Revelations declare themselves to be perfect and eternally valid because they are communicated to Man by Divine agency. Their rules, laws, principles are designed for application by the entire specific collectivity: the Ecclesia for Christianity, the Umma for Islam. Concurrently the contents of the Dharmas claim their respective instructions to be freely appraised by their devotees with each implementing the teachings dispensed in the singular mode of his existence: the meaning of the words of the Dharma texts is contained in his personal mode of living. Hence the morality of the Believer, Christian or Muslim, and the morality of the Dharma devotee have different sources and equally different finalities.

The right definition of the moral action. Essentially morality is a superlative mode of living. It does not need to be qualified as higher or lower, or by any other adjective. It must not be identified with actions or activities of conformity with, or of obedience to, the established social laws, with such gestures as courtesy or politeness, with respect for elders or superiors, with the maintenance of social order, however pleasant all these can be. Morality consists of the free, spontaneous expression originating from one's own, free, independent consciousnes it is undetermined by any external agency, or commandment, or pressure or force from anyone or from any institution, or any external authority. The Muslim who submits in conformity of a law, or precept, having its origin in the Quran or in the pronouncement of a Mullah, does not perform a moral action, however much he may earn the praise of his community. It is still less a moral act when he performs it with the expectation of the reward consisting of physical delights in Heaven. The desire for admission to Heaven confirms the incompleteness of life on Earth. Incompleteness lies at the root of the mobility of the Muslim and of the Christian, a psychological deficiency which has been the root of all explorations, of domination of feeble populations, of slavery, of colonialisms.

The comparison of finalities. It is the fundamental position of this essay to qualify 'morality' as prescribed in each of the Dharmas to be the norm compared to which the morality in Christianity or Islam has to be adjudged. The morality of the Brahmanist, for example, consists of two fundamental elements: (i) the absence of any harming of the Other, in thought, in speech, in action; (ii) the service and help of the Other to attain the beatitude of the *sac-cid-ānanda*. In addition, for his own spiritual well-being, the Brahmanist's morality consists of

doing what needs to be done, *without* any expectation of any reward. This mode of acting, the *karma* of the genuine moral individual is qualified as *niṣkāma karma.* Briefly then: *the essence of Morality consists of its being produced from within oneself, independently of any extraneous source or inspiration, and is fully carried out, without the slightest expectation of any reward. Essentially the moral man is good and his good act is distinguished by being effortless and spontaneous.*

Such morality constitutes the very foundation of each of the three Dharmas: Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism. The present description of Morality is valid in Brahmanism with its tolerance proudly taught and practiced with its bountiful provision of thirty-three millions of Gods and Goddesses. It is valid in both Buddhism and Jainism characterized by their rejection of the necessity of believing in God and in Heaven or Hell as necessary adjuncts of right believing for the right conduct.

Celebration of the moral act in the indigenous Dharma. In judicious comparison of the "morality" obtaining in the Dharmas, the moralities, which adorn the space of the revealed religions, according to which the Believer acts in expectation of the sensuous delights available as rewards enjoyed in Heaven, have nothing in common with the Mount Everest high Morality of the Dharmas. The gift to Humanity of Morality on the scale exposed in the ethos of each of the indigenous Dharmas is here declared, without pride, as the celebration of the original, personal, individual practice of beneficence in the Dhārmika environment. The originality is significant: the content of the moral act emerges from the essence of the individual in his relations with Others in his social environment without seeking any recognition or reward from them. The obligation to emphasize the meaning and the substance of the morality of the accomplished Dhārmika Man arises from the compulsion of rehabiliting the dignity and the worth of the Dharmas, Concurrently it consists of restoring the enhancement of the Humanity which they represented and got hidden under the leaden sheet imposed by the brute force of the two inferior alien hegemonies. Indeed, it is an irony that in a universal context brutality would succeed in enabling the two inferior alien hegemonies to pevail upon the sublime, humane, universalist civilisation which had its roots in the elevated view of life and of the world bequeathed by the ancient sages of India.

The irony of History. Indeed it is the irony of the History which

was ushered by Thucydides and glorified by subsequent, academic European learning, that a well-developped universalist civilisation like the Indian would have had to suffer diminution by the brute force of the two morally inferior alien hegemonies! There is no other example of such a colossal ravagement of a well-established civilisation being defeated, despoiled, and so demeaned as the Indian has been by the two alien powers invading with self-righteous brute force inspired by the intolerance from the laws and rules devised by the Only God of the Old Testament of the Bible.[2] But there is fortunately one consolation: India has survived the humiliations wreaked on her territory where the conquering brutish forces manifested themselves. But the soul of India remains whole and ready to alter the arrogance of brute international *realpolitik* with the moral force of which Mahatma Gandhi was the worthy incarnation and the noble norm for the ages.

The purpose of this essay. The reader may have guessed that the essay expresses the surprise over the death of the memory of the eighteen centuries of the indigenous Buddhism, the purest product of the *vanaprastha* (forest dwelling) culture of study and contemplation. As the original way of living founded by Gautama Buddha, the Middle Way (*Madhyama Pratipad*) has been the sublime gift to almost the whole of Asia, a gift which exceeds, with the infinite moral difference of the negative influences of Islam and British Protestant Christianity, all the more in consideration of these violent ideologies animating their Believers with the lust for power and with the passion for glory and greed. The definition of the spiritual vacuity of the West will be measured with its elites recognizing the merit of the Indian Soul, more than the Indian Mind, wrapped in the cloak of economic and military ascendancy. Ascetic Mahatma Gandhi's "moral force" which was spurned as weakbess and as a cipher in the realm of international *realpolitik*, will have its day with its being conveyed wrapped with Indian autonomous economic and military strength for, despite the

[2] The splendor of the ceremonial staged for the burial of Queen Elizabeth II, on 19 September 2022, on the tenth day of a resplendent period of a colourful display, which celebrates with high pomp corresponding to the pride of the British Empire, testified to the pride for the domination and of the immense suffering which the British could indeed wreak upon millions of men and women all over the globe. It is also an irony that the glitter of the celebration of the Empire would have coincided with the publication of Caroline Elkins' *Legacy of Violence,* with the sub-title: *A History of the British Empire.* It brings forth the irony of universal crime and suffering celebrated as pride and glory. It is a mind-numbing experience to read the last pages of this book in a fateful coincidence of the august display of the highness of four hundred invited celebrities from all longitudes and latitudes, and hundreds of thousands of British citizens mourning the former Queen who smiled through her brutish reign during seventy years!

image of Jesus Christ on the Cross as the centrality of Western religiosity, it is the mortiferous violence of the West which essentially defines the character of the Judeo-Christian European and the members of his extended family in the Anglo Saxon dominions. Above all, more than Jesus Christ, it is Jehovah, the Only God, who has instilled in the soul of the Judeo-Christian the intolerance and the emotion of insufficiency which propel the mobility of the Judeo-Christian across the seas to dominate, to impoverish, to humiliate other populations living according to their mores and beliefs. Islam, endowed with an enhanced Jehovah as Allah with a more ardent intolerant passion, immediately after its inauguration in Medina, went along the path conquering and transforming the world in a *Dar-ul-Islam.* It was with this zeal to reduce the world to being a *Dar-ul-Islam* that the Muslim horde invaded with the aim to write the story of their hegemony with the sword. In the consequent process of carving a space for the insallation of a portion of the *Dar-ul-Islam,* the Indian centres of learning had to disappear. Without a Kṣatriya power to protect the Buddhist Sangha and the followers of the infinitely noble Gautama Buddha, the sword and the hammer of Allah proceeded to extinguish the sublime culture which, with the absolute peace of study and contemplation as its distinctive features, had, with an abundant wealth of learning and of aesthetic realisations, so highly ennobled the land of its origin for eighteen centuries.

The pathetic disappearance of the Indian Buddhism from the memory of the majority Brahmnists. Sadness overwhelms the mind today when it contemplates the compulsion to measure the full extent of the calamity of the Islamic intolerance smashing into the sub-continent and causing a mountainous irrepararable desolations. From the very frst day of its birth Islam has unfailingly maintained its unbending violent intolerance of any idea, or of mode of thinking, or of any philosophy or religion, in its encounter with all the cultures and civilisations since the beginning of its expansion out of the limitations of the barren sands of Arabia. In India, in particular, the ravaging, as the expression of its intolerance, Islam has indeed been so successful that, with an immense irony, the Hindu community has gone through the last centuries with a sense of being whole despite the disappearance of the Buddhist Middle Way of Living (*Madhyama Pratipad*), a noble boon conferred by the Vedic tradition, the worth of which has its recognition in its vibrantly living in the hearts of the peoples of Asia. India had patiently, with infinite generosity, carved out a space for her Buddhism to manifest itself, with an intellectual

and moral glory luminously attractive enough, for it to be avidly appropriated by the sophisticated Chinese imperial elite which had already blossomed with their Taoist and Confucian cultural endowments.[3] With hindsight I now recall that during the eight years I spent in the Department of Philosophy, at the Banaras Hindu Philosophy, where courses on Buddhism were indeed taught to undergraduates and to students reading for the Master's degree, no one ever expressed any emotion about the non-existence of the Buddhist culture or about the cause of its diseappearance. It was a silence which, as a habit, universally shared, was, with the advantage of hindsight, the unsung homage to the success of the destructive Islamic intolerance which could obliterate the materiality and the spirituality of the Indian Buddhism from the collective memory of the Majority of the Hindus, even from the memory of the cream of the Hindu intelligentsia.

There lies a tale! Devoid of any substance, the stupendous Hindu oblivion of the companion Buddhism, has been most awkwardly disguised by the well-entrenched cosmic pretension that the Indian Buddhism has been absorbed by the Hindu religiosity or philosophy, or by Vedānta. Such an unsubstantiated, hollow pretence belies a collective, craven pusillanimity which has failed to attract the attention of historians. For there is no evidence, neither in academic or popular Hinduism, nor in Vedānta, of any synthesis claiming a victorious absorption of an ineffectual, pallid Buddhism. The magnificent concept of the "*māyā*" of Advaita Vedānta, which takes off from the concept of the "*Middle Way*" cannot be considered as sufficient metaphysical substance strong enough to annihilate the Indian Buddhism, which suddenly occurs in the XII century, that is, four centuries after the life of Śaṅkarācārya. Nor has any such synthesis travelled in the lands where the other Oriental philosophies prevailed.

The purpose of this essay. Confined to a wheel-chair, as a result of his having been struck by poliomyelitis, Franklin Delano Roosevelt could, during the last years of his long reign as the President, could guide the United States through the three years of the World War II while at the same time contributing to the vision of the imperial

[3] I surrender to my loyal remembrance of Professor T.R.V. Murti who said, among so many of his own curt, synthetic thoughts, this little pearl: "Buddhism is Hinduism packaged for export". In contrast, Professor Kaziyama, of Kyoto University, during a visit, in 1958, at the Banaras Hindu University, said: "Japanese Buddhism is our Buddhism. We do not have any debt to India in relation to our Buddhism"!

powers loosening the stranglehold exerted on their colonial possessions. He was sympathetic to the Indians demanding their independence from Great Britain. Throughout his life, Mahatma Gandhi, with self-sacrifice, courage in leading hartals and in his use of fasting, could prevail in India winning her Independence from a ruthlessly violent and haughty materialistic British domination. Recalling the memory of these two heroic leaders dedicated to noble causes, in the accomplishments of great heroic acts pregnant with the highest moral elevation, inspires the motivation to recall that it is time to give up the aberrant falsehood of the Hindus having successfully, to their elevating advantage, absorbed their eighteen-centuries old co-existent spiritual Buddhist tradition. That Buddhism flourishes all over Asia as the foundation and essence of vibrant cultures which hold the promise of the certainty of a moral reparation of the world caught in the cultural deliquescence of post-colonial resentments. For the primary benefit of the Indian nation and its people, for the restoration of the necessary fullness of the generously universalist Indian civilisation, as the obligation to assure the maintainance of the creed and the certitude of the perennial availability of the mystic perfection as the natural endowment of Man, it behooves the Brahmanist community to engage itself, with the energy recalling the mythic effortless, heroic undertakings of Hanuman, for the restoration of the Buddhism, the noblest gift of the *vanaprastha* India to Humanity.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The need for a revival of the Gandhian Truth.[1]

There is a difference between the meaning of Truth in the political ideology of Mahatma Gandhi and what it ever was in the truth of the western power against which he used the ancient values of *Satyāgraha* and *Ahiṁsā*, as the instruments, for the dissolution of the haughty might of the Empire. It is imperative to entertain this distinction in order to grasp the facts the discussion of which constitutes the purpose of this essay. *Satya* and *Ahiṁsā* are the repeated leitmotivs of the *Mahābhārata* Epic which defines itself as a treatise on Dharma.[2] In this essay they are assumed as the background of the study of the Indian native spiritualities in order to ensure a dispassionate understanding of the obstacles to the recovery of the authenticity of the Indian civilization, as it strives to come out of the centuries-old *tamas* of the two alien debilitating hegemonies.

---

[1] In order to transcend all the debates and confusions arising from the uses of the words "Hindu", "Hindutva", "Hinduism", the words "Brahmanism, Brahmanist" are used as derivatives from "Brahman" in the *mahvkya* of the Upaniṣad: *sarvam idaṁ khalu brahma.* Brahmanism translates perfectly the adherent to the universalism of the ONE, i.e. of the statement: *all this indeed is brahman.* Drawn from a native prescription of the oneness of all that exists Brahmanism is essentially faithful to the earliest unitive vision of the world. "Brahmanist" does more intimately express the idea of the Indian inheritor of the Vedas, than all incidental convolutions even of Damodar Savarkar's usage of the "Hindu" word originating from the Greeks. And the word "Dharma" is used instead of "Religion" in relation to Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism. "Religion" applies to the three revealed dispensations which have their origins in the Bible. The orthographic Brhmaṇa is used to denote the caste.

2 *aṣṭādaśa purāṇanm paṭhanād yat phalaṁ bhavet/ tat phalam samavāpnoti bhārata śravaṇāntaraḥ* (Whatever beneficence is obtained by the study of the eighteen purāṇas, is obtained by listening to the *Mahābhārata*. *Mahābhārata*, Last chapter, verse 9,

The 1950 Constitution does not abrogate the antiquity of India. The first requirement for an understanding of the Indian predicament consists of the accurate perception of the particularity of India and of what constitutes her uniqueness. These essential features exceed the nomenclature of the secular Republic. The 1950 Constitution has so far provided due guidance to, and protection for, the people living as an ordered pluri-religious nation unparalleled in the world. The essay is animated by the obligation to examine the mode of directing the ancient past of the Indian civilization as a requirement beneficial to all Humanity, not necessarily to only India. For, in an existential difference from the Christian and the Islamic communities, India has an antiquity which is still relevant to the present predicament of the Republic as well as what she hopes to be. The future of the India of the native Dharmas will necessarily be qualitatively different from the futures of the mainly Christian and Muslim communities. The difference between the Indian Christianity and the European Christianity is that the latter has its antiquity in the cultures of Rome and Greece, whereas the Indian Christianity originally started with the missionary activity of Apostle Thomas and remained isolated as, according to British Historian Arnold Toynbee, a fossilized form of Christianity. The present essay is concerned essentially with the content and the direction of the rehabilitation of the native universalist civilization which undoubtedly is the only one ever conceived and developed for the welfare of all humanity.

India is more than being the Republic. The India, in her avatar as a Republic, owns a reality which far exceeds the jurisprudential republic which was born on 15 August 1947. As a part of the Plenitude, the Fullness of the One, beside which nothing exists, India is the guardian of the civilization which spans more than ten millennia. In reality the essence of India calls to mind the majesty of the Vedas, the Darśanas, the Upaniṣads, the Purāṇas, the Epics, the Forest-dwelling Sages, the Fine Arts, the Architectural styles, the social laws, the supreme universal values of Truth and *Ahiṁsā*, the mystical finalities of human existence, and the founders of the sterling godless spiritualities

of Buddhism and Jainism. In the Cosmic Pūrṇam (Fullness) India, co-essential with It, has no tryst with any destiny. India simply Is, homogeneous with the All-One pronounced by the Upaniṣad: *sarvam idaṁ khalu brahma*! India, homogeneous with Brahman has always been Brahman, as reality, and has nothing to acquire to be complete in a fictitious tryst.

The openness of the Indian culture. As a colony of the British Power, India has manifested her affinity for whatever is culturally enriching by integrating the spirit of the supremacy of British jurisprudence, and the wealth of a highly sophisticated language endowed with the refinement illustrative of the Enlightenment. On the other hand, as a foreign power, Islam has offered to the highly developed Indian civilization the original contribution of its mortiferous intolerance centred in Allah's abomination of all men and women who do not believe in His revelation. It was imparted word for word to Muhammad for the consolidation of a violent totalitarian ideology. Islam brought no literature to India, in fact there was nothing cultural in its baggage. The further evidence of its intellectual indigence lasting a thousand years lies in its not having given to India a single book for the edification of the disbeliever, This essay is driven by the conviction that the values of the *Mahābhārata*, as a supreme exposition of Dharma - further enhanced with the virility of their usage in the Gandhian political morality of Truth and *Ahiṁsā* - rise higher than whatever ethos is held as supreme in each of the dualistic religiosities which have their sources in the Old Testament presided over by Jehovah. It does further asseverate that, by proclaiming His being the Only God, Jehovah, or rather the Biblical concept of the Sole God, has contaminated the Earth with the whole spectrum of religious Intolerances, as a calamity to human nature, lasting forever. [3]

The importance and the relevance of the ONE. There

[3] Though Mahatma himself uses the word "non-violence" in his articles, as the equivalent of *ahiṁsā,* the word which means "not causing harm to any living being by thought, by speech, by action". The sacred cord, composed of three cotton threads, indicative of the *janeu,* or *upanayanam* consecration.

exists an authentic native India which calls for its being duly respected as such by all those who believe in her and in the meaning and the substance of her reality. The Ganges does reach the ocean by remaining loyal to its origin. The quiet faithfulness of the sacred river invites the equal faithfulness of the contemporary citizen to remember and integrate the venerable past which coheres with the present. For in the vision of the cosmos as the ONE, the past and the present and the future are co-existent, in the totality of a civilization which never was designed to be and to flourish in a linear existence terminating in an apocalyptic reduction to nothingness. The primitive Indian's foundational *Weltanschauung* of the One, that is, "That, beside which Nothing exists", will recur, throughout this essay, in the comparison of the revealed religions with the native Dharmas, as a necessity for the right understanding of whither will the XX century Democracy lead the Indian civilization, with its perennial universalism, for the welfare of all Humanity.

The meaningfulness of remembering the past. Just as the Ganges reaches the Ocean because it remains loyal to its origin, so can contemporary India aspire to reach its destiny by means of the restored plenitude of her loyalty to her glorious past. It is imperative, therefore, that the nation cultivates the joyful desire of the recovery of the past. The Indian today claims the past because he loves it and takes pride in remembering and recovering it essentially as such a memory comforts his mental disposition of taking pride in the long history molded by the wisdom and the knowledge of the forest-dwelling renouncers. It was, and it is, a civilization which never deem it useful, or necessary, to invade a neighboring country for the sake of acquiring its wealth, or for the enjoyment of victory over a weaker people or nation. The past of India is relevant for its statements which maintain their power of inspiration and usefulness in the mode of living with the plenitude of gracefulness and elevation of the soul. In fact the past, with own celebrations of what was *purāṇa* to it, provides pride to the present people for acknowledging its relevant inspirations. Nearly four centuries of peace and of tranquility would have weakened the military power of the Indians when the Muslim

hordes came down to write their history of *tamas* with the sword and eliminate so much of what a civilized people had accumulated over several millennia.

The correspondence of Indian classical civilization and the notion of the ONE. By not being a skeleton of dry bones, the past of India rides as a contemporary living reality homogeneous with the ONE, the fundamental concept which defines and, as a living reality, undergirds, the moral and spiritual specificity of authentic India. The *Weltanschauung* of the earliest Indian seeing the cosmos as ONE, which means "That, beside which No-thing exists" extends its timeless worth to the present and beyond. It is the substratum of all that India dreamed and achieved. It is a reality in which the past, the present, the future are coterminous, as an ever present totality, without the prop of any linearity. That is, the Indian Mind remains tied with myths and is felicitously dispensed without any reliance on the servitude to History, to the memory of past achievements and expectations. Hence it is at ease in welcoming new knowledges and realizations as additions homogeneous with the ONE. Therefore it is necessary to postulate the defining reality of the ONE as *the Unique Cosmology* which the denizens of *all other* civilizations, qualified each by its respective duality, find immensely difficult to comprehend.[4] During a conversation Professor J. L. Mehta, who taught Western Philosophy at the Banaras Hindu University, during the 1950s, told me: "The West cannot understand us, with our concept of the ONE. Their incomprehension extends to their politics, particularly to their foreign policies."[5] And let it be laid down, at this early stage, that the categorical imperative overseeing this essay consists of the recognition that the indigenous Indian civilization has been,

---

[4] Thomas Bilodeau, an Oblate Catholic Priest, who taught Philosophy at the University of Alberta, and a close friend of my family, said, after dinner: "Dad, this concept of the One is something which I cannot grasp. It is beyond my understanding. I do not see how it can be!"

[5] Professor J.L.Mehta is the author of the first book, in English, on Heidegger, published by the B.H.U. press. He spent his last active years at the Centre for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University.

since its earliest beginning, blessed with the absence of the concept of Jehovah, of the glorification of History by Thucydides, of the rationality of Socrates.

The call of the past. It is heart-warming to acknowledge the reality of the nostalgia for the past of the Indian civilization as a constituent of the consciousness of the XXI century citizen in Pavan Varma's *The Great Indian Civilisation.*[6] Patiently, with cogent dialectical competence, he proceeds, in the first chapter of the book, to refute the many criticisms of India's past in comparison with the achievements and the affirmations of the supremacy of the West. With the aid of a withering logic and of a genuine acquaintance with the nobility and elevation of the Indian sources of knowing, he successfully debunks the self-congratulatory arguments of each of the scholars, politicians, historians who, by assuming the superiority of the Western civilization, rest their self-confidence on knowledge gathered in the elite universities in America and in the United Kingdom. In particular, relevant to this essay, Pavan Varma tears into the politics of Uncle Tom Indians toadying to British culture and to their successfully sealing the rivet of the British mentality into the mentality of the Indian people who, during the sixty years of the ascendancy of the Congress Party, willingly accepted the sway of the English-knowing elite as a national beneficence.

The bane of the English speaking mercenary. The wide-spread corruption, which had affected the Civil Service during the three generations of the Congress rule, proceeded from the prolongation of the mercenary mentality infused, during the ninety years following the "Indian Mutiny", by the Conqueror exerting the Master Race's enslaving vigour. Elated by his fondness for the cultural and political supremacy of the British people, Nehru bequeathed a legacy contrary to what all the other leaders of the struggles for freedom from oppression achieved, each in the striving for the social rehabilitation of the down-trodden people, during the XIX and XX centuries. On the ground Nehru's legacy impeded the new Indian nation from

---

[6] Published by Westland Non-Fiction, Chennai; 2021; 403 pp.

institutionalizing the substance of a unifying cultural identity, by his government's total indifference to the reconstruction of the system of the public education. With hindsight it is astounding that the elite gravitating around Nehru did not have the understanding that only a virile, elevating reconstructed education, at all three levels, was an absolute indispensability for the reconstruction of the damaged civilization. Besides there could be no other instrument for the implementation of social justice and for the consolidation of the national identity with roots in the indigenous culture. Nehru, in particular, in view of his own superlative education, just could not grasp that the Indian, lost and helplessly disabled in rural poverty, deserved, in the spirit of the National Independence, an education at least inspired by the equal to with what he had had the good fortune to be blessed. In relation to the Constitutional provision of the civic equality for the entire nation, one is aghast to contemplate the enormity of the fact that Nehru never noticed that the ideology of Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood, of the French Revolution of 1789, was immediately implemented with the establishment of a free public education designed for the acquisition of elevated knowledge coupled with the cultivation of republican virtues. The French Republic still keeps alive the free public education, from the first elementary grade to the doctoral degree.

The irony in the politics of the Congress Party. Nor did Nehru strive energetically enough – indeed as he, with equal vehemence, energetically kept berating the conservatism of the Brahmin priestly community - for the consolidation of a national language other than English, the instrument which had been used to colonize the Indian mind. Ironically, realizing the prescription of Macaulay of anglicizing the Indian by means of the English language, Nehru preferred independent India to remain attached to Great Britain and the Commonwealth rather than renew with the cultures of the Greater India. Indeed Nehru, the sincere and noble fighter for a national independence, used his deserved immense popularity and the trust the people reposed in him, to dress Mother India, for her tryst with destiny, with the raiment of a cultural alienation. In a significant contrast

the other four great countries which today assert their prestigious presence - America, Russia, China, Japan - have each its respective indigenous national language used by its culturally unitive population. In a radical difference from these companion states, India does not have an indigenous national language. Additionally India is shackled by a significantly large *minority* holding its identity with the memory of the former alien *minority* imposing its dominion over the *majority* native Indians. Strengthened with its identity in the Sharia, the "minority" functions, *within* the "majority", as an autonomous state holding its totalitarian political ideology attired in the religiosity of the five religious obligations. It is with this preamble that this essay strives to understand the present predicament of India as a reflection on what the future can, or ought to be, for the benefit of the average Indian citizen and, concomitantly, of all Humanity.

The obligation to remember. There is an India perceived by a fragment of the English-knowing Middle Class which is different from the India of those in the same Middle Class who heart-fully desire to maintain the *continuity* of the Indian civilization. The latter desire with all their hearts to revive the glories of the past which are supremely relevant to the present and the future of the nation. They believe that the collective loyalty to the past is essential for the uplift of the moral and spiritual uniqueness of a civilization which holds that all the transcendental finalities of individual human existence - *mokṣa, nirvāṇa kaivalya* – are experienced in the mental space of the individual. Further they have a collective affinity with the ONE in which the present, the past and the future, mingle in a creative civilizational singularity. To buttress this collective nostalgia also does this essay address itself with the expectation of further studies in the exploration of the fundamentals of the alien religions. For the purpose of carrying out their socio-political obligations, it is essential for the followers of the three indigenous Dharmas to be dispassionately acquainted with the fundamentals of the alien[7] religions and with the contents of

[7] It is true that Indian Christianity started with the missionary activity of

their influences on what the ONE will unfold.

The ambiguities fostered by the Constitution. The constitutional warranty of the freedoms of expression, of conscience, of belief, has inevitably engendered, among the anglicized Brahmanist middle class, a mentality whereby it is considered to be progressive if one frowns upon those who seek the rehabilitation of the past of the Indian civilization. The Quixotic, idiosyncratic, but existentially ennobling recuperation of the past actually represents a disconcerting simplicity: the past of India is eminently inspiring, in the thick of the ecological turmoil, with the nobility of its moral outlook. In particular the integration of the past illumines the imagination with the rediscovery of the wisdom distilled by the anonymous forest dwellers who silently lived as a striving for the realization of the spirituality intimated by the Vedas. In the age of prodigious technological innovations, there ought to be possibilities for contemplating the wonder of the Indian civilization which was built by dwellers fashioning the art of individual self-perfecting in the quietude of sylvan surroundings. It is this singularity which marks off the Indian civilization from all the others which have emerged from centres of royal or priestly power in association with the exercise of brute force. The supreme virtues and their modes of attainment uncovered within their consciousness by the forest-dwellers provided the ease of inspired emulation to city residents. The Indian civilization was thus born from the spiritual osmosis of the essence of contemplative striving with the householder's yearnings for the bliss of self-realization transmitted in such statements of perfection as *aham brahmā'smi* (I am Brahman), as *ātman brahman aikyam* (the self and Brahman are one). In regard to the Other, the felicitous pronouncement is *tat tvam asi* (thou art that) signifies the fundamental *sameness* of all in and with the One.

Apostle Thomas, the disciple of Jesus. The Christians of Kerala are proud to be descendants of the first generation of Christians. But they functioned as a subordinate component of European Christianity, especially of the Roman Catholic Church. They got their first Cardinal after India acceded to Independence.

There is no need to stress that the English word 'self' does not bear a weight equal to that of *ātman.* The identity of the individual self with the Absolute Being is blasphemous for the Christian and the Muslim. For the Brahmanist it is that very reality which animates the striving of the *sādhaka* (the striver for the perfect knowing as *sac-cid-ānanda* (being-thought-bliss). Brahmanism, as well as Buddhism and Jainism, stand or fall on the beatitude of the realization of self-perfection as the finality of *individual* existence. In an emphatic contrast the finality of human existence, according to Judaism, Islam and Christianity, is the *collective* Judgement on the Final Day of Resurrection. And there is absolutely nothing common between the strict disenchanted materiality of the Biblical world created by Jehovah and the One pervaded by the Supreme Being. For the Indian all that moves and does not move (*carācara*) is sacred. That is why the land as India is a network of *tīrthas* (centres of pilgrimage).

Self-perfection as the goal of Humanity: the spiritual signature of Indian culture. Hence it is a boon to remember this lofty period in the history of India's distant past when renouncers animated by ethereal aspirations for a sublime experience chose forest-dwelling as the concordant way of life. Recalling that heroic style of living still stirs a feeling of nostalgic yearning evoked by the presence of the *Tīrthas* (places of pilgrimage) which weave their sacredness into the geography of consumerist India, in defiance of all pretensions of reasoned sufficiency. It was in the forest that the art of sculpting out the chips and banalities of comfortable living and unveiling the hidden perfection latent in every individual, just as the sculptor chisels off the unworthy covering masses which enfolded the perfect form. In the forest hermitage the search for pure knowledge and the attainment of self-fulfillment was undertaken with the fullest freedom and right consciousness, enhanced with renunciation as a heroic way of living which happened to have been devised to its ultimate perfection only in the forest culture of India. Hallowed were the forests where the self-perfection as ultimate goal of life was devised and bequeathed as sublime holiness compared to which nothing can be imagined to be

nobler.

The culmination of Humanity, indispensable to the belief in the existence of God. In post-Independence India the Muslims lean on their constitutional freedoms to forget that all the native gods and goddesses who, worthy to be revered and worshipped, are imagined by the devotee to contemplate Man and to rejoice in his freedom to honour them with loving worship. They cannot conceive that, if there were no human beings, there would be no intimation of the existence of God, nor any fancy of His existence in the midst of galaxies, stars, black holes. It is Man's feeling of incompleteness, of inadequacy, which impels him to postulate a supreme being as the lode star to guide him in the exploration of his mental space. The Muslim prefers to believe that there is only one God, The God (Al Lah) with whom he is shackled, by voluntary submission. There can be no dialogue or argument to convince him that even before Gabriel came down to murmur in the ear of Muhammad, Īśvara had been dwelling in the soul of all sentient beings and, indeed essentially in, and as, Man's existence. The Muslim – as well as the Jew and the Christian – locks himself in the invincible Word of Revelation, in its duality, in the ignorance of the ineffable *sac-cid-nanda* gained by the self-effort leading to the mystical *nirvikalpa-samādhi* (the pure contemplation without any object of thought or image of the imagination). The Muslim choose to dwell within the closed space of submission to the externality of the revealed commands, without realizing the universality of the wordless ontological experience of the transcendental *Nirvikalpa Samādhi.* Nor, in the land of *mokṣa, nirvāṇa, kaivalya,* has the Indian Christianity adorned its own history with an exemplar distinguished with an experience essentially like the Dark Night of the Soul of Saint John of the Cross.

The impossibility of a dialogue with the Muslim. Hence in India today, there are all those millions of Muslim men and women who, in the face of fourteen centuries of evidence, obdurately refuse to concede that their violent political religion holds a lethal poison, a venom for the soul: the divine order to

hate all that is different from what Allah has revealed. As Voltaire accurately surmised, there can be no dialogue with the Muslim who hates the different Other as a virtuous act commanded by Allah. In the economy of the Hindu or Brahmanist vision of the world and of life, hatred is considered one of the three evil fundamental negative human propensities: *rāga* (attachment), *dweṣa* (hatred), *moha* (bewilderment), foibles which are eliminated by strenuous striving with the means of reflection and of contemplation. That is, hatred *as such* is an evil, a sin, *irrespective of the object of the hating, however much it may be legitimate, or tolerable, according to extant social laws and customs.* The opposite of the hating is its *elimination* and the recuperation of the mental state of being permanently freed from and purified of the weakness of hatred. It is the *absence*, the nullification of the evil, which is translated in common parlance as *love.*

Such a discipline is not available in the Islamic revelation. On the contrary the hatred of the Kaffir is an expressly enjoined virtue required by the Quranic injunctions, as a defining proof of the Believer's faith. Nor does the Muslim regard, as in any way meritorious, that Brahmanist Hindus seeking absolute tranquility and self-abnegation as supreme attainments never left their borders to dominate others with energies stimulated by greed and the lust of brutishness. On the contrary, the Muslim feels indignant and takes offence immediately when he is confronted with his hating as a loathsome attribute. When reminded of the ugliness of his unprovoked, but religiously correct attitude, he spontaneously assumes a delicate air of hurt innocence with the sensitivity of the squinting eyes of a cockled snail. In India this aspect of the Muslim becomes invisible due to the common usage of the English language and of the minimal ordinariness of social behavior. The study of the Hadiths brings forth not one single example of a companion expressing any sentiment of sympathy, or of horror, or of sorrow or pity, in the contemplation of the countless examples of the Prophet's cruelties and cold-blooded killings of helpless men and women whom he happened to dislike.

In truth, no Muslim ever admits the reality of his iconoclasm

and of his ravages of the cultures which manifest the virtues and merits of the indigenous Dharmas. In reality the emasculation of Indian civilization persists as a potent element in the collective pride of the Indian Muslims, especially as they have put so little, if any, as replacement of all that they obliterated.

The courage to confront the inadequacies of the Brahmanist majority. It is a paradox that while the fame of Mahatma Gandhi rests, to a large extent, on his courage to speak the truth to the might of the greatest empire in world history, there is the disconcerting irony of a certain tribe within the Brahmanist Middle Class being afraid to call the Muslim spade a spade, in the matter of his hostility to the Kaffir. In the name of an inverted tolerance, this breed of Hindus prefer to kneel and assume, as civic propriety, the comfort of a voluntary '*dhimmitude*' as the reasonable disposition in the face of the Muslim's intolerant exclusivism. Opting for the preservation of a cowardly comfort the voluntary *Dhimmi* is intellectually ill-equipped to buttress a virile tolerance which, without incurring any liability or distortion, could enable a genuine animadversion of the history of Islamic abuses of Indian civilization. Instead the fear of timidity and the intellectual inability to evoke the memory of the historic abuses of Islamic belief, are transmuted as tolerance dressed with the vacuous phrase of *sarva dharma sama bhāva.* For tolerance need not, and must not, be corrupted as voluntary *dhimmitude and fear of the truth* to call by its name the ironic evil of *the cultural inferiority of a minority overcoming* the sophisticated Indian culture, the diminution of which is claimed as a prowess by the believer with an arrogance sanctioned by Allah.

The variety of voluntary Dhimmis. Among the voluntary Dhimmis there are those who parrot praise for the constitutional aberration of proclaiming the equality of all the religions extant in the Indian Republic, without having ever taken the pains to distinguish the difference between the sublimely peaceful Dharmas in contradistinction from the intolerant violence and genocidal aggressiveness of the revealed religiosities.

There are those voluntary Dhimmis who, in the name of the

common good, are keen to checkmate and paralyze the ruling authorities untrained in western universities and frustrate particularly the enthusiasm of a Prime Minister who happens to be the first national Builder after more than a thousand years.

There are those who, in a conscious difference from Mahatma Gandhi, want to treat India as an area needing to be swept by all winds to the detriment of her culture, of her ideals, and of the beneficences of her history which begins with the Harappan culture.

There are those who choose to defend only their economic interests, the preservation of the privileges of class, of castes, of jobs, of ideologies, availing from the freedoms of conscience and of belief, without any affinity or identity with the indigenous mystical finalities.

There are those who do not consider that the prime duty of the State is to build the beneficial unity of the people and to engage in the irreversible extinction of poverty.

There are those, among the followers of the Dharmas, who know and have, yet do not do enough, or do nothing at all.

In the matter of interreligious obligations there are those who point to a tree and loudly proclaim it as a forest. Bollywood imitators of Hollywood Originals claim to be sages and opine that *bhai-bhai* speak must efface the history of iconoclasm, of forcible conversion, of the genocide of the Buddhists, of Partition mayhem, of Allah ordained intolerance and of the necessary war to be waged as the response to the Revelation for the world to be made into a *Dar-ul-Islam.*

There are those who forget or ignore that Buddhism once flourished in India and do not know why or how can a Muslim country have emerged between Brahmanist India and Buddhist Burma. Nor are they concerned or willing to know the reason of the genesis of one more India-hating nation of Believers.

And there are those who believe that English is the best provider of the mongrel culture which India needs for the easiest tryst with destiny. They are not troubled by the national debility

of India not having a status on a par with the Anglo-Saxon countries. Nor do the users of English feel the inferiority of the nation believing that a Booker Prize is generally deemed to be more prestigious and more honourable than a consecration by the Sahitya Academy. Nor are they disturbed by Indian English having not produced a single Nobel Prize. Tagore won the prize with his translation of his own work in the original Bengali.

There are those millions who are not troubled by the fact that the secondary status of Indian English in the world is coterminous with Bollywood, the title which confirms the secondary status of the main component of the Indian cinema industry for being an endurable imitation of Hollywood.

There is a substantial fraction of the Indian Middle Class that is not troubled by its attachment to an industry aping American aesthetic taste. It reflects the entrenched habit of maintaining a deadened aesthetic disposition which constitutes the gravitational pull hostile to the setting into motion the cultural reconsideration of the knowledges which illumined the still relevant past. And it behooves the Republic to acknowledge the silent dedication to this task by a silent minority of faithful guardians of the continuity of the indigenous civilization. In the present predicament of the Indian nation one does not hear of the pronouncement and the deeds of such luminaries in the domain of public education as Madan Mohan Malviya, Tagore, Rukmini Arundale. Nor has till now any Prime Minister deemed it imperative to build an education with such standards as those which attracted scholars from far off lands. Nor does post-Independence India seem to be urged with the passion to build a first-rate educational system, in particular, endowed with universities matching the excellence of the topmost tertiary institutions of the West. The memory of Indian civilization being the only one which the past luminaries built with high knowledge as its foundation does not appear in the electoral manifestos of the political parties engaged with the widest spectrum of socio-political preoccupation.

The purpose of this essay. Hence the purpose of this essay will be an exploration of the themes outlined above with

emphatic reference to the obligation of a reconstruction of the national culture which has been ravaged and diminished by the depredations carried out by the two alien fundamentalist conquerors. Its leitmotiv will rest on the obligation to engage in the transmission of the past as the necessary condition for a soul-dignifying reconstruction of a damaged civilization. For it is the dedication to the task of transmission of the civilizing vitality which can bring forth the continuity of apt innovations and reaffirmations of values established in the past. As the Gandhian Truth and *Ahiṁsā*, energized after having been lifted from the *Mahābhārata*, have shown, the ancient classical virtues and knowledges are still pregnant with possibilities for the realization of what has hitherto been stalled by the invasions of the two inferior but supremely aggressive, alien revelations. Mahatma Gandhi did not invent the humanely absolute concepts of Truth and Non-Violence: he had the genius to prove their eternal relevance even in a century martyred by the two World Wars initiated by Judeo-Christian Europe. To the Truth and the *Ahiṁsā* of the *Mahābhārata* the Mahatma provided a living body- His! In the present study the emphasis will have to be on Islam as a violent, totalitarian political force cloaked in the garb of a religion. Historically the Prophet prescribed the religious obligations as a set of duties subsequent to his proclamation of the Revelation which had been communicated to him by Allah, through the mediation of Angel Gabriel. The freedom to undertake this task is a homage to the liberal prescriptions of the 1950 Constitution, one of the best four or five democratic, secular constitutions of the world.

The homage due to the "Truth" of Mahatma Gandhi. "Truth" of Mahatma Gandhi derives from his having used it as a potent moral force to combat the soulless domination of the mightiest power which ever existed. For the fact of this unique application of Truth against an apparently invincible material power, we allocate to the Mahatma's Truth the status of an absolute Norm. We do so particularly in regard to the fact that not a single clerical and ecclesiastical bureaucracy or institution in Judeo-Christendom has evinced due recognition of the historically unparalleled merit of the Gandhian morality.

Infinitely far worse than Winston Churchill's venomous hostility to the Hindus, whom he qualified as a "bestial people believing in a bestial religion", it is the Indian Islamic majority who followed the Muslim League, led and inspired by Jinnah and his likes: they poured viral contempt on the pacifist policy of the Mahatma-led Congress Party, a contempt armed with the mortiferous violence unleashed, with Allah's approval, by Believers acting as His proxies in accordance with the revelation (**Quran 8. 17**): *Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them. And thou, (Muhammad) threwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that He might test the believers by a fair test from Him. Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower.*

But the Mahatma's Truth will be better seen and appraised, in a further century down the stretch of the Kali Yuga, when India shall come out of the long shadow of alien distortions and regain her authenticity as an active member of Humanity as a unified family. This essay is dedicated to the wish of India contributing her specificity to the construction of what she understands as *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* (the World is one family). For it is only India which, as the sole propagator of the concept of universal salvation does, with her tolerance and store of cognate learning, hold the promise of this universalist realization.

The Indian response to the genocide disguised by the euphemism of *Bengal Famine*.

It is a matter of surprise that Indians teaching History in prestigious British Universities would have left it to the credit of a journalist based in Frankfurt, Germany, to bring forth the diabolical mechanism set up by Winston Churchill to generate the genocide which killed several millions of the "bestial people". That genocide of brown and dark skinned Indians got, due to the British control of the news industry, presented as an act of God, the Bengal Famine. It was the cheapest of all genocides, beginning with the Biblical description of Jehovah ordering the Jews to kill the Canaanans. The Jews killed all the men, all the women, all the children, even all their animals. The Bengal Famine was cheaper to carry out: all it required was the

cost of the morse messages transmitted by Churchill, from the bunker war room in London during the Second World War, to the Vice-Roy in New Delhi. For the killing of the millions of the Bengalis, there was no need for barbed wire, for guards, for miradors, for dogs, for Zygon gas cans, for a murdering bureaucracy, for railway tracks, for trains, for a bureaucracy. Churchill's genius could do with the open countryside deprived of foodstuff. It was so elementary. Indian history is grateful to Madhusree Mukerjee to bring out, in great detail, based on patient, intelligent research in the archives, in the available minutes of proceedings of the meetings which Churchill conducted, with the meetings of his ministers, in the war room of the bunker as the seat of the government.[8]

Madhusree Mukerjee, however, leaves out of her impressive treatment of the records relevant to the Bengal Genocide, the minor detail of any reference to Emmanuel Shinwell, the only Jew in the government led by Winston Churchill. Mukerjee records faithfully the interventions of Leopold S. Amery, the Secretary of State for India, in favour of the Indians and his telling Churchill that his treatment of the Indians was like the Germans' treatment of the Jews. There is, there has been, no evidence of any remark, of any sentiment, expressed by Emmanuel Shinwell when, after the war, he came to be informed of the magnitude of the Bengal Genocide. Till his death in his 101th year, he never said anything about the Genocide carried out by Churchill's Secret War in which he was a collaborator.

The Bengal genocide. The Bengal genocide needs to be set against the background of the genocides which – *all of them* - have been carried out by communities and societies *inspired by the ethos of the three revealed religions*: the genocides of the Mayas and the Incas by the Spanish Catholics of the Counter Reformation, of the Tutsis by the Catholic Hutus, of the Buddhist Cambodians by the Khmer Rouges motivated by

---

[8] Madhusree Mukerjee, *Churchill's Secret War*, Perseus Books Group, New York, 2010; 282 pp, + 36 pp of Bibliography,+Index.

Communism which is an offshoot of Christianity, and the Holocaust perpetrated against the European Jews by Germany and its allies during the Second World War. Islam has, to its satanic credit, the genocide leading to the complete disappearance of these cultures: The Buddhisms of India, of Indonesia, of Afghanistan, of Central Asia, of Den Huang in North-West China: additionally, the disappearance of Zoroastrian Persia, of the Christianities of the Middle East and of North Africa, of Byzantium.

The difference between the Christian and the Islamic genocidal vocations deserves to be stressed. It is true that the Mayans and the Incas could never recover and rebuild their civilisations. But the Spanish Catholics compensated what they destroyed with a replacement consisting of a sophisticated, rich literature, of laws for a civilized social order, of medical science, of the three levels of education, of the Catholic religion together with its fine arts, and of a sophisticated vision of the world and of life, despite its inadequacies. In India the Christian power did a lot of genocidal famishing and of impoverishing. But the patient dedication of the intellectuals of the East India Company saved India from total effacement by the Islamic slaughterous intolerance: they helped the Indian with his recovering the memory and the evidence of his past and the pride in the glory of his native civilization.

But what did the Ottoman Islam give to the Balkans in half a millennium of their conquering presence? What benefit did the Arabs themselves receive from the Ottoman Muslim Masters who had colonized them during six centuries? Indonesia was a creative Buddhism, witness of which is borne by the wonder of Borobudur, now protected by the UNESCO, as a world heritage. The Buddhism of Central Asia was a creative Buddhism which invented Chan (Zen) Buddhism and had been in existence for more than a thousand years, before it got obliterated by the Believers of Allah. The Manuscripts of the Buddhists of Den Huang now lies in crates held by the National Library in Paris. They were saved by the monks who wrapped the books in silk cloth, stored them and then walled the hall, before they were massacred by the Islamic hordes. They have been replaced by

Uighur Muslims. Not a single meaningful book has come out from all those replacements by Islam.[9]

The necessary question which cries to be asked. There is a huge difference between a genocide perpetrated by a Christian power and the genocide carried out by an Islamic force. Invariably the Christians who destroy a weaker people put in the place of the disappeared culture a worthy replacement. The Jewish destruction of the Canaanans was a reduction of the latter to an absolute annihilation. So is the way in which the Muslims destroy a culture: it is a reduction to finality of a zero, with only the bodies of Believers as replacement. In 2002 the Taliban Government even went so far as to demolish the Bamiyan Buddhas which had been in existence for thirteen centuries. Even though the previous past Muslim regimes did not deem those statues to be an affront to the Islamic faith.

The question then is: why and how have all the elites of Brahmanists and of Jainas, not felt any emotion in the presence of the vast and deep hole which the Muslims dug in their environment, without anyone bearing sorrowful witness of it? Why is there not a single sentence having been written to deplore the loss of an original, magnificent mode of living, adorned with the spectacular refinement of its aesthetic illlustrations, its institutions, its centres of learning, coming to a full stop? Below is a reproduction of the testimony of a Muslim chronicler describing the devastations wreaked by the forces of the Sultan. Yet there is no corresponding report written by a Brhmaṇa scholar about such repeated widespread losses of the native culture which testified to workmanship and talent which would have taken generations to bring to perfection. But the ravages of the Muslims, their intolerance, their cruelty, their hatred of great art, kept being repeated, generation after generation, by successive waves of organized iconoclasms, without any one taking pen and ink to express even an iota of a lament!

---

[9] The Guimet Museum in Paris has a section of exhibits of art works representing the culture of Central Asian Buddhism.

The immense difference between the Holocaust and the genocide of Indian Buddhism. Despite all the horrors of the Shoah and its ceaseless reminders in books, in review articles, in films, all referring incessantly to the great misfortune which struck the European Jews during the World War II, in the midst of civilized Europe, there is a slow, but insistent, return of Jews to Germany. With distinguished sobriety the new Jews acknowledge the widespread contrition and the admission of shame felt among the Germans in remembrance of what their country did to its well assimilated Jewish minority.[10]

The Jews in Berlin now have a synagogue. It is possible to think of a renaissance of European Jewry existing freely without fear of a repetition of their tragic fate. In a sharp contrast, the blow which the Muslims struck against the Indian Buddhism, which had been active and vibrant during more than seventeen centuries, has been so effective, that most Hindus have even forgotten that once India had a glorious and flourishing Buddhism as one of the most beautiful and useful doctrine and culture which the Human mind could ever conceive. During the eight years of study and research I spent at the Banaras Hindu University no one ever mentioned the disappearance of Buddhism as it was once practiced. Courses were indeed taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Professor T.R.V. Murti gave excellent lectures on Mahāyāna Buddhism at a time when his *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* was widely known to specialists in the West and in Japan. But at to time in the department of Philosophy was any conversation engaged on the sudden destruction of the Indian Buddhism. With hindsight such a monumental silence is incomprehensible. Or it is comprehensible in view of the disappearance of Buddhism having fostered a mode of thinking of the truncated India, without its Buddhism, being its natural totality as a matter of fact since the remotest beginning. The surprise is further overwhelming that no native Indian Professor of Indian Philosophy has hitherto been concerned with the appropriate

[10] Vide: Susan Nieman's *Learning from Germans.*

research as Charles Allen has done in his heart rending book *Ashoka* describing how the Muslims could achieve such a demonic success in their obliteration of the Indian Buddhism to the extent of India being pushed to the verge of losing all knowledge and remembrance of her history filled with a luminous, exalted past.[11] There is no evidence, among the Muslims of India and of Pakistan and Bangladesh expressing a sentiment of regret for their having so thoroughly ravaged the Indian Buddhism, with the acknowledgement of their genocidal destruction of a noble and beautiful culture. The humane expression of responsibility and of shame and regret for what was inflicted upon the Jews draws its strength from their Christian faith with its recognition of the private and public atonement for the Judeocide. The absence of a similar sentiment in the heart and mind of the Muslims of the entire sub-continent is due to their faith in Allah's commending and approving the genocide of the Indian Buddhism. It gives substance to the thought that the essence of Islam in the Believer's silence is a statement of apathy towards the suffering of Others as their victims. The enormity of the Indian Muslims' indifference to the thorough iconoclastic genocide of Indian Buddhism, with the assumed approval of God, reflects, in comparison with the German seeking atonement in their Christian faith, the inferiority of Islam with Allah being so deficient of compassion as to bestow approval of the genocidal destruction of the Indian Buddhism.

The threat to an elimination of the memory of the past of India. The continued history of India fallen under the double alien hegemony of Islam and of Anglican Christianity kept the country's past hidden under their domination. Nevertheless the saving grace of the mercantile elite of the East Indian Company was, for the native India, a boon, due to the intellectual curiosity which propelled its owners to explore the Sanskrit language up to the use of their talent for archaeology to uncover the wealth of the ancient culture of the sub-continent, a past which could have

[11] Charles Allen, Ashoka: The Search for India's Lost Emperor, little Brown, London UK.

been forgotten forever. It is significant that all the august past of India became public knowledge as the result of the labours of the East India Company elite employees.[12] Subsequently the British elite serving the interest of Great Britain took over the rule of the sub-continent after the first War of Independence in 1857. It is a fact that the direct rule of India by the British was at first welcomed by the majority Hindu population as a freedom from under the leaden sheet of Muslim intolerant supremacy. It is true that the British main concern was the economic exploitation of the sub-continent. Still throughout the entire Muslim hegemony one finds no Sultan having the sophisticated taste of Lord Curzon who did so much in the restoration of the Indian past. He repaired and rebuilt what had been broken for he wanted India to be a beautiful portion of the Empire. While to a large extent the material wealth of India remained within the country, it was the civilization which got wrecked by genocidal Islamic iconoclasm as the demonstration of faith in Allah's revelations. The Muslim kings and sultans chose to break, to demolish, to obliterate great beauties, with the Luciferan zeal of believing that their destroying for the sake of Allah was a direct accession to Paradise. Indeed, in recalling the past of these two hegemonies the Indian today cannot be convinced that a God who relishes in inspiring his Believers to ravage Beauty on such an immense scale, one cannot hesitate to see in Him a disconcerting bigotry and an absence of forbearance towards the achievements and the refined products of the learnings and the arts of non-Muslims. The world now provides sustenance of one and a half billion Muslims who legitimately feel it is their duty to overcome the remaining seven billions of non-Muslims and thereby reduce the world to the frightening status of being a *Dar-ul-Islam.*

Why is there no initiative for the restoration of Indian Buddhism? In India there is no movement for the recovery of the Indian Buddhism on a par with the return of the Jews after their having suffered the genocide of the Holocaust. The

---

[12] Vide John Keay, *India Discovered: The Recovery of a Lost Civilisation*, Harper Collins,London, Uk;2001

thoroughness of the obliteration is so compelling that it has not only fostered the forgetting of the magnificent culture which contributed to the peaceful spiritual promotion of the whole of South Asia. But as an infinitely absurd consequence of this extraordinary destruction, unique in world history, the sensitivity towards this monumental loss has been interpreted *as a promotion* of Brahmanism! The destruction of Indian Buddhism has passed into the folklore, with the fabrication by the Hindu Brāhmaṇa literati, as its having suffered absorption by Vednta! Most likely this stupendous distortion having occurred in the midst of Indian civilization – a cultural disaster unparalleled in History – is due to the comment of Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan in the chapter on Buddhism, in his two-volume *Indian Philosophy*. In consideration of his book having first appeared in 1923, he may have thought it was a way of his explaining *away* the disappearance of Indian Buddhism during a time when the sub-continent was awash with the *bhai-bhaiism* of the Congress Party led by Mahatma Gandhi. It is an affront to the hallowed metaphysics of the Vedānta, especially of its Advaita component, and to Buddhism itself, that it should disappear into the depths of Brahmanism four centuries after the advent of Śaṅkarācārya. Nor has any explanation come forward to explain why such an "absorption" would not have travelled beyond India into the lands where Buddhism has plunged roots. *Above all why and how has the Islamic genocidal destruction of Indian Buddhism been metamorphosed into the perversity of the Scottish Syndrome of the Hindus believing that it got absorbed by the Vedānta of the Brāhmaṇas. As if the genocide of Indian Buddhism was not sufficient, the triumph of Muslim iconoclasm deserved to be promoted by a defeated elite as its own Vedāntic victory.* In the only civilization where absolute knowledge is *a meta-linguistic experience of sac-cid- ānanda* corresponding to the transcendental experience indicated by Patañjali's *nirvikalpa samādhi,* the Scottish Syndrome expressing the genocide of Indian Buddhism by the proxies of Allah as *absorption in Vedānta,* is in reality an inversion of Maya, the most felicitous concept in the totality of all Philosophies, by looking at the Muslim snake and believing it to be a rope!

The justification of the title of this essay. It behooves the nation to set the virile norms and obligations for the reconstruction of the Indian civilization battered by the two alien hegemonies. In upholding the idea of this reconstruction appeal this essay deems it indispensable to appeal for the full restoration of Buddhism to its former glory. The more than seven hundred universities already have the material and intellectual means for the fulfillment of this noble enterprise. The central government would have to contribute its share in this task of revival by setting up, in every city, statues of standing Gautama Buddha in the mode of the '*abhaya mudrā*'! More importantly, the resurrection of Indian Buddhism will perforce lend itself to the effective recovery of the authenticity of the native civilization as an affirmation of the TRUTH of what once WAS, absolutely independent of any Islamic interdict. India can truthfully claim to bring her spiritual fullness to the building of the *Vasudhaiva kutumbakam* when she completes the restoration of what was taken away from her by the annihilating exertion of a barbaric force.

What native historians do not say. In 1181, Sultan Muhammad of Ghor, known as *Jahanzos,* the 'World Burner' had captured Lahore, as the springboard for his further advance into India. The subsequent progress of his armies commanded by his general Qutb-ud-din Aybak had been recorded by the Sultan's chronicler, the Persian Sadruddin Muhammad Hasan Nizami:

"He purged by his sword the land of Hind from the filth of infidelity …. And the impurity of idol-worship, and left not one temple standing … When he arrived at Mirat (Meerut) all the idol temples were converted into mosques. He then marched and encamped under the fort of Delhi. The city and its vicinity were freed from idols and idol-worship, and in the sanctuaries, mosques were raised by the worshippers of one God. The royal army proceeded towards Benares, which is the centre of the country of Hind, and here they destroyed nearly one thousand temples. The temples were converted into mosques and abodes of goodness, and the ejaculations of bead-counters and voices of summoners to prayer ascended to high heaven, and

the very name of idolatry was annihilated."[13]

Charles Allen writes: 'It was at this point, with the upper Gangetic plains secured for Ilam, that Muhammad Bakhtiyar as given permission to push on with his small band of mujahideen. Hardened by years of campaigning, inspired by the belief that they were engaged in jihad, he and they gave no thought to their own comfort. We may imagine them whipping their ponies on, intent on covering the 160 miles to their goal as fast as humanly possible. They carried little other than swords, spears and shields, knowing that God would provide.

'Their immediate goal was Bihar, which was both the name of the plains country they rode through and the seat of the last of the Pala dynasty of kings. …. They may not even have known that an hour's ride west of Bihar fort was a second seat of power, one without ramparts or garrison but presenting a direct challenge to their belief in the oneness of God. This was the *Mahāvihara,* or 'Great Monastery', of Nalanda, known throughout the Buddhist world as the *Dharmarañjaka,* or 'Treasury of the Moral Law'.

'For centuries Nalanda had been the most important seat of learning in Asia. It contained the most extensive repository of Buddhist knowledge in the world, housed in three mult-storeyed libraries: the *Ratnasāgara*, or 'Sea of Jewels'; the *Ratnadadhi,* or 'Ocean of Jewels'; and the *Ratnaranjaka,* or 'Jewels of Delight'. Generation upon generation of the Buddhist world's most gifted scholars had come here to study and teach the sacred texts of the Buddhist canon.

' … Surprise and terror were the twin pillars of Muhammad Bakhtiyar's success as a military commander. He took the fortress of Bihar before most of its occupants even knew they were under attack. He then turned his attentions on Nalanda –

---

[13] Charles Allen, *Ashoka: The Search for India's Last Emperor,* Little, Brown, London, 2012; pp.

but not before sending a messenger to enquire if its libraries contained a copy of the *Quran.* On learning that they did not, he ordered the destruction of the Great Monastery and all it contained.

'What followed was chronicled by Minhaj-ud-din, a judge of Ghor who had accompanied Muhammad of Ghor's invading army into India:

The greater number of the inhabitants of that place were Brahmans … and they were all slain. There were a great number of books there; and when all these books came under the observation of the Mussalmans they summoned a number of Hindus that they might give them information respecting the import of these books; but the whole of the Hindus had been killed …. When that victory was effected, Muhammad Bakhtiyar returned with great booty, and came to the presence of the beneficent Sultan Kutb-ud-din Ibak, and received great honour and distinction.

'But Minhad-ud-din was wrong in thinking that Nalanda's inhabitants were Hindus. They were, of course, Buddhist monks, whose numbers included many Indians of the Brahman caste. Nor did Minhaj-ud-din trouble to mention that the raiders put the entire site, extending over many acres, to the torch or that the task of burning the library took them several months, during which time 'smoke from burning manuscripts

There were at this time three major centres of Buddhist learning in Bihar and two more in Bengal, Nalanda was the first to go up in flames, quickly followed by the nearby monastery of Odantapuri, then the larger site at Vikramshila, on the north bank of the Ganges. A decade later Muhammad Bakhtiyar completed the work begun in Bihar by staging another of his lightning strikes on the capital of the Sena kings of Bengal at Nuddia, Here too, he applied fire and sword to the last two remaining Buddhist Great Monasteries at omapura and Jagadalala on the banks of the lower Ganges, and to as many lesser monastic sites as he could find.

Muhammad Bakhtiyar was afterwards assassinated in his

bed, but he lived to see Muslim dominion extended over Bihar and Bengal. The destruction he wrought at Nalanda and the other great Buddhist libraries has a superficial parallel in the burning of the great royal library at Alexandria – but there is a crucial difference in what was lost at Alexandria occurred by stages over many centuries. What Muhammad Bakhtiyar did at Nalanda and the other great monasteries in Bihar and Bengal was once and for all. For Buddhism in northern India it was the final *coup de grâce* and its consequences wee catastrophic: the virtual obliteration of every page of a thousand years of Buddhist history on the subcontinent. Thus India's Buddhist past was all but lost – and very soon forgotten.'

Comment on Charles Allen's summary of the description of the Buddhist genocide. The brief, but cogent and enormously convincing description of the obliteration of Indian Buddhism encapsulates the barbaric *modus operandi* which the Muslims exerted during the centuries of their brutish rules. It brings out the quintessence of the Muslim passion which leavens the raw beastliness provoked by the presence of any idea, or ideal, or belief, or taste, which happens to be excluded from Allah's catalogue of rules and precepts revealed for His *Taqdīr*. Any difference from the Quranic prescriptions must be emphatically opposed by brute force as evil, as an impurity which calls for its elimination, never by persuasion, but always, without explanation, by spontaneous raw violence and total destruction. Purity, and supremely so, Islamic purity, exacts uncompromising violence. The hatred of impurity and its elimination by physical liquidation is an obligatory prescription in the Islamic jurisprudence. Sultan Muhammad of Ghor followed by Sultan Qutb-ud-din and the general Muhammad Bakhtiyar most persuasively demonstrate how a minority, animated by a violent totalitarian ideology, and well-armed, could bend to its will and its power the large Hindu majority, even to the extent of a total obliteration. Unfortunately the Kshatriya caste had apparently lost its military efficacy after the long period of peace before the Muslim hordes came after more than a century of military activity following the death of Muhammad. They were a potent force, motivated by the lust for

violence and conquest, with a martial revelation advocating the transformation of the world by the ceaseless pursuit of war until the fullest realization of the *Dar-ul-Islam.* The Muslims came, not to share a civilization for they did not have one. They came with the sword, with the relish for aggression and with nothing else but with the will to enforce obedience and submission to the violent ideology devised by the Prophet, in obedience to Allah. Without bringing into the Indian sub-continent any cultural beneficence, but they had already mastered the art of writing the story foretold by Allah by the use of the sword.

The definition of Islam underlying this essay. It is so unfortunate that, in the XX century, the Hindu leaders in all the political parties have not taken notice of Montesquieu's accurate perception of the reality of Islam: *It is a misfortune to human nature when religion is given by a conqueror. The Mahometan religion, which speaks only with the sword, acts still upon Man with that spirit with which it was founded.*[14] There is nothing in the politics of the Congress Party, since its inception in 1885, throughout the turmoil of the first half of the XX century, which indicates that such leaders as Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru and all those eminent associates of theirs, ever said or acted in a manner which would have reflected the sagacity of Montesquieu (1689-1755) in saying in so few words a precise definition of what Islam is. It is with his perceptive definition of Islam that this essay proceeds to examine, as an invitation for further study of what the future holds for the durable presence of Islam within a Harbi environment empowered by a Kaffir majority. It takes special notice of the Muslim citizen's overriding perception, since Independence in 1947, of the fateful relationship having arisen between Islam, essentially endowed with divine sanction for violence and conquest, and the indigenous communities guided by the principles of the Dharmas, which stimulate *universalist* brotherhood and mystical finalities realizable on earth, in the body, as private, *individual* experience.

The durable violence of Islam and the misfortune of

[1414] Montesqieu, *The Spirit of the Laws,* Book 24, Ch. 4

India. Sadness is overwhelmed when one surveys the long period during which the relentless blows were inflicted by the Muslims, despite many examples of heroic defences by the native forces. It is difficult today to imagine that Ghaznavid Mahmud could make seventeen inroads into India without any native force challenging or stopping him. It is depressing to imagine that he could cut through the sub-continent all the way to Varanasi where he took a big loot and returned to his native Afghanistan in safety and earn honour and reward from the Caliph in recognition of his feats of demonstrating Islamic superiority over the non-Believing Kaffirs. How could he return with all that loot at the speed of bullock carts or of camels or elephants bearing loads of treasure, without anyone molesting or frustrating him? Later, as Charles Allen so brilliantly describes it, Sultan Muhammad of Ghor, followed by Sultan Qutb-ud-din and the general Muhammad Bakhtiyar could just walk over, without any provocation, and destroy temples, centres of learning, burn libraries. Indeed how could Muhammad Bakhtiyar so coldly, without any resistance, massacre thousands of defenceless monks devoted to the acquisition of high learning, extinguish with genocidal rigour the pacifist and beautiful spirituality of Buddhism? Later still we learn that Warren Hastings experienced great difficulty to wean the Bengali Pundits to coach Charles Wilkins in his translation of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, at the rate of one rupee a day! Terror had been effective in driving into silence and obscurity the native Brāhmaṇa community. Today Indian Muslims take pride in all these feats accomplished by their forbears and delight in reminding the Hindus how the Islamic powers lorded the Allah-instilled power over them as weak indifferent Kafirs!

The source of Muslim violent intolerance. Recalling these incidents and events confirm the long period of undiminished violence which would have driven the Brāhmaṇa elites underground. Fear and prudence would have suppressed any incentive to protest and call for armed protection. It was an environment which could not produce a Viśvamitra going to ask a Daśaratha to send Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to rid the land of the plague afflicting the forest seekers dedicated to high knowing.

The devastations, which the Muslims deemed necessary for them to give vitality to their identity, stem from the simple statement of the first commandment of Moses declaring that Jehovah had appeared in person to give him the tablet on which He had inscribed what the Jews had to believe. The concept of Jehovah being the only God became the source of all the religious intolerances which have racked Humanity with its fanatics implementing its mortiferous hatred of whatever is different from the commandments. The destruction of Indian Buddhism - and of the other cultures which have disappeared, like the Incas and the Aztecs, for example - are distant tragedies which have their satanic causes and justifications rooted in the Mosaic proclamation of Jehovah being the Only God. Muhammad further steeled the Jewish concept which, enshrined in the Book of Genesis, will remain as the permanent reason for the elimination of the Other, damned merely for being Other. In India the instrument of the activation of the killing curse, as the legacy of Jehovah, has not been used by the Indian Christian. It was used as sufficient reason for the implementation of the genocide of the Indian Buddhists by the Muslims as believers obeying the injunctions of Jehovah, the Only God of Moses, Al Lah (The God) of Muhammad. It bewilders the mind that the Rabbinate would not have been moved to question the justification of the concept of Jehovah as the distant cause of the Holocaust. Nor has there been, on the part of the theologians pertaining to all the Christian denominations, any reflection of the causality linking Christian belief with the practice of slavery, of the violences of colonialisms and of the conquests of weaker nations. Still less has any Indian Muslim felt any curiosity to explain the enormous irrationality of all the devastations on which they stake their collective pride.

The call for the necessary rehabilitation of Indian Buddhism. It is perhaps this stupendous leaden sheet of Islamic oppression which would have suffocated all desires of condemnation or criticism of such a lasting oppressiveness

maintained by the force of the sword. 15 Yet, despite the dominance of the harsh intolerance of the Islamic preponderance, the traditional philosophers continued, in silence, to produce seminal treatises, for the further elevation of Brahmanist thought and metaphysical elevation, in a quiet defiance of the alien hegemony. That the Muslim hordes could so freely wield the sword of Islam over the land can be understood by remembering that at that time, indeed during those dark centuries, India was a civilisation where the Cakravartin did not lose sight of the pre-eminence of moral values riding the prestige of overlordship. India was not a nation, determined by a unifying continental authority and commanding an army on a scale like Emperor Aśoka's which he used to promote the moral radiance of Buddhism in the regions of his vast empire. That is the reason, in the XXI century, for the rehabilitation of Buddhism which, nurtured in the forest, indicated a mode of living with knowledge and compassion, as the foundation of salvation for all sentient beings. There is nothing in Islam, not even in the whole range of Sufism, comparable to this hallowed promise of Buddhism. It is certainly worthy of remembrance, that the long lasting culture of the forest dwellers and its transmission of mystical self-enlightenment as the essence of living, epitomized the value which, far above kingship, exalts the supreme attainment in earthly existence. Gautama Buddha is the noblest product of the spiritual culture of the forest-dwellers. He is the foremost exemplar of a way of life with its reason being the mystical self-fulfillment of the individual, as the certitude of universal salvation. The revival of Gautama Buddha's legacy would restore the fullness of the Indian spirituality together with the restoration of the integrity of the sub-continental ontological Oneness as the unique contribution to a moral universal

---

[15] One can understand the collective silence enforced upon the native Indians living under the intolerant Islamic rule by the observation of the silence of the vast Chinese population controlled by a small bureaucracy in charge of a large, well equipped army which has acquired the experience of war during the 1930s and 1940s.

peacefulness. Elevated with the restoration of the *Madhyama Pratipad* India will, with her wholeness, represent to the world the unique concept of the ONE as the assurance of making real her ennobling all Humanity as *vasudhaikam kutumbakam* (the world as a family).

It is immensely ironic that Buddhism could have crossed the borders of the vast sub-continent to enrich the different cultures of Asia, while in the land of its birth it had to disappear under the blows of an intolerance which had its origin in the sands of Arabia. With the completion of the integrity of what India once was, that is, with the recovery of her Buddhism, a unique universalist mode of Being, the promise of the World as a Family represents the ultimate combination of Beauty, Goodness, Truth in comparison of the frightening prospect of a violent, intolerant *Dar-ul-Islam.*

Meanwhile wisdom invites the belief that transcendence designated with the imagery of Heaven is a fiction as an aid for the conduct the good life with fear of the wrath of God. Gautama Buddha, the ideal representative of the culture of forest-dwelling, gently, with unlimited compassion, freed his disciples from the error of believing in a concrete man living in the unlit space of Heaven and inflicting Mankind with his *Taqdīr*. Buddha went so far as to teach that the mere thought of God is an impediment to the progress of following the Eight-fold path to the attainment of *nirvāṇa*. This supreme spirituality, this unique way to be fully human as a '*nirvanized'* individual, calls for its rehabilitation from the *tamas* of Islamic materialism praised as its Final Day occurring on the Greek Calends.

The ease of the Western Powers to misuse their material power. It is possible to understand the ease with which the Muslims rushed to write a history of India with the use of the sword. In a different set-up, with the use of different instruments, small groups of Europeans, sailing with the protection of gunboats and well equipped with superior military hardware, could travel to distant China and there burn the imperial capital. In addition the small bands of Western marauders could, with the use of musket and gunboat, control all

the commercial activities of China. It was a time when, military superiority could enable small armies to submit to the dictates of the conquerors. China suffered the violence of the greed of the Christian powers in spite of its being a unified country with a well-established central authority. India and China, both highly developed civilizations spread over immense territories, could fall victims to small numerical minorities which were unfortunately militarily well equipped. In fact all military victories and conquests have been won by the use of military instruments more effective than those of the defeated opponents.

India acquired a unity only late, towards the end of the XIX century and fully as a unified nation in the XX century, due to the organizing power of the Mahatma Gandhi led Congress Party. To-day, despite the Muslim Kaum and its exclusivist politics, a Muhammad Bakhtiyar would have no free space to relate to a subdued mass with the language of the sword. What is significant is that today, after a thousand years of co-habitation, the Muslim Kaum has nothing cultural, or anything cognate else, to contribute to the welfare and the enrichment of the India shorn of its Buddhism.

India will have to be alone in the reconstruction of her Buddhism. It stands to reason that India must not delude herself by contemplating any prospect of the redemption of the destruction of her Buddhism by the Muslim Kaum contributing to such an undertaking. For that would imply their acknowledgement of the genocide which they achieved in the name of their God. Any Muslim cooperation in the revival of Indian Buddhism would require the Believers, against the testimony of fourteen centuries of their violent totalitarianism, to yield to the recognition of god-less Buddhism as a genuine religion or spirituality providing moral and mystical precepts diametrically opposite to the belief that the Quran was dictated, word for word, by Allah Himself. It is inconceivable that any Mullah or Imam would consent to an admission of Islam being equivalent to a godless religion however impressive has its beneficence been for more than twenty-one centuries.

The meaning of India receives its authentic understanding

when the history of the sub-continent is viewed in a global perspective. Only then can the catastrophic convulsion of Partition be understood as one moment in the long continuation of the Muslim tradition having always been a manner of speaking with the demeaned Kaffir Idol-Worshipper, with the Mussalman's sword always striking with the innocent sentiment of his blood-shedding submission to the revelations of God. The womb which gave birth to this history of catastrophes remains fertile, despite the superficial civilities, especially in their expression with the use of the English language. It will remain fertile for a long, long time. And it will require the dis-Believer Kaffir Brahmanist to cultivate the art of seeing through the screen of his civil speak the reality of the hostile Islamism of his silence.

The deficient perception of Islam by the Hindu. The question is: what is the right perception of the Muslim who believes that the Quran contains every word spelled out by God and transmitted word for word by Gabriel to Muhammad, that it is a perfect revelation, that it is the only Truth spoken by the Only God, that its Truth will remain eternally valid, that it is legitimate and moral to be permanently hostile to the Disbeliever. Why do Brahmanists or Hindus persist in relating to Islam as a religion despite the prodigious evidence of its being, since its very inception, a political totalitarian ideology of conquest, in which all Muslims take unqualified pride? Why, even after Partition and its horrors, as the realization of the separation willed by the educated, anglicized Muslim middle class, do Hindus seek refuge in a voluntary Dhimmitude which they flaunt as their traditional tolerance? And what tolerance can there be in the reliance on the falsehood of *sarva dharma sama bhāva*, particularly when no Muslim manifests the least reciprocity by subscribing to the meaning and the intention adduced to it? Islam was never a "dharma". Why, after the centuries of Islam writing the pages of its Indian history with the sword, no Hindu intellectual would have considered the perception of Muhammad as a Conqueror initiating religion which speaks with the sword, as Montesquieu, in the first half of the XVIII century, so accurately expressed in two sentences? It

baffles the mind that even during the catastrophic year of the Partition mayhem such leaders as the Mahatma, Nehru, Patel, would not have asked, for explanations from Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, the simple question: "Why do your co-Believers hate us so much?" when the partition was a demand made, not by the Mullahs, but by anglicized, educated Middle class Muslims? Why during his long talks, in September 1946, Mahatma Gandhi could not assess the depth of the hatred of the Hindu which Jinnah was so clearly exposing to him? Was it his saintly mind which prompted the Mahatma, after the horror of Partition, to wish to walk to Pakistan with the extraordinary hope of reconnecting with the Muslims? And why do Hindus not look at a world map where so many Buddhisms, where there was no Vedānta, have been replaced by Islam which has not given anything to all its replacements? Does it not behoove the Hindu to ask the Muslim Kaum what *original* cultural contribution has it made to Indian civilization?

Two western views of Islam. Further western perceptions of Islam may be relevant in illustrating the inadequacy of Indian perception of the reality of Islam. Here are two examples of distinguished, scholarly Europeans expressing what they see in Islam:

The transition from a modernity, which exalts the freedom of critical examination, to a post-modernity qualified by the predominant concern for equality, determines the perception which we now have of the world of Islam.

If we endorse the ideal of free investigation, we find that there is an abundance of reasons to criticize Islam. This is a religion which does not seem to be in the least ready to submit to analogous exigencies its own perception of its origins. On the other hand, for their part, even if it be a self-evident matter of fact, Judaism and Christianity have yielded to their sources, their leading characters, their texts being subjected to a sometimes devastating historical and critical approach: in reference, concerning the Jewish world, to calling into question the historicity of the time spent in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the very person of Moses, nothing similar has occurred in Islam. Yet radical questions are being raised about its origins,

whether in relation to the development of the Quran or to the life of the prophet. But the Muslim world avoids it by deliberately stressing the belief in a Quran which was dictated word for word by God Himself. Moreover it is a fact that the freedom of conscience is not prized in the Muslim countries.

Prior to the advent of post-modernity, to refer critically to Islam did not seem to be detrimental to the ideal of equality. On the contrary, to deprecate a doctrine for being hostile to the ideals of the Enlightenment was in reality a more general denigration of all the forms of obscurantism. The purpose was to help the victims of this obscurantism to free themselves of it, and consequently to contribute to the construction of an egalitarian citizenship; it did not imply the belief in the equality of all religions. It even seemed beneficial to criticize those particularly obscurantist religions, if only for the purpose of calling upon their faithful followers to transform them. It is in this perspective that Montesquieu could write: [16]

"The Christian religion is a stranger to mere despotic power. The mildness so frequently recommended in the Gospel is incompatible with the despotic rage with which a prince punishes his subjects and exercises himself with cruelty.

"As this religion forbids the plurality of wives, its princes are less confined, less concealed from their subjects, and consequently have more humanity: they are more disposed to be directed by laws, and more capable of perceiving that they cannot do whatever they please.

"While the Mahometan princes incessantly give or receive death, the religion of the Christian renders their princes less timid, and consequently less cruel. The prince confides in his subjects, and the subjects in the prince. ……"

And, in the context of the on-going history of India, will ever someone in India have the sagacity and the courage to emulate Montesquieu saying?

---

[16] Philippe D'Iribarne, *Islamophobie : Intoxication idéologique*, pp. 129-131

"From the characters of the Christian and Mahometan religions, we ought, without any further examination, to embrace the one and reject the other: for it is much easier to prove that religion ought to humanize the manners of men than that any particular religion is true."[17]

Further commenting on Islam, Philippe d'Iribarne provides this statement by Claude Lévi-Strauss:

In comparison with the universal benevolence of Buddhism and with the Christian desire for dialogue, the Muslim intolerance unconsciously assumes a form which they readily adopt. For, if they do not always, with brutality, try to win the Other to adopt their truth, they are nevertheless – and this is more serious – incapable of bearing the existence of the Other as Other. The only means open to them to feel secure from doubt and humiliation consists of their reduction, to "nothingness", of the Other who is considered to be a witness to another faith and to a different upbringing.

The strange Stockholm Syndrome of the Hindu intelligentsia. After perusing the contents of the preceding paragraphs, it is reasonable to ask: what kind of God was pleased by the savagery of those Sultans referred to above, with their genocidal obliteration of the pacifist, compassionate humanity of Buddhism, which had adorned the Bharat Land with a culture enhanced with an elevated literature illustrated with soul-delighting art monuments? And how could the perverse strangeness of the popular belief of Vedānta having absorbed Buddhism be chanted as a triumph of Hinduism, when in fact it is a humiliating abjection hymned, by generations of Hindus, as a Scottish Syndrome to hide the triumph of a barbaric vandalism and the loss of a great, beneficent segment of Indian civilization? It is a reason to wonder why and how could such an aberrant reversal of history have become homogeneous with the daily routine of the Hindu's belief and preoccupation? It reads like those educated members of the French aristocracy and upper class, on the right wing of French politics, who welcomed and

[17] Montesquieu, Book 24, Chs, 3-4

applauded the defeat of France in June 1940: they praised the victorious Germans for their having dealt a deadly blow to the potency of the Leftist ideologies to which they attributed the decadence which had weakened the authentic, valorous French State. In India the reversal of History is simply a mind-boggling surrender to a victor who is ethnologically, religiously, different as light is from darken. It is worse, more drastic than the cultural shift resulting from the defeat of France by Nazi Germany in 1940. The members of the higher echelons of French society who welcomed the German victory in 1940 shared a common civilization and culture, a common religion and mode of thinking having their inspiration and substance from common sources in the antiquity of the Greek and Roman civilisations. But in India the Hindus have asserted their Stockholm Syndrome in favour of an entirely *different* conquering race endowed with a world vision, and a mode of living with values and merits, which were, and still are, diametrically hostile for being entirely *alien* in regard to the extant native civilization. The Indian Stockholm Syndrome is all the more incomprehensible due to the entire nation having accepted the amputation of the Indian Buddhism with the unfounded belief that it has been integrated and dissolved into the present body politic incorporating the majority Hindu community. Nor has the unbroken history of the Jaina Dharma and the preservation of its ethos and of the vitality of its influence entertained a questioning of the cause of the disappearance of the Buddhist *modus vivendi* occurring *suddenly* after a history of its having flourished during more than seventeen centuries. And why has Hindu intelligentsia not asked itself why it has not observed the cognate sudden disappearance of the Buddhisms of Indonesia, of Afghanistan, of Central Asia, of Den Huang and their replacements by Islam? All these disappearances bring to the mind the direct, exclusive influence of intolerant Islam as their common cause. In India too the intolerant, iconoclastic hegemony of Islam coincided with the sudden disappearance of the Indian Buddhism. The reality consists of the fact that Islamic hegemony presided over India suffering the disappearance of the Original Buddhism after it had been in a vibrant existence during so many centuries characterized by the still standing public art bearing testimony to

its past splendor. That the Hindu intellectual and moral elites would have deemed it reasonable to attribute, to the iconoclastic genocide of the Bauddha Dharma, the causality of the Sanātana Dharma having absorbed it, is a cultural perversity of monumental proportion unique in world history.

The imperative to make the Indian civilization whole. Reflection on the predicament of present Independent India needs to dwell resolutely on the preservation of the sterling tolerance which is inherent in the essence of the three Dharmas. Concurrently there must not be any hope for an abatement of the love which the Muslim bears for violence, which is co-essential with the substance of Islam. No Muslim has ever expressed any regret, any sentiment of pain, in regard to the genocides which his brethren have inflicted upon so many cultures. The Muslim does not feel the hurt or the harm which he consciously inflicts on the non-Believer. He is so assured of being always right, for the fact of being a proxy of Allah to whose revelation he voluntarily submits. On the contrary the Muslim, in particular, the Indian Muslim resents being confronted with the past ravages which distinguish his history in India. He expresses pain by adopting the attitude of a sufferer when he is confronted by the Kaffir recalling the iconoclastic nature of his hegemony. He obtains justification for the violent treatment of Indian Kaffir culture by Hindus themselves who, while studiously refraining from acknowledging the dark chapters of their own history, would, out of a mongrelized tolerance, appeal for abstention of references to the enormities of the devastations wrought upon their own civilisation as submission to Allah's decrees. This false tolerance, coupled with the total ignorance of Islam as an intolerant totalitarian ideology was expressed by a senior member of the Bharatiya Janta Party who denounced Prime Minister Modi's speech of the occasion of the inauguration of the rehabilitation of the Vishvanath Temple at Varanasi, on 22 December 2021, as "an event which has raised questions of propriety in a secular democracy". He referred to the extraordinary feat of the partial reconstruction of the indigenous culture carried, at Kashi, as a partial restoration of the glory of Indian culture, which alienated members of the opposition

consider "as a violation of the fine line of democratic behavior". Prime Minister Modi's words reveal to what extent the Hindu political elite can be ignorant of the religious facts obtaining in the country for which they are supposed to stand on guard. One such a prominent Hindu writes: "Nobody taught me to be secular but I was secular naturally and, therefore, had no difficulty in treating the followers of all faiths equally. I was and continue to be a devout Hindu." He rails against the repair work and beautifying such places as Ayodhya, Kedarnath, Badrinath as lacking of political propriety.[18] One is dumbfounded that a senior Hindu politician would object with such vehemence to the repair work timidly accomplished by the Modi Government. With all his high education, his political experience, that he would so blatantly write to the English speaking public that he sees all religions to be equal, is utterly incomprehensible.

The Hindu's ignorance of the religions of the Others. Or it helps to understand the Hindu's monumental ignorance of the essential differences, in doctrine and in history, of the religions practiced in India, in particular of Islam which claims, with the authority of Allah's pronouncements that no religion, not even the Jewish and the Christian, is equal to Islam. Likewise the Christian believes that his faith is God-centric, on account of the Word becoming Flesh in Jesus: on this theological dogma the faithful Christian does legitimately consider that only the Christian faith can offer salvation. Judaism remains incomplete because of the Jews still waiting for the coming of the Messiah. That a senior minister in a national government would write his believing in the equality of all religions is an invitation to discouragement, to despair! The minister in question helps to understand the ignorance which determines the will to see all religions as equal, when they are not. Indeed they have never been equal. Above all, it sheds light on the monstrosity of the genocide of the Indian Buddhism and on the Hindu's forgetting

[18] Yashwant Sinha, former minister in the A. B. Vajpayee Government, disgruntled, and turned antagonistic towards his political home, for not being a part in the Government of Narendra Modi, in an article in *The Indian Express* of 23 December 2021.

that it was deliberately carried out by Muslim iconoclasts. And, most painfully, it unveils the perversity of the Hindu claiming the Buddhist genocide as the paramount metaphysical triumph of his Dharma.

Iconoclasm as a sacred duty. There can be no possibility of a dialogue with the Muslim in relation to his religiosity. For the Muslim, iconoclasm is a sacred duty, it is carried out as the fulfillment of Allah's wish for a perfect *Dar-ul-Islam*. In reality submission to the word of Allah justifies the Muslim's compulsion to seek his identity by countervailing the Indians from reclaiming the integrality of their civilization. Nevertheless the task and the duty of the Dharma-centred India must be affirmed with the virility of maintaining the tolerance together with the dispassionate telling the truth of the Muslim's persistent hostility by having its source and reason to be in the Quran, in the Hadiths and in the Sirah of Muhammad. Any moral and social beneficence that can come out of the proposition *sarva dharma-sama-bhāva,* must come from fundamentalist Theologians unchallenged by any Mullah or by any independent scholar in Islamic jurisprudence. Till then it would be desirable for the central government to consider, as a desirable norm, the example of the Emperor Aśoka who strove for peace according to the teachings of Gautama Buddha, while keeping his army in a fighting condition. In the present state of political rivalries, the Brahmanist majority must not apologize for being a natural, historic majority and its reconstruction must not be engaged with the approval or disapproval of the Muslim apology of a minority.

The appeal for the reconstruction of Indian Buddhism. Hence this essay has, as its *raison d'être,* the realisation of the completion of the Indian civilization by the fullest reconstruction of its Buddhism and the restoration of its splendor. Such an achievement would be the demonstration of India being capable of being what she was before the monument-breaker and library-burning Muslim horde, animated with the lust for aggressiveness, invaded the sub-continent as a giant step for the transformation of the world into the *Dar-ul-*

Islam as desired by Allah. The restoration of Indian Buddhism would be a boon for all Humanity in undoing a senseless genocide before the eyes of the world. By so doing India shall bring home to the Indian Muslims, and consequently to all men and women, the reality of Islam as a mortiferous political ideology, a lot more than what its fringe of Sufi mysticism would assert as its spirituality. Above all the rebuilding of Indian Buddhism will show the world that the paradox of the reality of Islam claiming to be the perfect religion is, at best, in spite of whatever it may have contributed to the welfare of Humanity, only a piece of Arab poetic license.

The agents of the reconstruction of the Indian Buddhism. It is assumed in this essay that the tools and resources for the revival of the Indian Buddhism are available in the Departments of Philosophy, of History, of Political Science, in addition to the still living remnants of small pockets of Buddhism in India and in Bangladesh. The presence of the Tibetan scholars would provide a body of Mahāyāna learning which could revive the metaphysics of Nāgārjuna on a par with the magnificent Vedānta of Śaṅkara. As the nonpareil land of Metaphysics, India is still capable to manifest the reappearance of her Buddhism with the summit which once was, together with the peaks of the philosophical Himalaya, India, before the Islamic vandals descended on the vast Gangetic plain, to kill and break and burn. Let it be known that whatever the Muslims can muster with appeals of praise for the contribution of the few Mughal kings, these do not compensate for what India lost due to the quintessential destructiveness characteristic of Islam from its very beginning in Medina. The Taj Mahal, for example, a homage to erotic love and to death, does not compensate the loss of one of the three libraries of Nalanda. It is in reference to Knowledge as central to individual life as well as to the totality of Indian civilization that a fair comparison must be made in comparison of values and merits related to India. For the completion of its humane beneficence, the world expects India to bring back her Buddhism with the sole merit of its holding as its world-vision the certitude of universal salvation.

The obligatory need of Buddha images. Let there be statues of Gautama Buddha all over the country. Let the statues representing the four fundamental *mudras* decorate the major public places for everyone, Buddhists and non-Buddhists, to recognize the saga that once there was a noble part of India which, resurrected, can still move the mind and the heart of those who would find joy in the quiet elevation of the soul in a world wearied and nearly lost by the hegemony of western materialisms. The signs of Buddhist metaphysical grandeur will establish in the land, where the reality of the ONE is the supreme Idea, an elevated pacifism for the joyfulness of all Humanity. For, did not the Mahatma expose his dream of a free India being able to sacrifice herself for the good of all Humanity? Only he forgot to add the footnote of the necessity of a restoration of the Indian Buddhism. Indeed, more than any other religion, it is the godless spirituality of Buddhism which, with the ontological centrality of its Middle Way (*Madhyama Pratipad*) stored in the *individual's* heart and mind, best represents the secularity represented by the 1950 Constitution. And, above all, let there be the dissemination of the taste for the ineffable enjoyment of contemplating the enchanting metaphysics of Nāgārjuna and the host of superlative exponents of the Mahāyāna!

The mystery of the collective Stockholm Syndrome. The question which calls for being asked is: How did this falsehood arise that it is Vedānta, or Hinduism, which has "absorbed" Buddhism? How could the destruction of Buddhism, by an unprovoked, gratuitous iconoclasm, have been endorsed by the Hindu majority as its own triumph when *the facts are recorded by the Muslim ruling elites themselves as their faithful observation of the revealed decrees*? How could the soul elevating art works of Buddhism - of Sanchi, of Barhut, of Sarnath, of Ajanta - stop reminding the Brahmanist community of such an enormous void in the culture of India? By what kind of fate, or willful interiorizing of a wound and simultaneously dispelling it from the collective memory, have the Hindus lived during the past millennium without feeling the sadness of the absence of the Noble Doctrine, the *non pareil* original culture

which Gautama Buddha initiated within the Vedic civilisation? Why is there no standard publication on the withering of the Bengal Buddhism and its replacement by an Islam which asserted itself with the murderous slaughter of Hindus as the Islamic means to create an inimical Islam on the eastern part of the sub-continent? How could the Bhadra Lok elites have contemplated with infinite dispassion the loss of such a noble, beautiful, supremely beneficent way of life? What is the explanation of the mammoth Stockholm Syndrome, unique in world history, assumed by the majority Brahmanist community attributing to itself the destruction of Buddhism effectively carried out by the Sultans and their murderous Generals and armies? Can this Stockholm Syndrome be explained by the coolness of Jawaharlal Nehru flatly, as a banal matter of fact, explaining away the defeat in 1962 as the Chinese having only taken a few square kilometers of rock? Was such a shameful rationalization of national weakness an indication, a right, revealing measure, for understanding the Stockholm Syndrome in relation to the loss of Buddhism?

During the years I spent studying Philosophy at the Banaras Hindu University, and later served as a Senior Research Fellow, I never heard any of the distinguished professors mention the loss of Buddhism. There was no significant literature produced in relation to the disappearance of Indian Buddhism when the National Government celebrated the 2500th year birth anniversary of Buddhism, with the publication, for the occasion, of a book of essays written by eminent Buddhist scholars. But there was no exploration, no mention, of the cause of the absence of Buddhism as one of the vital components of the Indian civilization.

The appeal. With passionate feeling and humility accompanying, let this book be viewed as an appeal for the urgent revival of the Indian Buddhism as the restoration of a great philosophy and a significantly heightened way of living as the reparation for the forgetfulness which has been so deeply ensconced in the national consciousness as a glorification of Muslim iconoclasm. The evidence is forcefully brought forth in the public indifference to anything associated with the mode of

living prescribed by Gautama Buddha. In a disconcerting contrast Buddhism is eminently present in the consciousness of the people all over Asia. It is a shame that venerable allusions to Buddhism are made by distinguished Japanese film directors like Kon Ichikawa, Kenzi Mizoguchi, Akira Kurosawa. But Buddhism has never been given any space in the history of Indian cinema.[19] It is such a cultural irony that practically no one seems to be aware of the absurd fact of a Muslim country having emerged at the extreme eastern part of the country, when Islam has swept the entire western section of the sub-continent when Afghanistan and beyond were Buddhist.

Incidental questions related to the collective Stockholm Syndrome. There are other cognate questions subsidiary to the Stockholm Syndrome. Where were the Gandhians when Tamil Nadu supported the terror campaign of the LTTE against the peaceful Sri Lankan Buddhists? Why did Tamil Nadu not help the LTTE to mount a Gandhian campaign in favour of their cause? How could India have contemplated the Buddhists of Sri Lanka being forced to use fire power against a Hindu minority? What did Tamil Nadu really gain by darkening the Indian ethos of peace with forcing Sri Lanka to using a military, after twenty-five years of LTTE terror, as the solution of a simple social problem of which Singapore already had produced the working model of a *modus vivendi* with the official use of the three languages of English, Chinese and Tamil? By what moral quirk did the Indian national government supplicate the Americans to restrain the Pakistani terror campaign against the country, at the very time when Tamil Nadu, like a soft Pakistan, was openly helping the terrorism of the LTTE to the extent of its murdering an Indian Prime Minister? Whatever may be the excuses the precedents will remain as dark chapters in Indian history that a certain emotional dryness did silently plunge roots in the psyche of the Brahmanist legendary tolerance and drained its traditional virility, the virility which Mahatma Gandhi could, and did,

---

[19] The third rate Bollywood film *Amrapalli* is all about a dancer falling in love with the King against the background of Buddha and the company of monks moving among sets built on the ground of the film centre.

direct against the might of the British Empire. That tolerance got corrupted into the Stockholm Syndrome. When the Bihar Chief Minister, Nitish Kumar, publicly boasted that he would restore the Nalanda Centre of Buddhist Studies to its former glory, he held himself from telling the ignorant public why and how Nalanda got obliterated, all the more cowardly as he could have prudently, for electoral reasons, protected himself, by referring to the already published book *Aśoka* of Charles Allen.

Let this book be an appeal to the Brahmanist community to be proud, for what it has achieved during the last century, for the Independence of the country and for the restoration of the people's pride in the consciousness of a ten thousand continuity of the Indian civilisation. Still it behooves the present generation to enhance the consciousness of a legitimate pride with the completion of the India with the restoration of its purest, noblest, most peaceful gift to Humanity that Buddhism is, with the evidence of its avatars active all over Asia for the edification of the hundreds of millions. It deserves to have it revived in order to embellish the land of many *tīrthas* with more Sanchis, Barhuts, Sarnaths. For this rebuilding the central government must take the lead, together with the Departments of Philosophy in the Universities and with the further development of Nalanda.

It would be a sign of the Buddhist restoration if every major city were adorned with status of the Smiling Buddha in the four fundamental mudras, especially the Abhaya Mudra indicating that the individual who knows the Dharma lives without any fear in the mind or in the heart.

CHAPTER TWO

Brahmanism in Comparison with the Revealed faiths

How can you answer a man who tells you that he would rather obey god than men, and who is therefore sure to deserve heaven in cutting your throat?

Voltaire [1]

The absurd burden of the Muslim minority. In India the presence of an active "minority" calls to the mind the Parsis and their praiseworthy contribution to the prosperity of India and her people. Further the word 'minority' evokes the realities of the Santals, the Nagas, the Gurkhas, and those tribes still holding and preserving their identity in the north-eastern regions of the country. Moreover, in relation to the compulsions of electoral politics, the government finds itself handicapped with the obligation to represent as many voting constituencies as possible, sometimes to the detriment of the necessity of providing efficient and beneficial rule of the entire nation. In the midst of this heap of hurdles residing in the wills of the many minorities, India is a nation, without being a people. She is a nation with the endowments of a common constitutional law, an army, a foreign policy, a judicial system, a common taxation, a post office, a common road and railway network, a flag. But India is not a

---

[1] Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary,* Tr. By Theodore Besterman, Penguin Books, 1972; p. 203

people. The use of the regional languages and dialects, the differences in dress, in gastronomic tastes, the prevalence of the caste distinctions, the antagonisms of the political parties and of the linguistic regions, do not foster a feeling of togetherness, a feeling of solidary in belonging to a unitive State.

The authentic India is neither a nation nor a people. She is more, for she transcends the limitations of nationhood and her being constricted as the possession of a fragmented people. She is a civilization, and it is as a civilization that she can be authentically what she was, what she can be, and must be, for the sake of the good of all humanity. For India alone can provide the call of a mystical perfection in a world freed from the *asurika* preponderance of Matter in its avatars as technology, profit and the violence of power. It is the India of the Vedas, of the Upaniṣads, the Purāṇas, the Dharmas, the Metaphysics of the Darśanas, the literatures, the languages, the spiritualities and, above all, of mystical knowledge as the be-all and end-all of life, as the finality of individual human existence as the perennial certitude of universal salvation.

It is with this definition that this essay proposes to study the fundamental roles which the different dualistic, revealed religions play, and will play, in a world riddled with conflicts which have their source mainly in the spirit and content of the revealed faiths. The emphasis shall be on a study of the main scriptures of Islam in order to understand the specificity of the politics of the Indian Islam. This essay makes the humble claim of providing an example of a Brahmanist view of Islam based on an examination of the essential literature of Islam, in authoritative translations in mainly English and French sources. It is undertaken with the hope that it may provoke further and more pertinent Brahmanist studies of the fundamental texts of Islam in view of a better understanding of the future of India handicapped with the gratuitous claim of the Indian Islam insisting on its being a minority.

The potentiality of the Indian Muslim's exclusiveness. In the midst of this national unity and of a popular plurality of the Indian polity, the Muslim

minority acts as a promise of, or a waiting for a second Partition. In the meantime with the benefit of the legally authorized and maintained Sharia, the Muslim minority acts as a soft Pakistan to the same measure as Tamil Nadu with its exclusivist democratic politics. In the midst of a largely Brahmanist Republic, the Indian Muslims actively project themselves as a minority signifying a weakness to which political privileges are due, under the dispensation provided by the 1950 Constitution. They do actually succeed to assert the right to minority privileges in spite of the monumental evidence of the existence of both Pakistan and Bangladesh being the products of the Muslim minority acting while being in a much smaller ratio within the former sub-continent. In the present state of the Republic, where the remaining Muslims find themselves living in a more lively cultural environment, decisively more enriching than what the theocracies Pakistan or Bangladesh can provide, the remaining Muslims still project themselves as a weak community entitled to compensating privileges. In reality, the broad view of Indian History compels the perception of the misfortunes which have struck the civilization of the sub-continent have been perpetrated by the Islamic and British minority powers. The present minority of India does still nurture the confidence of its being a threat to the integrity of the nation and of the Constitution. The Friday noon prayer in a masjid will always provide the opportunity for a repetition of the Direct Action of 15 September 1946.

The irony of the Indian Islam as a minority. The demography of the Indian Islam is larger than the demography of each of the countries which now constitute the European Union. It is larger than that of Russia. It is larger than either the demography of Pakistan or of Bangladesh. Each of these two theocracies is a full-fledged nation, without being a people. Both do not grant equal civic rights to their minorities and consequently, despite their claims, are not genuine democracies. The markings on a map do not have corresponding frontiers in the minds of the Indian Muslims who, before Partition, constituted the single exclusive Kaum with its lumpen proletariat following the will of the educated class and endorsed the historic separateness of violent Indian Islam. Misled apparently by the

vacuity of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva*, fostered by the generosity of the Congress Party for nearly sixty years, the Brahmanist community does not seem to grasp the fact that the Indian Muslim feels inferior to either the Bangladeshi or the Pakistani, who are ruled by Muslims, while he finds himself trapped in a country ruled by Kaffirs. It is a *different* feeling of inferiority, compared to their feeling of *inferiority* in reference to the Arab countries *not giving them either refuge or equal citizenship*.

Compared to the independent minorities functioning on their own as Pakistan and Bangladesh, the corrosive absurdity of the Indian Muslim "minority" consists, after having taken part in the mayhem of Partition, of its claiming an inadequacy which requires compensation, on a par with the other minorities which have indeed suffered economic and cultural deprivations during the centuries of the Muslim and British hegemonies. The Indian Muslims did not manifest any live solidarity with India when their former co-Believers waged three wars and a persistent campaign of terror against India during most of the time since Partition. They staged communal riots during the time of the Congress rule, but never a popular demonstration against Pakistani belligerency, or the quiet return of Bangladeshi Muslims to India. Victimizing India is still a Quran-sanctioned virtue.

The Indian Kaum compared to Japan. Today the Indian Muslims, after having produced Pakistan and Bangladesh, are demographically more than twice the population of Japan which nurtures a wealthy, culturally advanced people who preserves the dynamic continuity of a three millennium old civilization. Under the protection of a liberal constitution, that a Kaum who produced Pakistan and its continued belligerence since 1947 would have the gall to qualify itself as a minority claiming the right to civic privileges, is in reality maintaining the continuity of the policies of the ravaging sultans, with the willing fiction of their minority sufferance. After all the desecrations and devastations which the Believers, as a minority, have wreaked in dutiful submission to Allah's decrees, the present predicament of India, burdened with the leaden weight of the humbug of

the Muslim minority still enduring, eight decades after Partition, invites asking: What would it take for the Hindu or the Brahmanist to summon the moral valor to call the Muslim spade a spade, with the virility which sustained an unquestioned and unquestionable tolerance which is still vibrant after several millennia?

The uniqueness of the present state of the coexistence of Dhārmika India with Islam. History and Theology fail to enable the Christians also to come to a permanent peaceful coexistence, for the reasons that they share the same merits and disadvantages. Briefly, both Christianity and Islam are dualities marked by fundamental similarities: Muhammad's *miraj*, the night flight to Heaven where he saw God physically, bears a dramatically enhanced similarity with the resurrection of the body of Jesus ascending to Heaven on the third day after his crucifixion; the Bible as the common source of both dispensations; the lethal legacy of Jehovah who as the Only God is the source of all religious intolerances; the history of wars and conflicts within each of the two religions; and above all, the common centrality of the belief in the Resurrection of the Body on the Final Day of Judgement.

The three Dharmas of India have nothing in common with these features of the revealed religions. Indian Muslims face the fact that India, China and Japan are three pluri-religious civilizations with corresponding cultures which have never clashed with one another. Before the Muslims invaded and sought to communicate only by means of the language of the sword, India already had three indigenous spiritual ways of living and stable minorities of Christians and Jews. The main Dharmas never clashed with one another, not did any of their followers ever evinced any thought or desire for the cleansing of the minorities. In particular the only time when Jewish blood stained the Indian soil, happened on 26 November 2011, when a Muslim commando of Pakistani terrorists killed the Rabbi and his wife in Mumbai. The Killers and the Rabbi family belonged to faiths pertaining to the same Revelation.

The further difference between European and Indian perception of Islam. Interest in the future well-being of India would necessarily require an objective perception of Islam which is essentially a political doctrine dressed with the light cloth of a religiosity of the five obligations: prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, alms giving, *jihad*. The future of the co-existence between the Muslims and the Indians will be fraught with tension due to these three enormous difficulties: (i) the basic Constitutional guarantee of the *equality* of the religions practiced in India having absolutely no foundation in their histories and their doctrines; (ii) the emotional hurdle facing the Muslims having to contend with a Kaffir majority which is unified for the first time as a nation equipped with intellectual and material protections against Muslims ravaging in the name of God; (iii) the neurosis due to the Muslim's believing in the eternal perfection of the Quran and of its being the only Truth and his sharing the same social space where the ruler is a non-Believer.

The immense chasm separating the native Indian from the Muslim neighbor. It always astonishes that, despite a co-existence having lasted more than a millennium, a psychological and cultural chasm still persists, despite appearances, between the indigenous Indians and their 'outsider' Muslim neighbors. The chasm persists unbridged despite the presence and the interaction of responsible elites who have shared the same space, on both sides of the divide, during such a long period, marked more by conflict and misunderstanding, violence and depredation, than by collaboration and lasting mutual enrichment. The qualification of the Muslim as 'outsider' in historical and, particularly, in theological and psychological terms, refers to his religious and socio-political distinctiveness, characterized by his use of the Arabic script in the written expression of Urdu. In truth the Muslim takes delight and finds comfort in the closedness of his consciousness that he owns the words which God has communicated to him, through the medium of the Prophet listening to Gabriel's recitation of the Book. He is happy to live in the cocoon of a revelation which obliges him to believe in its perfection distinguished with eternal purity and validity. With such a belief there cannot ever be a meaningful dialogue,

especially with a follower of any of the Dharmas, which are condemned as errors and deserving of being expurgated, preferably by force. The obstacle which impedes a salutary dialogue lies, to a great extent, in the reality of Truth not residing in a book or in a doctrine, but in the conduct of the individual follower of the doctrine: that is, for it to be Truth it must, of a necessity, be made live in the believer's sitting, in his walking, in his speaking. Therein lies the unsurmountable impediment: the Muslim believes he can, and he does, kill an innocent, virtuous non-Believer, in submission to the Revelation, as the proxy of Allah, [2] with the unadulterated belief that he is acting to God's injunction. Against such an ethos the Brahmanist has absolutely no argument for a winning contention. The Islamic records of the historians and witnesses of countless acts of iconoclasm do not mention a single example of regret or remorse, of second thought or of doubt, ever felt by a witnessing Muslim, either caliph or commoner. Besides it is not the Brahmanist, or any other native Indian, who classify the Muslim as the "Outsider". The adjective expresses the characteristic mentality of the Muslim willingly and proudly claiming the privilege of his life being regulated by the *Taqdīr* of Allah, as the manifestation of His *Rubūbiyat* (Sovereignty).

The specificity of the use of Urdu by the outsider community. As the national language of Pakistan, Urdu is an Indo-European language which was developed in the central region of the old undivided India. The adoption of the Arabic script fostered its popularity due to its exclusive association with the Islamic Faith. Despite some notable exceptions of Hindus distinguishing themselves in the use of the language, Urdu did not establish itself as a secular instrument of inter-communal communication owning a status on a par with the other outsider English language. Neither the indigenous Indian, nor the outsider Muslim, ever experienced any stress of alienation with their having had to use the English language under

[2] Quran 8. 17

duress felt as a subordination to Anglican Christianity. Despite its Arabic script Urdu, specific to India*, represents the most successful example of an alien minority generating its autonomous language as the foundation of its identity, within a multilingual environment where most of the Muslim Urdu speakers and writers do ethnologically belong to the native, largely Brahmanist community*.[3] It is perhaps too early for the emergence of cognate affirmations of identities to emerge among the plurality of Muslim emigrants from Africa, the Middle East and Asia flooding Europe since the end of World War II.

The difference of being Jewish and being Christian. It is true, in the scheme of this essay, that the Jewish and the Christian communities have, during the last two thousand years, preserved their specific ways of feeling and of acting out their outsider attribute, buttressed by the corresponding affinities with the Judeo-Christian communities of the West. The Indian Christians do rightly claim a certain 'uniqueness' for being *original* on account of their history starting from the very first converts due to the proselytizing ministry of Thomas, one of the twelve Apostles of Jesus. Indian Christians take pride in their Christianity having been in existence for more than four centuries before the conversion of Clovis (A.D.465-511) the first Christian King of France. In England the Angles were the first to accept the new faith resulting from the ministry of the first Archbishop of Canterbury, Saint Austin Augustin (d. 604)

Nevertheless, despite the advantage of its early presence in the southern province of the sub-continent, Indian Christianity did not develop a

---

[3] Throughout this essay the word "Brahmanist" is used instead of Hindu as it reflects the authenticity and the historical connotation of its essence designated by the Upaniṣadic *māhāvākyas: sarvam idam khalu brahman, aham brahmo'smi.* The word Brāhmaṇa designates the member of the caste. As a Dharma, Brahmanism in this essay is not a translation, or equivalent of 'Hindutva'.

theology specific to its geography and its surrounding culture. Despite its precedence having lasted close to half a millennium, the Christianity of Kerala became, in the words of British historian Arnold Toynbee, a distant fossilized appendage of the flourishing European Roman Catholicism.

The Indian Christianity signified its inferiority by its ecclesiastical bureaucracy not producing a single Cardinal throughout its long history up to 1947 when India became a unified Independent nation. As the most potent political organization, the Vatican acknowledged free India as a new born power and accordingly elevated Archbishop Fernandez of Bombay to the cardinalate.

The theological infecundity of the Indian Christianity. Indian Christianity has not contributed a single idea to the magnificence of Theological Literature generated by the patristic thinkers of Europe. The borrowing of the orthodox symbols, the imitation of the religious architecture, the adoption of the rituals and of the clerical vestments, have illustrated the tradition of the mimetic influence of European Christianity. The Indian Christians chose to make their history as a subsidiary of the European fellowship.

The non-existence of a Holy Spirit based Indian Christianity. In the midst of the environment persuaded by the mysticisms of Brahmanism, of Buddhism and of Jainism, it is immensely disappointing, that the Indian Christianity could not initiate and bring forth, as a spiritual gift to Humanity, a theology founded on the mystery of the Holy Spirit. Nor did the theologians of the Indian Christianity deemed it important and relevant to develop the fundamental features which are common to both the structure of the Church and the salient features of Hinduism and Buddhism. The concept of the Ecclesia or Church arose on the model of the Buddhist Sangha. Before Gautama Buddha established the Sangha of the monks, at the very start of the Bauddha Dharma, there was no equivalent of an association of believers anywhere in the world. The Nicene Creed was developed four centuries after the appearance of the Trikāya Doctrine which, in Mahāyāna Buddhism, consists of the Dharma

Kāya (Body of the Dharma), Nirmāṇa Kāya (Body of Transformation = Gautama Buddha), Sambhoga Kāya (Body of Bliss = Nirvāṇa). The Sambhoga Kāya would have provided reason and substance for the development of a Theology of the Holy Spirit, a genuine mystical contribution to the history of the Christian faith. The Sambhoga Kāya refers to the individual Buddhist searching for the attainment of the perfect Arhat state. The Nicene Creed limited the Holy Spirit only to Mary being pregnant and giving birth to Jesus. What the Bishops missed at their conclave, at Nicea for establishing the fundamental creed of the Holy Trinity, was their limiting the Holy Spirit, the equivalent of the Sambhoga Kāya, to the belly of Mary, and not in the belly of every living human being. Had they done so, they would have rested the Trinitarian God on a monistic theology based on meditation and contemplation leading to the transubstantiation as an ontological experience for every living soul. But it was preferable to maintain the duality of God-There and Man-Here as the reason and the support of clerical power.

It was indeed a fateful theological pronouncement which deviated the Holy Spirit from the life of the ordinary member of the Ecclesia. It limited the practice of Christian piety to prayer and to a morality conforming to the virtues prescribed by the clerical bureaucracy. It excluded the personal exercise of meditation and contemplation, according to the principles taught by the Yogasūtras of Patañjali which are common to the three indigenous Dharmas.

Additional similarities with Buddhism are the institutionalizing of confession, an original practice in the original Sangha, the important theme of the Immaculate Conception of Gautama pronounced nearly five centuries before the Immaculate Conception of Jesus, the concept of the avatar relate to the God Viṣṇu and the proclamation of the Word becoming Flesh in History as Jesus; the disc at the back of the head of Buddha in the Buddhist iconography copied as the circle of light over the head of the Saint in Christian iconography; the *aham brahmo'smi* of the early

Upaniṣad corresponds to Meister Eckhart pronouncing that the Father begets the Son in him, in a monistic union of the Supreme Deity and Man. With these similarities being fashioned in the first centuries of Christianity, in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire and in the Middle East crisscrossed by Buddhist missionaries, it is remarkable that the Indian Christian theologians would not have seen, and even today do not see, what was so openly visible and widespread around them. The only reason which can explain this closed-mindedness must be due to the legacy of the fateful revelation of Jehovah telling Moses that He is the Only God. It is the mother closure of the mind which has lasted till today, in the three revealed religions and in the intolerant and violent political ideologies as their subsidiary developments.

Indian Buddhist culture as the antithesis of Islam. Hitherto there has been no credible, lasting refutation, within the Judeo-Christian community of intellectuals, of a valid critique of the murderous malevolence lying at the heart of the commandment of Jehovah being the only God. It is the faith in Jehovah's avatar as Allah, which spurred the Believers to be instilled with sacred obscurantism, and with faithful obedience to divine hatred for difference and otherness, to lay waste to so much of India, in particular. Their Luciferan success in the devastation of Buddhism has been to such an extent that the Indians themselves forgot that once it flourished over almost the whole north of the old sub-continent up to Afghanistan and beyond. Today millions of Indians are unaware that what is now Bangladesh was once a vibrant form of extended Buddhism, nor do they ask themselves how could a Muslim Kaum have emerged between India and Burma.

There might have been a reason for the apocalyptic terror which struck the Indian Buddhism: the setting in motion of a sublime spirituality growing without the use of brutish power and of the sword, but as a human enterprise undertaken for a transcendental self-perfection without the necessity of believing in God. Hence nothing could totally debunk the very essence of Islam and its pretention to be the only truthful religiosity than

the quiet confrontation of a godless culture which had already flourished into a magnificent culture by the side of Brahmanism, Jainism and with the Indian version of Christianity.

The fossilization of Indian Christianity. Instead Indian Christianity chose to stand still within the narrow specificity of its attachment to its rigid, static Christologic based faith. But, most probably out of the conviction that their faith was perfect and exclusively satisfactory for their religious needs, the Christians adopted an attitude of indifference to the surrounding religiosities. The fossilization of the Indian Christianity happens not to elicit any concern in the study of the religious question of the sub-continent. With melancholy apathy, which rivals that of the fervid Islamic community, the Indian Christians have not graced the sub-continent with a single book of universal appeal. Not even in the emergence of a major event like the struggle for Independence did the Indian Christian Church stir the passion for freedom in the heart of its flock, not even when Mahatma Gandhi overtly claimed his having been inspired by the Beatitudes according to the Gospel of Matthew. Despite his Indian roots and history, the indigenous Christian evinced solidarity with the meretricious Christianity of the conqueror.

The case of the Indian Jewry and of the Indian convert. The religious affinity displayed by the indigenous Christians further explains the Jewish minority too supporting the British in their domination of the sub-continent. It was an affinity which obscured the fact of the many pogroms undertaken on British soil against the Jews, while at the same time their brethren and co-believers were living in peace in India throughout the duration of their diaspora since the first century A.D.

The irrelevance of the dogma of the Original Sin. Today one may wonder if, when Apostle Thomas started to spread his message, his first Indian disciple would have questioned his being asked to submit to the dogma of the Original Sin. Would that first convert asked why he would have had the intelligence to question why he was *naturally* afflicted, at his birth, because, in a *distant* land, at a *distant* time, a *distant* Semite youth ate an

apple? And that absurdity remains vital to this day: what has an illiterate Bihari villager have to do with Henry VIII's quarrel with the Pope, if he be asked to be an Anglican Indian Christian? Or why must he, as a convert to Roman Catholicism, be subjected to own, as his, the history of the massacre of more than 3000 Huguenots, on Saint Bartholomew's Day on 24 August 1572, at the instigation of Catherine of Medicis, or of the obliteration of the Jansenists of Port Royal on orders of Louis XIV, urged by fundamentalist Jesuit zealots? Why must the Indian convert have to alienate himself from the history of his birth community, by his being lured away, by means of a material enticement, to adhere to an alien History marketed as the authentic creed bequeathed by Jesus, which Swami Vivekanand rightly characterized as Churchianity?

The vindication of the traditional tolerance and of the humanity of the followers of the Dharmas. But the Original Sin does not deserve any more space in the fulfilment of the purpose of our inquiry. It is to the credit of the tolerant Brahmanist community and especially of the no-hate ideology of *Satyagraha* and *Ahiṁsā,* that Independence has not been followed by any ill-feeling towards the Indian Christians and the Indian Jews. Nor have even the British evinced any acknowledgement of the humane absence of any recrimination directed against them by Independent India. Even after they had left the sub-continent in a state of chaos, after having depleted it of its wealth and welfare, during more than two centuries, in order to batten themselves, they did not have the grace to express due recognition that it was due to the gentlemanly attitude of the Indian that the British left without any shame or guilt. The elegance which the Hindu manifested towards the departing imperialists, became evident with asking Mountbatten to stay one year more as the Governor General of the country and with India joining the Commonwealth. It was a dignified response of forgiveness and friendship, without any recrimination or asking for any compensation, for all the wealth taken by force. It was a Hindu gracefulness which did not pay any heed to Winston Churchill's virulent racism in defining the Hindus as "a bestial people believing in a

bestial religion!" And he further emphasized his contempt for the Hindus by referring to Mahatma Gandhi as the "naked fakir"!

The maintenance of the moral integrity of Indian culture despite Islam. It is Islam which will continue to affect, as adversely as it has done for more than a millennium, the welfare and the furtherance of the indigenous civilization of the Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina India. Indeed, despite the territorial reduction of the former sub-continent with the separation of the two Muslim Theocratic states, India still offers to Mankind the blessing of its cultural integrity and of maintaining, without any intellectual or aesthetic diminution, the vibrant continuity of its unique moral civilization.

The false victimhood of the Muslim and the advantage of the perennial Dharma stated. The barbaric delivery of Partition from the womb of Indian Islam, will not prevent the Land of Bhārata from lasting throughout the Islamic time till well beyond the Day of Judgement. For the time being, as the pole star of the post-Partition Indian firmament, Mohamed Ali Jinnah has defined as relevant for all time the distinctiveness of the two main Indian communities with the proclamation of the ''Two Nation (*kaum*) Doctrine''. Pakistan and Bangladesh will, for all time, remind both Muslims and Brahmanists of the unbridgeable abyss which, the vacuity of *bhai-bhaiism* notwithstanding, safeguards their specific autonomies. Just as it took nearly a century for Indians to interpret the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 as the first War for Independence, likewise will it take a few generations more for Indians to look back and upgrade Partition as the Jihad for Muslim Independence from an assumed Harbi Kaffir oppression. Symbolized by the Minar-e-Pakistan monument in Lahore, the abyss of the Muslim's reversal of Indian history has acquired a more persuasive meaning with Islamabad being the only capital of a country to bear the name of a religion. The meanings of the two symbols - the pillar commemorating Muslim communal hatred of the Indian Kaffir and the Name of the capital trumpeting the eternal hostility of Allah towards all non-Believers - will preserve for all time Muslim exclusiveness as the chasm separating him from the followers of the indigenous Dharmas.

The Muslim perversity of the inversion of Indian History. The Minar is a beacon which will never cease to remind the remaining Indian Muslim of the insufficiency of his vote bank as a compensation for the preferred fullness of living as an independent Kaum. The subsequent post-Independence communal riots, as footnotes to the Partition story, would have been expressions of contempt for the generosity and compassion which the Hindu leaders of the Congress Party evinced towards them. The Vote Bank was the obligatory reminder of the Pakistan for which they had earlier wreaked utter violence and which, belatedly and ironically, they discovered, with the sentiment of a collective trauma, to have been beyond their reach. In remembrance of all the hatred and killing due to the Jinnahi Jihad of the parting, the Vote Bank was a humiliating consolation. It is eminently more the symbol of a reversal of Indian History. For the victimhood of Hindu oppression of the Muslim is a downright negation and a perverse Machiavellian inversion of the history of the ravaging, during centuries, of the Indian civilization which suffered the barbaric invasion of a religious horde of Believers earnestly using the sword as the preferred means of impressing themselves upon the subdued natives.

The Vote Bank of the pro-Partition Muslims. After Independence the Indian Muslims who, in their large majority found themselves stuck in India, did not give any expression of a reconciliation to the One-Nation doctrine of the Congress Party in whose tent they had sought refuge. On the contrary they retreated into the Vote Bank for electoral reasons, while retaining the Sharia inserted in the Constitution as the right to their separate identity. The Sharia actually consolidates the Muslim community's authority to their exclusiveness, in particular to their right to adhere to the totalitarian unitiveness of their religion cohering with the violent politics which, initiated by the Prophet, has endured during fourteen centuries. The Sharia in fact, and in the psychology of the Muslim Kaum, offers to the Muslim minority the status of a state within the nation. At the same time it represents a diminution of the fundamental claim of the Constitution that it secures the secularity of the State. The Sharia, by law, and the Vote Bank, by electoral imperative, constitute convenient,

tolerated exceptions to the purity of the separation of religion from secular politics guaranteed by the 1950 Constitution.

The contradiction of the Sharia as a juridical necessity. With hindsight it seems really absurd and contrary to the historical realities specific to India, that the Constituent Assembly would have, despite the barbarism enacted for the implementation of the Partition, conceded the right to the Sharia superseding the primacy of the Constitution. The authors of the Constitution may have been moved by feelings of compassion and of a civilized desire to reassure the Muslims of Brahmanist tolerance and compassion. But did they know that the Muslims would not reciprocate the generosity of the Hindu elites? Otherwise why would the remnants of the Muslim League indulge in all those communal riots which so often punctuated the history of the Congress rule of the Commonwealth?

The difference between the Indian Muslim and the Muslim Indian. Indian Islam further emphasizes its distinctiveness by the use of Urdu as specific to the culture and to the identity of the Muslim who zealously maintains his cultural exclusivism as essential to his identity. It is nevertheless true that, as an Indo-European language, Urdu has arisen and has been cultivated and perfected within the largely sanskritized space of the sub-continent. Despite its having been assumed and cultivated with distinction by a small fraction of the Hindu intelligentsia, Urdu has failed to serve as a bridge between the two religious communities. In reality Urdu was indulged in as a marker of Islam, not as a language for all communities, as English has been.

Indifferent to the fine arts, to philosophy and to high learning - for there can be nothing higher or nobler than the eternally perfect verses revealed by Allah! - the Muslim rulers did not establish a system of public education which would have disseminated the knowledge of the language among their non-Islamic subjects. It is noteworthy that, in this context, Urdu failed to gain any acceptance by the people of East Pakistan (which became Bangladesh in 1971), despite the efforts of the leaders of West Pakistan to impose the language on their Bengali co-believers.

The irony of Muslim ignorance of the cultural history of the sub-continent. India witnessed the fateful rejoinder of a great irony: the Muslim *minority* could prevail to break-up the sub-continent by the use of raw violence against the pacifism of most of the Hindus. Yet within Pakistan itself, the *minority* of the West Wing could not prevail to establish its supremacy over *its own majority* and impose, by the use of military force, the adoption of Urdu as the national language of the Eastern Wing! The Partition leaders and zealots, ignorant of the history of the composite culture of the sub-continent, indeed of any culture, could not grasp the Bengali's attachment to his Sanskrit-based language and its corresponding script as a variation of the Devanāgarī. Nor could they grasp the plain fact that, by sharing a common faith, the Bengalis would not, of a political necessity, yield to a collective alienation by means of the sudden replacement of their language and the wealth of its heritage with the alienating Urdu written in the Arabic script.

The leaders of the Jinnah Muslim League - and that includes the early Sheikh Mujibar Rehman, as an ardent League activist-supporter - could not imagine that Islam could not, by itself, prevail upon the Bengalis to justify the claim for Partition and, concurrently, to extinguish their collective personality immanent in their language. They could not grasp the preposterousness of securing the unity of the two populations separated by about a thousand miles of foreign territory. The political establishment of Pakistan did not have the universalist sensitivity of the Indian leaders who, for example, provided the requisite mental space to accommodate the different cultural sensitivity of the South Indian communities and their demands for the recognition of their distinctive cultural dispositions. Faced with the stringent opposition of the Tamil speaking population of the former Madras State, the central government in New Delhi evinced the elegance of accommodating the specificity of the Tamil language and the culture of Tamil Nadu. In reality, as a kind of soft Pakistan, Tamil Nadu has remained an integral part of the Indian Union, despite the persistence of its popular hostility to the ‘imposition’ of Hindi prescribed as the national

language by the 1950 Constitution and its opposition to Sanskrit being included in the educational system.

The contents of Muslim exclusivism. In Pakistan the adherence to the Arabic script is maintained in regions animated by dialects and languages expressed in a variety of indigenous scripts. In India the Muslim's zeal to maintain his separateness is further buttressed by the madrassas which prescribe and teach their curricula with the use of Persian and Arabic languages. These academic institutions provide an instruction related to the preservation of an identity characterized by ways of thinking and of feeling which, aided by the memory of the corresponding exclusive cultural heritage, strengthen the sense of Muslim separateness. The Indian Muslims are, in reality, subservient, as colonized adherents of Arab Islam: the symbols which remind them of this subservience are their inability to migrate to the Arab countries as co-equal citizens, the regularity of the Haj pilgrimage, and naturally the Use of the Arabic alphabet and language.

The different between the Muslim and the Kaffir in the mimesis of cultures. In an imitation of the Islamic subservience to the religious and linguistic supremacy of the Arab nations, the Indian native middle class has till now maintained the attachment to the language, the law, the political institutions, as modes of mimetic admiration of the original British values. The striking difference consists of the gracefulness of Great Britain admitting Indians as citizens enjoying all the rights and privileges of the native inhabitants and even to admit them to the higher levels of social ranks. The Arab nations resolutely, as a banal matter of fact, do not admit non-Arab Muslims to live in their midst as co-equal participants in their civil and military institutions. Yet, all the mayhem wrought by the Jinnahist Muslims live under the illusion of freedom from Kaffirs while they have locked themselves within a subsidiariness in relation to the Arab Muslims for the remaining time till the Day of Resurrection.

Furthermore, over the entire nation, the deeply rooted distinctiveness of the Muslim *kaum* exerts the gravitational pull of a closed-minded resolve of the Believers' submission to the revelation and fidelity to the Sharia. As

a result the spirit of such a distinctiveness consolidates the Indo-Muslim's identity with the memory of all the spoliations with which he afflicted the land of his settlement in his thrall to Allah's injunctions and to His abomination of the Kaffir world.

India had everything before the arrival of the Muslims. It is easy for the largely Brahmanist majority to understand the psychological compulsions being required by the Muslim for his identity, considering that he has little, apart from the Sharia as an external adjunct, to rely on for the representation of his self-esteem. For the reality of the Indian civilization compels the recognition that - long before the advent of Muhammad and longer still before the arrival of the first Muslim horde - India had everything. Indeed, to the fullest measure of civilizational fullness, India had architecture, urban planning, humane social laws, an abundance of philosophical achievements and of a functioning religious plurality boasting of a high degree of elevated humaneness, of fully developed fine arts, of sophisticated literatures, a harmonious plurality of beliefs and religious practices, all this and a heavenly tolerance of all peaceful differences. In addition, Indian civilization was adorned with a material prosperity which attracted so many invaders and looters from beyond her borders. Moreover the arrival of the barbaric Muslim hordes put an end to the period of more than three centuries of peace and social tranquility.

The cultural deficiency of the Muslim hordes. In a palpable contrast the Muslim invader came in without bringing a tradition of original fine arts and of the other refinements of civilization. To India they did not even bring any extension of the sophisticated culture which flourished during the early two centuries of the Abbasid Dynasty in Baghdad before the arrival of the Mongol Halaku. The Muslim invader did not even spread a language and its accompanying literature among the surrounding population. Whatever language or tradition of miniature painting may be attributed to Muslim patronage were in reality projections of the pre-Islamic Persian Aryan culture conveyed to India by the Semitic components of the Arab and Turkish invaders. It is worth recalling that the two greatest

names in Islamic history are not Arabs, but Aryans: Ibn Sina (Avicenna) and Firdausi. The Muslims arrived as seasoned military marauders endowed with minds closed with the will to obliterate what they did not understand. Most importantly the Muslims arrived in India with bringing in a mentality utterly insensitive to the Beauty, the Goodness, the Truth so abundantly displayed all over the sub-continental territory. Their destructiveness was infinitely worse than the ravages of the Goths in Europe and especially in the Roman Empire. The Goths did have arts of their own which they bequeathed to the regions where they came to settle. But the Muslims did nothing more than destroying all that they could not understand and all that they had never seen before, to the extent that in the whole of north India there is scarcely a statue that was not defaced by the Islamic invaders, scarcely a temple that was not ravaged. In Delhi the desecrations and destruction were total. And the same was true of Mathurā, the other site on Cunningham's list which is of particular relevance to Indian sculpture.

According to Fa Hsien Mathurā had been a thriving Buddhist and Jain center and, as the scene of Kṛṣṇa's youthful exploits, an important place of Hindu pilgrimage. Indeed the latter still is.

But today not a single building in the Mathurā area dates back beyond the seventeenth century. The stupas, the monasteries, the temples were all razed to the ground by the invaders. Fa Hsien reported twenty Buddhist monasteries and 3,000 monks, considerably more than Sarnath. In his day the domes of the stupas were clad in gold leaf and the railings and their reliefs brightly painted. The monasteries and temples were covered with frescoes and the stone sculptures could barely compete with the multitude of god and silver images. One such, of solid god, carried away by Mahmud of Ghazni in 1017, weighed half a ton and bore a single sapphire of three and a half pounds; Mahmud's loot also included five more solid gold

figures with rubies for eyes and a hundred silver images each of which was heavy enough to constitute a single load of a camel.[4]

The similarity of Muslim cultural intransigence in early India and in Europe since the 1970s. The drama of the ill-feelings generated at the present time by the Muslim migrants in contemporary Europe arises from their giving little, if anything, in the matter of culture to their host societies. Notwithstanding their having no socio-political benefits to share, nor any proven cultural refinements to enrich the living style of their host countries, they have, on the contrary, been pressing their host societies to conform to their religious intolerance and the narrowness of their customs in ways which offend the established traditions of their hosts. To a great extent the emigrating Muslims even attempt to impose their Sharia upon the Europeans by decrying their laws and institutions for being decadent and needing to be replaced by the perfect Islamic dispensation. Insisting on the host acknowledging their cultural difference, the Muslim minorities insist on the provision of *hallal* in their diet and on the women wearing the veil or the *burqa*, as a political statement.

The unsuitability of the Sharia in liberal Europe. To grasp the Muslims' intent to enforce their Sharia as a jurisprudence superior to the constitutions of the West European democracies, it suffices to recall the British law of *habeas corpus* adopted by all the constitutions based on the Anglo-American jurisprudence of which India chose to be a partner with the 1950 Constitution, which is one of the best four or five democratic constitutions. The Habeas Corpus law is fundamental to these democratic constitutions. It was passed in 1315 when the aristocrats forced King John to enshrine it in British jurisprudence. No other legal system, especially not the one devised and revealed by Allah, has such a law which ensures physical protection to the individual against any arbitrary treatment by the

---

[44] John Keay, *India Discovered: The Recovery of a Lost Civilization,* Harper Collins, 2001; p.102.

ruling power without authority based on due legal process. In some of the majority Muslim democracies, the rules and the injunctions, by which the believer abides, in order to follow the Straight Path indicated in the first Sura of the Quran, have been strengthened by the law of *habeas corpus*. This reference to the Habeas Corpus suffices to understand, the angry reaction of Europeans when they are confronted by Mullahs arrogantly arguing for the Sharia being a superlative, enlightened jurisprudence in complete disregard, of the secularity of the enlightened democracies endowed with liberal legislations designed for the consolidation of justice, of equality and of a political liberality inherited from historical experience. It is indeed shocking that the Mullahs, serving the Muslim minorities particularly in Western Europe, do neither grasp, nor understand, the significant progress realized with the struggles and sacrifices indulged in with heroic selflessness by past generations in order to enact the enlightened legislations separating the established religion from the secular politics of the state. Fortunately the French authorities have reacted in passing due legislation to preserve the moral and spiritual integrity which defines the secular cultural pre-eminence of France. It is consequently natural for the French people, in its majority, to be allergic to the institutionalization of Muslim vote banks.

The difference between the Christian and the Islamic communities in secular India. In India popular reverence is evinced - respectfully by non-Muslims - towards certain mausoleums and tombs of Muslim men revered as saintly paragons of the Islamic faith. Favored by the public, such a widely acknowledged practice is tolerated in spite of its violation of Islamic orthodoxy which states that only Allah deserves to be worshipped or to be worthy of veneration. However the most intense Muslim popular worship happens to be performed as the pilgrimage to the spiritual center of gravity located in the Arabian cities of Mecca and Medina. It is manifested in the enthusiastic undertaking of the pilgrimage to the sacred Kaba, as one of the five obligatory duties to be performed at least once in the Muslim's lifetime, depending on the available material means related to this purpose. The Hajj heightens the prestige of Arabia in the mind of the

Muslim in contrast with the Brahmanist's reverence for the Bhārata Land as an endeared geography crisscrossed with *tīrthas*. While the places of Gautama Buddha's birth and of his attainment of Nirvāṇa, for example, are held to be sacred by the Buddhists living in countries beyond the borders of India, the faithful are not required to visit any of these places, as obligatory pilgrimages prescribed by Gautama Buddha himself, or by the Sūtras. It is to the infinite credit due to Gautama Buddha that, to the monks attending him on his death bed, he reminded them to adhere to the Dharma which he had taught, with the imperative of each to be a lamp unto himself. This fundamental proposition of the individual, personal interpretation of the generic principle of moral conduct, is, with its admirable simplicity, the crown of the perfection of how a religious or spiritual life must be taught and practiced with the sole wisdom and responsibility of the individual seeker for the ultimate self-reality. Such a perfect mode of guiding a spiritual Sangha precedes the advent of Jesus by more than four centuries; it precedes by seven centuries Emperor Constantine's diktat of transforming the Christianity based on the Nicene Creed in 323 of the Common Era; it precedes by eleven centuries Muhammad declaring his pure Revelation to be the religion of Islam which required the submission of the Believer. It was that marvel of a religious prescription and of its inflexible *modus operandi* which was effectively propelled forward by His obedient proxies.

The specificity of the Buddhist Dharma. Buddhists insist on the Dharma specific to the culture of their own country as a fully developed, independent religious totality, complete with its rituals and its aesthetic particulars, without any obligation to India or to Indians for their independently nurtured devotion. There does not exist a Buddhist ''Umma'', or a unitive universal ''Church or Ecclesia'', led each by a centralized bureaucratic authority wielding an unlimited dogmatic power maintained in a state of readiness to exert dire reprobation against any perceived deviation from orthodoxy. The Sangha, as a collegial association of monks, was first instituted by Gautama Buddha himself in the fifth

century B.C.E. In the Sangha the hierarchy rests only on the age of the monk, the elder commanding respect by the younger monk. But any local body did not associate itself with any centralized political power to constitute a theocratic Buddhist state.

The promise of the mysticisms of Brahmanism and Buddhism. Together with the offerings of the indigenous Indian civilization, all the Buddhist states and communities, extant today in the world, hold the certitude of a transcendental view of the good life as an alternative vision for the future of mankind other than what the Judeo-Christian religiosity can offer with the load of its own failures and of its suppressions of elevated humanities. The independence of the Buddhist affirms a marked contrast with the fellowship of Indian Christianity.

It is true, particularly in Kerala, that the Christians take pride in their being the descendants of the original followers of the faith, as the inheritors of the mission undertaken by Thomas, one of the twelve apostolic companions of Jesus. They rightly claim that they are not converted Christians and assert their pride in their Christianity having experienced and established its history already during four or five centuries before Western Europe became converted to the new faith. Yet throughout their history they have remained, by choice, subservient to the congregations nurtured in the Judeo-Christian West. Indian Christians further illustrate their subordinate status by their not having contributed a single original idea to the spectacular theological literature of their Faith. It strikes the imagination sometimes when a dark-skinned Indian Christian, belonging to the last of several generations of converts, expresses the nostalgia for England as his home and the sterile longing for going to England, the far away home of desire. Conversion fosters the contradiction in the heart of the underdog who was lured by material benefit to adhere to the Christian faith propagated as a sentimental El Dorado. The convert got lured to live entrapped by the contradiction of a life made up of bubble beads of being-there strung on a thread of living-here.

The specificity of the Indian Christianity and its sharing in the White Man's Burden. Nevertheless, despite their having never suffered from any violence, or persecution, or from any bias, from the Hindus, during the nearly twenty centuries of their uneventful practice of their faith, the Indian Christians demonstrated their identity with the foreign Christian power in their opposition to the Independence movement led by Mahatma Gandhi. In particular, during the World War II years, with the collaboration of the Communist Party, they silently approved of the demand for a Muslim homeland and the Partition of the sub-continent. The more than nineteen centuries of peaceful co-existence did not, in the moment of Independence and of Partition, intimate upon the Indian Christians any solidarity with the majority Hindus peacefully striving, with moral resistance and persuasion, for an independence from an oppressive alien power. With the tropism of theological affinity prevailing, they preferred to side with Caesar's imperial power rather than to the faith in the dispensation preaching of the mystical Kingdom of God being eternally present in all beings. They abided by the *specific theological reason* which justified their identifying themselves with the might of Caesar, for whom they prayed to God to confer long life. The loving solicitude of Jesus and the calls stemming from his dolorous experiences happened to fall on deaf ears. The Indian Christian chose to shut his eyes and close his ears and further sealed his mouth, when the drama of the struggle from “possible” oppression unfolded in the chaos and carnage of Partition. It staggers the mind to think that there has been no academic or other interest in the exploration of the collective silence of the Christian community during all the time when the Luciferan barbarity unfolded from the womb of a cognate revelation.

The uniqueness of the presence of the plurality of religions in India. A fundamental plurality has characterized India as the only region where the three cultures - the Jewish, the Christian and the Islamic - determined by their respective *dualistic*, *revealed* dispensations, have co-existed, with the mystical, *monistic, humane* complex of the Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina ways of life. The clash began around the ninth century CE with the first

Muslim invasions, which brought to an end the previous period of close to four centuries of absolute peace all over India. During those peaceful centuries the Christian community had an almost invisible existence, marked by a quiet, uneventful, dull existence without any conflict with the Hindu Kingdoms or even later with the Muslim potentates and the small Muslim populations. Indian Christianity has not been tarnished with any extension of the Holy Inquisition, despite certain incidents which came to light at some time shortly after the Independence, in 1947. In truth Indian Christianity justifies Historian Arnold Toynbee's qualifying it as a fossilized religion to illustrate his theory of the Challenge and Response. According to this theory a religion, or a culture, grows and develops a vitality favorable to creative changes and improvements when it is faced with an alien opposing way of life which is neither too weak to be able to provoke any creative enrichment, nor too strong in overwhelming the receiving culture into atrophy or fossilization. The fact is that the Indian Christians have not contributed anything to the development and growth of the spectacular, but essentially European, theological literature. In Europe theologians creatively reacted to the vast array of wisdoms accumulated by the Greeks and the Romans. They worked out meaningful syntheses, during the Renaissance of the XII century, as a result of the fertilization of Greco-Roman influence on the original science of Theology. During the same period, the Indian Christians persisted in their state of theological satisfaction characterized by their dwelling unmoved by, and unconcerned with, the metaphysics and mystical knowledges of the Brahmanists, the Buddhists, and even with the unparalleled, superlatively ethical culture of the minority Jainas. *They missed the unique opportunity of bringing forth, for the benefit of all humanity, a gnostic theology of the Holy Spirit.* Instead they doggedly persisted in preserving the centrality of the Christological doctrine in their faith.

The failure of a religious experiment. During the 1940s and 1950s the Benedictine monk, Jules Monchanin, tried to indianize the liturgy, by the singing of Vedic hymns as Gregorian melodies and Catholic prayers as Indian rāgas, to the accompaniment of Indian drums and musical

instruments. He introduced Yoga meditation as the Introit part of the liturgy of the Sunday Mass. His experiment provoked the ire and opposition of his ecclesiastical superiors based in Chennai and he was sent to a distant, backward, impoverished parish in Tamil Nadu where his health degenerated to such an extent that he was sent back to France for the surgery of an ulcer which had by then advanced to a desperate stage. Had Fr. Monchanin survived and allowed a free hand to initiate a mystical version of the Christian faith in a creative and beneficent development, he would have set into motion the construction of a new Christianity centered on the Holy Ghost.[5] Instead the Indian Christianity has been laboring on as the fossilized appendix to the European Judeo-Christian heritage which paradoxically generates wide-spread lamentations over the loss of its soul due to the irrelevance of its *raison d'être* in the midst of consumerist abundance.

Western ethnocentric indifference to the clash of cultures in India. Western ethnocentrisms have till today failed to take any notice of the clash of civilizations which, since very early times, has been coterminous with Indian history. Nowhere else has the world witnessed the co-existence of the three major revealed religions with the three man-made, humane ways of life derived from the original Vedic poetry with its perennial plenitude of wisdoms which inspired and brought forth the mystical sublimities of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism. It was only in the enchanted space of the sub-continent that the Indian civilization, endowed with such a triple home-grown foundation of the One, bestowed on Humanity the correlative tolerance which has lasted so long, as the master norm for the measure of all extant and possible tolerances.

The remarkable resilience of Indian tolerance. The tolerance, which characterizes the moral civilization of India, still endures despite the

---

[5] Fr. Monchanin described his experience in the book *Les Ermites du Saccidananda.*

catastrophic blows delivered to the indigenous humanity by the violences which are concomitant with the monotheistic beliefs. In the Indian sub-continent the violence generated by Islam rode through the repeated and the forced conversions of millions of mainly Brahmanists in addition to the iconoclastic ravages of Indigenous monuments and centers of high learning. The violence of the British Anglican Christianity was applied to the ruthless exploitation of the people punctuated by the regular man-made famines, the defining feature of British supremacy implemented with brutish heartlessness. The famine as a defining characteristic of British imperialists' stern affirmation of themselves as a master race in their colonizing as a civilizing mission, was, in practice, on the ground, a deliberate man-made catastrophe as lawful loot, the nature and scale of which acquired, after the Second World War, the apt substantive of 'genocide' as consequently defined in International Law.[6]

The concurrence of God-given dispensations with genocidal intolerance. Without exception the dualistic faiths claimed, as variations of the Biblical God, unquestioned devotion and submission to their absolute Transcendence. However, contrary to the well-entrenched spirit a of tolerance fostered by the universalist Dharmas, the extreme religious violence in India occurred only with the Islamic invasions and subsequently with the British conquest. Both clashes were informed by closed ideologies animating their respective exclusivist mentalities. The earlier, more vehement in its iconoclastic destructive power, was inspired by the martial injunctions of Allah. The second clash with a Christian power occurred, in its first phase, with Merchants who, struck by the discovery of the sophistication and richness of Sanskrit learning, undertook the process of recovering the glorious past of the Indians. They restored the prestige of Sanskrit lore, they dug out the history of the Harappan civilization, they established the new component of their University Humanities with the

[6] A genocide is the killing, at one time, in one space, of a large number of unarmed men, women, children, who are not in a state of war or of rebellion.

science of Indology, encouraged the necessary social reforms and, for a price, used the sub-continent as the uncontested space for their practice of the savage capitalism, and then left the empire broken in a state of extreme impoverishment. All this, with Partition too, was carried out in the name of sweet Jesus by Merchants marshalling Christ for glory and profit by means of the White Man's burden weighed down with heartless rapacity.[7]

The difference between the Indian Christianity and British Christianity. One may then ask: what was the moral and intellectual difference between the indigenous Indian Christianity and the British Christianity? Why did the Indian Christianity remain so resolutely indifferent to the native excellences of the vast land in which they chose to maintain the collective contentment for their frozen exclusiveness? And how and why did the Indian Christians not see their closed-mindedness as its being an infirmity kindred with the Islamic closed-mindedness? It is the manifestation of this commonly shared vertical closed-mindedness which, more than their common source in the Old Testament, spared the Indian Christianity the visitation of the Islamic violent propensity towards iconoclastic demolition.

The disconcerting silences among the proponents of monotheistic beliefs. Across the globe and particularly in Europe after the shock of the Holocaust, there has been no debate or reflection on the genocides which have, in *all* cases, been perpetrated by, and within, communities and societies inspired, predisposed, impelled by the beliefs in the three revealed religions of Judaism, Christianity, Islam. It bewilders the mind that the Judeocide carried out by the Nazis would not have induced any

---

[7] No religious personality pertaining to any of the three Dharmas would ever in his wildest dream say such words as uttered by Pope Jules II, encouraging his artillery men: "Fire, my men, Fire! show these Frenchmen what balls does the Pope have!" The French enemy army was led by the equally Catholic Francis I who was indeed defeated! He wrote to his Mother to say that he had lost everything except his honour as his *raison d'être.*

reflection, within the Rabbinate, on the fact that all the religious intolerances have originated from the Old Testament, in particular from the invention of the notion of the Only God, Jehovah. None among the Rabbinate would have thought that perhaps, just perhaps, the Judeocide, perpetrated by the Nazis, could have been a distant consequence of the intolerance signified by Jehovah prevailing to have Moses acknowledging Him to be the Only God who wrote the Law on the tablet. If the Biblical story be taken as a precedent, the first genocide was carried out when Yahweh ordered the Jews to eliminate the Canaanites. They killed all the men, they killed all the women, they killed all the children, they even killed all the animals, of the Canaanites. One does never come across a similar passage in the scriptures of all the peoples belonging to the Oriental cultures of India, China, Japan. Nor has any theologian, or missionary, or priest, in any of the Christian denominations, and more significantly so, from the Roman Catholic and Anglican ecclesiastical elites, questioned the remorseless justification of the Christian ethos in the soulless practice of the inhumanities of slavery, colonialisms and genocides, of the fiendish usage of the weakness of Human Beings for being naturally, culturally different!

The imperative need for the study of the fundamentals of political Islam. The present study shall preferentially examine the relationship between the native Brahmanists and the outsider Muslims. Hitherto no meaningful, authoritative Indian literature exists to provide an in-depth examination of the divide which will, for a long time more, characterize the history of India fashioned by the two main communities. In concrete terms, the two communities will, for all practical purposes, be qualified as the *monistic-indigenous* and *the dualistic-outsider*.

Western thinkers, academics, theologians, historians, have produced an abundant mass of information, collected with scientific rigor, on the history, the culture, the arts, of Islam. Western scholarship still generates intense scientific interest in Islam, its influence and the fears it spreads due to its assumed or real threat to European civilization. Such is not the case

in the Indian sub-continent where the two main communities have co-existed for more than a millennium in ignorance of each other. Neither has the Brahmanist evinced any appreciable effort to understand the way of thinking of his Muslim neighbor, of his belief, of his aspiration, of his intolerance, of his exclusiveness, of his hostility to idol worship, of the magnitude of his being different, of his totalitarian fusion of the religious and the political. Reciprocally the Muslim, especially the convert from his Brahmanist background and family, has never been interested in the arts of the Brahmanist, in his philosophies, in the metaphysical foundation of his tolerance, his feeling and respect for social hierarchy, his recognition of the religious being distinct from the political, and most particularly his belief in all that exists being One. Besides it is generally recognized that the convert always views, with intense hatred, the culture and mores which he has disowned in preference to his new faith.

In India, the extreme mutual communal ignorance was plastered over, during the past millennium, by the widespread superstition according to which the habitually entrenched belief in a peaceful communal coexistence was only marked by the minor difference of one praying in a temple, and, within the same neighborhood, the other praying in a mosque. Nothing did hide the falsehood of this apparent communal cohesion so much as the collective delusion, on the part of the Brahmanists, of their belief that *Islam was just a religion, when it had always been a potent political ideology dressed in the costume of the five obligations of the shahada (the confession of the faith), the prayer, alms giving, fasting, pilgrimage;* with others including the *jihad* as the most important. Few Hindus, if any, understood or knew that the Muslim neighbor also always held alive the thought of the duty to wage war for the establishment of the world as the *Dar-ul-Islam.*

Without ever ceasing to be a volcano, the volcano at rest and in silence never loses its destructive ferocity which it displays at the time of its own choosing. With hindsight it is immensely surprising that during the 1950s, the course on *''The Comparative Study of Religions*'', taught in the

Department of Philosophy of the Banaras Hindu University, did not include even the slightest reference to Islam. At that time the crowds of refugees, who still reminded the citizens of Vārāṇasī of the Partition catastrophe, did not disturb the stoic indifference to Islam in the minds of the specialists in Indian and Western philosophies. The well settled opinion consisted of the assumption that there was nothing philosophically worth studying in the Quran. To a large extent this is true of the legalistic substance of the Holy Book. Indeed the Indian philosophers derived comfort from the fact that Arthur Schopenhauer is known for his declaring that he did not find a single idea in the Quran. But even then the enormity of the barbaric burst of the Partition violence ought to have motivated a meaningful inquiry into the reasons and unreasons of the upheaval.

The incapacity of the Brahmanists to distinguish tolerance from self-delusion and the need of their study of Islam - as a violent, intolerant totalitarian political ideology - being more than a mere religion has, most unfortunately, persisted to this day. For more than a thousand years Muslims have lived within the same Indian geographical space without bringing forth a *modus vivendi* designed and structured for sustaining a mutually amicable and creative communal congruity. As a result both communities have opted to live like two ostriches agitating their bodies while their heads lie buried in the sands of the persistent ignorance of each other. The impressions thus gathered consisted of only a surface, without any depth. *We proceed in this essay as an invitation to the Brahmanist community leaders, in particular, to engage in the study of the history of Islam, at least to the same degree of thoroughness as has been demonstrated, for generations, by European scholars*. It is indeed surprising that Brahmanist historians have elected to neglect adequately necessary in-depth studies of the fundamentals of Islam: its theology, its jurisprudence, its psychology, its history, its glories, its violences, its victories, its defeats and, most importantly, its divinely enjoined hatred of the Other viewed to be, as such, radically evil just for being different. Even the relentless movement of the educated Muslim community towards Partition failed to move the Brahmanist Ostrich to pull its head *from the*

sand of a tolerance which meant so little to the heart and the mind of the Muslim who, inclined by belief, prefers to use the language of the sword, and never of persuasion. Since the beginning of the Islamic history the Muslim has belonged to a culture which, born in Medina, was wracked by an internecine violence. Its intolerance of any kind of difference or opposition informed the stern politics of the Prophet. With the absence of universalist intellectuals on the side of the Muslims, during the whole period beginning with the foundation of the Congress Party in 1885, up to the Partition, *the Brahmanists kept harping on tolerance, and more tolerance, which meant next to nothing to the Believer immersed in the submission to a revelation which urges him to wage war against the Unbelieving Kaffir*.

Hannah Arendt is wrong. It has become almost a cliché among Western historians, sociologists, political writers, that Mahatma Gandhi succeeded in prevailing with his politics of Truth and *Ahiṁsā* because he was opposed by the British who believed in the merit of law and order and accordingly exhibited a high measure of decency. With an abundance of self-righteousness, based on an immense ignorance of the brutish remorselessness of the British mode of conducting their imperial rule, the benighted detractors of the Truth and Non-Violence pacifism of Mahatma Gandhi claimed, and still claim, that he would not have prevailed against Hither or Mussolini. Their naivety matching their ignorance of the Mahatma's moral stature and of his *modus operandi* obscured the fact of their unawareness of the absence, in European civilization, of the peace-based spirit which underscored his adamantly moral political assertiveness. Otherwise, had the detractors of Gandhi known, they should have asked why the Judeo-Christian civilization naturally lent itself to the proliferation of intolerant dictators acting with the collusion of the ecclesiastical establishments. The critics of Gandhian pacifism still ignore, or pretend to ignore, the fact that the defining genius of the Western Civilization is constituted of Force, translated as the ideology of *Might is Right*. The Roman ideology of the formula: *If you want Peace, prepare for War* (Ci vis pacem, para bellum), is the foundational directive of the political dogma of

Equilibrium of Powers and of the use of force to settle conflicting political issues. Simone Weil is right to hail Homer's *Iliad* as the defining insignia of Force as the essential moral constituent of the Western Civilization. In a stark difference, the cultural category of Peace *(śānti)* is supremely characteristic of the Brahmanist culture. The West knows the *armistice*, but not the *peace.*[8] The Islamic Revelation enjoining war for the establishment of the *Dar-ul-Islam* is in harmony with the fundamental category of the Western Man's use of Force and the glorification of his Might as justification for the imposition of the victor's Right. Western Judeo-Christian civilization, although centered on the sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross, does paradoxically banish the very thought of voluntary act of grace as the personal self-sacrifice in the defense and protection of a just public cause. On the contrary, Brahmanist culture does not entertain any intimation of the merit of the concept of the scape-goat of which the sacrifice of Jesus is transubstantiated into the source of the elimination of the Original Sin concomitant with birth according to the foundational belief propounded by the Revealed religions. The concept of the Original Sin, most fortunately, does not have its presence, of its equivalence, in any of the Oriental cultures.

The unasked or unthought question. For instance, no one in Europe thought of asking or even speculating what could have happened in Europe if Pope Pius XII, or either of the Catholic or the Protestant German Archbishop, had done a *Gandhian* act of his self-sacrifice in favor of the protection of the European Jews. Hannah Arendt and all those who adopt her line of thinking miss the point by not asking why did *"gandhiism", instead of Mahatma Gandhi himself, as such, physically, not arise as an able-*

[8] When Marshal Ferdinand Foch examined the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles of 1919, he declared, with a singularly prescient perception, that it was an armistice for twenty years. In fact the date of the World War II starting on 1 September 1939 was 2 months and 10 days short of 20 years since the armistice ending the World War I on 11 November 1919. Marshal Foch had been the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces in the earlier war.

bodied Ecclesiastical Personality, anywhere, in Christendom, against the rule of the Nazis requiring the extermination of the European Jewry.

Moreover Western critics have not spared the criticism of the Mahatma who exclaimed why the Jews, who knew what their fate was to be, failed to offer any resistance to the German authorities. Scores of Jews did commit suicide, out of despair, in Germany, during those harsh years. Yet none of them decided to qualify their self sacrifice as a protest against the Nazi's hatred of the Jew, which was indeed well entrenched in European culture, with the psychological and moral encouragement of nearly two millennia of Christian vilification of the Jews as the tormenting killers of Jesus, as laid down in the Gospel.

The apocalyptic irony of the personal piety of the Christian. It is convenient for the Christian to believe that Jesus, as God incarnate, should suffer abject humiliation, extreme physical torture, and crucifixion, for the sake of the happiness of the believing sinner, for the sake of the slave trader's comfort, for the sake of the colonizer's too, and for providing an escape from the Original Sin, committed by Adam in his search for enlightenment and freedom from the slavery of Ignorance as beatific living in the Garden of Eden! But it did not pertain to any Christian Believer to sacrifice himself for the salvation of the suffering Other, as the Buddhist monks did, in downtown Saigon when, in midday, in full view of passers-by - in 1962, during the war in Vietnam - immolate themselves by burning, as a protest against the oppressive rule of Catholic President Diem. Or as the Mahatma who resolves to fast till death, in 1932, against the British politics of "divide and rule", with their resolve to create a separate non-Hindu party of Harijans. The act of self-sacrifice was not tried in Germany, for no one knows how the Nazis would have reacted if the Pope, or the two Catholic and Protestant German Archbishops, threatened to do a 'Gandhi'. During the years of the World War II, in occupied Denmark the Germans did not molest the Jews because every afternoon the King would ride his horse slowly in the capital while wearing, stitched to his coat, a large yellow sign like what all Jews were required to wear.

But Hannah Arendt may exceptionally have a point: *during all the time when the vision of a Medina as Pakistan was offered to the imagination of the majority of the Muslims, led by Jinnah, they did pour contempt on the Mahatma's Ahiṁsā, which they derided as cowardice. For Allah commands war on non-Believers, and Muhammad the Messenger waged thirty-six wars, and Jinnah followed faithfully in declaring the Direct Action, as the euphemism for jihad, which was faithfully carried out, with the British, in the full possession of the police and the military, being unable, or unwilling, to oppose. A year earlier they had been using more than two million Indian men to wage war against Fascism in Europe and in the Pacific Orient!*

The consequence of the collective delusion due to the use of the English language. What has remained unperceived till now by all the educated middle classes, on both sides of the Muslim-Brahmanist divide, has been the assumed understanding of each other by means of the use of the English language. The banal fact is this: the Muslim Believer thinks and acts according to a *reason* which is not identical with the Socratic rationality which pervades the English language. Nor does the Brahmanist use a *reason* which is identical with the Socratic rationality of the English language used as the *lingua franca* of the educated classes of both Brahmanists and Muslims. It is this failure to recognize the specificity of each of these different rationalities which subsumes the unbridgeable chasms which separated, and still separate, the two different communities from each other.

Otherwise it is not possible to understand the failure of the talks engaged by the Mahatma and Jinnah in September 1946, or the contempt of the Muslim League leaders heaping contempt and abuse over the politics of *Ahiṁsā*, or the inability of intelligent and widely read men like Nehru, Rajagopalachari, Mahatma Gandhi himself, to understand the working of the mind of Jinnah, though he was trained in the same British Law as so many of his Brahmanist opponents. When the Mahatma reported to Rajagopalachari that he was unable to convince Jinnah of any of his arguments, he was strangely unaware that Jinnah was throughout all the

episodes of the talks thinking in and with the *logic* rooted in the particular mentality distilled by the Quran. Jinnah was talking to the Mahatma as someone faithfully *submitted* to the language spoken by Allah. When the Mahatma told Jinnah that it was the first time that a group of converts would claim to be a people or Kaum fundamentally different from their former culture, he was oblivious of the fact, or he never realized, that indeed history confirms the reality of converts becoming fanatical haters of their previous culture and contemptuous of their former relatives and friends. Indeed hatred was a far more potent force impelling the cultural difference felt by the convert against the culture which he has definitively abjured. The convert's hatred of his original culture has always superseded the ethnological divide separating two resulting antagonistic communities.

In Europe the worst antiSemites were converted Jews and sons and daughters of converted Jews. The harshest prosecutor in the Spanish Inquisition, Torquemada, belonged to a family of 'reformados', of converted Jews. The elite corps of the Ottoman army comprised the Janissaries who, as lowly Christian prisoners, were converted and well cared for and trained as a potent fighting corps of the imperial army. It was the Janissaries who led the assault and broke the walls defending the city of Constantinople in 1453 and put an end to the history of Byzantium. In Mauritius the haters of the Hindus in the first half of the XX century were not the descendants of the early French aristocratic settlers. It was the Creole community with its elite largely constituted of converts from the second and third generations of the Indians who, with the encouragement and protection assured by the Anglican and the Catholic Bishops, manifested hatred of the Indians brought by the French and the British as indentured labor. It became easy for the Indian Convert to obtain an earning position in the Government Public School System, in the Police, in the Civil Service. The economic crash of the 1930s proved to be most advantageous to the efforts of the converting zealots among the Catholic and Anglican clergies. The promise and the certainty of a job proved to be an irresistible attractiveness for converting, with the added exhilaration of hating the pagan who was contemptuously viewed to be mired in a sub-

cultural ignorance allied to poverty and insecurity. Such a cultural perversion implicit in any conversion was absent in the socio-political vision of the Mahatma who unfortunately missed seeing the convert's mentality during the twenty-one years he spent in South Africa. He missed it also in India. Otherwise he would have understood Jinnah's effortless, but Machiavellian, use of the millions of Hindus converted to Islam as the constituents of the distinctive Kaum braying loudest, at the right convenient time, for Partition!

The failure to discern the existence of a plurality of rationalities. A simple example illustrating this tragic inability to cross over from one rationality to the other may be mentioned in the use of Mahatma Gandhi's faith in his *allah īśvar terā nām.* Did he know that this refrain was *haram* for the Muslim Believer? The Quran proclaims the uniqueness of Allah, being incomparable, absolute, superlative, infinitely above any other Divinity. Did not the Prophet actually see, with his eyes, the real person of Allah when he reached Paradise at the end of his night flight riding on the back of his flying horse Burak? The Quran explicitly rejects the Christian belief in the Holy Trinity as an offending denial of the Unity of God. Did Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad ever advise the Mahatma about the repetition of this formula being offensive and blasphemous to the Muslim sensitivity? Any believer would see blasphemy in placing Allah on the same level and meaning as Viṣṇu or Śiva or Brahmā. Besides one never saw or heard a Mullah singing *allah īśvar terā nām*.[9] Furthermore it is the difference in the rationalities which has prevented any lasting agreement signed, or orally struck, by Pakistani and Indian diplomats during the last decades after Independence. The question is: *why, with such an abundance of evidence, does the Brahmanist Ostrich still keep his head buried in the sand of a misinterpreted tolerance?*

---

[99] Apparently there is no published record of the *allah īśvar terā nām* having ever been sung in a mosque, or in a political gathering of Muslims.

Without surrendering any iota of his tolerance, the Brahmanist has the obligation to acquire an unerring grasp of the contents of the Muslim's *rationality*. It behooves the Brahmanist to recognize, with quiet assurance that, endowed with his characteristic *rationality,* the Muslim feels free to think and act with the aid of *taqiyya,* in emulation of the Prophet and in strict cohesion with his *submission* to the Quranic revelation. Even without *taqiyya*, the Muslim feels, with the approval and the incentive provided by the Quran, no qualm in using falsehood in his relation with the Hindu Kaffir. Faithfully he does not question the validity of those Quranic verses which enjoin hatred of the Kaffir and urge the faithful to wage war against the world of Kaffir paganism (*Dar-ul-Harb*). The Mahatma was a Kaffir. He belonged to the world of Kaffirs.

Jinnah's use of Taqiyya. All the biographies of Jinnah and all the publications of the reason of Partition have at least one common factor: *Jinnah did not believe he was telling any lie*. He was always using *taqiyya*, which the Prophet used to confuse his enemies by the use of misleading falsehoods with a view to attain his ends which he deemed to be good. Nehru was often frustrated by the oral contortions of the statements of Jinnah. With a good conscience Jinnah must have felt the exhilaration of translating the anti-Kaffir ideology of Allah with his frequent gyrations. He was not in any way equal to any of the top leaders of the Congress Party. He showed it when he addressed the Mahatma as Mr. Gandhi, for he craved to be seen as the equal to him. As the sole proxy of Allah he felt himself to be supreme. With his words refracted through *his* reason, *his* truth always stood at the antipode of the Mahatma's *Satyagraha*.

The difference between the Mahatma's Truth and the revealed truth in the Holy Book. The Quran claims to be the only source of Truth and the truths claimed by all other doctrines are errors which need to be eliminated by the immediate use of force, without any consideration for the power of persuasion. For the Quran dictates that any idea, feeling or sentiment, must be perforce evil for being beyond the pale of the revelation. And it is the religious duty of the Believer to suppress by means of Force whatever the Revelation decrees to be evil or foreign to the proclaimed Truth. Yet the

Quranic Truth of Pakistan and of Bangladesh bears no equivalence with the Satyam in the *satyam eva jayate* of the Indian national emblem. Nor is there any Biblical equivalent to what the Mahatma understood Truth to be. During a visit to Romain Rolland, in 1931, on his return from London, where he had represented India in a Round Table Conference for discussion on political changes in India, Mahatma Gandhi said: "Since my childhood I had believed that God is Truth. Now I have come to the conclusion that Truth is God!"[10]

Afterwards in a letter to a friend in America, Romain Rolland wrote that he was amused by the Mahatma's statement. But the conversation, at the residence of Romain Rolland, the distinguished Nobel Prize Winner, was the setting for the Mahatma to signify his attributing a transcendental dimension to his elevated vision of the meaning and the content of Truth as God. Whether he was enunciating a *fact* or not, the Mahatma was conveying "Truth" as the *ne plus ultra* of moral values.

The justification of the Partition. The demand for and the successful realization, of the partition of the sub-continent were predicated with the will to maintain the purity of the religious heritage of the Indian Muslim population. It would have also been motivated by the fear of having to answer for the depredations which Muslim barbarism had inflicted upon the Indian civilization. As the mayhem of the monumental devastations forced, with fanatical obedience to Allah's injunctions and to the vigor of Dajjal the Islamic Antichrist, upon the Indians, Partition was the apotheosis of a genocide generating tradition which had its genesis in Medina where a violent intolerance and an extreme blood-letting were initiated and steeled with the divine injunction to wage war on the world of the non-Believer. The lethal combination of tribal and revealed violences, unique in History, was favored by geography. The intolerance and blood-spilling, swelled as an unrestrained fervidness, was spurred by the Quranic injunction to wage war against the non-Islamic world. With the availability

[10] *Romain Rolland and Gandhi Correspondence,* Publications Division, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Govt of India, 1990; p. 186

of a few hundreds of horsemen already broken and well trained by the frequent razzias, tribal conflicts and the strifes with the Jews and the Christians, it was easy for them to drive, without encountering any opposition, through the sparsely populated North Africa, up to the Atlantic coast and thence to the Pyrenees. Military success provided the confirmation of Islam as the ultimate revelation. It was felt as Islamic Goodness, as the triumph of the only Truth. *After the Battle of Badr, Muhammad convinced his troops that victory was won because it was Allah who had fought, not the men*. The victory at Badr forged the Believer's faith in his submission to Allah as an invincible security in victory and in the inerrancy of walking on the Straight Path. It was a moment of exultation, which still pervades the Muslim's nostalgia for the glories of the past conquests and of the ravages of the cultures of the enemies, as justification of the assumed *ne plus ultra* merit and worth of Islam.

The Islamic ethos is antithetical to the ethos of Bhahmanism. There could not be, and there is still not, any more radical difference between the Brahmanist postulate in the *Mahābhārata* vigorously emphasizing that *Ahiṁsā* is the supreme Dharma, and the Islam enjoining upon the Believer the obligatory duty to wage war against the *Dar-ul-Harb*, as a categorical imperative, even when there exists no legitimacy or provocation justifying military devotion. In fact the ravages of Indian civilization were the response to this injunction, for which Muslims do not feel or own any guilt or wrong doing. Unparalleled in relation to all the major religions, the divine injunction to wage war, for the love of Allah's vision of the total *Dar-ul-Islam*, would have motivated Jinnah, in a contemptuous denigration of the Mahatma's pacifism, to pride himself for holding a revolver when he launched his Jihad (he called it "Direct Action") on 15 August 1946. Fired up during the Friday noon prayer, his goons rushed out of the Masjid and went on a rampage by setting Calcutta ablaze amidst lusty chants of killing Kaffirs. It was an indication of the kind of war necessitated by God's prescription for the transformation of the world into a *Dar-ul-Islam.* However incongruous it may strike one, it is nevertheless true that the Muslim is, by virtue of his submission to the verses revealed by Allah, ill-

disposed to be persuaded by the pacifist exhortations of the Dharmas. Partition violence was just one more delivery by the fertile womb of the Islamic revelation which has settled for incubating in the heart of Hindustan. Pakistan and Bangladesh are frog leaps of the Umma towards the establishment of the world as *Dar-ul-Islam.*

The way of the success of Islamic cunning. What animated the reason for a separate homeland for the Muslims was the hoax that Islam was in danger. The murderous hostility against the Hindus had its divine *raison d'être* in the Quranic dogma calling upon the Believer to abominate the Kaffir. With his reputed scholarship in Islamic learning, did Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad alert his Hindu colleagues, in the Congress Party leadership, of the Quranic source of the Muslim Kaum's hatred of the Kaffir? Did he instruct his Hindu colleagues in learning that the emphasis on Islam as *religion* had been instituted as the glue for binding loyalty and enthusiasm for war as the means of attaining political goals? There is no record of any conversation having taken place among the Congress Leaders on these monumental events of hate-filled violence enjoined by God and sanctioned by the Ulema and the Imamate.

The brazen cunning of proclaiming Islam being in danger appealed to the largely illiterate masses and it quickly became a pernicious fad. It quickened the fanaticism of the lumpen proletariat, as an elemental force supplementing, at the lowest rungs of the Muslim community, the fanaticism of the anglicized, educated Middle Class.

Indeed, as an extension of Jinnah's revolver, the slogan, urged by the Middle Class, proved to be effective with its spreading the fear of an assault on Muslim piety which would happen, of a certainty, as the result of the British power coming to an end. With its Triumph over the Gandhian Truth, Jinnah's falsehood of Brahmanists subjugating the Muslims in a free India established the fact of the Muslim mind's repugnance for pacifism. Instead raw violence manifests itself as the *modus operandi* of political Islam.

The question still nags the mind today: why did the Mahatma persist with his *īśvar terā nām* as a Hindu univocal belief contradicting the basic premise of the unshared transcendental reality of Allah? In reality, during the past fourteen centuries, the Ulema has been proclaiming and teaching that Allah is the only God who earlier had informed Moses of His uniqueness? Why did the Mawlānā not propose a kindred sentiment from Islamic lore, or from the Quran, which would have represented the ethics of the one-state doctrine? The Mawlānā could not do it. For there is not one revealed verse in the Quran which would have helped the Mawlānā to propose an Islamic equivalent to the Mahatma's seeing what he was seeing and to his knowing what he knew! To raise this question today brings forth the irony: it is after all a beneficence for India to be rid of the burden of the weighty gravitational pull of the invincible Islamic hatred as a permanent encumbrance. The Mahatma's heroic benevolence, to which he attached meaning till his last day, remains as a bequest vindicating the goodness of the perennial wisdom of the heritage bearing the moral imprint of the Ācāryas of the past.

The specific feature of the myth of Hindu intolerance. The prompt endorsement of this lie of Hindu persecution and intolerance by the largely illiterate Muslim masses, bears the similarity with the sociological feature of the masses voluntarily manifesting eagerness and zeal to support the Fascist leaders in the 1920s and 1930s in Europe. Jinnah at times addressed huge crowds in English, which the lumpen proletariat did not understand. But they followed him with ecstatic fervor and provided their allegiance almost voluntarily with Islam-inspired gusto. The masses in Italy and in Germany eagerly followed Mussolini and Hitler without any great effort on the part of the respective leaders. At the liberation of France, on 19 August 1944, the Parisian crowds filled the streets to express their joyful praise of General de Gaulle. It was a strange, surreal sight for a few weeks earlier, the eighty-eight year old Marshal Pétain had received an equally effusive welcome from the same Parisians, when the capital was still under German occupation.

The historical irony of India being "inferiorized" by a small community.[11] With hindsight that successful falsehood of persecution inflicted by Hindus, distilled by the Jinnah-led Muslim League, generated the astonishing paradox of the Congress Leadership not challenging it, out of the consideration of what the Muslim-Hindu relationship had been during the earlier centuries. It was a time *when the minority Muslim community* could prevail and inflict irreparable damage *on the native majority*. It still stuns the mind being assailed by the thought that the Congress Leadership, abiding by the Truth of the Mahatma, could not just in so many words call the bluff of the inversion of Indian history by Jinnah and his henchmen in the Muslim League. For the latter were falsely representing Hindus as the breakers of whatever the Muslims had achieved since the time of their first aggression. In reality the Muslim League wily slogan of representing the prospect of future Hindu antagonism prevailed as a lie, with the easy capitulation, by the Hindus failing to refute it. It could have been easily contested, for the Hindus and the Muslims of the Congress Party had the moral and intellectual resources to turn the Jinnah-formulated falsehood on its head. The only reason of this fateful silence of those who knew and kept silent, in the midst of the raging storm, was the fear of not antagonizing the lesser number of Congress Muslims who acted as a hostage, as the reason for obscuring the truth of Muslim iconoclasm against the native Indian civilization. *The hard truth consisted of the historical fact of the Muslims who, as a minority, had ravaged the Indian civilization, to the extent of the obliteration of the original Buddhism which had flourished for more than seventeen centuries*. This fact, despite the monumental scale of the Islamic destructiveness, as a rejoinder to the

---

[11] It was a far larger occurrence which now bears similitude with how Alain Peyrefitte, the Home Minister in the first Ge Gaulle Government, in his *Le Mal Français* describes the culture of the Francophone Catholic province of Quebec having been, for more than three centuries, been *infériorisée* (i.e. reduced to a state of inferiority) by the small dominant Anglophone Protestant community in control of the economy and acting with the aid of the Church. The Catholic Archbishops of Quebec were mostly English-Speaking Irish. I have arbitrarily coined the verb *inferiorize* as the translation of the original French verb *infériorisier* used by Peyrefitte.

possible future suffering of the Muslims under a Hindu majority, never came up during the two decades of the Muslim League aggressiveness prior to Partition. It is still not mentioned by the Brahmanist elites despite the Muslim minority clinging to its Sharia and never hesitating to raise the banner of revolt. In reality the Muslim Kaum did initiate a revolt by questioning the cultural and moral legitimacy of the Citizenship Amendment Act which was openly mentioned in the electoral manifestation of the Bharatiya Janta Party and duly passed by the Parliament in 2021. There would have been no need for the CAA if the Muslim Kaum had devised, after a millennium of co-existence, simple ways of social harmony with non-Muslims, especially when the latter are endowed with a more humane way of living than what the revealed prescriptions permit.

The failure of the Vote Bank solution. However in 1945-47 the silence of the Congress leadership was a failure, a moral ineptitude, which was subsequently compensated - negatively - with the institutionalization of an unproductive Vote Bank. And the Vote Bank has rewarded the solicitude of the Hindus by acting as the keeper of the fictitious Muslim victimhood which it eternalizes, despite its substantial demography, as a *minority*. With the privilege of owning the Sharia, the Vote Bank further consolidates its cramping influence on the *native majority*. It does so by using the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution to perpetuate, with cunning silence, the presence and the possible use of Jinnah's revolver as the Sword of Damocles hanging over the present government's timidity in undertaking the repair of the broken Indian civilization.

The conjunction of the falsehood of Muslim victimhood with the native majority coming into its own after the eclipse of about ten centuries. Despite the constitutional unification of the Indian territory, it is extraordinarily unquestionable that the History of India, for the Muslim, must begin with the invasion of the first horde, in the VIII-IX centuries. For the native it goes back several millennia marked by soul-elevating accomplishments. The Sharia, as an independent legal dispensation,

illustrates this historical and psychological divide. Most particularly, with the presence of the Sharia coupled with the exclusivist closed-mindedness of the Muslim Kaum, and the native Dharma-following Indians maintaining a cultural continuity spanning several millennia, the present Indian Polity does not make a unified people with a common national sentiment. Moreover it needs emphasizing that the Sharia was included for the first time in the 1937 British India Act of which the 1950 Constitution is an enlightened varied adaptation. It means that, in 1947, the Sharia had been in existence in British Law for only ten years when India won Independence.

The respective sociology of the Muslim and of the native Indian. It is significant that the Christian community, despite its affinity with Islam, does not affect the culture and the politics of the native population with a like violence. The novelty of the present configuration of the Indian nation consists of the native Indians having, by the force of events, acquired political primacy for the first time after a thousand years. It is a different novelty for the Muslims who, for the first time in a thousand years, find themselves, as a Kaum, living *within* a Kaffir society, under a liberal, secular constitution, which is one of best four or five democratic constitutions in the world today. Still, out of prudence, it behooves the adherents to the Dharmas never to forget that the Muslim pseudo-minority feels alienated by having to live under a Kaffir rule. It is not beyond the Brahmanist's imagination that the Kaum would prudently be nurturing a reflex of discontent in reserved readiness for another breakaway. It has no equivalence with the Muslim minorities who, in Europe, do not feel alienated, on account of the Quran acknowledging its co-equality in relation to the Judeo-Christian dispensation.

The disappearance of empty spaces favorable to the mobility of armies pertaining to the Revelations. Moreover, in the present physical predicament of the world, there is no more any vast, empty space for Christians and Muslims to manifest their mobilities in ways of conquest, of enslaving, of colonizing. India today has no empty space for a new

Muhammad Bakhtiyar or a new Mahmud of Ghazni to emerge and rove about the land to loot, destroy and massacre as privileged modes to be authentic, faithful Mussalmans. During the long era of the immensity of open places and of European and Muslim mobilities, the Oriental peoples, India and China primarily, did not leave their borders in order to conquer, to loot, to dominate and exploit other peoples and reduce them to servitude. India and China had the manpower, the naval technologies, the financial wealth all of their own: they did not colonize or enslave any alien population. Colonizing and enslaving were the privileges of those people to whom once the Only God had spoken and revealed Himself and later dispatched an angel to repeat His words to a Messenger.

The silence of the Partition loving Muslims who remained. So far there has been little, if any, reflection, on the part of the elite of the Indian Muslims, on their experience in independent India, of any verification of Jinnah's pronouncement that Muslims cannot live, or do not want to live, together with Hindus. Their identity was frequently asserted by the outbreak of communal riots, which have conveniently stopped as a characteristic expression of belonging to Indian Islam, with the rise of the Bharatiya Janta Party.

The durability of Islamic closed-mindedness. In relation to the post-independence adjustment of the Muslims to the majority Brahmanists, the absence of any communal riot does not signify any concomitant diminution or loss of their obdurate closed-mindedness. Their large demography provides the social and psychological scope for its maintenance with the association with madrassas, the Sharia, the Theological Schools and related religious associations as the guardians of the purity of the religion. They use their political vote blocs in the electoral politics and thereby cement their exclusivist mentality. It is a permanent paradox evident in the Muslim Kaum zealously maintaining his exclusivism and complaining all the time of their social unease. They find it hard to own that their zealously guarded separatist mentality does breed a well-established communal separateness as the assurance of their identity. It is

a no-exit social predicament preserved by the Muslims as the guarantee of their collective personality. Their political ideology consists essentially of their fossilized Islamic exclusiveness congruent with the fossilized Indian Christianity.

The Muslim reaction to the CAA law. The Muslims' reaction to the Citizenship Amendment Act, enacted into law on 12 December 2019, illustrates the confusion churning in the collective mind of the Muslim community. This law guarantees citizenship to Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, Parsis, Christians who seek refuge in India from Pakistan, Bangladesh and Afghanistan. It provoked quite a hoopla by Muslims denouncing the law for not including Muslims among the categories of refugees from the three majority Muslim Countries. Their hostile reaction to the CAA law was indeed paradoxical for their not being concerned with the absurdity of not asking themselves why the former Muslim League Muslim who morphed into being a Pakistani or Bangladeshi would seek the privilege of returning to the India which they earlier reviled and now reclaim the citizenship which they had abandoned out of their virulent fanatical hatred of the Hindu Kaffir. The Indian Muslim leaders, dwelling mostly silent on this rather mild rebellion, staged by a crowd of elderly Muslim matrons, did not seem to acknowledge the damage caused by the falsehood of those tens of millions of Muslims who believed in the Muslim League myth of their certain suffering by persecution in a free India with a Hindu majority. Nor did they see the irony of their protesting against the law excluding Muslims migrating back to India, after they had left, with simultaneously creating a catastrophic mayhem of killing, burning, raping, in order to be able to live well in the two majority Muslim nations. Nor did they expressly chastise the Muslim majority nations mentioned in the CAA law for their Muslim citizens seeking a better life in Kaffir India. Nor did they direct their anger to a critique of the two-nation doctrine of the pro-Partition Muslims.

The protest against the Citizenship Amendment Act gave proof of the ambivalence of the Indian Muslim who is deft in using the freedom of protesting, guaranteed by the Constitution, as a legitimate form of political

action and, at the same time, without any reason, gratuitously, projecting their violent intolerant exclusivist attitude as a minority right to walk on the revealed straight path. In short it was good Islam to Partition the country. It was further a good Islam to indulge in the horrors of Partition in order to live in a Medina-like Pakistan. It was still good Islam when, with a good conscience, the Believers want to go back to the same India which they had repudiated and which they still abominate. Nor do the Pakistani and the Bangladeshi see the inhumanity of their ethnic cleansing and of treating their minorities as second class citizens in their theocracies. Moreover they do not see the irony of screaming that their rights are frustrated by Indians defending themselves against the former jihadists returning to seek refuge in Vote Banks.

The successful inversion of Indian history by the Muslim League leadership. It was easy for the vast majority of the Muslim population to buy this preposterous inversion of History which made shambles of whatever gossamer thin *bhai-bhaiism* they would have felt, during generations, for their Brahmanist neighbours. The nurturing of the ''idea'' of a separate Muslim State appealed to the community which asserts its identity in the collective lust for power. The prospect of belonging to a separate state ruled by Muslims animated the pre-disposed tropism into a violence which is concomitant with the history of Islam. It is littered with examples which show that whenever the Believer encounters an idea, or a principle, or an ideology, which happens to be in opposition to the revealed law or principle, he does not engage a debate or any form of discussion or persuasion to convince the opponent of the unquestionable merit of the truth revealed by Allah. If the opponent persists with claiming a more elevated argument, the Believer responds by the obliteration of the opponent, preferably with brute force.

Hindus misperceiving the attitude of the Muslim Middle Class. Hindu sociologists in the first half of the XX century failed to bring out the sentimental distance separating the Middle Class Muslim from the Middle Class Hindu. Hindus failed to recognize that the common usage of the

English language had all the time after 1857 been the screen which effectively kept the store of this intimate Quran-based thoughts hidden in their Muslim neighbours' silence. The Muslim naturally does never expose his genuine Islamic feelings in his use of the English language. The Moderate Muslim, for example, rarely, if ever, expresses an opinion on Kashmiri separatism, or on Pakistani ill-treatment of non-islamic minorities, or anything in the Kaffir culture which he appreciates at its just value. Hatred of the Hindu resided in the hearts, not of the Mullahs (for these came later), but of the anglicized, educated Muslim companions or neighbors. Indian moderate Muslims were indifferent that it took Pakistan seventy-three years to pass legislation recognizing the validity of the Hindu marriage. Even then the law contains a sub-clause signifying the automatic dissolution of the wedding if one of the wedded partners converts to Islam!

The post-Partition popular slogan of: ''*hansne se mila Pakistan, ladne se lenge Hindustan (*"We got Pakistan by laughing, we shall get Hindustan by fighting.") epitomized the success of the brute violence animated by the anglicized Muslim Middle Class easily defeating the pacifism of the majority Hindu-Sikh community. It encapsulates the spirit of Indian Islamic contemptuous exclusivism and its reliance on Force as the means of realizing Allah's expectations. Partition provided the dramatic difference between Islam as a cyclonic Force and a Brahmanist culture based on the virtues of Truth and *Ahiṁsā* and of a historic aversion to use brute force to kill the other for believing differently. Above all Brahmanists were unfortunately almost totally ignorant of the history of Muslims beyond the borders of India. They had no knowledge of Muslims having all through their history been turbulent minorities and intolerant majorities. The French historian René Grousset correctly, in his *Bilan de l'Histoire* (A Survey of History) pertinently concludes that as minorities Muslims keep quiet in states ruled by autocrats and absolute monarchs, as in Tsarist and Stalinist Russia and in China; as majorities they wipe out their minorities.

That is exactly what has been the role of the "minority" Muslims in militarily weak Brahmanist sub-continent. [12]

Comparing the Partition with the French Revolution. In 1789 the French Revolution broke out with the action of idealistic members of the educated, professional bourgeoisie being spurred by Jean Jacques Rousseau's famous dictum: *''Man is born free and everywhere he is in shackles*''. Rousseau's humanistic philosophy guided the minds of the framers of the American Constitution of 1776. In France, the working class followed the supremely educated bourgeois revolutionary leaders. The workers were driven by the accumulated rage rising from the suffering of the heavy taxation imposed by the aristocracy conniving with the Catholic clergy. In India the crass poverty of the Muslim proletariat was scarcely different from the economic condition of the Hindu proletariat. During Muslim rule the Hindu converting to Islam retained his poverty. But during the British rule the Hindu converting to Christianity did to a large extent obtain an improvement of his economic condition: the railways, for example, became a big employer of poor Hindus converted to the Christian faith.

The fierce cruelty of the direct British colonial rule. Nevertheless, after 1857, the heavy taxation and impoverishment of the masses was due to the policy of the British imperialists. After breaking the power of the Muslim hegemony, the British used, to a large extent, the Hindu landlord as their collaborating intermediary to collect the taxes whether the crops failed or not. As a result it became easy in the 1930s to carry out a propaganda against the Hindu landlords as the oppressors of the Muslim landless millions. The hatred of the landlord provided the ready reason for distributing the hatred among the entire Hindu community, not against

---

[12] René Grousset's perception of Muslims as turbulent or quiet minorities has been vindicated by the rise of the Tchechens during the rule of Eltsin as the weak ruler of Russia and of their quietness after the harsh suppression of the revolt by Putin. At its creation in 1947, Pakistan had a minority of 23% of the population. Its successful ethnic cleansing has reduced the minority to less than 2%.

the hard-hearted tax collector. This hate campaign was further intensified by the influence of the Wahhabi and Afghani reform of Islam, which the Hindu leaders did not think it necessary to study and assess the measure of its influence. Mahatma Gandhi failed to respond to the wind of Islamic reform blowing over the country when he supported the movement for the restoration of the Caliphate in association with the conservative stratum of the Muslim Kaum. In the interest of the Indian political struggle against British imperialism the Mahatma's supporting the conservative Mussalmans favoring the return of the Califate was supremely contrary to the liberal modernizing policy carried out by Kemal Ataturk in Turkey. Mahatma Gandhi was motivated to build bridges of concord with the Indian Muslim Kaum, for which he earned the hostility of the few liberal Muslims who in reality got pushed aside by the fascist rise of the Muslim League in political congruence with the Fascisms rising in Italy, in Spain, in Germany, in Japan.

The Muslim cunning in the inversion of History. However, in India, while collaborating with the colonialist power, especially during the middle and late 1900s, the educated, middle class Muslims chose to invert history by the gratuitous *assumption* of the certainty of *their suffering* under the rule of the majority Hindus, after the departure of the British. The slogan of *Islam in danger* initiated a rallying of the masses, not, against the British rule, but against an intolerant Hindu majority represented as a certainty. Subsequently the Muslim who adhered to the vote bank after independence never let out that they had been misled by Muslim League propaganda against the pacifism of the Hindu majority. Nor did the intellectual class among the Hindu majority receive any reciprocal recognition of their tolerance, even after the horrors of Partition. The silence of the Vote Bank Muslims further emphasizes the specific *rationality* of the Muslim when it gets translated into the reluctance to recognize the virtue of the Other as a threat to the comfort of his God-determined psychology of spontaneous hostility to any thought or sentiment not prescribed by the revelation.

A brief confirmation of the inversion of History by the Muslim League. The reverse side of the box which holds the two-volume book *India Partitioned*, edited by Mushirul Hasan, shows the black-and-white photograph of the front line of young, elegantly well dressed, adult Muslims leading a crowd and carrying two apparently cardboard posters: the one on the left reads in Bold Letters: *MOSLEMS CALL TO ARMS DIRECT ACTION (in smaller letters:) THE BRITISH HAVE BROKEN THEIR SOLEMN PLEDGE AND BETRAYED THE MOSLEMS. THE MOSLEMS HAVE RESOLVED TO RESORT TO DIRECT ACTION AND SMASH THE UNHOLY ANGLO-HINDU ALLIANCE AND ACHIEVE THEIR INDEPNDENT STATE OF PAKISTAN.*

On its right the poster carried in bold across the entire surface the two words: *PAKISTAN OR PERISH***.** The men carrying the posters hanging round their necks have their mouths open like those of the men behind them in the crowd. They are dressed in suits tailored in British style. The inversion of history is so brazenly advertised for those men would have known that while ALL the leaders of the Congress Party were locked in jail during the war years, only the leaders of the Muslim League and of the Communist Party were free to organize and strengthen their movements. The British were openly in favor of Jinnah and his followers. Yet the posters were telling the lie of a Winston Churchill-led British Government's collusion with the anti-Congress Party. It worked well to rouse the masses around their fidelity to Islam. *The proletariat masses indeed followed the well-to-do anglicized middle class by spontaneously providing mass support*, in an uncannily similarity of the masses lustily supporting the fascist middle class led by Mussolini in 1921 and by Hitler in 1932. During the XX century all over the world the masses provided the necessary convenience and support for the establishment of totalitarian Fascist states: in Spain, in Italy, in Germany, in Japan, subsequently in Pakistan. The masses lent themselves also to the emergence of totalitarian Communism which lost no time in paradoxically endowing itself with a feared Police as the guardian of socialist purity. In fact, wherever there is a political demand for purity, there is the inevitable concomitant powerful, sinister Police for the protection of political social monolithic integrity. Significantly the

monumental difference was evident in the huge crowds attending the speeches of Mahatma Gandhi and following his policy of opposition to the British Empire by peaceful means. They provided the elevated moral example in an infinite contrast with the masses which provided mass support of the European Fascisms.

The Muslim mode of exercising the right to autonomy. In summing up the argument related to India, the Muslim demand for Partition was, according to B. R. Ambedkar, a legitimate sentiment. Islam being what it is, in conformity with its history of aggression and of conquest, it was inevitable that Partition would be carried out as a *modus operandi* homogeneous with the *modus operandi* of Sultans Muhammad Ghori, Qutb-ud-din Aibak and of such generals as Muhammad Bakhtiyar and of looters like Ghaznavid Mahmud.

The legacy of the Mahatma. During the last phase of the movement for Independence, the Indian leaders displayed a failure which has ironically bequeathed the legacy of pacifism for the benefit of all humanity: like Caesar who left his name to History, so has, but with a more humane éclat, M. K. Gandhi bequeathed *gandhiism* as a synonym for peace, as the norm for the political guidance of all men and women wishing and hoping to live humanely well. The Truth and the *Ahiṁsā* of the *Mahābhārata*, energized by the Mahatma, will live as a vital force for tranquility and peace, with even Muslims after their seeking solace in the memory of killers and looters, as a tribute to Allah's continuing *Taqdīr.* Indeed what has Islam to contribute to the labor of the native Indian laboring to recover his past in order to redeem the civilization which had, as its centrality, a variety of mystical self-enlightenment as the finality of human existence?

Why did the Hindu leaders nor refute Jinnah's inversion of Indian History? On a grand scale, it was the illustration of the story of the majority of the Francophone Catholic majority of the population of Quebec, the eastern province of Canada, which got '*inferiorized*' by its

Anglophone Protestant minority for close to three centuries.[13] It is difficult to imagine and understand how and why the Hindu elites of the Congress Party, led by Mahatma Gandhi and his immensely capable followers like Jawaharlal Nehru and Vallabhai Patel, would not have ''seen'' this immense distortion of the history of the sub-continent by the action of the Muslim minority led by Jinnah and the Muslim League. *It was an immense paradox of the Hindu leaders who, while bearing the burdens of Satyagraha and Ahiṁsā, supplemented with the peerless heritage of tolerance, would have evinced the fear of telling the truth to the Muslims by recalling their history of iconoclastic intolerance in order to call the bluff of their victimhood. Why did they not remind Jinnah of the Muslims having destroyed the beautiful and humane culture of the Buddhists? Would this restraint have been due to the scruple of not offending the small fraction of the upper crust Muslim elite adhering to the Congress Party?*[14] *Would this small minority of pro-Congress Muslims have held the entire nation hostage by the means of their ineffective support, as a factor in the make-believe policy of the Congress representing the entire Hindu-Muslim community? And after Partition, why did none of the pro-Congress Muslims declare that the Kaum won with the fanatical brashness of a lie?*

The notion of a separate Muslim state was in the air since the beginning of the century. The intimations of separation were already defined by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Muhammad Iqbal, who had already lent the prestige of their support for an Islamic State carved out of the sub-continent. All along the Hindu intelligentsia refused, or neglected, to recognize what the

---

[13] I stress the connotation 'Hindu' because the important Buddhist culture of India became nearly extinct as a result of the Muslims' using the obliterating iconoclasm as their brand of intolerance.

[14] Whenever I have raised this centrality of the Muslim hegemony with an educated Muslim, the quick rejoinder was: "What about the Taj Mahal?" He would remain silent when I observed: "The Taj Mahal is no compensation for the Monuments and Institutions of high Learning, which, being more important than the Taj Mahal, your folks deemed necessary to be obliterated!"

Quran says about the non-Believer. Till today there seems to be no one among the Hindu leaders who really commands an objective evaluation of the full dimension of the Quran's rejection of the Kaffir as someone who does not have a meaningful reason to exist. And if the Kaffir exists, he needs to be eliminated either by conversion or by death inflicted by Allah's innocent proxy.

Instead the Hindu leadership allowed the huge lie to prevail when the simple fact, illustrated by the countless ruins of monuments visible all over the territory, tells the story of the Muslims who, after having in reality so openly spoliated the Indian civilization, were now claiming instead *their* victimhood as the reason and justification of their demand for Partition.

The moral and political ineffectiveness of the Congress Party Muslims against the Muslim League ideology. The right to remember calls for a well-researched publication on the silence and the ineffectiveness of the Congress Party Muslim elites in their not having controverted the Muslim League ideology of Muslim victimhood. The incongruity which now confronts the Indian Muslims forces them to confront the fact of their having to define their future as a "minority" burdened with the obligation to bring forth a just *modus vivendi*, in peaceful harmony with the Brahmanist majority. Now centralized as a nation, the Brahmanist majority is inevitably saddled with the memory of the past iconoclastic depredations. However, the denizens of the two theocracies - Pakistanis and Bangladeshis - would be simultaneously spared the psychological obligation to acknowledge the ravages which were carried out with greater ferocity and thoroughness and in which they participated when they were integral sections of the former undivided sub-continent.

The intellectual failure of the Congress Party in view of the memory of the past Muslim hegemony. While they sincerely cast themselves as advocates and, ironically, as hostages, to their "*Bhai-Bhaiism*", the Brahmanist leaders, in repeated efforts, during the first half of the XX century, chose to bend backwards in order to humor the fanatical closed-mindedness of most Muslims, with assurances that their fears of being

dominated were unfounded. The Brahmanist leaders, however, failed to take stock of the fact that in reality the Muslims had ingratiated themselves with the British conquerors, especially immediately after the First War of Independence in 1857. The large Brahmanist mass provided one common factor which provided the basis of the semblance of the defeated Muslim elite claiming the former history of their ruling as having equality of rank with the British rule. The sentiment of superiority over the native dharma-centric majority was based, not on cultural achievements, but on the possession of armed power. The memory of the lost predominance must have tormented the minds of the once hegemonic Muslim elite, with the prospect of having to swallow the bitterness of equality with those they once dominated. The pain due to such a prospect was further exacerbated by the realization of the defeated Muslims being forced to confront their diminished demography in a democratic state, equipped with representation constituted of electoral voting on the basis of one-citizen-one vote. This sentiment of a dramatic collapse did not have similitude with the Congress Party led by high-caste leaders who had enthusiastically espoused the ideology of a democracy based on the representation by one citizen having a single vote. Despite the collapse of the Mughal power, the Muslim leaders would have entertained the delusion of assuming that, as the former dominant power, they were on the same moral level as the British. It did not matter, in their self-admiration due to the remembrance of their former raw power, that they entertained the delusion of the new imperial authority resting on the sword of Islam and on the rifle of the British. It did not molest the pride of Jinnah, for example, that Lord Macaulay had as much of a loathing of the Hindu as he had of the Arab or the Muslim. Nevertheless the Muslim leaders, during the first half of the XX century, especially during the 1930s, claimed parity with the British in the similitude of their histories of domination over the inferior natives. Hence, nearly a century later, they felt it would be galling, in nostalgic remembrance of their lost supremacy, to bear the status of subordination in a Harbi polity run by Kaffirs. Essentially British power was not, according to Islamic Orthodoxy, a Harbi

power. Accordingly the Muslims could accommodate themselves within the empire run by a power duly recognized to have the respected status of religious homogeneity for being based on a revealed dispensation. The Indian Muslim, under British Christian rule, represented a fateful imitation of the Arab Muslims having endured six centuries of the hegemony of the Ottoman Muslims. Since 1947 the Indian Muslims, for the first time in a thousand years, and alone in the Umma, find themselves in the unfavorable condition of having to live subordinately within a Harbi dominion. Their collective feeling of a disorientation may be due to their having no alternative recourse in the Revelation for the construction of a harmonious settlement with a Kaffir ascendancy.

The disheartening prospect of the Indian Muslims having to live in a Harbi environment. Before 1947, as subjects of the British Monarch, whose main title is the Defender of the Faith, the Muslims nevertheless felt an affinity with their overlord. But the prospect of being secondary in a Kaffir Harbi ascendancy was felt as a depressing reality which justified the majority Muslim community to identify with the British in its last imperial phase. The cultural logic of the Muslim could, during that crucial time, conveniently forget that the British prestige had rested on the glory of their annihilation of the Moghul Empire. Nor did they see the cultural importance of the talented officers of the East India Company discovering the India which the Muslims had almost buried in the mire of their devastations of the Indian civilization.

Openly expressing their abomination of the Hindu Kaffirs, with justification derived from the injunctions of Allah, according to the Quran, the antagonism of the Muslim majority once melded with the British consciousness of their racial superiority. It coincided with Winston Churchill bold-facedly blurting out in regard to the followers of the Mahatma: *''Hindus are a bestial people believing in a bestial religion*''. He further emphasized his contempt for the Hindus by qualifying the Mahatma as a "*Naked Fakir*".

For his part, the Muslim drew his sense of superiority from the submission to the ultimate, perfect dispensation physically revealed by the only able-bodied God who once really walked among the Jews and spoke to Moses and sent Angel Gabriel to murmur His words into the ears of Muhammad. Such a belief was further comforted by the nostalgia for the lost military supremacy, which the Believer claims had been divinely ordained.

The clash of opposite cultures. All these cultural forces clashed at the time of the British resolve to leave their empire. But they could not forsake their own atavistic propensity of scuttling their departure with a sudden burst of destructive fury generated by the anger of losing the empire coinciding with the victory over the Fascist forces of Europe. Mesmerized by the success and inspiration of the soul stirring enthusiasms born of *Satyagraha* and *Ahiṁsā* the Congress Leaders found themselves to be lost at the sea of the conjunction of the violences of the British and of the Muslims. It lay beyond their imagination that the British were then secretly conducting their abandoning the empire simultaneously with the preservation of the Middle Eastern oil-fields which happened to be in territories owned by Islamic powers. Germany lost in both world wars because it was forced to fight on two separate fronts. The Congress Party and its allies lost the battle of Independence because they had to fight on the two fronts of the Muslims and of the British helping the latter. The lasting gain for the losers was in the perennial augustness of the Gandhian Truth and *Ahiṁsā,* gloried evermore with the fact that these values as political forces lie beyond the ken of Al Lah - Jehovah.

The betrayal of the Hindu intellectual elites. In spite, or perhaps indeed because of, the presence of a number of highly educated and scholarly Muslim nationalists as allies and members of the Congress Party, the Hindu leaders failed to evaluate the Muslim elite's respectful admiration of the British supremacy, with which they felt a historical affinity in the memory of their own past hegemony. The Hindu intelligentsia could not muster the psychological and intellectual cognizance enabling them to weigh the nostalgia for the lost power in the mind of the Muslim.

The unforeseen and unimagined fate of the Muslims living as a minority in a Harbi country. To a large extent the atavistic tendency of the Hindus, expressed by the unfounded *bhai-bhaiism,* clouded their perception of the naked Force as the essence of Islam, to the same raw extent of its centrality in Western Civilization. It was now galling for the Muslim to be forced to confront the prospect of living in a polity ruled by what, during the past several centuries, had been perceived by him as a politically inferior Harbi community, whom he could at will defeat and despoil. In a future independent India the Muslim would see himself as a people who, having been raised by Allah above all the non-Muslims living on Earth, would have to live in a perpetual state of subordination under the Harbi rule of the Hindus. The Quran provides no revelation for advice or guidance to the Believer on how to lead a faithful, happy *modus vivendi* in a Harbi land.

In reality, this is the predicament today of the Indian Muslims who have remained after Partition. However, while their innate mobility gets cramped with the psychological unease due to the prospect of their being secondary, the submission to the Quran and to the Sharia personal law code does nevertheless gratify the self-esteem of the Muslims with the thought of their being, as Believers, *above* all the ''Others''.

The falsehood at the heart of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* formula. Despite the long history of the violent diminutions of their civilization, the Hindus still today seek comfort in the self-deluding sentimentality of the formula *sarva dharma sama bhāva* which the Islamic revelation emphatically rejects. In the historical perspective of Indian History the Hindu's obsession with this vacuous formula is in reality a betrayal of the tolerant essence of the Dharmas. For, with its XX century pretention, the slogan is false because it does not correspond to a past constituted of several millennia of preeminent cultural accomplishments. Fate has - seemingly - played a trick which the Muslims did not, and could not, foresee. As has been affirmed earlier, India has nothing to learn from Islam, nor has Islam anything culturally worthy to add to what the

indigenous people has accumulated over time. The Gandhian value of Truth, valid in all the aspects of private and social life, is wider and more profound than what the Quran designates as 'truth' in its legalistic vision of life. In sum, the Muslim Kaum living in Harbi India is tempted to play, and does play, its self-selected ruse of continuing to contend against the State as a demographic "minority". It does, by so doing, consolidate this voluntary imposture for some time, or, if it persists, it will remain a fossilized piece of Islam, as the Indian Christianity has chosen to be. However, if it realizes that the demographic minority coincides with its cultural inferiority, in comparison with the totality of the wealth of values and their corresponding achievements - heaped by the three Dharmas over periods of time far more substantial than the fourteen centuries of Islam - it may be tempted to evolve with the fullest available freedom of action and of thought, dispensed by the Indian Constitution. That is, it can produce a form of Islam richer and more sparkling than the Islam of the Abbassid dynasty. The unique opportunity of a new, Enlightenment Islam has the opportunity to come into existence in the three spaces of freedom provided by the willing fortunate combination with the three Harbi Dharmas.

The inverse Māyā of the Brahmanist elite. When, in utter ignorance of the Muslim psychology, the Brahmanist leaders believe that the Muslims, ensconced in the vote banks, are their sincere friends, they innocently delude themselves with *the inverse Māyā of seeing the snake as a rope.* Even after Partition, the elites of the Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangha have persisted in not making any effort to reflect on the Islamic reason of the ethnic cleansing of the Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan, further sealed with the three wars against Nehru-led India, followed with relentless use of terrorisms across the Line of Control marking off the two territories. In Pakistan the ethnic cleansing was carried out with the Sunni Islamist's cathartic impulse arising from the fear, or unwillingness, *to have even the semblance of an obligation to abide faithfully by the democratic respect of the Kaffir minorities. For the latter to be endowed with socio-political equality with the Believer majority would contravene the fundamentals of*

the Quran having precedence in the theocratic state symbolically attired as a democracy. Brahmanists have not given up the comfort of burying their heads into the sands of the constitutional provision of religious and civic equality of all the religious groups functioning within the national polity. Out of a collective generosity they have chosen to submit to this fundamental law guaranteeing equality to all the religions availing in India, in contradiction with historical realities. The 1950 Constitution seemingly ignored the reality, for example, that Christianity and Islam claim each to be the only absolute Truth! [15]

Yet the reality is that, under the aegis of the Constitution, each religiosity holds its specific doctrinal and cultural autonomy, without the different religions being theologically equal, both in their doctrines and in their histories. The Muslims persist in maintaining their exclusivist socio-political stance by refusing to join the common code of civil law, nor do they express a willingness to define their interpretation of the word "provisional" used when the Sharia was included in the Constitution, with the proviso that the Muslim Kaum would join the common civil code at their own voluntary request. This has not happened up to now. Surely the Muslims, aware of whatever hostility or animus they may experience, it is their duty to observe towards the non-Believer, in submission to the Quranic commands, that they are right not to subscribe to the inanity of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* slogan which contradicts their reverence for their own faith.

The deleterious effect of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* shibboleth. The banal fact is that there is nothing in the native Indian culture and civilization which is common to the religions or beliefs of both the Believer

[15] It is worth noting that in the entire Christendom, no one reflected on the TRUTH which Mahatma Gandhi leveled, as a force against British power, exerted in the name of the Monarch, Defender of the Faith. No theologian in the West said a word about the Mahatma spending time in a jail for being condemned due to his using TRUTH against a Christian power.

and the Kaffir in regard to the respective *Weltanschauung* of each. To begin with the Quran, with unqualified equanimity, demonizes all the native Dharmas as errors, as untruths, *as deserving of Allah's abomination.* There is nothing common to Allah and Īśvara. Seen by Muhammad during his nocturnal flight to Heaven, Allah is a physical, able bodied personality, who wages war and reveals that it was He who won the first Islamic battle at Badr. As a mythic personality, Śrī Kṛṣṇa visits Duryodhana to plead for peace with the Pāṇdava Brothers. He does take part in the battle on the field of Kuru, only as a charioteer and as a witness. After the battle He is roundly reproached by Gāndhārī for His not having prevented the hostilities and she curses Him, in potent verses, unique in world literature, for their daring and for the untrammeled independence of Brahmanist thought expressed eloquently in simple words cursing Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the most beloved Deity of the Hindus. In Brahmanism each of the great gods bears a weapon, which he uses for the elimination of evil doers, with the evil being always associated with the abuse of absolute power by mythic Kings and Demons. They do not take part in the life of historical Kings seeking the prestige of "*cakravartin*". Of all the Kings who have ruled in India, no one has gone to battle under the aegis of a favored particular deity against an opposing monarch claiming the help of another favored deity. However India is unique in this particular *ne plus ultra* of belief, or rather in the well-entrenched naturally believing that the essence of the favorite divinity *(iṣṭa devatā*) is the in-dweller (*antaryāmī*) as the essence of the individual, of any individual. And there is no common measure between Islam having, as its central doctrine, the resurrection of the body on the Day of Resurrection, and the Dharmas elucidating mystical finalities realized in the body, as a private, personal experience, on the surface of the Earth, as *mokṣa* in Brahmanism, as *nirvāṇa* in Theravāda or as *śūnyatā* in Mahāyāna, as *kaivalya* in Jainism. Nor is there any common trait between Muhammad and Gautama Buddha or Mahāvīra. None of the Indian founders of Dharmas, or any Ṛṣi, or Ācārya, exhibits such characteristic personal attributes as the sexual lust, the attachment to wealth and power, the love

for waging wars, the massacres, the free use of swords, the practice of *Taqiyya,* which characterize the career of Muhammad believed by the faithful Muslims to be the ultimate perfect Man. No event or incident demonstrated with equal vigor the stark insignificance of the *sama bhāva* embracing all religions as did the destruction, in 2002 A.D., of the Bamiyan Buddhas which Mullah Omar, the ruler of the Taliban Government of Afghanistan, piously declared to be an appurtenance contrary to the purity of the Islamic State.

Mullah Omar was right and Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee was wrong. The thirteen centuries old Bamiyan Buddhas were reminders of Afghanistan having been for centuries a Buddhist region. It was one of those Buddhisms which were obliterated by Islamic iconoclasts. The statues were protected by the UNESCO as monuments of the world heritage. When Mullah Omar decided to have the Bamiyan Buddhas destroyed, the OIC (Organization of Islamic Countries) sent a delegation to plead with Mullah Omar to save the monuments. Mullah Omar challenged the delegates to refute his decision taken in conformity with the Sharia and his argument that the presence of the Buddha statues constituted an offence to a theocratic Islamic country. The OIC delegates failed to convince the Mullah of the desirability of tolerating the presence of the Buddhist images.

The misrepresentation of Muslim intolerance by Prime Minister Vajpayee. Responding to the demolition of the Bamiyan Buddhas Prime Minister Vajpayee gave a speech in which he declared that the destruction of the Buddhist monuments *was against the tenets of Islam.* Apparently with the desire to please the Muslim Vote Bank, his speech was diametrically opposed to the decision taken by Mullah Omar and to the acquiescence of the OIC delegates who did not offer any reasoned opposition strong enough to save the Buddhist monuments. Prime Minister Vajpayee lost a rare opportunity to bring to the consciousness of the Indian nation, and of the world at large, the barbaric practice of iconoclasm with which the Muslims had wrought so

much havoc in the Indian civilization. The large-hearted, scholarly Vajpayee consciously went against the facts of history to argue, in the face of the whole world, that the Mullah had committed an act contrary to the spirit and the history of Islam. It was a huge falsehood delivered with the intention of not offending the Muslims of India, in particular, and doing so by *inverting* the history of iconoclasm the products of which are indicated by the remnant ruins of Kaffir monuments littering the Indian soil. Undoubtedly the Prime Minister may have been motivated by the hope that his turning *upside down* the Islamic traditional hostility to any representative art would win him the votes of the Muslim community. As a 'gratitude' for the magnanimity of Vajpayee, the Muslim community, at the following national election, voted the Bharatiya Janta Party *out*, and set the effete Congress party to rule for two terms during the following decade. Vajpayee played the trump card of *sarva dharma sama bhāva* and lost. It was a loss which testified to the wasted opportunity to lament on the erasure of a unique symbol which, honored by the UNESCO in the name of all nations, recalled the hallowed dispensation taught by Gautama Buddha, the holiest Indian who ever walked in the dust of Bhārata Land. More than being the author of a mere additional affirmation of religious tolerance, Buddha deserved, on the part of Vajpayee, a reminder, for the edification of the Indian nation, of the destruction of Indian Buddhism by Muslim fundamentalist bigotry, and a eulogy of the august Middle Way with which he had adorned the sub-continent. When, in 2002, the two statues were blown up in Bamiyan, it was no compensation accruing to India that the world of decency could bear witness to the barbaric ignorance arrogantly flouted, by the mortiferous Taliban, as the purity of faith in totalitarian Islam.[16]

---

[16] It is noteworthy that the United Nations adopted an attitude of indifference and failed to intervene to save the Bamiyan Buddhas. After all the thirteen centuries old monuments were under the protection of the UNESCO which is an affiliate of the United Nations.

The essential differences between the native Indian Dharmas and the revealed religions. Moreover there is nothing in Islam which is the equivalent of the *''tat tvam asi'' mahāvākya* of the Upaniṣad. For the Muslim this profound universalist pronouncement would be considered a blasphemy because, in a disenchanted world created out of chaos, by Al Lah (The God) cannot be impurely associated with any earthly object. The Biblical cosmology, which the Quran endorses, attributes purity to Heaven, to the Only God, and all that pertains to the created world is deficient of purity and it is sinful to attribute any physical association of the material world to Him. Further when God came down to give Moses the tablets on which He had inscribed the Ten Commandments, he had taken the precaution to mention especially the prohibition of artificial representations of any kind. It was this anti-art commandment which has justified the practice of the countless iconoclastic destructions which Muslims have perpetrated in the Indian sub-continent. Even today the Muslims in India do not hesitate to express their contempt and abomination of Hindus worshipping idols, though it is the good fortune of the Indian civilization that idol-worshipping is also accompanied with the beauty of song and music. It is a further high mark of aesthetic perfection that idol worship can also be practiced by the art of the dancer. Richard Wagner argues that the original contribution which Christianity has made to European civilization is Music. He did not know that Indian classical music owes its origin in the art of singing the verses of the Sāma Veda, and that at all recorded time India has associated Music as contingent upon sentiments exalting the experience of the ineffable self-realization. The Islamic prohibition of the use of music as such, and more so, in associating it with religiosity is, in view of its sublime expressions in the religious traditions of Europe and of India, a definitive civilizational contraction favorable to fundamental fanaticism compatible with the Believer's hatred of the other. Nevertheless, while music is vehemently taught to be contrary to Allah's dispensation, according to Islamic orthodoxy, in India Muslims have evinced excellence in the mastery of the traditional classic music by borrowing from the Hindu traditional exponents. But Muslims do

not associate music with the namaz in the mosque. Qavvālis, imitations of Brahmanist Bhajans, are based on the motifs of Brahmanist classical Music, and they constitute a particular Muslim chanting specific to India.[17] Beyond the sub-continent, there are no Qavvāls in the Muslim countries.

What is abhorrent to the Muslim is a preference to the Brahmanist. The Brahmanist is at ease in worship God as Man-Lion, or as a Boar, or as a Young Man with an Elephant head; he worships a Monkey as a loving and helping Deity. A major distinction which marks off Islam from the native Dharmas is the unitiveness of the religious and the profane in Islam, while they are discontinuous in the indigenous traditions. There is one conspicuous particularity between the native Dharmas and the three revealed religions (Jewish, Christian, Islamic): *there is no genocide in the history of any of the Dharmas; genocides, slaveries, colonialisms, are products of societies, communities, nations, inspired, motivated and justified, by the contents of the three revealed monotheistic Jewish, Christian, Islamic religions*. There in no common measure between the mystical finalities prescribed by the Dharmas and the finality of human existence on the Day of Resurrection prescribed as central to the three Revealed religions, with their roots in the Old Testament.

The deleterious influence of the "*sarva dharma sama bhāva*" non sequitur. All these enormous, fundamental differences illustrate the inanity of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva.* It is to the infinite credit of Mahatma Gandhi that the formula of *sarva dharma sama bhāva* was not a glib statement for the service of a passing political opportunistic fancy. It reflected his genuine concern for a strategy of permanent conciliation of the two dominant communities for the sake of a free unified sub-continent

---

[17] Ayatollah Ruholla Khomeni pronounced a sermon at the University of Teheran in which he asked the students not to study music as the cause of its corrupting the mind. In Canada Muslim parents have insisted on their right to withdraw their sons and daughters from taking lessons in music freely taught in the schools.

with the promise of building a great, enlightened civilization. The hard fact consists of his dream, based on his advocacy of a fundamental unitive foundation of all the religions obtaining in India. But it did not have any echo in the hearts of, neither the Muslim masses, nor of the Muslim leaders adhering to both the Congress Party and to the Muslim League. With hindsight, the scruple for an honest appraisal of the Mahatma's formula must recognize that, in the history of Islam, in particular, there exists no substance, no idea, no value, no intention, no willingness, for any kind of equality or concord, or the slightest *rapprochement*, between a revelation issued by Allah and a set of indigenous doctrines elucidated by humans, however learned and virtuous they might have been. Even with the hindsight of the past more than seven decades, no Muslim, none among even the "moderates" of the Congress party, has endorsed the sentiment which inspired the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* magnanimously enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi. This failure constitutes a most persuasive homage to his passion for sub- continental unity based on universalist friendship. *It was a shooting star which shone for a while as it disappeared into the tamas of revealed hatred*.

Hence, it behooves the present day citizen to acknowledge that the heroism of Mahatma Gandhi, a feat which occurred, in a crucial context, once in several millennia, was a hope, without any correspondence in the reality of the scriptures and the history of Islam. This hollow formula, now dear to uninformed Brahmanists, in particular, has a further deleterious consequence. Essentially coined and used mostly, if not exclusively, by half-baked political activists, the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* has been, in particular, since 1947, a magnificent delusion masquerading as the traditional tolerance. In the Indian context of the absence of any reciprocity on the part of the Muslims, even of those who wear the dress of fictitious moderation, the constant reiteration of the four-word slogan has become a sterile substitute for the traditional tolerance based on the metaphysics of the Dharmas. In particular Brahmanist tolerance has always been a private and social expression of believing that God is

antaryāmī (in-dweller) and of *tat tvam asi* (thou art that). In agreement with Buddhism and Jainism, the Brahmanist category of thought is not available in all other religions or philosophies. It is actually sternly proscribed by Islamic orthodoxy.

The naturalness of Brahmanist tolerance in contrast to the intolerance emphasized in the revelations. In truth, the tolerance of the Indian, whose psyche is distinguished by the humaneness of each of the three Dharmas, is integral to the way of being spontaneously and effortlessly normal. Native Indian culture is pervaded with tolerance which is as natural, beautiful and perennial as the Himalayas. No one proves the reality of the Himalayas. No one needs to trumpet the tolerance of the non-Muslim native citizens. If the Muslims do not have the sensitivity to own the reality of the native tolerance and its beneficence, then the sociological tensions, which their ignorance generates, are cognate to their responsibility, to the contents of their belief and to the reason of their willing closed-mindedness. Of the obligation to bring forth a permanent frictionless *modus vivendi* in Harbi Kaffirdom, the onus lies on the conscience of the Muslim Kaum.

The durability of the chasm between the two communal world-visions. It does not pertain to the politics of the majority Brahmanists, who have neither the means, nor the authority, to instill in the Umma any measure of humaneness towards the seven billion Kaffirs against whom the Believers are required to wage war. The followers of the Dharmas wrote their tolerance in the permanent stones of Ajanta. Tolerance is built into the numerous *tīrthas* which constitute the Indian territory as a sacred land, which for the Muslim is an abomination, for only Allah is sacred and nothing else is worthy of veneration. In the whole world, for the Muslim, only the Kaba is an object of veneration. In India there is not a single square millimeter of land which is sacred for the Muslim.

Death: viewed differently in Islam and in the Dharmas. The significant monuments of Indian Islam are mausoleums as reminders of Death. For the Brahmanist death is as natural as birth. The real is assumed to dwell in

the series of rebirths. The present existence is one in a series of rebirths (*punar janma*), which means that the birth of the present body was preceded by the death of the previous existence. Death is not the only one to occur to the present body; a previous death preceded the birth of the present body.

The absence of a tragic sense in native Indian civilization. No one in India has ever felt any tragic sense of life: Indian literature has no equivalent of the tragic playwrights and poets of the West. The Indian temples and museums do not display any object related to death as do the churches and museums in Judeo-Christian Europe. It is indeed immensely paradoxical that the three revealed religions, which are grounded in the belief of a God-given single life between birth and death, would have so abundantly infused their doctrines with such drastic, lethal intolerance and violence as necessary components. It is all the more perplexing that the theologians of these violence-prone religions would have remained so totally impassive in their indifference to the peacefulness at the heart of the Oriental religions. The theologians of the revealed faiths have lavished their blessings on the violences of their co-believers acting out their colonizing furies on the Asian cultures. Disdained for their military inferiority the Oriental cultures suffered the additional ignominy of being held down for cherishing a corresponding religious inferiority. The arrogance formulated by the principle of Might is Right, which is distinctively characteristic of Western Civilization, is exalted by Rudyard Kipling's congratulatory eulogy of the White Man's Burden!

The absence of a tragic sense in any of Indian Dharmas. There is no tragic sense of life in the sensibility of the Brahmanist. Evidently, the Dharmas, native to India, have no extensions in other countries by forced conversions of by military conquests. The spread of Buddhism has been effected by renouncer monks and the Buddhisms of Asia are specific independent spiritual totalities. All the festivities related to the indigenous Dharmas are remarkably unrelated to historical events. The celebration of the birth of Gautama Buddha is the sole exception. Indian Islam is a

tributary of Arab Islam and it demonstrates it, on a grand scale, with the obligatory Hajj to Mecca and Medina. It zealously maintains its outsider status as its prominent singularity.[18]

There is no *sama bhāva* qualifying the homogeneity of the *dualistic* revealed religions on equal theological terms with the totally different *non-dual* metaphysics of the indigenous Dharmas. Signified by this slogan, the reality of the theological sameness of all the major religions practiced in India has never existed. Nor is it vouchsafed by their written sources and their divergences. There is nothing in the Quran, for example, which in any manner echoes the *Mahābhārata* repeatedly stressing *Satya* (Truth) and *Ahiṁsā* as the ultimate morality (*paramo dharma*). The finalities which the Quran and the Dharmas prescribe will keep their divergences till the end of the Kali Yuga. In the meantime the Constitution remains the only recourse as the foundation for the practical equilibrium of mutually exclusive intellectual and religious norms and expressions co-existing in a peaceful, secular, egalitarian society.

The harm done by the *sarva dharma sama bhāva.* The more important damage, which the *non sequitur "sarva dharma sama bhāva"* causes, lies in the quiet indifference to it, on the part of the Muslim community. They do not reject it off hand as a pernicious attempt to weaken the radical fundamentalism of the Islamic faith, whether it is defined by the fundamentalist or by the pseudo-moderate Believer. This means that the Brahmanist, who keeps rattling the four-word sound, is actually shouting in the desert of Muslim indifference. In reality the Muslim is content with projecting on the Brahmanist's mind the illusion of his agreement when in

---

[18] No doubt there are in fact Muslims who do sincerely collaborate with Hindus in all walks of life, in the military, for example. This essay lays emphasis on the dominant influence of the majority of the Muslims who actively preserve the specificity of their communal autonomy as such. The exceptions are the few swallows who do not make the summer of a liberal, secular Kaum.

his own private understanding he has to remain faithful to the obligation to submit to the rules and principles of the Islamic scriptures. And no Muslim, in any party, has as yet come forward to reflect on the Quranic abomination of the non-Believers as undesirable and contrary to the peaceful communal co-existence prevailing in India. On this score the silence of the Muslim is the silence of the volcano which chooses its day for the desired explosion as communal riot or as the horror of a partition.

The violence hidden in the silence of the Muslim. Worse: the Brahmanist uses his slogan as an end in itself and accordingly excuses himself from the obligation to study the Islamic scriptures and accede to a right understanding of Islam as a totalitarian political ideology dressed as a religion. Only the knowledge of the sources and content of the rules and principles of Islam thus gathered can enable a reliable appraisal of all the thoughts and inspirations which persuade the action of the Muslim. The womb which gave birth to the horrors of Partition is still fertile: its existence generates the politeness, the conformity to the Constitution, the quiet identity felt with the possession of the Sharia, the manifest congeniality. All these, under the appearance of concord, co-exist with the silence on the ethnic cleansing in Pakistan and Bangladesh, on Kashmiri separatism, on the politics of terror carried out with Islamic fervor, on the obdurate resistance to the decency of a resolution of the Ayodhya imbroglio which lasted for about the whole of the XX century. As callous approvals of these violences, the silences contrast with the violent bursts of anger of Indian Muslims protesting against a few caricatures making fun of the Prophet and being published in a Danish newspaper. Indeed nothing proved the misleading influence and the vacuity of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva,* on both the Brahmanists and the Muslims than the Ayodhya "problem" and the tension continuing in relation to the temples in Mathurā and in Vārāṇasī.

The Hindu fear of saying the one word. In reality the Ayodhya-Babri conundrum in the XX century provided the evidence of the Muslims' absolute self-righteous imperviousness to their having committing any

wrong in the destruction of thousands of the temples of the Hindus, the Buddhists and the Jainas. But the demolition of the decrepit Babri Mosque suddenly provoked their indignation and a deep sense of suffering which they exhibited with raw murderous violence in Mumbai. The slightest criticism of a Muslim's fanatical offense to the Hindu generates in the offender a painful reaction equal to the delicate sensitivity of the squinting eyes of a cockled snail. The eruption of the Muslims' violence was the affirmation of innocence in their practice of iconoclasm as a sacred duty, which called for retaliation against Hindus destroying their mosque which maintained, in Independent India ruled by a liberal constitution, its worth as the symbol of Muslim iconoclastic hegemony over the native Kaffirs. The Muslim feels that it is within his right to enact his submission to the injunctions of Allah by means of his iconoclasm and he breaks out into a loud lamentation when the non-Believers try to retrieve what was lost during Muslim hegemony. The revealed verses of the Quran dull the Believer's sensitivity to the extent of rendering him incapable of seeing the Beauty of the Kaffir's monument or sculpture which he contemplates without seeing. Just as he does not know whom he knows as his neighbor. The Brahmanist too imitates the Muslim neighbor in not seeing what he sees and does not know what he knows and translates it as the meaningless sterile sound of *sarva dharma sama bhāva!* Their coexistence at the same place, at the same time, gets mired in a convolution of mutual misrepresentations which enable the Muslim to hold in reserve his loyalty to God's everlasting intolerance of all that pertains to Kaffirdom.

Further the situation generated by the demolition of the Babri mosque was characterized by the fear which even the judges of the Supreme Court displayed in their refraining from taking into account that the communal tension generated at Ayodhya was the product of Islamic iconoclasm as a sacred duty enjoined upon the Believer by Allah. The obscenity of the situation consisted of the fact that the Muslims would so adamantly want the symbol of their intolerance to be preserved in a secular, liberal independent India where communal amicability was an indispensable prerequisite. Yet, during the close to a hundred years during which the

Ayodhyan sore had festered, no one, among the Brahmanist priests, judges, academics, historians, anthropologists, archeologists, media writers, artists, spiritual leaders, utter the word: *iconoclasm*, as the infernal sacred duty which was abundantly practiced by the Muslims, with the aid of the sword as a mandate stipulated by the Quran. It was an occasion when the Gandhian Truth once told to the might of the Raj was absent: with their silence the Hindus paradoxically held themselves as a collective hostage to Muslim iconoclastic intolerance! It was a Brahmanist exhibition of an anemic tolerance which failed to address the imperative of Islamic intolerance of the different Other. Additionally it evinced the inability, on the part of the Brahmanist, to devise, without compromising the integrity of his tolerance, a virile dialogue on the indispensability, or otherwise, of iconoclasm as an unquestionable mode of Islamic piety.

The groundless fear of Islam being in danger in majority Kaffir India. Undeniably the Muslims never did, and still do not, care for the *''bhai-bhaiist*" sentimentality which, in silence, they believe - correctly - to be repugnant to the anti-Kaffir ideology of the Quran. No evidence has come forward to enable the belief that the elite Brahmanist leaders of the Congress party and of the Hindu Maha Sabha, in particular, ever had any cognizance *of the reason* of the chasm which separated their One-Nation ideology from the Muslim's antipathy with the cry of "Islam is in danger". Nor has there been any evidence of any Muslim intellectual endorsing the Congress Party's vision of an Independent India and coming forward to inform the Muslim masses that, in truth, it was the Muslim minority who had brutalized the majority Hindus and ravaged their civilization. Noteworthy was the absence of any Muslim leader summoning the courage to tell his community that it did not need, on historical and moral grounds, to heed the hate summons of the Muslim League. Submission to the revelations of Allah draws an opaque curtain of an invincible insentient callousness in front of the total spoliation of the Other as a celebration of Allah's Sovereignty (*Rubūbiyat*).

Furthermore there never was any material or philosophical reason for the Muslims to have any fear of the traditionally tolerant Hindu community swamping Muslim culture in India and crippling the Muslims' freedom and development in a free, independent undivided country. In the Muslim Kaum, the esoteric idioms of a few ephemeral poets, or the writings of middling journalists, vindicating a certain faith in an undivided India, were, however much they were deserving of praise for their contents and for the courage of their authors, merely the stray swallows which, while heroically flitting, did not make the summer of a whole, integrated sub-continent. The two-volume *India Partitioned*, edited by Mushirul Hasan, is a characteristic example of the few swallows who claim to offer to posterity the vanity of the ''Other Face of Freedom''. It does not erase from History the memory of authentic Muslimness *as the fulfilment* of Allah's command to spread the Faith by war in the manner in which it got implemented in the demonic paroxysm of Partition. It was a characteristic display of sterling Islam in jihadic action for which no Muslim ever felt any guilt or sorrow. On the contrary they hailed it as the triumph of the Muslims creating two new Islamic states. And in Pakistan honoring Jinnah as a Great Fuehrer (*Qaid e Azam).*

As Mahatma Gandhi desired, rightly, and thereby assured the permanence of his legacy, it behooves the Brahmanist to contemplate the authenticity of Islam in, and as, Partition, with equanimity, without losing any iota of the substance of the tolerance which, as a heritage, rests on the foundation of the meta-psychic reality of *tat tvam asi* and *aham brahmō'smi*. Such indeed is the bedrock of the spirit of the Dharmas, come what may, in all time in the future! But the mystic fulfillment at the heart of each of the Dharmas requires the virile protection in the manner illustrated by the Mauryan Emperor Aśoka who published in stone and in marble pillars his message of Buddhist peace, while he kept intact his mighty army.

The silence of the nationalist Muslims. It is still an open question of why eminent, learned Muslims gravitating around the Congress Party – Abdul

Kalam Azad, Zakir Hussain, Fakhruddin Ahmed, M. C. Chagla, Humayun Kabir, and so many others – did not, or could not, exert commensurate influence to counter Jinnah's claim to be the sole representative of all the Muslims of the sub-continent. Nor is there any evidence of whatever talks, or conversations, were indulged in, off the record, spontaneously, by Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru, Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Govind Vallabh Pant, for example, with Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, about the psychology of the Muslims and the hatred they harbored against Hindus and every aspect of Hindu culture. What were the remarks, the spontaneous thoughts, the expressions of shock and of the painful witnessing of the abundance of murderous violence, which would have been exchanged when the Mahatma and the scholarly Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad met, when the catastrophic misfortune was sweeping across the sub-continent? There is no printed material of those conversations which must have been indulged in in the face of the horrors of communal riots provoked by the demand for Muslim separation. Mahadev Desai, the Mahatma's private Secretary, has not left any written document which would have recorded his casual remarks, observations, reflections, on the events in which he was a major participant, on the personalities who were dear or hostile to him, on his moments of happiness and of dejection.

Islam is more a totalitarian political ideology than a strictly independent religion. Towering above all the tumult of the years preceding the Partition, there was this failure on the part of the Brahmanist leadership, across the entire spectrum of the political parties, not grasping the essential component of the forces arrayed against them: Islam erupting as a volcano and inundating all of them with its unforgiving lava. Like self-confident ostriches they kept their heads buried in the sands of "*bhai-bhaiic*" self-delusion of thinking that Islam was only a religion. It was an *avidyā* of colossal scale to persist in seeing the snake as a rope. The dimension of this blinkered seeing can be further assessed by the speculation that even now most, if not all, the Brahmanist leaders do persist in their ignorance of the simple fact that Islam is not only religion,

but even more so, a violent totalitarian political ideology which has been what it is, since its very inception, in Medina, by the Prophet's initiative. The Muslim League in the middle 1940s was not clamoring for mosques in order to pray. It called for the establishment of a State where the Muslims would be free to exert their power and their hatred of the Kaffirs and to own a sinless conscience in waging war against the Harbi India as enjoined by God. The Islam of the Indian Muslim is one and the same as the Islam of Jinnah and of the Muslim League. Its quietness is connatural with the "quietness" of Pakistan or of Bangladesh. They are all parts of the singular Umma presided over by Allah and the Messenger. With the transcendental expectation of the realization of the world as *Dar ul Islam*, these Islamic formations are for the time being the quiet, live volcanoes.

The Constitution enshrines an unrealistic view of the equality of the Indian religions. Ever since 1947, in the sub-continent, Islam has manifested itself in the sudden emergence of Pakistan and of Bangladesh. Moreover, in full view of the world, Islam further magnified its exclusivism, in relation to India and the Hindu Kaffir majority, in four wars and several decades of terrorism sponsored by the freely elected, theocratic government of Pakistan. In the meantime the Indian ostriches still self-contentedly have been holding their heads in the sands of a timidity which is simultaneously imagined as tolerance and upraised as a benevolent foreign policy. Hindu failure to grapple with the political tragedies punctuating the XX century stems from the obstinacy of avoiding an in-depth study of the anti-Kaffir pronouncements of the Islamic Scripture which comprises the Quran, the Sharia and the Hadiths which record the authenticated, reliable reports of the words and deeds of the Prophet. The continued violence exerted by Pakistan, since 1947, against India failed to deter the Hindu from his struthious approach to the realities of Pakistani politics. To a large extent, the Hindu resilience in not adopting a tit-for-tat reaction has been due to the fidelity to the 1950 Constitution proclaiming the equality of the main world religions belonging to the history and the geography of India. The Pakistanis were not burdened by any communal scruple subsequent to the near elimination of the minorities. Those who

remained had secondary civic status and did not exert any influence in the national political economy of Pakistan. The terror politics of Pakistan was not hampered by any moral or political consideration of the sentiments of its small, second-class minorities. The socio-political situation obtaining in India was different. The Hindu majority was constrained by the obligation of not antagonizing its Muslim fellow citizens, despite the latter having earlier ardently supported the demand for partition.

The obligation of Hindu elites to be well acquainted with the politics and theology of Islam. Nevertheless it is germane in the prevailing socio-political condition of India to wonder, and to ask why, most, if not all, the leaders and spokesmen in the whole spectrum of the political parties, have absolutely no inkling of the Islamic scripture and its ancillary jurisprudence. [19] Few Hindus are acquainted with the Islamic jurisprudence according to which a Muslim, living in a non-Muslim country which is at war against an Islamic nation, has the duty to wage war against his host country, in solidarity with the Muslim inimical nation. When Indian Muslims protest that they do remain loyal to India in the wars against Pakistan, they are conscious that they do so at the same time for the protection also of the lives of their own large number of co-Believers.

In the face of the constitutional provision of the Muslims' right to have the Sharia, the majority Hindu elites flaunt, as an affirmation of their liberal posture, the tolerance which had been a matter of fact reality for millenia. Hindu tolerance has no root in Law. It has been since time immemorial an integral fact of the way of living in the sub-continent. On the other hand,

---

[19] It is astonishing that diaspora Hindus do exhibit a low acquaintance with the fundamentls of the Indian culture. Their knowledge of the Brahmanist Civilisation is dismally minimal. Apart from the popular Indian groceries, for example, there are no outlets for books on India, nor for CDs of Classical Music. The groceries do sell Chinese made idols of Hindu deities for private home *pūjās* and CDs mainly of Bollywood film songs.

the Quranic revelation expressly insists on the intolerance of whatever lies beyond the ambit of the Revelations.

The need for Hindu vigilance against Islamic intolerance. The ways of intolerance, as described earlier in relation to the destruction of Buddhism, in particular, do extol the essence of Islam, with which the Hindu cannot have any dialogue. For that very reason it behooves him to have a prudent, appropriate perception of its political ideology, its jurisprudence, and its history spanning the last fourteen centuries. It is incumbent upon the Hindu, in particular, to assess the rationale of the Indian Muslim claiming superiority of Islam, not with its historical expressions, but *qua* Revelation by God. He refuses dialogue on the merit or demerit of the clauses of the Revelation which, being divine, lies beyond the reach of words pronounced by Man. Should a debate or examination of the revelation be engaged by reason, the Muslim simply negates the questioner and his way of living. The Muslim is not disturbed by any criticism of the deficiencies of Islam in comparison with other civilizations or cultures. He is never disposed to acknowledge the relentless vandalism wreaked against the monuments, centers of learning, of the Hindus and Buddhists, for it was carried out in good faith and in dutiful submission to God's decrees. In brief: the Islamic Revelation generates its specific logic and rationality. Though it cannot be overcome or altered by any form of persuasion, either from enlightened Believers, or from outsiders. That is the real reason for the Hindu to acquire a dispassionate, thorough understanding of the contents of the Muslim's authenticity, not what the English-speaking Muslim projects as himself through the English language, in brief encounters, with banal civilities. Hindus all too often beguile themselves with believing a few trees to be a forest.

The cultural meaning of the Sharia. The maintenance of the Sharia in the Indian Constitution confers upon the Believer a status additionally higher than the one provided to the non-Believer. There is accordingly no symmetry between the citizenship of the Muslim and the Brahmanist's. It is pertinent to dwell on this sociological peculiarity specific to no other

country, in order to see it as the representation of the psychological wall distinguishing the Believers from the Kaffirs in a Kaffir-ruled secular republic. With the Sharia the Muslim minority of more than two hundred million inhabitants consolidate the feeling of their Islamism as a desired separateness. Unable to grasp the inevitable outcome of this difference as a communal alienation, a certain type of Hindu intellectuals find it convenient to parade themselves as paragons of tolerance in favor of Muslim victimhood. Such a perverse liberalism gets published in the oral and written media in India and in newspapers published in the West, particularly in the United Kingdom and in the United States.

Nearly eight decades after Independence, it is reasonable to ask if the writers of the 1950 Constitution were fully acquainted with Islamic jurisprudence and the history of Islamic exclusiveness. Throughout the governance of the Congress Party in the execution of its policies, one finds no significant evidence of its leaders claiming an accurate knowledge of the principles and rules of the Islamic scripture. It was worse with Nehru who never even referred to the universalism of the Upaniṣad and the *Bhagavad Gītā*. Nor has a knowledge of Islamic history and of the politics of Islam *as Islam* ever been demonstrated by the leaders of the non-Congress governing parties. Today hindsight compels the disturbing awareness that the writers of the Constitution themselves acted with ignorance of what Islam has been in India and what had been the realization of its iconoclasm during the long time of Muslim hegemony. Of, if they knew, they did not deem it necessary and prudent to translate the meaning of their knowledge into the contents of the Constitution.

The fateful absence of a definition of religious conversion in the multi-religious context of Indian society. It is this ignorance which is evident in the absence, in the preamble of the Constitution, of a definition of *religious conversion* specific to the history and the character of the pluri-religious society where traditionally Brahmanists have not utilized the practice of proselytizing. Historically the art and practice of conversion was initiated by the Buddhists, with the encouragement and missionary zeal of

Emperor Aśoka, in the third century B.C.E. From then on, throughout the entire history of Buddhism, its missionaries have been monks bearing and transmitting their messages with the aid of words, not of swords, throughout the whole of Asia, in contradistinction from the many uses of force by Christian and Islamic agents of conversion.

The misleading constitutional postulate of the equality of the religions. With its arbitrarily abstract provision of equality of religions, the Constitution undermines its guarantee of civic equality for all citizens. It does so despite the evidence of the stark differences which distinguish the three different revealed religions: on the ground, as well as in their theologies and their histories, there does not exist any equality among them. Otherwise how would the authors of the Constitution justify the centuries of the wars between Muslims and Christians, apart from the internecine conflicts within the history of each revealed religion? Moreover the constant violent conflicts between the Palestinians and the Israelis seem to be replicas of Biblical originals. Violence erupted in the Eden created by Jehovah. Adam lost no time in incurring the extreme wrath of the Only God.

Additionally each of the three divine revelations claims the incontrovertible fact of moral and spiritual superiority over the three indigenous Dharmas which rest their mystical finalities on the foundations of humanities taught by contemplative renouncers.

In particular the Muslim believes that he follows the only Straight Path drawn by Allah. His submission to the verses of the Quran make him the privileged knower and follower of the only eternal Truth that ever has been or can ever be. The scholarly authors of the Constitution failed to acknowledge that, by simply rushing out of a Friday noon prayer, Believers could, and are always ready to, with frenzied immediacy, transmute the spirit of their *namaz* into a devastating hurricane by shouting: Allahu Akbar, there is only one God, and Allah is the One God! The praying congregation can effortlessly lit up and mutate into a preying mob transubstantiating its faith, as *Dīn*, into Islam as vehement tumult. It is

tempting to speculate that, as a prelude to pronouncing the equality of all religions, the authors of the Constitution had never been acquainted with the elementary fact of the architectural design pertaining to the Hindu or Buddhist or Jain Temple bearing a stark difference from that of the Church for the Christian, the Synagogue for the Jew, and the Mosque for the Muslim.

If, however, the constitutional jurists had indeed seen these houses of worship and understood the rationale of their respective architecture, they would nevertheless still have failed to assess the socio-political consequences corresponding to the differences of their purposes served by their architectures. However extensive can be the ground on which a Hindu temple may have been built and however huge can the Temple itself be, the *sanctum sanctorum* where the holy idol is placed does allow only enough space for access to only a few standing individuals. In contrast, the traditional Church offers a space large enough to admit the entire local congregation, or parish, to worship at the same time while sitting on chairs or on benches. The pious congregation evinces a devotion which includes a sermon delivered by the priest standing on the pulpit, with the ornamental top decked with the Cross. The symbolism represents the verticality of God-Priest-Worshipper providing the spiritual sustenance to the devout attendant. The sermon functions as a moral discourse or, depending on the circumstance, a political statement in favor or honor of the Prince. Such a requirement has been since the beginning of the history of Christianity, especially since theology became the ideology of the State. The architectural design of the church corresponds to the purpose of the sermon and provides the space for assembling the community of the faithful, into a homogeneous *ecclesia.* Likewise the Mosque has its interior as an empty, cavernous space, with a minimally decked pulpit built against the wall facing the worshipping congregation. The presence of the Imam leading the prayer quite often, when the situation demands it, lends itself to the delivery of a sermon calling for a particular political action. On 15 August 1946 Jinnah inaugurated, against the Brahmanist majority, the Direct Action (or *Jihad*) as the extension of the Friday noon prayer.

Subsequently Jinnah preened himself with declaring that he held a revolver! Actually he was boasting of a wry modesty: against the sympathizers of *Ahiṁsā* his revolver had the effect of such a Big Bertha as thundered heavily on the Western Front during World War I.

In a Mosque the devotion is practiced by the community, that is, the *Umma.* In a Hindu Temple the devotee worships as an *individual*. In a temple built according to classic norms of traditional architecture, the Temple symbolically represents the universe. The intelligent individual devotee worships in communion and in solidarity with the whole world.[20]

There never was any equality between the revealed religions and the natural Dharmas. There is no equality among the revealed religions and the three Dharmas of India. There never was. The Christian believes Jesus was God Incarnate, the Word that became Flesh in History, and accordingly claims that his religion is the best of all religions. The pious Christian, especially the Roman Catholic, finds it absurd that non-Christians would not recognize God who came to the world out of love for all men and women. These days the Muslim Imams in Europe do not hesitate to affirm that the Christian West is decadent and it can only be redeemed by adopting Islam. In India the Muslim berates the Hindu as an ignorant idol-worshipper and feels infinitely proud of believing in a way of life as defined in the Quran which has been physically written, before Creation, by Allah Himself. The Indian Muslim is considered to be a lesser Muslim by the Pakistani or by the Bangladeshi because he lives in a Harbi State which is not ruled by Muslims. The creation and the religious

---

[20] It is a different style of worship by members of the Hindu diaspora, in Canada, for example. The worship in the local temple, or cultural center, is modelled on the Christian congregational Sunday prayer. The priest, representing the traditional *pujārī*, enhances the ritual with a speech, in the manner of a Catholic or Protestant priest or of an Imam. The particular difference consists of the two-hour ritual inevitably concluding with a free vegetarian meal qualified with the rubric *prīti bhoj*. Some 'devotees' fervently make it a point to arrive within the last quarter of an hour of the ritual in order to partake of the freshly cooked meal and then leave - quietly.

meaning of Pakistan and Bangladesh, in distinction to the inferiority of the Indian Islam, constitute an undeniable refutation of the 1950 Constitution proclaiming the equality of the religions extant in India.

The preservation of the memory of violent Islamic exclusiveness. The memory of the explosion of brute violence which accompanied the Partition will be kept alive for all time by the presence of Pakistan and Bangladesh as permanent testimonies of Islamic exclusiveness. The Indian will have at all times the opportunity to know the meaning of the ideal represented by the Minar-e-Pakistan and to be reminded of the history of Muslim iconoclastic rejection of Hindus and of Harbi culture. In addition the independent states of Pakistan and of Bangladesh provide the evidence of the freedom of their Muslims and the promise of their welfare away from the collective subaltern state of the Indian co-Believers being ruled by the inferior, evil Kaffirs. The roots, the reasons, the imperatives of this unbridgeable psychological and cultural abyss need to be dispassionately examined as the prerequisite to a judicious understanding of the communal realities of the post-Partition India. It has been an evidence of the moral excellence of Prime Minister Narendra Modi to have decreed the fourteenth day of August as Memorial Day for the remembrance of the sufferings of Indians due to the Muslim *jihad* launched for the partition of the sub-continent.

The authors of the 1950 Constitution did not, or preferably, could not, foresee or contemplate the possibility of the paradox emerging from the universalism inherent in the Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina culture. There is no universalism in the theologies of the three revealed religions since they are limited each to its followers. Their finalities are cultural and materialistic, with rewards of sensual joys in heaven enjoyed by the resurrected physical body.

Prescribed by the Dharmas, the ultimate contemplative self-realization is Indian when it was first pronounced as a personal wordless mystical experience which transcends all limitations related to History and Geography. As such *they are eminently universalist*. It was born by the

inheritors of the Vedas and published in the texts of Dharma literatures and in the whole spectrum of practices for the attainment of the transcendental self-fulfillment as the ultimate celebration of Humanity as the locus of self-perfection. The Dharmas eulogize the predominance of Humanity on the surface of the Earth, more than the abstract proposition of perfection in a fictitious Heaven as the cynosure calling for the supreme attainment.

Nevertheless the constitutional provision of religious equality within the plurality of the six fundamental dispensations has up to now been beneficial in maintaining a respectable social tranquility by the effectiveness of the constitutional law retaining its majesty.[21] To a large extent, if not to the largest extent, the effectiveness of the 1950 Constitution, based on the inviolate authority of the Law and of the independent Judicial system, as well as an Independent Army, has been maintained by the Hindu majority with its cultural emphasis on Individual responsibility, not essentially with obligatory collective adhesion. Christianity and Islam address themselves to the Ecclesia and the Umma. Hinduism stands entirely on individual culture and responsibility.

What is Muslim exclusiveness*?* The present essay will strive, within the perspective of a Kaffir, to demonstrate that the substance of Islamic exclusiveness has its why and wherefore lucidly laid down in the Holy Book, the Sharia and in the Hadiths. They are further emphasized in the Sira of Muhammad who is venerated as the Ideal Man. They are taught and transmitted as the prescriptions of human duties and accomplishments, as well as the rules and principles required for the Straight Path indispensable to personal and social proprieties. In India for too long the communal relationships have been intertwined with simplified, sentimental impressions based on minimalist acquaintances

[21] The six religions are: Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam.

with Islamic theology and history, especially on the part of non-Muslims. This profitless collective ignorance maintained by the Brahmanists, in particular, has been, at times, projected as a deluding tolerance which has generated a lot of misunderstanding.

The corruption of tolerance and the obligation to tell the Truth without Fear. With its historic nobility diminished and corrupted as weakness passing itself for generosity, tolerance has manifested itself, on the margin of the Constitution, as the institutionalization of the Vote Bank. It consolidated and hardened the Muslim's exclusiveness while practically reducing the Brahmanist's benevolence into a voluntary dhimmitude.

Nothing explains this sociological perversity more than the readiness of the Brahmanist to forsake the Mahatma's courage to tell the Truth to the well-entrenched Imperial Might, with the right words, at the right time, at the right place, for the right cause. He told the Truth to the mightiest power on Earth. And he prevailed. This Gandhian courage needs to be revived and it singularly behooves the responsible non-Islamic leaders themselves to tell the Indian history as it needs to be freely unfurled, not as it must be dovetailed to suit the vagaries of circumstantial political arrangements of the day. The Germans still labor to lighten the burden laid upon their national pride in the acknowledgement of the Judeocide perpetrated during World War II. In contrast the Americans have not yet deemed it their moral duty to express any apology for the inhumanity inflicted upon the slaves during three centuries. Nor have they offered due redress for all the degrading liabilities which the latter, and their descendants, have suffered. Nor have Americans apologized and offered due compensation for all the genocides executed against the many pre-Columbian populations. Nor has any British King or Queen offered any regret or apology for all the genocidal famines which had been willfully engineered, with the authority of a Christian self-righteousness, for the benefit of the Treasury in London and of the prosperity of the upper classes. On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Independence of India, when Queen Elizabeth apologized for the Jalianwala Bagh massacre,

which occurred on 10 April 1919, she prudently avoided any reference to Winston Churchill's willful organization of the Bengal Genocide of 1943-44, euphemistically called the Bengal Famine, as the apotheosis of the twenty-three famines which punctuated every four or five years during the 1790-1900 period. They were all man-made famines, in times when the word 'genocide' had not been invented. It is in a cognate variation of this facet of British imperial history of callous heartlessness and moral apathy, that the Indian Muslims, most of whom are ethnologically linked to the largely Brahmanist stock, have secured the pride of their hegemony over, if not their contempt of, the Hindus qualified as disbelieving *dhimmis*. No Indian Muslim has, in full view of the ruins of monuments as reminders of the vindication of their faith, deemed it worth a reconciliation by expressing a word of regret. They would instead like the Brahmanists to forget all the ignominies endured as their never ending contempt. They would prefer the victimized Hindus to seek ways of reconciliation. Instead they prefer to evince irritation and vexation whenever they are reminded of the horrors which they view as the stuff of their hegemonic pride. Hindu hatred was to a large extent the soothing agent of the cultural void of the passable Indian Muslim society.

On not questioning the Muslim's indifference to the tragic past. On the part of the Hindus, there need be no fear, no betrayal of social tranquility, no subversion of political alliances or loyalties, in the reconstruction of the ravages wrought by Muslim hegemony. For what reason, for example, must the destruction of Nalanda not be told, if indeed there is a commitment to restore and rebuild the Centre of Buddhist Studies back to its splendor of yore? Besides, was that destruction not carried out by Believers submitting to the will of Allah and for which their descendants claim glory and pride in recalling the devastating feats of their hegemony? Why would a Hindu historian not say or write what Charles Allen so lucidly, in simple, direct prose, brings forth the ruthlessness and the arrogance with which the Muslim powers enabled their hegemony to exert the free use of their swords as the instruments for realizing their lust for devastation?

Do not the Muslims themselves take pride in all their destructive iconoclasms as their glorious heritage? Was not the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in 2002 one more proof of the still active mentality which finds its expression in iconoclasm as sacred obedience to Allah's dispensation? Why then must the Hindu victim be still cowed into craven pusillanimity in the task of the reconstruction and of the reparation of the damages inflicted by Muslim iconoclasm? In short, why must the Hindu feel ashamed or hesitant, in face of the lovers of iconoclasm, to rebuild a heritage in the space where he has been since time immemorial, during which he never went out to lord over a fellow human being living beyond the borders of the land?

The past is not *behind* the Muslim; it is *above* him. These questions are relevant, all the more because the Muslim does not view the past as what has happened *behind* him. His past consists of the *vertical* relationship with Allah. It is this verticality which renders him insentient to the Hindu's past and not to feel in any way indebted to the Hindus. The children and grandchildren of those who participated in Jinnah's *jihad* (titled as Direct Action) would find it hard that it should behoove them to offer excuses or compensation for the ravages wrought by their forbears. It would be galling for them to do so, when their co-Believers in Pakistan and in Bangladesh would be free to maintain the unqualified pride in the memory of their hegemony now vindicated in their fundamentalist autonomy.

The theological futility of the univalent *sarva dharma sama bhāva*. As a reflection of the mutually deluding perception of inter-communal convergences, the inane formula of *sarva dharma sama bhāva* has won a certain popularity in the post-Partition Indian folklore. Mainly among Brahmanists, it has been used as the expression of a heightened broad-mindedness. In truth it is an obfuscating set of four words historically and literally signifying nothing, despite its honorable association with Mahatma Gandhi. This four word dictum means nothing to the Muslim, mainly because the Quran bids him believe that there can be no religion higher, or better then Allah's revelation. Moreover there is no other god

beside Allah. All the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, the Purāṇas, are masses of errors. To think or do otherwise than what is revealed would expose one to the wrath of Allah.

The folly represented by the four word dictum is evident in its not having a presence or relevance in any of the two Muslim theocracies born of Partition. There is not indeed any revelation in the Quran or any Hadith advocating, or tolerating, or proposing a form of co-existence with a non-Muslim neigborhood. On the contrary the Quran expressly advocates and enjoins upon the Believer not to befriend the Other and to view and treat Him as the enemy, for the merest reason of being Other.[22]

In reality, the four-word slogan is utterly devoid of any theological validity. It lulls the educated and the politically active Brahmanists into the struthious habit of refraining themselves from making the effort to explore, beneath the visible glitter of religiosity in the visible portion of the Muslim's iceberg, the hostile, political death-inflicting potential mass of iciness hidden, below its floating line, in the ocean of the Umma. Therein lies the essence of the totality of the Muslim's mentality and his world vision, together with his authentic attitude towards the Disbelieving Other. The superficial, social exchanges of graceful behavior which have became popular, particularly among the active political class, have always been swallows which were indeed swallows, which never made any summer. Nor did the few trees in the guise of embraces on festive occasions ever constitute a lasting, dense forest or an orchard of sweet tasting fruit!

The use of remembering the demolition of the Bamiyan Buddhas. Muslims in India chose to remain silent when Mullah Omar decided to have the Bamiyan Buddhas destroyed for the sake of preserving the purity

---

[22] **Quran: 4.89: "**They long that ye should disbelieve as they disbelieve, that ye may be upon a level (with them). So choose not friends from them till they forsake their homes in the way of Allah; if they turn back (to enmity), then take hem and kill them whenever ye find them, and choose no friend nor helper from among them." This is one among several verses advocating the Believer's moral duty towards the Other.

of the Afghan theocracy. Their silence was further judiciously held in reserve over the separatist movement in Kashmir. More common is the absence of reciprocity, on the part of the Muslims, when a certain type of educated Hindus, dressed in the garb of voluntary Dhimmitude, censure the authorities for presumed obstruction to the welfare of the Muslim pseudo-minority.

Because of his ignorance of Islamic jurisprudence, the Brahmanist ostrich cannot, with his head buried in the sands of complacency, see that a chasm separates the *Indian Muslim* from the possible *Muslim Indian* hopefully to be born in the distant future of the secular Indian Republic. Judging from the history of the past millennium, this possible initiation a lasting communal friendship may occur, for the sake of consolation, at some date in the Greek calends!

The vanity of the Muslim-Brahmanist bhai-bhaiism. It is a well-entrenched fiction entertained by Brahmanists that the Muslim neighbor, viewed as a *Bhai,* expresses his difference *only* when he fulfills his duty to pray at the Mosque.[23] The delusion consists in not recognizing that the religious difference itself constitutes the totality of the cultural and psychological difference, with the prayer itself being charged with the potentiality of breaking out into hostility. By habit and with the favor of long spells of social tranquility the Brahmanist lulls himself with the thought of a symmetry between the Muslim's honoring the practice of his *Dīn* at the Masjid and his own having a pious *darśana* of the idol of his favorite deity at the local Mandir. Concurrently the Muslim does as a habit affirm his secularist commitment in modes of speech and conduct conforming to the laws and prescriptions of the 1950 Constitution. Thereby he correctly conforms to the Brahmanist's superficial impression

[23] Such was the sentiment of my School Master Father throughout his life. I grew up with this belief that the *only* difference between the Muslim and the Hindu was limited to the specific mode of praying.

of his being a *Bhai.* The Brahmanist fails to perceive and internalize the reality of the latter's fidelity to the Quran which, when the occasion demands it, recalls Allah's having enjoined that, as a Kaffir, the Brahmanist must not be trusted and must instead be treated with contempt and hostility. The *Bhai-Bhaiism* vulgarity works on the surface of social inter-mingling, in a well ordered neighborhood, at the office, in the exchange of greetings on festive occasions. It even gets honored as a respectable norm of social behavior. Most Brahmanists, at all social undertakings, assume that the lightness of the formal difference, confined to Mandir and Masjid, does not obscure the more vitally directive revelations which lie dormant in the deep recesses of the Muslim's sub-consciousness. The Brahmanist sees only the top of the Muslim iceberg above the surface of his psychic Ocean. Nevertheless the mass of the iceberg hidden below the surface of the water maintains in a dormant state the authentic identity of the Muslim neighbor. Otherwise there can be no explanation of the sudden explosion of the bubble of conventional brotherhood when, mostly in the rural areas, neighbors on either side of the divide discovered they were Kaffirs and Believers. At the present juncture in the history of the Indian Muslim, there is no indication of how he will confront the inevitable quest of the Brahmanist for the establishment of the integrity of the Indian civilization with the recovery of a hallowed past which has preserved the eminence of a learning which is still relevant with its store of *satyam* (truth), *śivam* (goodness), *sundaram* (beauty).

This invisible mass of the Islamic iceberg keeps alive the force designated by the predominance of the high number of the Quranic passages calling for the elimination of the *Dar-ul Harb* of the Non-Believing Brahmanists and all the other non-Muslims of the sub-continent. That is what explains the sudden bursts of hostility among close-knit communities of Brahmanists or Sikhs who would have for generations a shared living together harmoniously with their Muslim neighbors. Acquaintance with the Quranic revelations would have facilitated, with stoic objectivity, the confrontation of the sudden outbreak of Islamic enmity as a normal occurrence, instead of its being felt as a painful surprise. It is ignorance of

the revealed verses which impedes the perception that the substance of the Masjid experience yields to, and coalesces with, the authority of the contrary political call for action against the Other. Even when the ordinary lay Muslim is ignorant of the contents of the choleric verses which preach hostility to the Disbelievers, he could easily be roused to manifest a mortiferous enthusiasm against his Kaffir neighbor by the summons to action and to the memory of the appropriate revealed verses recited at the masjid by the Imam.

The root of Muslim-Brahmanist alienation. In all the forms of his social intercourse with the Muslims, the Brahmanist further exposes himself to being at a disadvantage owing to the assumption that he is solely responsible for the sincerity of his relationships. The Law of Karma, in association with the belief in the cosmic homogeneous One and in the consciousness of personal responsibility, do as a rule induce the Brahmanist to live up to his commitments. He assumes that the Muslim, as the incarnation of the *tat tvam asi* adage, is a mirror image of his own moral individuality. But Islam is a religion, not so much for the individual, as it is for the entire Umma, the entire community of the more than one billion believers. The *One* for the Brahmanist is the antithetical transcendence of the Muslim's *Umma*. The difference between these two spiritual entities is crucial, in order to grasp the moral motivations of each. The *One* represents the ineffable totality of all that *IS* is homogeneous with the life of sentient beings, with their individual essence, most primarily the *essence* of Man, the singular human being in whom the ultimate reality resides as *antaryāmī.* For the Muslim, the Umma is a concrete mass of human beings only; it is a material mass, a physical quantity, with the individual Muslim having a body which will rise, as such, from the tomb, to appear before God as the Judge on the Final Day. The Muslim has the ultimate goal of entering Paradise as an anatomic physical body, capable of enjoying infinite materialistic enjoyment. It is from the comparison of these two finalities that can correctly evaluate the phenomenal difference between the spiritual destiny of the Brahmanist in *sac-cid-ānanda*,

coinciding with the *nirvikalpa samādhi* enunciated by Patañjali, in contrast with the flesh-centerd, gross physical enjoyment of sensual pleasures as the finality of the Muslim's destiny.

The difference between the ONE and the UMMA. When the common run of the Brahmanists, as well as of their leaders, were shocked by the sudden explosion of hatred of neighbors suddenly being transformed into enemies impelled by a killing frenzy by the prospect of Partition, they failed to understand that the 'individual' Muslim was only acting with passionate loyalty to the Umma, not as the lifelong friend assumed to be loyal to his Brahmanist or Sikh neighbor.[24] More than the Brahmanist, the Muslim did not know, and still does not know, that a friendship is never broken. Whatever the earlier amicability would have been, even if it lasted through several generations, it was nevertheless only a superficial sentimentality which got abrogated by the call to battle for a pure Islamic state. The duty of the Muslim to fight for the cause of Islam supersedes all other bonds of loyalty to the non-Muslim. Partition was the revelation that there was never any friendship between the Muslim and the Brahmanist, or, if there was a friendship, it was *never* based on any revelation. For example, this is what Allah bids the Prophet to do: O Prophet! Strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites! Be harsh with them. Their ultimate abode is hell, a hapless journey's end. (**Q. 9.73**).[25]

The Islamic Revelation being 'perfect', with its injunctions having eternal relevance, any thought or proclamation of friendship between the two communities would be a superficial gracefulness pertaining to the protocol

---

24 There have been quite a few cases of Muslims protecting Hindus and Sikhs from Muslim killers and vice versa throughout the duration of the Partition communal violence. These compassionate cases, however commendable, did not constitute the reality of Partition and the jihadic way in which it got implemented. It was in continuity with the brutish destructions which characterized the earlier Islamic hegemony.

25 The chapter on the choleric verses provides more verses which urge how the Believer must view and treat the infidel.

of social courtesy. Rarely, if ever, do Hindus ask their Muslim colleagues or friends what they think or feel about the many Quranic verses asseverating Believer mistrust in, and rejection of, the infidel. There is scarcely any recorded evidence of Hindus asking their Muslim friends if they would openly state their disbelief in the choleric verses and appeal for their deletion. Nor even after the satanic brutalities of the implementation of Partition has any Theologian deemed it moral to examine the suitability of the anti-Kaffir revelations in a pluri-religious environment of the Indian secular state. Such obduracy in the maintenance of Islamic intolerance is all too often absent in the minds of those Hindus who, as voluntary Dhimmis, expose, as tolerance, their defense of Muslim sufferance due to the primacy of Hindutva politics. Nor have the beneficiaries of the politics and ethos of the Vote Bank have, in eighty years, evinced the slightest inclination to abate the implacable emphasis of the Quran enjoining hatred of the Other, even if the Other be a saintly monk spending his life in study and in contemplation.

The obligation to study the importance of the Umma. It is this Umma dimension of the *individual* Muslim which requires to be studied, to be known. The corresponding knowledge or information needs to be spread as a nation-wide civic education. It is disappointing that, at this stage in history, even after the hot winds of Partition and its sequels of wars and terrorisms have been blowing over the Bhārata Land, the Brahmanist elites still do not provide evidence of a trustworthy knowing of the Islamic scripture and of an intellectual commitment to acquire a sober, rational exploration of the arcane propositions of its cognate Theology and Jurisprudence. Meanwhile it is the obligation of both the Hindu and the Muslim to acknowledge the importance of the significant difference between the two finalities of existence. The Muslim believes in the resurrection of the body on the Final Day when *all* the Believers of the Umma will congregate to submit to the Judgement of God. For the followers of the Dharmas the finality of existence consists of the *distinct, individual and private* experience, in the pre-mortem living body to experience either *jīvan-mukti,* or *nirvāṇa,* or *kaivalya.* The event of the

Final Day occupies a privileged place in the faith and belief of Jews, Christians, Muslims, despite the fact that it is a fiction which got consecrated as the centrality of the revelations.

The normative difference between the absolutes in the revelations and in the Dharmas. The concept of Heaven and Hell in the revelations correspond to the belief that they are physical, material places which, without any prospect of their going out of existence, will last till at least the completion of the Judgement on the Final Day of Resurrection. Pope Benedict XVI publicly declared his conviction that Heaven does indeed exist as a real Hall somewhere in Space, though it has not yet been found. If indeed the physical Heaven does exist as a real immense Castle in the Air assumed to be identical with the Euclidean space of the planet Earth - as Pope Benedict XVI asseverates as an expression of his profound theological learning - it would imply that heavenly happiness is a permanent experience of physical delight, a mundane, carnal-sensible experience which has nothing in common with the ethereal bliss of the self-perfections prescribed by the doctrines of the Dharmas. A genuine intellectual, if Pope Benedict be indeed a genuine intellectual in addition to his being a priest, would not, by training and education, by personal idealism, subject himself to yearning for physical, sensual satisfactions as a desired goal. The complete intellectual works without the slightest desire for any attachment, even if it be an attachment to pleasure and satisfaction in Heaven. He strives to be free of the desire of any reward for his strivings in a life of complete disinterestedness on earth or in heaven. The perfect intellectual is defined by Śaṅkarācārya as he who is freed from attachment to all the fruits of action, in this world, and in the world beyond: *ihāmutra karma phala bhoga virāgah.*[26] As the Brahmanist ideal, which never appealed to the authors of the Islamic scriptures, it lies beyond the imagination of the Believer. Indeed the Vedānta definition of

[26] Commentary of the first Brahma sūtra.

the ultimate purity of living a life of complete freedom shines as the noble signature of the teachings prescribed by the Dharmas. The virile attainment of personal freedom as laid down by Śaṅkara, as realizable by Man as such, without the limitation of its being believed to be particular to only the native Indian citizen. It is pre-eminently universal, because it remains beyond the range of the Believer's submission to God's injunctions.

There can be nothing more to add to the content of such a virile, heroic, pre-eminent moral mode of existing. For the prospect of a seat in Heaven, however exalted, is still an attachment, an incompletion, a reason to strive to go beyond it. Only in Indian metaphysical speculation does one find this sublime realization of self-perfection which transcends all, inclusive of the rejection of all Heaven-stored attractions. To be alone as all-one, to have nothing, to be fearless of anything, of anyone, at any time, in any place, but solely to Be - silently heralds the unearthly victor of all desires and toils, as the dwelling of the ONE, beside which there in no-thing. And there can be nothing more Evil than to raise the sword-handling arm, as Allah commands, against the culture which nurtures the authentic worthiness in Man consisting of his unveiling the One in sitting, in walking, in speaking, on the surface of the Earth.

The story of Yayāti. The story of Yayāti is well known: he fatefully told the gods assembled to welcome him that he was the foremost of all men in the accomplishment of self-perfectioning enlightenment. Though he was not telling a lie, but due to that faint touch of egoism and of self-pride, he is cast down back to earth for not being equal to the deities. He then submissively forced himself to resume his devotion and contemplation during another stage as an earthling, in order to deserve a right admission to the company of the heavenly deities.

A comparison with the claim to impartiality. Evidently the comparative evaluation is not meant to postulate, as a subjective socio-cultural affirmation, the superiority of the finalities of existence prescribed by the Dharmas. Its justification consists in correcting the widespread belief,

assumed to be irrefutable, of Truth belonging only to the revealed religions. The foundation of this claim rests on the conviction that Truth does not exist in a word, or in a book, or in a doctrine, or in history as an established form of academic learning. Truth exists and manifests itself in the thought, in the speech, in the action of the Truth-full individual. Truth dwells also in the sleeping, in the dreaming. A book which claims to BE the truth, beyond which there is nothing more than what is stipulated in it, constitutes a block to the attainment of the Truth *as* thinking, *as* speaking, *as* acting. All the Scriptures related to the Dharmas: the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, the Purāṇas, the Darśanas, Grammar, Vāstuśāstras, yield to the silence of the ultimate self-realization of *sac-cid-ananda* as the *nirvikalpa samādhi* (contemplation without any object of thought or of the imagination) of Patañjali. Historically, neither the Bible, nor the Quran, as books revered for being co-essential with God (either as Jehovah or Allah), have equivalence with the Dharma Scriptures. The ontological difference between the Book of the three Revealed Religions and the Scriptures and Literatures of the Dharmas is this: the Book requires *submission to laws, to the legalism* which determines order in the life of the Believer, whereas, according to the Dharmas, which function as mere *indicators* to the *im-mediate experience* of the Ultimate Reality,[27] the follower designs his individual mode of existence *according to his private, independent interpretation* of the right moral and spiritual step to take in thought, in speech, in action. The familiar metaphor which illustrates the function of the Dharma prescription is the arrow which points to the direction the traveler has to take, but the arrow is not the direction or the labor required to reach the destination. The other relevant metaphor is the finger which points to the moon: when the moon is seen, the finger ceases to be! In short the aspirant relies on his personal physical, intellectual and

[27] The term *im-mediate* indicates a knowledge acquired without the medium of the five sense-organs. It is gained by pure contemplation resulting from intense meditation with guidance provided by a preceptor (Guru).

psychological resources to make the effort towards the attainment of the ontological experience of oneness with the ONE, familiarly designated as “Brahman”.

The fundamental difference then consists of the legalism predominant in the revealed religions, in a qualitative contrast with the Dharmas offering the free interpretation of their contents in the follower’s conduct of his personal way of living and searching for the ultimate self-enlightenment. The obedience to Dogma in the Judeo-Christian dispensations in view of the finality of a reward in Heaven is the antipode of the Freedom from all pairs of opposites, in the pursuit of a personal *modus vivendi* according to the Dharmas leading to the transcendental finality of the mystical knowledge as self- perfection, experienced in the body, on Earth. The Heaven and Hell fiction may be efficient as reminders to keep to the right striving for the self-enlightenment. Very few seekers are naturally endowed to pursue an ascetic *modus vivendi* with the practice of imageless concentration of the mind as the support of meditation and contemplation. Few may be naturally endowed to be able to practice the meditation and contemplation on Brahman which does not require the use of a sign or image. Only in Buddhism does the member of the Sangha selects what he likes in the Śūtras in order to organize his existence with the intent to arrive to his personal, humane attainment of *nirvāṇa* or the *arhat* state in the Theravāda or *Śūnyatā* in the Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Swami Vivekananda says that there are only two beings who do not need to worship God: the animal and the self-perfected Yogi. The animal is gratuitously assumed – by Humans - not to have any incentive to know what is the ultimate reality. The Yogi who has acquired the ultimate mystical knowledge, may dispense with the use of any ritual or with a dual relationship with the Supreme Deity. But, in practice, it does happen that the accomplished Yogi continues to worship his *iṣṭa devatā* (favored deity) as a gesture of gratitude, for the provisional use of an image as a means for mental concentration which leads to the transcendence of all forms of thought and of imagination.

The relevant case of Buddhism. Indian and Western intellectuals owe it to the imperatives of Truth, by acknowledging the superlative, specific teaching of Buddhism which the imperial, Confucian-Taoist Chinese elite, of their own desire, integrated with their well-established moral society. But the exclusive Truth of the Revealed dispensations happen to have been spread over the five continents by the advantage of colonization and of the use of military force. True it is that Indian Christianity has been well ensconced in the Indian sub-continent by peaceful conversion. It has stayed and maintained itself for the past more than two thousand years, in a manner which has been quite different from the way in which the pre-Columbian peoples were converted by missionaries with the support of triumphant armies in the service of the major monarchical powers of Europe. The Indian Christians produced their own clergy, without undergoing any contrariety within the sub-continent, though all the time they maintained themselves as a subordinate member of the Ecclesia. As a result, during centuries, the Biblical pronouncement of Jehovah being the only God has held sway in conjunction with the preponderance of the might of European powers.

The particular feature of the Earth in the XXI century. But in the XXI century Humanity finds itself in an era where, in the present state of the world, space has become limited to the extent of not providing room for arbitrary imperial extensions and of their spreading their correlative materialisms, as signs of their *moral* achievement for themselves and for the *beneficence* of the colonial subjects. Both values, if they can be so described, had a mortiferous essentiality. Till yesterday it had become easy to assert what is indeed right in the Judeo-Christian socio-cultural supremacy to keep itself going, at times with nostalgia, without any religious contrition or overt arrogance. As the fog lifts up off the old beliefs in the virtues of military exploits as the beneficent norms of the cultures derived from Judeo-Christian-Islamic revelations, the attractiveness of the ways of the pursuit of earthly self-perfection as laid down in the Dharmas will rise up as the promise of the birthright of all men and women seeking beatitude in Humanity redeemed and cherished, more than in the

preference for Heaven. To that end, the Humanities of the Brahmanist-Buddhist cultures of Asia will be ready to fulfill that promise. Otherwise, Humanity would be certain to sink into the misfortune of the materialism and intolerance ushered in Time when Moses concocted the concept of Jehovah as the sole God. Death is implicit in Jehovah's merciless intolerance hailed by his devotees as the eternally exclusive Truth which - praised as the inspirer of the materialisms of slavery, of colonialisms, of the catastrophic violences of capitalisms, of communisms, of fascisms, of Man cannibalizing Man, with the means of exploitation - has built an infinite store of universal misery. The significant evolution of the Western and Islamic greeds for conquest and submission of the militarily weak populations has now come to a dead stop. The West and the Umma may confront Arnold Toynbee, the British Historian, who argued: "It is not true that the Law of Karma exists only for the Oriental and not for the Occidental Man. It exists for both the Oriental and the Western Man, the difference being that the Oriental happens to be more sensitive to it". The world has moved to the stage in which the former imperial states now wince and torment themselves by being forced to apologize and atone for their past colonizing lust, with the enslaving, genocidal brutalizing, famishing crimes committed brazenly, arrogantly against those whom they had conquered with the use of sophisticated weaponry. It was ironic that the savage economic exploitation of India would have enabled the development of the British capitalism and the consequent development of the Industrial Revolution which enabled Great Britain to forge the machines of war for the easy accumulation of the greatest empire in History and for the infinite suffering of those who fell victims to such innovations as the Winchester rifle and the machine-gun, made possible by the forced labor of the starving Indians and of the Caribbeans. It is noteworthy that in India the Indian Muslims, heavily attuned to the acquisition and the holding of Power and the use of Force proved to be utterly incapable to stop or weaken the British juggernaut in its relentless policy of brutish dehumanizing impoverishment of the whole sub-continental people.

The relevance of the awareness of the Muslim as an iceberg and the particularity of his iconoclasm. Hence the burden lies on the Kaffir who, for the right understanding of the Muslim psyche, must always be cautiously aware of his ignorance of the hidden bulk of the individual Muslim Iceberg. That is, the nine-tenth of the mass, which lies below the surface of the Islamic psychic Ocean, harbors his opaque indifference to the magnificence of Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina learning and artistic glories. It is not an indifference due to self-satisfaction or a sort of laziness of the mind. It is a willful indifference which can get spontaneously translated into a violent hostility which draws its rationale from the innocent submission to the revelation. It is a positive indifference, which is dynamically expressed as iconoclasm willed and practiced as a sacred duty. Islamic iconoclasm bears no similitude with the iconoclasm, for example, of the revolutionaries who, during the French Revolution of 1789, broke images in churches, to vent their anger and resentment against the Church which had for centuries supported the oppressive rule of the 'Ancien Régime' of the aristocrats in league with the monarchy.

The particularity of Islamic iconoclasm. The Muslim's iconoclasm is a spirited élan to please Allah and honor his command; it is a duty which earned approval and reward from the Caliphs and the learned jurists and theologians. There is no possibility for the sufferers to make their anguish felt by the idol breakers. The brutality in reality was so severe that the terrorized native elites did not in the least think it necessary or prudent to record their losses and to describe their sorrows. The iconoclastic ravages were thorough as Islamic religious services predominantly practiced as jihad; they left no possibility of any rehabilitation or repair. They gave to the word "annihilation" its literal meaning; the Islamists perfected the skill for destruction to the extent of its including the effacement of the memory of the art object or monument destroyed. It was complete to the extent of the Brahmanist victims themselves assuming the iconoclasm as *their own* triumph, and accordingly attributing to Vedānta the triumph of the cannibalizing of the original Buddhism. Nowhere else in the world has religion given a similar example of such genocidal elimination as what

Islam effected in the obliteration, in India, of Buddhism which had been flourishing for more than eighteen centuries. As if the shame and the humiliation of the majority Brahmanist community is not sufficient as a homage to the sovereignty of Allah, the Muslims adopt a haughty silence over their easy vandalizing the cultures of India without ever expressing the slightest word of regret for the substantial diminution of the native civilization. All their depredations of Indian civilization remain locked up in their collective consciousness as feats of pious submission to the revelations. They rubbed off the history of whatever glory existed before it got erased by writing their iconoclastic history with the sword.

The supreme characteristic of Muslim iconoclasm consists of its transforming Islam into a replacement of the native civilization with its cultural emptiness without even an iota of moral adornment. During the centuries when the destruction of the Indian civilization was a priority for the Muslim powers, the eulogies of the iconoclastic triumphs written by the court historians now reflect a condign refutation of the superlative morality claimed by the Quran as the best of all past, extant and future possible spiritual ideologies. While ravaging the French territory, in the V century, Attila (406-453), the King of the Huns, boasted with these words: "*The grass does not grow any more wherever my horse runs*!" He would have felt humbled if he could have witnessed the successes, in India, of the Medieval Sultans and their killer hirelings like Muhammad Bakhtiyar. It is indeed a great misfortune for the human nature, as Montesquieu felicitously observes, that the unprovoked, dehumanizing devastations which Islam has inflicted upon so many cultures – more tragically upon the Indian civilization where reigned the humane traditions of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism - would be hailed by their perpetrators as benefactions in faithful obedience to the laws of God! The ruins which recall that calamity do further bring out so forcefully the recognition of the irreducible perversity of Islamic intolerance, with which it is impossible for any non-Muslim to entertain a rational dialogue.

That the mentality which undergirds this mode of thinking will last for a long time, if not for ever, raises the question for which there is no answer: why would the Cosmos have been contaminated, so early, with the origination of the idea of the absolute unity of Jehovah as the source and sustenance of all religious intolerances? How has the Idea of Jehovah, as *the* mortiferous source of implacable hatred, remained alive in a Judeo-Christian environment despite all the learning, all the beauty, all the goodness, all the wisdom, which have embellished the history of Europe? Why has it persisted so doggedly in defiance of all the sufferings caused by wars, conflicts, genocides, slaveries, colonialisms? Above all, why has no body of thought arisen to bring forth a correction of the hitherto invincible death-generating concept invented as the transcendent source of man-made endless suffering? Why indeed has there been no question asked by the Rabbinate when the world, with civilized Europe in particular, experienced the shock of the recognition of the Judeocide?

In his highly commendable *Génie du Christianisme,* Chateaubriand does not refer to the source of religious intolerance and of its disastrous manifestations.[28] Why do the Christian and Muslim theologians and philosophers not *see* the poison of exclusivism, of hatred, of violence, of unforgiving intolerance, at the heart of their ideologies? Why, for the sake of humane loving-kindness, could they not acknowledge that the pronouncements of *aham brahmo'smi* and *tat tvam asi* – even if they were "wrong" – would still have prevailed by averting so many religious conflicts, the deaths of so many humane cultures, the tragedies represented by so many hecatombs?

Examination of the Umma as the cosmology of Islam. The perfect, last revelation which Allah visits upon the responsibility of the Bedouin Arabs of the VII century persuades the Believers to build the correspondingly

---

[28] Published in 1804, Chateaubriand's book does not refer to Napoleon who, as Chief Consul, had restored, in 1799, the Slavery which had been abolished by the revolutionary National Assembly in 1791.

perfect world. It was with that belief, or pretext, that the Arab army felt bound to rush across the entire range of North Africa, past the Strait of Gibraltar, all the way up to the Pyrenees. The Muslim Brotherhood today still believes that it is incumbent upon the Muslim to realize the transformation of the whole world into a *Dar-ul-Islam* (World of Islam). Already the fifty-eight majority Islamic countries, with a totality of one and a half billion Believers, do offer the picture of what the whole world would look like and what it would provide to the seven billion non-Believers in existence today. It would be a world deprived of the fine arts, of libraries and books on matters unconnected with Islam, a world wracked with unending conflicts among Believers, peopled with extremely wealthy Arabs and extremely deprived Rohingyas. For the original Islam, conducted by the Messenger himself, was a frenzy of warfare, of violence, of intolerance, of genocides. It was not a world in which order reigned as a peaceful signature of Islam. There were no missionaries to spread the good word. The community spread by the surrender to Force applied as the mandate of Allah with Muhammad as the unrivalled transmitter of the revelation.

The corresponding world of the Greeks. In Europe the notion of order as the perfect state of society was bequeathed by the Greeks who imagined a world characterized by harmony designated by the word *cosmos*. The supreme role of the Divinity and of His honor, according to the Greek philosophers, did not consist of the creation of the world, but to have installed, within it, an order which coincided with human intelligibility. But there was no relationship between this serene intellectual contemplation and the passion for order to be realized by the implementation of the Islamic divine revelation.

The notion of state order in Islamic lore, in question in this essay, can be grasped by the illustration of the destruction, of the Bamiyan Buddhas in 2002: they were viewed as a disturbance, or an alienation, which offended the sentiment of a well-ordered Taliban-Islamic Afghan society. The State of the World is defined by the disciplined acceptance of the normality of

Afghan Islam commanding the barbaric destruction of the historic Bamiyan Buddhas, World Heritage emblems of pacifist Buddhism, as a matter of fact incident, blessed by the silence of the United Nations. Earlier Islamic passion for order had been the dominant compulsion for Believers to clear India of all the temples, monuments and institutions which breached the perfect order of the Islamic hegemon's vision of a society ordered and perfected in order to correspond to Allah's *Weltanschauung* and to be presided over by the Mullahs and the Doctors in Islamic jurisprudence![29] Moreover, corresponding to this Islamic concept of the society, the Greeks did not have a notion corresponding to the Umma, which, in Islam, represents the existential world of the Believers. It needs stressing that the Revelation has been bestowed upon Humanity, through Muhammad the Messenger, for the express purpose of bringing all that exists within the purview of the laws dictated to him. The passion for this realization on the scale of the entire world animated, and still animates, the hopes and the energies of the Muslims, galvanized by Force to bring about the immediate realization of the perfect world. Order and passion became the leading ideas driving the conquering lust of the Muhammadan forces. It was a gigantic concept of order and collective passion formulated as the particular *reason* forged by Muhammad who never ceased to exert irresistible constraint on all the tribes of Arabia in conformity with the vision of the *Dar-ul-Islam.* He actually prevailed in Islamizing the whole of the Arabian peninsula.

The contrast of the *Dar-ul-Islam* with the Brahmanist vision of the *ONE.* With characteristic simplicity, the Brahmanist philosophers had the genius, so early in the history of India, to express the reality of all that exists as the

---

[29] The books on the Muslim rule of Spain, mentioned in the Bibliography, all describe in great detail the immense destruction of Jewish and Christian Churches by the Muslims. The victims were viewed as "hypocrites" and non-Believers despite the Quran qualifying Jews and Christians as peoples of the Book.

homogeneous ONE, and state it as an absolute banality: *sarva, idam khalu brahman* (all this indeed is Brahman). And they supplied to this sublime statement the quiet splendor of: *aham brahmo'smi* (I am Brahman) and *ātman brahman aikyam* (the oneness of the soul and Brahman). In the entire world of philosophical speculation these Upaniṣadic *mahāvākyas* (great pronouncements) stand as the representations of the finality of speculative virtue. The elevated belief of the Cosmos as the ONE animated by the pervasive spiritual principle of Brahman is the antipode of the creation by Jehovah of the disenchanted World out of the nothingness of Chaos, according to the Book of Genesis. The unadulterated revelation which Muhammad introduces as an authentic replacement of Judaism, happens to have been spread over the whole world by means of the conquests of Islam and of its writing the contents of the pure revelation by the use of the sword. In the midst of the ecological crisis Humanity is at a loss to grapple with the disconcertingly stark simplicity of the prevalence of the Biblical prescript of a world *qua* mere matter, over which Jehovah placed Adam as its Lord. Hence a straight line inexorably links Moses' invention of Jehovah as the only God to the Judo-Christian dominated world agitated by the imperative of ecological correction.

When Osiris lost to Jehovah. Simone Weil, the Jewish philosopher, writes movingly how, of all the divinities available in the Mediterranean environment, Osiris was, and still is, the most loving, compassionate, peaceful, forgiving, gentle divinity who nevertheless loses to the dominance of Jehovah who is irascible, vindictive, cruel, violent. Yet the rise of Christianity was not accompanied with the iconoclasm of Jehovah being replaced by the transcendental humane, loving Father of whom Jesus claimed to be the Son. With the hindsight of fourteen centuries and of the disappearance of so many worthy cultures – the Persian, the Byzantine, the pacifist Buddhisms - it is no exaggeration to argue that Jehovah, heightened as Allah, has afflicted Humanity with unrelenting mortiferous violence, of which there seems to be no end.

The fateful triumph of dualities and the marginalization of Non-dualism. While he stood on the soil of his land, the Greek, with the majesty of his speculative endowment, nevertheless chose to ignore the physical sensation of solidarity with all the physical universe. He imagined that he was separated from the theatre of the Cosmos which he envisaged as an external object of his perception. He therefore thought that he was *distinct from* the cosmos and thus, for all time, sealed the duality of all the forms of knowing with the use of the Socratic rationality. The dominant rationality of Socrates subsequently solidified all speculative thought in *discursive* language, in a dramatic departure from the tradition of the *reflective* mode of thinking of the pre-Socratic philosophers. For some inexplicable reason the early Brahmanist thinkers had the genius to dwell within the reflective mode of thinking and came up with the discovery of the *darśana* (seeing) of *all that IS as ONE, beside which No-Thing exists*. To this specific mode of "seeing", the early Brahmanist supplied the contemplative apprehension of existence, that is, the apt *yoga* ethical conduct and contemplation as the means for the realization of the essential unity with the ONE as a distinct personal *experience*, connatural with his *ātman* (self).[30] The Brahmanist, in silence, bequeathed, to the fortunate native born in the Bhārata Land, the grace of being able to discover the homogeneity of his existence with the existence of all that exists. That total apprehension of the individual being *one* with the Cosmic ONE became, for all time, the rock foundation of the Indian civilization, unique in world history. It is the Crown concept which has served as the lode star which has guided all the philosophical and mystical enterprises undertaken in Bhārata Land.

Thereby, in an ontological difference from the Greek's perception, the Brahmanist does not need to see order in the Cosmos of which he is an

---

[30] The English word "self" is the usual weak translation of the Sanskrit "ātman". In Hinduism it could be used as the equivalent of "soul", which would have a different connotation in the Buddhist metaphysics.

integral part. Nor does he see the necessity of Force, as a gigantic form of coercion, in order to entrench the notion of material perfection in the social structure around him. He naturally, without any effort or calculation, sees himself as homogeneous of all that he sees. He is one with the speck of dust under his feet as well as with the distant Sun which he chooses to worship as the source of light, worthy of reverence as the impeller of his contemplation. If there be chaos, the Brahmanist senses it in the medley of his thoughts and feelings due to his attachments. He then, somehow, discovers the possibility to separate himself from his private chaotic predicament. He then arms himself with the weapon of renunciation whereby he distances himself, in his mental space, from the chaos of external attachments and internal confusions and patiently struggles and strives to reach the destination of the oneness with the ONE. All the dualities pregnant with conflict and violence and with the arrogance of belief specificities bestowed by Jehovah worship, have for ages, obscured the gem buried in the existential depths of personal dualist abidingness and unknowing: the promise and the certitude of universal salvation, as the obligation of personal mystical self-realization.

The meaning and importance of the ONE. In a marked contrast, with an enormous difference between the Western and the Indian civilizations, the Brahmanist does not, like the Greek, see the Cosmos as an external object of his perception. In an entirely different mode of seeing, the Brahmanist sees all that Is, pervaded by the essence of the immanent God, Is divine. He is, *of, in, with* the Cosmos as the One. The essence of his *ātman* is connatural with the divine essence. Muhammad listened to Gabriel, but Gabriel could not tell that Muhammad was God, whom, in his *miraj* he saw, with his eyes, as a *standing anatomical physical reality*. Neither Gabriel, nor Muhammad could grasp the reality of the experience of the *ātman-brahman-aikyam,* as a mystical experience. The sacredness of Jehovah or of Allah cannot be contaminated by any contact with any earthly substance. The purity of God, in the Judeo-Christian religiosities, requires its absolute transcendence, without any admixture or contamination with the hither disenchanted world. In the Brahmanist *Weltanschauung* the

ONE which is the All of the Cosmos is a living reality, charged with the radiance of the divine essence. In a fidelity to this vision the Bhārata Land is a living network of seats of pilgrimage (*tīrthas*) and is revered as Mother, to whom is dedicated the temple Bhārata Mātā Mandir, in Vārāṇasī.[31]

The Islamic Man may and will deny the validity of self-enlightenment as the homogeneity of the experience of the ONE in oneself, in *one's self*. In fact his history is riddled with the eager killing of saintly followers of the Dharmas, such as the massacre of the thousands of Buddhist and Hindu at the Nalanda Centre of Buddhist Studies.

The meaning of the silence of Jesus to the question of Pontius Pilate. The only response to the Muslim's refusal to believe in the mystical accomplishment of the Brahmanist or of the Buddhist, or of the Jaina, in this context, would be the smile of the enlightened one, in the related iconographic representation, signifying the impossibility or the vanity of answering to the closed mind. That must have been the sentiment of Jesus who responded with silence when Pontius Pilate asked him: "*What is truth*?" As if taking his cue from Buddha, Jesus did not answer in view of the four conditions which Pilate did not meet: neither the time, nor the place; neither the intellectual competence of Pilate, nor the intention of his asking such a question. These conditions not availing it was not possible for Jesus to give any correct answer. To the Brahmanist striving for *mokṣa* and the Buddhist striving for *nirvāṇa,* the Muslim responded with murderous assault. Such was the essence and the practice of faithful submission to the revealed message of Allah. It still is the practice. For the Muslim the ultimate mode of proving the substance of his belief is in the unquestioning submission to the commands dictated to the Apostle. In

---

[31] There is no need to mention that for the Muslim this reverence for the sacred nature of the Motherland is a blasphemy, a high offence to Allah who is Sovereign, Knower of all that exists, is close to the Believer's jugular vein, but remains separate, untainted by any contact with the world that He has created out of nothing. Only Allah deserves to be venerated.

submission there is no moral initiative of the Believer's own contribution. Most importantly the Believer does not have any doubt which, for a free individual, is the source and the motivation for the search for knowledge, acquired by spiritual labor. He does as a matter of fact believe that the knowledge dispensed by the Revelation is the only eternally valid Truth and therefore can and must be trusted and obeyed without any questioning or doubting. The history of Islam does not offer the existence of an equivalent of René Descartes who, starting from the recognition of his doubting, establishes the laws of reason for the acquisition of the right knowledge. In the world of the Dharmas, the search for the mystic self-fulfillment is triggered by the experience of suffering, or of doubt, or uncertainty, or due to the contact with other searchers meeting as a *sat sangha* which exudes the allurement of their joyful endeavor. The Muslim is simply under the obligation to obey. Even his claim to personal responsibility of a particular action is alive as the extension of Allah's *Taqdīr.* There is nothing that the Muslim thinks or does, which can be without Allah's knowing and measuring it according to the physical and immaterial circumstances surrounding the particular existential situation.

Whenever, in any social gathering, or in any situation, such as an office, or in the same neighborhood, in a private party of non-Believers, the Muslim displays a congenial and pleasant behavior, on his own, as an expression of his naturally good disposition, he is acting in contradiction of the enmity which Allah commands him to evince towards the non-Believer. Any protest on his part that his kindness to the Kaffir is prompted by faithful submission to the revelation would be just 'nice', a whiff of social courtesy, as a natural kindness. If he be a sincere Believer, he knows that his 'friendliness contravenes his submission to the injunctions of God. If he insists on the merit of his sincere, unqualified friendship, even if he knows that he does so against Allah's express command, he still does not go as far as wishing or proposing the abrogation of the relevant revelation. The Muslim's friendliness and the friendliness of the Brahmanist are mutually exclusive sentiments. For the Muslim it is a manifestation of Allah's *Taqdīr*; for which he will answer on the Final Day. For the Brahmanist, moral

integrity obliges him to view the other as *tat tvam asi*, which, in practice, in regard to the Muslim's obligation to obey Allah willing him to hate the Other, may prove to be an arduous task.

The difference in the finalities of Islam and of Brahmanism. The difference between the Islamic and the Brahmanist-Buddhist finalities of human existence is this: the Islamic finality is the lowly, vulgar banality of sensual delights experienced by the resurrected body, in Paradise.[32] By such a promise as a historically concrete realization, the Islamic prescription of the perfect life totally ignores the sublime virtue of the authentic moral man living *without* the purpose of enjoying earthly rewards. The complete moral individual leads a mode of life unrelated to material or to any other sensual or material gratification, that is, a life freed from the servitude of expecting rewards. Disinterestedness of the moral man is the absolute norm of the genuinely honorable way of living, however hard it may be. The glory of Buddhism precisely consists in its fundamental prescription of detachment as a way of living without the need of believing in, or thinking of, the existence, of God, of any God, of even holding the *thought* of some particular supernatural being, or god. The Buddhist does not need God for him to be compassionate in reducing the suffering of the Other and in contributing to his effort to attain *nirvāṇa*!

The humane finalities of human existence according to the Dharmas. It is a distinguishing feature of the Islamic mode of walking along the Straight Path that it does so crassly promise the basest heavenly enjoyment as the reward of the labour of living according to the revealed, supernatural precepts. It is beyond sober comprehension that a Muslim would have the gall to pronounce that *heavenly* gratifications would have been showered

---

[32] Nothing can be more obscene than the suicide-bombing mujahideen killing defenseless, unarmed men, women and children, even in Muslim crowds, and thereby earning the instant reward of frolicking with seventy-two virgins in the Islamic paradise. And these houris are supposed to remain virgins eternally.

upon the Muhammad Bakhtiyars and Ghaznavi Mahmuds of Islam as rewards more desirable, and more dignified, than the sublime, wordless, transcendental, *earthly* experience of the bliss of being a *jīvan-mukta* or an *arhat.* On this question too, it is impossible for the Brahmanist to have a dialogue with an Imam who cannot take the smallest step away from his submission to the law which commands him to obey the prescription spelled out word for word to Muhammad by God Himself. But that is no impediment to the *dhārmika* striver holding unerringly that there is nothing beyond or higher than the nonpareil ethereal bliss of *jīvan-mukti* or *nirvāṇa,* as the finality of human existence. In truth, there is no prescription of the finality of human earthly existence in any of the three revealed religions. The latter grant privilege to the destiny in a Heaven assumed to be as real as an earthly acre of Euclidean space.

The divine sanction for senseless war and banditry. There can be nothing heroic in the banditry feats of Ghaznavi Mahmud carried out in a sparse space of the sub-continent as a vast territory with little defense and without a central authority commanding a military force. Nor was there any military valour displayed by the Sultans like Qutb-ud-din Aybak and murderous generals like Muhammad Bakhtiyar in the suppression of defenceless centers of learning and of massacring peaceful monks living in monasteries designed for study and contemplation. But all their actions were holy offerings to Allah who claimed His *Rubūbiyat* with the submission of his proxies in the practice of their genocidal fervor. Voltaire correctly understood that there is absolutely no possibility of a dialogue with a Muslim motivated with a divine injunction to kill the Other as a virtuous deed and to eliminate all forms of knowledge which did not fall within the purview of Arab Muslim consciousness. Gratifications and honors were indeed showered by their respective Caliphs upon the Muhammad Bakhtiyars and Ghaznavi Mahmuds as rewards more desirable, and more dignified, than the sublime, wordless, transcendental, *earthly* experience of the bliss of being a *jīvan-mukta* or an *arhat.* The genocidal perpetrators, such as those nurtured by the revelations of Allah-

Jehovah, bear witness to the immensely sorrowful fact that the death of a peaceful, supremely humane civilization can be swiftly carried out by a small, well-armed army of barbarians bereft of any sensitivity for accommodating the perception of *difference* in the sublime works and refinements of their victims. The barbaric display of extreme violence by the different Muslim powers is in a revealing contrast with the intellectual curiosity of those British pioneers who, as servants of the commercial East India Company, expressed admiration of the highly sophisticated Sanskrit language with its wealth of knowledge accumulated over centuries. Indian Islam has not produced any equivalent of E. B. Havell writing eulogies of native Indian art produced with perfect mastery for public admiring edification. The comparison of Muslim iconoclasm with British discovery of the aesthetic visage of Indian art and learning and dedication to making them known to civilized Europe justifies an objective reproving of Islam as a form of thinking which blights the imagination of the Believer with the alchemy of inverting the beauty of a different culture into a loathsome mass of abominations. Christians too have, in certain occasions, in certain places, frowned upon arts and practices, which did not meet their religious and aesthetic propriety. But they had sophisticated aesthetic and intellectual refinements of their own which they installed as compensations. In India the Muslims destroyed an immense lot and replaced with nothing, for they had nothing to propose or implant as compensations. It was all hatred and destruction transmogrified as virtues, with justification flaunted with divine sanction.

Furthermore there is nothing heroic, nor is there any freedom, nor any personal responsibility, in the Believer's submission to Revelation, such as there is, always in abundance, as an effortless consent, in the conduct of a Dharma follower. The native Indian determines his thought, his speech, his action, of his own choosing, with the guiding belief in the Law of Karma. The inflexible causal power of Karma is riveted in the belief of the Oriental, particularly of the people of the Dharmas. It is assumed as a matter of fact reality, as natural as the air which the Dharma follower breathes, without its being propounded or questioned by any celestial denizen commanding

obedience, however mighty and endowed with absolute authority he can be. The submission to the divine law is attractive because it grants the fullest freedom from exerting individual responsibility. Submission is a liberation from the obligation to choose, with the aid of reason, the right obligation in an either-or situation. Submission confers the warmth of the lustiest enthusiasm enhanced with a sense of infinite, innocent freedom to hate as a virtue and to kill as a proxy of Allah, with the assurance of a heavenly reward. Indeed it must be exhilarating for the Believer to feel enhanced and self-fulfilled by being given freedom to exult in the prospect of islamizing the whole world with the ecstatic prospect of delights in Paradise. With such an ease in winning a seat in Paradise and earning eternal delight, the Believer does not need to have, in his social surrounding, any need of lofty exemplars as guidance for a way of living with an elevated thought and feeling without any desire for material gains and satisfactions. Indian Muslims do not produce eminent men like Madan Mohan Malviya, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Vinoba Bhave; women like Sarojini Naidu, Rukmini Arundale, Kamala Chattopadhyaya. Indian Muslims have Allah.

It is germane to imagine that the prospect of dying to gain an easy access to the eternal celestial delights would appeal to the Believing followers of the violent theology of the Muslim Brotherhood dedicated to the passion for converting the world into a *Dar-ul-Islam.*

The real metaphysics of Islam. The vision of striving for the realizing the *Dar-ul-Islam* represents the real metaphysical goal of the Umma. It is a prescribed collective perfection of the Umma which is unique among *all* religions. Exalted with the impossible expectation of seven billion non-Muslims living in the world today who must be brought within the single World of Islam, the Believer would be enthused by the violent theology of the Muslim Brotherhood. Thereby he feels authorized to believe that the future offers limitless opportunity to exert the virtue of Islamic violence without any moral restraint. For he is assured of the blessing of the unlimited favour of God stimulating His proxies along such a Straight Path.

This goal, however, may never be attained. But it keeps the Umma's submission alive with fervid readiness to march on the Straight Path envisioned by Muhammad, the Conqueror.

The nobility of individual striving for mystic self-perfection. The striver (*sādhaka*) for self-enlightenment seeks with the all-consuming expectation of ultimately experiencing the perfect state by means of effort, of endeavor, of persistence in spite of momentary failures. Backslidings may occur, but after each, the seeker gets up and patiently, heroically, resumes the struggle with dogged conviction, even when he knows, or even because he knows, that Śaṅkarācārya, with immense honesty, asserts that "it is easier to drain the ocean, drop by drop, by using a blade of grass, than to obtain *mokṣa*!"[33] It goes to the credit of the indigenous seeker for the ultimate self-perfectibility to dwell undeterred by the prospect so honestly defined by the preeminent true-hearted Ācārya. Hence an honest comparison of these Islamic and the Dhārmika finalities cannot but favour the certainty of the unrivalled perfection of what the finality of human existence can be as told by the scriptures of the Dharmas. It heightens the sadness due to the acknowledgement that, during many centuries, these finalities had been taught and proclaimed with the certitude of salvation attainable by every individual in all Humanity. The sadness follows in the wake of the accident which occurred when Jehovah-Allah sent Angel Gabriel to bring down the mortiferous, totalitarian ideology which led to the misfortune of India losing her Buddhism. It was a misfortune which extended to all the cultures which, after several millennia of their brilliant history, got replaced by Islam. In spite of whatever merit Islam may indeed have in sustaining the satisfied happiness of the Umma, it evinces the fact that it put really nothing culturally worthy, as a universal appeal, in its replacements, as due compensation. It is incumbent upon the dispassionate observer of History to acknowledge that Al Lah, as t he

---

[33] Vide Śaṅkarācārya's Commentary on the Māṅdūkya Upaniṣad.

avatar of Jehovah, the architect, who has used the instruments of the three revealed religions, to wreck the nobility of Humanity, with the corrupting superstition that indeed there is somewhere in space a real, physical Heaven, owned by an able-bodied, anthropomorphic male God who dispensed the Revelation with the use of the Arabic language.

The reason of the infinitely different finalities. And why are the finalities, which characterize the Dharmas, infinitely superior to what Allah prescribes as the destiny of the Believer? Because the finality of human existence for the Brahmanist and the Buddhist is an event occurring in the *psychic space* and *in the psychic time* of the seeker, in a superlative dissimilitude from the Muslim who seeks the limitless, base enjoyment in his *material body in a material paradise in the astronomical, calendar time.* This limit posting argument lies beyond the Mussalman's power of reflection on ineffable experiences. In reality it evinces the evidence of his never having been engaged during the thousand years of the Islamic hegemony and during the centuries of British cultural ascendancy. That is one explanation for which Islamic orthodoxy has always frowned upon Sufism and its mystical finality. Indeed one may wonder if a relevant discussion of this cardinal subject would have ever stirred the academic willingness of Muslim scholars and theologians! They avoid any confrontation with the difference between their moral and philosophical fundamentals and the native Indian concept of the immortality of the *ātman* (or soul) of the Brahmanist passing through a series of rebirths until the finality of its union with the Absolute Reality or Brahman. The Indian Dharmas advocate their negation of a tragic view of life, because of the concept and the reality of the *iṣṭa devatā* (the favourite Deity as the transcendent representative of Brahman, as Īśvara) being the permanent in-dweller (*antaryāmī*), the existential experience of whom supersedes the concept of Heaven. The *Bhagavad Gītā* sums it in a straightforward declaration that *the soul is eternal, the sword does not cut it, fire does not burn it, water does not wet it, wind does not dry it*. All the three Dharmas emphasize the central fact of *punar janma* (rebirth) as a continuum, which

implies, in an unequivocal difference from the Islamic notion of the personality, that *the presently living being has been living in a different body before the present life. That is, a birth preceded the present rebirth.* The three revelations are silent on the pre-existence of a birth; they postulate the fable of the Final Day of Resurrection as a physical reality, and raise it to the summit of their respective faith. Nor do they consider the monumental impossibility of every Believer's body rising by its own dynamic initiative on the Final Day, nor the mode of transportation to reach the place where God is seated and is ready to pass judgement on the merits and demerits of his life on earth. [34]

Athe meaning of a Buddhist parable. The significant difference pertaining to the concept of the Day of Resurrection of the three revelations consists of their having no opinion, or any explanation of what *precedes* the present life. They establish the mystery of life and death on the assumption of *eternity as a post-mortem reality,* despite the abundance of a highly eloquent and elevating theological literature exalting the mystery of Death and of the Biblical transcendence of God. The Dharmas postulate the concept of Eternity as what Is, that is, an existence which inhabits the past, the present, the future as one instant. The *ātman* being eternal must have existed in the past as what it IS now and will be present as what constitutes the *individual's* future. Eternity is present in the present

---

[34] In his singularly impressive film *J'Accuse*, Abel Gance brings forth his pacifist message with the striking sequence of the hero going to a military cemetery. There, kneeling in front of a tomb, he appeals in French, in English, in German, to the dead of the First World War to come out and prevent the outbreak of the Second World War. The scene, accompanied with a slow, deep drum and trumpet sound of ghosts of the dead, with their bandages over their *gueules cassées* (broken faces), some without one leg and walking with a crutch, a whole regiment of the grievously wounded coming forward in silence to the viewer and the scene ends with panic in the cities to show men and women frightened by the clouds of a war approaching. Abel Gance used the imagery suggested by the Christian belief in the Final Day of the Resurrection of the bodies, as an idiom for his pacifism.

moment: the 'now' moment is an egg out of which comes out the chick of eternity, at the right opportunity.

A Buddhist parable expounds this concept of eternity. On one occasion Gautama Buddha came upon a group of inquiring monks and he tells them: "O Monks! If in a basket there are ten, eleven or twelve eggs, and if, after a certain time, out of one of the eggs, either by the action of the claw or of the beak, there comes a chick. Would you say that this chick is the youngest or the oldest?" One monk replied: "Bhagavan, of course, this chick is the oldest!" – "Rightly, O Monk, have you answered! In like manner, O Monks, it so happened that I am the first to have been awakened to the ultimate reality. Accordingly I am the most ancient (*purāṇa*)!"

This parable explains, by means of the attainment of what is *purāṇa,* (as the culmination of a strenuous contemplative striving as laid down in the *Yogasūtras* of Patañjali) explains what Jesus meant when he said: "When Abraham was, I am!" The belief in the Day of Resurrection, even in view of the consolation which it provides to the living with the "certainty" of their reunion with their beloved ones, it is nevertheless a refined form of crude attachment and of a denial of the freedom of the departed. The heroic, virile belief which runs through the Indian vision of "death" as a transfer to another existence puts Karma as the determinant of life after death, for both the living and the departed. Michelangelo's magnificent master fresco painting of the Last Judgement at the Sistine Chapel, in Rome, is undoubtedly the most impressive example of beauty used to dress what is after all, beyond its imagery, monumentally macabre! All the more because, according to the Dharma view of life being eternal, for there has never been a time when the Soul has not been in existence and there will never be a time when it will cease to be.

The banal exercise of committing the dead body to Fire (Agni as the god representing all divinities) is a purely loving, spiritual consecration of the soul liberated to choose its rebirth in its search for the eternal union with Brahman in a transcendent *ātman brahman aikyam* (oneness of soul and brahman).

Partition as the Indian Muslims' proof of their incapacity to meet the challenge of generating a synthetic, Islamic Enlightenment. The endeavor corresponding to this study will further establish that the Partition of the old India was a dramatic confirmation of the failure of the Islamic community to even contemplate the unique possibility of a cultural synthesis in communion with the Brahmanist, the Buddhist and the Jaina mystical ideologies, with the vision of a still unborn Islamic Enlightenment. Indeed 'failure' may be the wrong word. For the Muslim claims that he already is privileged to have the knowledge necessary for his walking along the Straight Path drawn for him by Allah. In view of the Muslim believing that all other forms of knowledge are errors, there is absolutely no reason for him to even think that there can be anything worthwhile to learn from them. That is why the Indian Muslim thinks and acts according to his thought that, despite all the evidence of history, he believes that Muhammad is the best man who ever lived, even in comparison with Jesus, or Gautama Buddha, or Lao Tzu, or Confucius, or Mahāvīra.

The absence of doubt in Islam. Consequently, the Muslim never has any doubt in the perfection of Allah's revelation being essential to his right living as is the air which he breathes in order to remain alive. Besides, if he happens to see or hear of some unrevealed meaningful occurrence, he reacts to its being *haram* and he therefore calls for its being eliminated. In India the beauty of the countless sculptures of the human body adorning the thousands of temples invited, not admiration and joy, but the Believer's spontaneous zeal to disfigure or destroy them. It is difficult, if not impossible, to grasp that, during fourteen centuries, Muslims would have been so steadfast in their refusal to acknowledge the Beauty of the human body expressed in stone, in marble, in painting. It is all due to Moses enunciating the anti-art commandment, in the few words which have been responsible for the destruction of so many works of art, resulting in the doleful impoverishment of the world, due to the denial of one noble aspect of humanity.

There is no straight line in living. It is altogether a different question if not an outright *falsehood, that the indispensability of the Straight Path mentioned in the first Surah of the Quran infallibly assures the realization of the sole truthfulness in human existence*. Living is never experienced as a straight Euclidean line. Filled with the vicissitudes of daily experience, moral life manifests itself in a constantly changing Time in which each individual finds himself into a labyrinth where he falls and strives again, succeeds and fails, laughs and weeps, earns happiness or suffers unexpected tribulations, hopes for the enjoyment of bliss and gets smitten with undeserved injustices, often without any consolation. *No one ever lives along a Straight Path. No one ever did, not even ever in Arabia. No one will ever do so anywhere, specially even in Mecca and Medina.* Christians like to recall, as a blessed moral lesson, Jesus falling three times while carrying the cross to the Mount of Golgotha.

The Muslim is not an independent thinker. Additionally, due to the influence of Hanbal and Ibn Tamiyya having prevailed, the Muslim can use his reason only to explain and follow the revealed pronouncements. These are unquestioned for they are believed to be divinely perfect, and will stay perfect for all eternity. By not questioning this divine perfection, the Believer disowns his personal freedom; he abstains from any convenient or purposeful interpretation for his exclusive benefit. He does not resent the obligation of submitting, for it is easy for him to surrender his freedom to the Revelation which is actually given not only to the individual Believer, but as a set of rules to be followed by the entire Umma. In such a perspective a free, independent personal interpretation of the Revelation would constitute a betrayal of the Umma. Belonging to the Umma ensures the comfort of solidarity which rivets the Believer to the literal interpretation of the Revelation. The non-Believer may wonder how a rational individual, a scientist, a mathematician, a doctor, an engineer, can so readily consent to submission to the Revelation and act according to its prescriptions. Because of his belonging to one of the Dharmas, the devotee (*bhakta*) does not have the intellectual categories to internalize the phenomenon of the Believer's spontaneous submission. Each of the three

Dharmas is not a Church ruling with the proclamation of Dogmas as prescriptions of moral or religious conduct for the totality of the Ecclesia (Church). The Dharma follower acts on his own responsibility, with what he thinks, in what he says, in how he walks. He is also free to indulge in a mode of living with the freedom of renunciation. Certainly the Dharmas are sustained in a civilized environment by the principles enunciated in the Dharma-śāstras, under the government of the King or of a duly recognized central authority. Within the society governed according to the classical Dharma-śāstras, the caste duties are individually carried out. It was significant that in the ancient classical India it was the Brāhmaṇa who owned higher regard than the King. Even in Buddhist countries today the Buddhist monk does not salute the King, for example in Thailand, or to the Head of State in any of the other Buddhist countries. Such a hierarchy did not exist in the Christian and Islamic States. In Christianity: the Pope holds the supreme authority of the political and the religious conduct of the Church. In Great Britain the Monarch is the supreme authority of both the religious and the secular powers. In India, the Kṣatriya remained below the prestige of the Brāhmaṇa who had no material power, other than the awe of his learning and his dedication to the search for the experience of Brahman. The Brāhmaṇa, as such, did not, as such, as a rule, seek wealth or power.

In Islam it does not pertain to any Believer to modify or question the meaning of the revealed words. Any change in the text of the Holy Book, or abrogation of a rule or precept, gets immediately translated as a death sentence for the modifier. To the non-Believer the Muslim offers the picture of a Man trapped within the Sharia. The few Muslim-majority countries have, as former colonies of the French and the British imperial powers, adopted democratic constitutions with the proviso that the laws be under the Sovereignty of Allah. They struggle with the collective neurosis of each having a divine, Umma-centric Sharia legalism, and a jurisprudence assuring the individual's freedom and his rational and moral responsibility. Though the governments of the Muslim countries do not

seem to internalize the fact and to reflect on it, the mobility of their citizens invariably opt for centrifugal migrations to the Western democracies which they subsequently abominate in praise of their Sharia, with an absurd twist of the Believer's mind impelled by a "Reason" specific to the Islamic mentality. Muslim migrations do not occur with centripetal motivations within the Umma itself. With the extreme rigor of the inflexibility of the contents of the Holy Scripture, to which the Believer submits unconditionally, the Muslim has absolutely no recourse to modify the intention and the scope of the revelations in any way he deems beneficent to him alone, in harmony with his particular reason.

The absolute characteristic of the modern Islamic jurisprudence. With the dispensation of the traditional Islamic jurisprudence dogmatically conferring immunity to any Believer to kill whoever would undertake to change any word or sign in the Holy scripture, the validity of the tradition remains, and shall remain till the Day of Judgement, unchanged. For the tradition and the fundamental texts to change, with the shifting currents of History, one agent would have to be available: the individual who, with untrammeled freedom, interprets the fundamental texts according to his private particular, personal, well-guided experience and to his expectations of a desired more agreeably enlightened future. As things stand at the beginning of the XXI century, the desired change may occur at some time in the Greek calends.

The intellectual limitation of the Indian Muslim. Speculation yields to pessimism in relation to the possible emergence of an Indian Muslim who, benefitting from the possibility of his community's tolerance, would venture to bring forth an interpretation of the Holy Scripture adapted to divergent sociological and intellectual exigencies. For example, would it be possible for an Indian Muslim to be a sculptor while remaining faithful to Allah? Would the Imamate recognize the merit of a Believer appealing for the abrogation of the verses which enjoin hatred of the Disbelievers? Would it be safe for an Indian Believer to claim that the Truths affirmed by Kaffir religions are as valid as the claim of the Quran that it is the only

Truth? Would it be desirable for the Muslim to accept the separation of the State from the Religion? These are not mere flights of the imagination. They refer to well established practices in the alien liberal, secular democracies.

The burden of Mother India. Most probably these questions, and others of a similar tenor, will not, or perhaps never will be raised in India. But the Indian citizen, and above all, the intelligentsia among the variety of political leaderships, may learn, from the following chapters, that such questions are indeed being raised, mostly in Western Europe, by Muslim intellectuals, reared in their faith and still in agonizing loyalty to their tradition. Indeed, they do openly advocate, in their writings, desirable broadenings of the humanity they attribute to the core of the Islam to which they proclaim an unfailing fealty.

The difference between the European Arab Muslim and the Indian Muslim. The substantive difference between the European Arab Muslim intellectuals and the Indian Muslims consists of their living and working in the liberal environments where they think in, besides the Arabic, non-English languages crossed with philosophical undercurrents which seduce and draw their minds and hearts towards values and virtues embellishing their native cultures on the southern borders of the Mediterranean. As Arab intellectuals their enlightened approach is devoid of the encumbrances which characterize the Indian Islamists. Fluent in their Arabic language and in the text of the Quran, they are proficient in the language of their hosts. Consequently they feel free to accommodate the excellences of the Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian European culture as adornments of their own inherited way of life. In India the Muslim, retreating to the singularity of the Urdu and the English languages, does not have the subjective autonomous cultural foundation equal to the stability and assurance of his European Arab co-believer. Moreover in India the Muslim labors under the double disadvantage of his religiosity being a subsidiary appendage of Arab Islam doomed to co-habit with a Kaffir majority. Further the Indian Muslim knows that while he does have the

fullest opportunity to be what he wants to be, he knows that he will never be accepted with equal citizenship in an Islamic Arab country. Paradoxically this personal and collective inadequacy strengthens the Indian Muslim's narrow conservatism.

The metaphysical difference between the Brahmanist and the Muslim. In Europe the Arab Muslims have the advantage of living in a milieu harboring the Judeo-Christian religiosity which is recognized by the Islamic Scripture as having equal validity as an earlier version of the Revelation. This important, vital sentiment of the North African Arabs being religiously at home in the midst of the former French imperial power, lends to the mind and the heart of the European Arab the possibility of a cultural synthesis emerging from the histories of the two civilizations: in language and in literature, in the fine arts, in political ideologies, in forms of creative collaborations, without the indispensability of any Arab Vote Bank. They enthusiastically call for an Islamic Enlightenment, a desire of which there is hardly any inkling among the Indian Muslims.

The impossible emergence of a Islam with philosophical synthesis with Brahmanism. However when one delves into the history of Brahmanism, one finds it having the Buddhist Middle Way as its antipode, with the result that nearly a millennium after the advent of Gautama Buddha and his doctrine which had by then attained its fullest development, the traditional Brahmanist metaphysicians could, with blissful eagerness, bring forth the magnificent synthesis of the Advaita Vedānta. In comparison, for the time being, at least, there is no sign of even the slightest intimation of the possibility of synthesis of an Indian Islam persuading itself with the possibility of a broadening inspiration drawn from the contemplation of the lofty metaphysics of the Vedānta. Such a synthesis would have been a contribution benefiting at least the Muslim presence in South Asia, in which case it would not be valid for the whole Umma, particularly for its segments in Africa and the Middle East. It would be a dream tantamount to wishing the Moon to be transformed into cheese. Indeed, on what ground can anyone even think of Allah loving the Kaffir as Kaffir? What

synthesis can be envisaged with a dispensation by Allah who enjoins war on the *Dar-ul-Harb* and even takes part in wars, as He did at Badr? But, essentially, Islam as a body of Law, with its advocacy of a legalistic single-mindedness, how can such an emphatic legalism work out a synthesis with the high attainments of Brahmanist thought? In reality Islam does neither have, nor allow the Believer to nurture the disposition, favorable to speculation like those of the Greeks, nor does it have any form of thinking commensurate with the elevated metaphysics of the Brahmanists and the Buddhists. To begin with the Muslim has no resource to enable him to contemplate the existential realization of Patañjali's *citta vṛtti nirodha* (cessation of the thought process) which squarely celebrates the transcendence of all words and concepts.

And how could a synthesis ever be, considering that Muhammad pronounced the revelation to be the last? Force be to conclude that India remains bound to spend the remainder of the Kali Yuga with sharing its space with a demographic volcano in its midst, with the choleric verses posing a permanent threat to the mystical peace propounded by the Dharmas. After all during all the centuries when the Christians and the Arabs have been fighting one another in the Middle East, without anyone, scholar or layman, ever attempting to promote a synthetic ideology for peace, to speculate about the possibility of such an initiative taking place in India today would be indulging in the vanity of quixotic thinking. Besides, not even the Indian Christian is born yet to conceive of the possibility of elaborating a Theology of the Holy Spirit, for which there is an abundance of favorable philosophical material and inspiration.

The failure of Indian Islam to generate an original mystical way to self-perfection. It is so unfortunate that in more than a thousand years the Indian Islamic elite has failed to grasp the unique opportunity to work out and promote a progressive, original mystical Islam with a concurrent ethos

and mode of living.[35] This failure proved to the world Umma that the Indian Muslims, in a socio-religious context unique in the world, could not break away from the shell of their closed-mindedness, into a more enlightened Islam, based on a more elevated eschatology than the Day of Judgement. Borrowed from the Jewish faith and consolidated as Christian Dogma by Saint Paul, the doctrine of the Day of the Resurrection of the body, recited at every Sunday Mass, as an act of faith, is a most unfortunate perversion of the teaching of Jesus.[36]

The failure of Indian Christianity to devise a Theology of the Holy Spirit distinct from the Christological Theology. While living in India the Muslim could have realized that while he believed that the Quran was actually written before Creation by Allah Himself, the notion or the belief, or even the fact, of the Final Day, was devised by human intelligence and taught by men in the Jewish tradition, and further emphasized as crucial to Christian piety by Saint Paul. Muhammad would have borrowed, from the Jews, or from Pauline Christianity, the centrality of the faith which Jesus never mentioned during his brief period of teaching, according to the Gospels. With the limitation of a comparable closed-mindedness inherent to its dogmatic vocation, the Indian Christian Church, indifferent to the extant plurality of the indigenous mystical cultures, could never open itself to the possibility, let alone the necessity, of fostering a theology of the Holy Spirit. Instead it labored on with the satisfaction of closing and fossilizing itself within a Christology which has not provided any original contribution to the magnificent articulation of Theological thought rising from the

---

[35] The Sufi component in Islam derives its origin most probably from Eastern Christian mysticism, from the XII century onward. Islamic Orthodoxy does not recognize it as a genuine, organic form of the revelation. There is nothing recalling Sufism in the biography of Muhammad or of any of his immediate companions. Nor in any life story of a Caliph.

[36] Emile Gillabert argues for the restoration of the concept of the Kingdom as preached by Jesus against the theology of St Paul, in *The Words of Jesus and Oriental Wisdom.*

southern shore of the Mediterranean sea and endowing continental Europe with the blossoming of a transcendental extension of its Greco-Roman heritage.

The closedness of the mind in relation to the interpretation of the revelation. That the Indian component of the Umma did not and could not transcend the limits of the Sharia, or even dream of thinking of the possibility of a mystical theological experience, results from the orthodox view that a possible cultural synthesis would be tantamount to a betrayal of the revealed integrity, to a defilement of a divinely ordered Islamic way of life. More than Eastern Christianity, it is the different forms of the Indian mysticisms which should have given birth to Sufism. It is a matter of profound thinking that the Indian Islam resolved to remain so devoid of any active Sufi component, as a beneficent, humanizing enrichment of the original violent Islam which it has chosen to preserve as proof of its authenticity as the guardian of its identity.

The glory of Islam in the diminution of Indian civilization. Above all, any kind of synthesis would be felt as a loss of the pride derived from a history of the diminution of the indigenous civilization, which the Believer recalls as Muslim glory. This mentality is common to all the followers of the revealed religions.[37] It rests on the foundation of the sentiment of being privileged with a perfect way of life well defined and laid down with eternal validity by an Omniscient and All-mighty God. For the past two thousand years the prestige, the claim to superiority and to perfection pertaining to the religions rising in the Middle East and in Europe, were particularly deemed to be perfect by being buttressed with the triumph won by military superiority and subsequent political domination. The ensuing transfiguration of the Western materialisms of Force and Domination into moral and cultural pre-eminence has, since the 1970s, finally been

[37] In reference to the Christian faith, the argument applies to the European, not to the Indian Christianity.

compelled to confront their blemishes, by the voices of former colonized elites, denouncing the pride of conquest and exploitation as iniquity and heartless barbarism. The swelling tides of protest, by the elites of the former victims of the use of Force by the former imperial powers, have evinced vigor in the explosion of legitimate anger and rebellion against the former abuses. What has come forward into the new consciousness of the former conquering powers and of their victims, is a revision of the former imperial glories, which had for a long time been covered over by the pronouncements of blinkered historians and sanctimonious politicians.

The world after 1492. Since 1492, when Christopher Columbus thought he had discovered India, the land rich with the abundance of spices, Christians have, without a single exception, engaged every non-Christian culture or community with intolerant self-righteousness and with genocidal exuberance. Without any exception they never made any effort towards sharing, or collaborating, or striving together in creative, aesthetic and moral enterprises, with the peoples pertaining to different beliefs and ways of being. Indeed since Cristobal Colon 'discovered' America, the spirit of the Bible has been honored on the ground, throughout the longitudes, to the East and to the West, of Western Europe, throughout latitudes to the South of Europe, with the reliance on the musket and fire power lit with righteousness drawn from the pages of the Bible.

In the Indian sub-continent a corresponding situation prevailed with the Muslims' belief that the Quran has been written before the Creation by Allah: it preserves the validity of its laws, rules and principles, till the end of time. For it does not behoove any human being to claim any kind of authority to amend or modify what God has stipulated for the benefit of the Believer.

Apart amidst the Indian sub-continent, nowhere else in the world has an Islamic community lived for more than a thousand years in contact with a sophisticated, enlightened, pluri-religious civilization brought about by the labors and aspirations of men and women striving to generate a harmony of three distinctive, mutually exclusive Dharmas, proclaiming their

mysticisms as finalities of human existence. It astounds the mind in contemplating the fact that, during a millennium, the Indian Muslims could have maintained intact the integrity of their belief without the least acknowledgement of a right understanding of the fundamentals of the moral civilization which they so assiduously "inferiorized" with the instruments of an implacable intolerance, most prominently exerted with the sword.

The failure or inability of the Indian Muslim. The Muslims of the sub-continent had the unique opportunity to come out of the cocoon of their *dualistic* revealed closedness. Thereby they could have been able to give to the world a truly original, syncretic form of the revealed way of Muslim life which could be compatible with a mutually benefitting congeniality amid the complex *monistic* indigenous civilization of India. *Instead they chose the murderous horrors of Partition* as the condition of their independent evolution. The future of Pakistan, above all, is bound to demonstrate how Islam evolves in conjunction with what it considers "democracy" to be and to evolve in conjunction with Sunni Islam, in harmony with the Umma and with the prospect of the world as *Dar-ul-Islam.*

An imagined view of India five centuries later. Half a millennium from today the common man and woman will look back on *the history of the XX century and contemplate, with disbelief, the satanic genesis, from the thunderous savagery of the Indian Umma, distilling with volcanic fury a quintessentially Islamic eruption of genocidal hatred in the midst of an ancient man-made mystical civilization*. Their disbelief will swell with the cognition that such an apocalyptic upheaval happened at the very time when, *out of the tamas of oppression brought about by the followers of Allah and of Jesus, such a Luciferan convulsion asserted itself in the environment distinguished with the Gandhian ahiṁsā as one of its distinctive attributes*.

The shining star seen from a far distance in Indian history. With Time magnifying to reveal the true size of the deserving genius, the ideal

historian, half a millennium later, will have to recognize, with disbelieving amazement the occurrence of a Man who gave to the world a word: *gandhiism,* to signify Peace and earned this homage from a most disinterested Mathematician and Scientist: *"A leader of his people, unsupported by any outward authority, a politician whose success rests not upon craft nor the mastery of technical devices, but simply on the convincing power of his personality; a victorious fighter who always scorned the use of force; a man of wisdom and humility, armed with resolve and inflexible consistency, who has devoted all his strength to the uplifting of his people and the betterment of their lot; a man who has confronted the brutality of Europe with the dignity of the simple human being, and thus at all times risen superior. Generations to come, it may be, will scarce believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth."*[38]

The meaning of the fossilization of Indian Christianity. With their dualistic way of life the Indian Christians too constitute the other community with its affinity with the mainly Judeo-Christian European-Western civilization. Despite its genuine connection with the Old Testament and the Biblical prophetic tradition, the Indian Christians rightly claim to be the original Christians, with their history having its beginning in the missionary activity of Thomas, one of the immediate twelve disciples of Jesus. Apparently little documentation has been published about the first four or five centuries of the Indian Christian way of life. Little is known of the daily habits and concerns of the earliest Indian Christians, about the structure of their rites, the contents of their priests' sermons, the designs and symbols of the ecclesiastical vestments, the earliest places and houses where their prayers were said. There is scarcely any reliable history of the daily life of the Indian Christians during the period beginning with the first century till the end of the fifth century marked by the conversion to the

[38] Albert Einstein's 1939 Letter to Mahatma Gandhi, published in "Out of My Later Years", 1950.

Christian faith of Clovis (481-511), King of the whole of Gaul, who was christened by Saint Rémy in 491.

Arnold Toynbee's theory of Challenge and Response. In illustrating his theory of *Challenge and Response* in the context of the meeting or the clash of two different cultures or civilizations, British historian Arnold Toynbee views Indian Christianity together with the Ethiopian Christianity as fossilized Christianities. In Europe the growth and the development of Christian culture came about as the result of the encounter with the Greco-Roman civilization. The Christian faith transported into the Roman Empire, already infused with Greek cultural influence, was itself an elevated reaction to the Jewish tradition. Saint Paul carried out his missionary work amidst the eastern part of the Roman Empire where Greek was the dominant medium of communication. It was as an independent, new religion which subsequently established ways to integrate forms of speculation borrowed from the Greek Philosophy in order to explicate the historical meaning of the advent of Jesus Christ. Europe offered the space where the new faith encountered the ancient Greco-Roman civilization and brought forth a creative response to the challenges forced upon it by the latter. In particular Theology, as a new science, drew an immense advantage from the highly sophisticated Greco-Roman culture which, of its own, still commands wonder and reverence on account of the splendor of its wealth of knowledge and wisdom. In India the Christians neither borrowed nor integrated anything from the surrounding wisdoms which had matured during millennia of growth, enhanced with an abundant production of high learning, of perfected ways of mystical accomplishments, bequeathed by the poets and the seers of Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism. Even if Aramaic was the language of the liturgy, the Indian Christian would have spoken the language of the people amidst which they were living. It is strange, and remarkable, that during the first four or five centuries the new Christians would not have known of the fundamental thoughts of the Indian non-Christian societies, in emulation

of their brethren who, in the Eastern province of the Roman Empire, flocked to listen to Saint Paul.[39]

Yet, despite the magnificence of Theology manifested with a novel energy drawn from the synthesis generating the wealth of influence derived from the Greco-Roman culture, there is never been an exact measure of the spirituality of the Christian of the first three centuries of the Religion of Jesus, compared with the spirituality of the common or of the highly learned Christian reared in the religion following its subjection to political power inaugurated by Emperor Constantine in 323 C.E.

The affinity of the Indian Christianity with the alien Christian power. In reality the Indian Christians proved their alienation from the whole mystical complex of the indigenous variety of Dharma-based ways of living, when they chose to side with the alien British power during the struggle for the Independence of the nation. They displayed their identity, not with the experience of twenty centuries of their being an integral component of the Indian sub-continent, but with the kindred believing transient community of British administrators who - after looting as much as they, of all conquerors, knew best how and what to loot - did not choose to settle in their colonial empire, not even in social closeness with the Indian Christians. After nearly eighteen centuries, the original Christians of India preferred to act and feel themselves as being Indian Christians rather than as Christian Indians, just as the Muslims regard themselves as Indian Muslims and not as Muslim Indians. It was the theological affinities which determined the identities of the two alien dispensations. The fossilized

---

[39] Without any offence to any caste, or to any one, it needs to be emphasized that neither the Christian Missionary, nor the Mullah, succeeded to convert the Brāhmaṇas to their faith. They did not have access to the store of indigenous knowledges in Sanskrit. It was the educated British men of the East India Company who had the affinity with Sanskrit. And they did not settle down in India. The absence of Brāhmaṇa converts to Islam and to Christianity may explain the correspondent absence of a form of Thought as the foundation of a corresponding cultural synthesis.

Indian Christianity received its first Cardinal when Archbishop Fernandez of Bombay was promoted in 1948, shortly after India acceded to Independence in August 1947. The absence of an Indian cardinalate for close to two thousand years convincingly illustrates, in regard to the bureaucratic mentality prevailing at the Vatican in Rome, the fossilization of the Indian Christianity and the low regard in which it had been held by the ecclesiastical officialdom residing in Rome. Nor has the Indian Christian community, despite the high incidence of literacy in their midst, contributed significantly to the reconstruction of the country after the departure of the British. Moreover it was no coincidence that Kerala and Bengal, the two provinces which, more than any of the other provinces, have historically experienced the longest acquaintance with the Christian way of life. Nor was it odd that the elite Indian Communist thinkers happened to be Brahmins, a phenomenon which did not foster a Brahmin theological component of the Indian Christianity since its earliest beginning in the first century of the Common Era. The two-centuries-long association with the tenets of the Christian faith, as an incidental coincidence with the British conquest, provided the affinity which facilitated the emergence and the growth of Communism in Kerala and in Bengal. The affinity was historically and philosophically inevitable, considering that Communism in reality is a natural offshoot of Christian culture and its theological underpinnings. Its antagonism to the spirit of the Dharmas justified the Communist Party favoring collaboration with the Raj during the years of the World War II when Russia was drawn in support of the Allies during the years of the war against the Axis Powers. It was in the interest of the British maintaining their hold on the Middle Eastern Oil that they sided with the Muslim League of Jinnah demanding Partition for the strategic reason of having a sympathetic Muslim country as a protecting bulwark in the control of the Middle Eastern oil fields.

As an idea, as a way of life, Communism does not plunge deep roots in the multi-faceted Brahmanist society. Indian Communists did not find it incongruous to take part in the traditional Hindu festivals. The poor, the underprivileged, followed Mahatma Gandhi, not Lenin, during the struggle

for Independence. The Russian Encyclopedia, published during the absolute dictatorship of Stalin, described the Mahatma as a Bourgeois, Middle Class, betrayer of the Indian proletariat. The argument of the Stalinist ideologue failed to discern the potent attractiveness of the humaneness of the Hindu Dharma, all the more as the extreme poverty of the Indian masses was a direct consequence of the savage depredations inflicted by the foreign Christian power. The misery of the Indian proletariat was the direct result of the brutish exploitation of the Indian economy by the foreign power. It was not the material result of the caste system pertaining to the Hindu Dharma. Among the invaders of India the British proved to be the most successful, most dehumanizing, with their gluttonous skill of leeching out the wealth and the prosperity of the caste-structure Indian people.

Avoiding an amalgamation of the Indian Islamic and Christian faiths. This brief, but fair and sensible, treatment of the Indian Christianity needs not to be amalgamated with the history of the Indian Muslims in reference to the purpose of this work. It is fortunate that, with the two communities practicing revealed religions and each holding to its own particular theological exclusiveness and to its not having a sentiment of rootedness in the geography and the history of the Bhāratavarśa, the Christians fortunately did have neither the critical mass nor the fanatical communal exclusivism, to sustain a demand for a separate Christian homeland. The history of India lays bare the daunting paradox of the infinite incongruity of the Only God of the Bible inspiring and justifying the Judeo-Christian civilization gratifying itself with inflicting upon Humans the sufferings of violent mortiferous conquests, slaveries, colonialisms, with the uses and applications of wars, destructions of wealth and properties, famines. The paradox persists with the remorseful acknowledgement, by the Germans, of the enormity of the Judeocide perpetrated during the World War II and by the absence of even the simple word “Sorry!” by the British for the genocide of the Bengalis perpetrated during 1943-44, coeval with the Judeocide. The world paid no heed to the reply of Mahatma Gandhi when a journalist what he thought of the forthcoming Nuremberg Trial of the

Nazi Leaders. Quietly, with a faint smile, the Mahatma replied: "*Why is Churchill not being tried for crimes against humanity?"*[40]

The armed rebellion of the Christian Nagas exceptionally provides the ground for a speculation of the possibility of what a critical mass of Indo-Christians, subject to the guidance and influence of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical power ensconced in Rome, could have brought about with the temptation of emulating the action of the Muslim League led by Jinnah. Scarcely was it surprising that the Indian Christians maintained a prudent neutral silence throughout the years of the Muslims agitating for obtaining a separate theocratic state. Besides the Indo-Christians had already perfected the fine art of observing a 'virtuous' silence during all the famines which the British, with merciless exploiting zeal, dutifully generated regularly every four or five years, during all the time of their rule apotheosized with the Bengal Famine, the cynical euphemism for the Bengal Genocide which, during 1943-44, coincided with the mass killing at Auschwitz, Treblinka and in other kindred coeval Nazi enterprises. **The Indian Christianity in obedience to the Vatican in Rome.** To a large extent the Indian public, as well as many among those involved in the written media, do not fully realize the importance of the exclusiveness of the Christian community and its obeisant and secondary status within the purview of the Vatican which rivets its supreme theological authority to the politics of a secular power. Thereby the Vatican exerts its influence over the loyalty of the international Ecclesia. In addition to the bureaucratic attribute of Holiness, the Pope, as the Vicar of God, acts also

---

[40] Madhusree Mukerjee's *Churchill's Secret War* convincingly demonstrates, with the help of archival testimony, how Churchill, single-handedly organized and resolutely sponsored the "Bengal Genocide", euphemistically labelled as "The Bengal Famine" of which there was no mass graves for the several millions who perished due to hunger. Indeed it was a famine, more painful than the killing at Auschwitz, willfully perpetrated by British imperial power, specialized in the Fine Art of famishing the Indians – Christianly!

as Caesar endowed with an unshared power. Under the guise of the Holy See, the Vatican, for example, has a non-voting representative at the United Nations. It has ambassadors in many countries, especially those with large Catholic populations.[41] Moreover the Vatican zealously maintains political links with Catholic communities disseminated all over the globe. That is why the Communist Chinese government does not allow the Pope to assert the secular component of his power and use his political authority to direct the destiny of the Catholic minority in Marxist-Leninist China. It is accordingly understandable that the leadership of the monolithic Communist Party would deny to the Vatican and its leader any right or privilege to exert any such political influence as would breach the integrity of the one-party rule.

The post-Independence spirit of generous reconciliation of the Hindu-dominated Congress Party. On the other hand, it is pertinent to stress the amicable attitude adopted by the first Nehru government to ask Matthai, an Indian Christian to join as a cabinet member. It was one more example of the generosity of the Hindu leadership showing friendship and accord towards those who had campaigned, in solidarity with the Raj, against the Independence movement. It is further necessary to stress the politics of reconciliation and of friendship of the post-Independence Indian Government, led by Jawaharlal Nehru, towards the former British power which repaid this generosity with opposing India at the Security Council whenever the Kashmir question came up for discussion. In every decision, India was repeatedly "saved" by the Russian veto. It was the immensely humane Truth and *Ahiṁsā* ideology of the Congress Party which enabled the British to depart from India as "Gentlemen" despite the barbarous apocalyptic conclusion of their "civilizing" rule, with their open support of the Muslims' demand for the partition of the sub-continent. With the

[41] I ended my subscription to the English version of the Osservatore Romano, the weekly publication of the Vatican, as it covered more the activities of the Pope as the Head of the clerical State, than matters related to Theology.

Christian religion having, since Emperor Constantine made it the state ideology, in 323 A.D., manifested itself in numerous conflicts, wars, genocides, it is the standard attitude of the West to have dwelt unmoved by the friendship and reconciliatory stoic and benevolent attitude of Independent India. The ineffable Christianity of Jesus, which lasted during the first three centuries, suffered a marked change with Emperor Constantine prevailing in reducing it to the status of the materialistic unifier of a Theocracy. It was *that* Christianity of Jesus which got transmogrified in the variety of the 'White Man's Burden" with the blessing of the British Monarchy qualified as the Defender of the Faith!

The moral neutrality of the Christian community in 1946-47. During the apocalyptic mayhem of the Partition in 1946-47 the quiet neutrality of the Indian Roman Catholics would have been supervised by the relevant Roman bureaucracy. There has been practically no evident manifestation of humane efforts inspired by Christian ethics of love and charity displayed in assuaging the sufferings of the victims of the Partition violence.[42] Majority Hindu India gracefully staged a state funeral of Mother Teresa who obtained due recognition of her charitable work among the poor and the homeless, during decades in Calcutta, when the province was being ruled by Communists. It does tease the mind that Calcutta needed the charitable services of Mother Teresa despite the Communists having ruled West Bengal, including Calcutta, the capital, during thirty-five years after the earlier administration of the Congress Party which had risen as a mass

---

[42] Lady Mountbatten did indeed volunteer in providing help to the refugees moving in both directions. But the Indian Christian establishments, of all denominations, distinguished themselves by a studied indifference. The spectacle of the immense suffering accompanying the enactment of the Partition did not bring forth the compassion of an Indian Florence Nightingale. Would two thousand years of worshipping a holy cadaver, fixed above the altar, have deadened the Believer's spirit into a coldness of heart in the face of an apocalyptic upheaval? Did it also subdue all sense of horror in the heart of the Europeans after the experience of two dehumanizing and destructive world wars, in the Lethe of the aftermath of consumerist fervor?

movement. After Independence the extreme dehumanization of the pauper class laid bare to the eyes of the world the thorough impoverishment of Bengal by the ruin of its agriculture and its productive industries. It was all carried out as loyal service to the Defender of the Faith.

Above all the extreme poverty of Calcutta which, till 1905, was the capital of the British power, logically stands, with its extreme poverty, as the emblem of the famishing exploitation and looting exerted by the commercial enterprise of the East India Company and subsequently by the brutish administration by the direct British imperial rule. Till today the eastern portion of India still remains the poorer part of the sub-continent, for it was longest under the British rule boasting of its showering the benefits of Christian civilization. The Indians of the Eastern provinces are physically smaller than the inhabitants of Punjab, for instance, the region least exploited and famished by the direct British rule. The extreme pauperization of Bengal, as a beneficence of Christian Civilization, and its ugly legacy, failed to impress the mind and the heart of Mother Teresa who went to distant countries, begging for monies to support her charitable enterprise. Yet she never went to Great Britain to ask for at least one shilling as a token compensation for the immense wealth which the British administrators looted during the time of their dominion. It was the wealthy Hindu merchants of Calcutta who mostly supplied the funds needed for her care of the abandoned paupers of Communist Bengal. Above all India is owed the recognition of the infinite generosity of having honored Mother Teresa with a state funeral.[43]

The arrogance of Pope John Paul XXII and his contempt of Indian spirituality. Throughout the history of Europe following Emperor Constantine's promotion of the Christian faith to the status of the state

---

[43] Christopher Hitchens provides a realistic appraisal of Mother Teresa's politics of Charity in *The Missionary Position: Mother Teresa in Theory and Practice,* 128 pages.

religion, in 323 CE, the Popes in Rome have never been wanting in evincing the right measures of astuteness in their political activities. Pope John Paul XXII, in the year 2000, desired to inaugurate the millennium with a speech asking all Asians to convert to Catholic Christianity. He wanted to make his appeal in the presence of the Chinese Catholic community. But, being denied a visa of entry into China, he was generously allowed to deliver his speech in New Delhi. On the day of the popular festival of Divali, he had no scruple in demeaning the welcoming hospitality of the mainly Hindu population by calling all non-Christian Asians to be converted to the Roman Catholic faith. His speech implied that, as converted Christians, the Asians would benefit from the spiritual and political guidance supplied by the Supreme Pontiff who traditionally gets elected by a few dozen cardinals claiming their votes to be divine intercessions coming down from the Holy Spirit! The Pope failed to notice that, due to the influence of the ethics of the Gandhian movement, Communism did not plunge roots in the Indian society. The irony of the Papal propaganda in favor of the fundamentalist Catholic faith did, with Machiavellian sophistication, mask the fact that he was advocating, in conformity with the history of Europe, the transforming of Asia into a dispensation which would, in due time, spawn the inhumanities of Communism and of Fascism as offshoots of the Church and its traditional theology. The hardy callousness of Pope John Paul XXII, evident in his ignorance of Indian experience of the effects of British Christianity, passed over the Indian landscape with the media and the political class evincing towards him the silence of a national indifference.

The convergence of Christian and Muslim religious exclusiveness. As pointed out briefly above, little attention, on the part of historians and politicians, has been given to the impassive neutrality of the Indo-Christians, even of the entire clergy, during the months of the carnage and of the dance of death brought about by the implementation of the Partition of the country. Their silence and their studied contemplation of the event framed the discreet, but persuasive approval of the exclusive ideology justifying the generation of a Muslim state. In the context of this

upheaval it is to the credit of the largely Brahmanist population that India stood unperturbed by the spiritual bankruptcy of the Indian Christian community's silence in the face of the extreme violence and hatred so openly manifested as the apotheosis of the British rule with which it had identified itself.

Electoral compulsions have egged the political elites on to foster the habit of considering both the Christian and the Muslim communities as minorities. It has become an entrenched disposition which generates the illusion of their civic equality in a society which assures fair treatment of its mutually exclusive cultural communities. The Law requires the Indian democracy to hold free, regular elections characterized by the shifting arithmetic of religiosities and castes, in ways which do not arise in the single party system of such governments as the Chinese. Hence, in relation to India, it behooves the observer to insist on one important difference which distinguishes the Christian from the Muslim community of India.

The difference between Indian Islam and Indian Christianity. Throughout their history the Indian Christians have not displayed the blemish of the compulsive violence and intolerance of the Muslims and, in particular, of the barbaric Muslim hordes who stormed into India. Nor do they evince the blot of the conflicts, of the wars, which European Christians waged against one another for centuries, especially after the schism brought about by Martin Luther in the XVI century. At least on this score the fossilization of the Indian Christianity is entitled to the recognition of its more or less redeeming placidity. Also noteworthy is the history of the Indian Christianity being untainted by any genocide, such as has been perpetrated by their brethren in America and in Europe. Fortunately the history of the Indian Christianity has been least, if at all, burdened with the dark history of the Inquisition conducted officially by Papal authority for nearly seven centuries.

The mobility and otherness of Indian Islam. However in addition to the Arabic script, the Muslim demonstrates his faith with the performance of one of the fundamental duties prescribed by the Revelation. A least once

in his lifetime, the individual believer is obligated to proceed to Mecca as a *Hajji.* Next to jihad, the pilgrimage to the Kaba is the most important act of Islamic piety. It burdens the Indian Mussalman with the physical commitment of a displacement to a distant sacred place, lasting several days. Moreover, with Mecca as the *locus* of the spiritual center of gravity of the Muslim, the Hajj, with its radiant prestige, does further strengthen and reaffirm the 'outsider' component of his self-conscious status. In contrast to the Hajji's, the piety of the Brahmanist transforms the land of his birth into a sacred geography divided into a number of pilgrimage spots (*tīrthas*). The Muslim does not have, nor does he feel, as a sacred sentiment, the material closeness with the land or with the soil of India. He would feel such a closeness as antithetical to his faith, as an affront to Allah, who alone is worthy of reverence.

With the background of the sentimental bond to Mecca and Medina where the assumed perfect state was established under the leadership of the Prophet, the Indian Muslim views the smaller span of the history of India starting with the first Arab invasion in the VII century as the precinct of his belonging and of his interest. The history of early Vedic, Buddhist and Jain India, lies beyond the intellectual and sentimental area of the India of Muslim consciousness. Such a psychological reduction of history and of geography fosters a mentality which recalls the similar attitude of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches which, in Nazi Germany, acknowledged the religion of the Jews up to the advent of Jesus. They associated their hatred of the Jews with their categorical refusal to recognize the subsequent Jewish faith of the Talmud and of the Torah.

The mobility of the Indian Muslim as the Outsider. Moreover in India the sentiment of being the Outsider exhibits itself both in outbursts of Jihadic violence which, in the common parlance, gets described as 'communal riots'. These bursts of violence occur when Islam becomes active. Social quietude assumes 'normality' with Islamic silence when Jihadism happens to be at rest. At all times the Muslim does not abandon the sentiment of being the superior Outsider in the midst of individuals whom his scriptures,

his history and his tradition, urge him to view as lesser beings, as Kaffirs believing in books and scriptures riddled with errors and untruths. By nurturing such a belief the Muslims did not foster a sentiment of rootedness similar to the sensitivity of the majority followers of the Three Dharmas.

The gestation and nurturing of such an alienation can be witnessed and studied in its present *modus operandi* in Western Europe where the spectacle of a minority equipped with an inferior culture can find ways to vex and disable a superior civilization away from its well-entrenched tradition. It is this absence of rootedness in the space of their living, collectively entertained by the Muslim migrants as a habit, in the host countries, which breeds, in the sensitivity of the Muslim, a mobility and a psychology determined by the feeling of incompleteness due to having to live in a country distant from Mecca and the Kaba. The mobility of the Muslim rests on his attitude to the past. The Muslim does not see or feel his past to be *behind* him. He sees his past *above* him, in Allah. The Muslim's rootlessness further enlivens the collective dissatisfaction with the desire to implement Allah's injunction to wage war against the pagan world (*Dar-ul-Harb)*, with the will to win the entire world to Islam. The sentiment of the unfulfilled realization of the will of Allah to transform the whole world as a *Dar-ul-Islam,* as urged by the revelation, instils in the heart of the Muslim a dissatisfaction translated by a mobility which disquiets the settled traditions of the democratic host societies.

The violence of the mobility of the Muslim. However the dream of a perfect world, administered by laws laid down by the revealed dispensation, rests on the Muslim's amnesia of the first Islamic state ruled by Muhammad himself. It was actually rife with murderous violence, distinguished dramatically, with emblematic characterization, by the murder of three of the four Caliphs immediately following the death of the Prophet. The discord among the followers of Muhammad was so intense that, after his death, his family was constrained to bury his body in his house, for no agreement was available on the choice of a worthy spot for

his grave. Nothing defines the Islamic mobility as the sudden rush of the conquering lust deriving from the first Caliphs hurling unopposed their cavalries across the entire stretch of North Africa up to the Atlantic coast and north up to the Pyrenees. Islam was never a religion of contemplation and quiet search for spiritual self-discovery. Whatever mysticism entered into the body of Islam as from the beginning of the XII century was due to influences flowing from the spirituality of Eastern Christianity, several centuries after the death of the Messenger. The irony in the history of Indian Islam manifests itself not in an Indian variety of Sufism, but in the abundance of the characteristic violent iconoclasm directed against the Indian civilization.

The reason of the Islamic mobility. The mobility of the Muslim, urged by the feeling of the personal and collective incompleteness, received its dramatic confirmation in the years following the end of the World War II. In Africa and in the Middle East, as a reaction to the humiliations inflicted by a triumphant Judeo-Christian West, the Muslims chose to seek a renewed identity in their own cultural history, in faithfulness to the revealed Truth and in the will to emulate the actions and thoughts of the Prophet, held to be the perfect ideal man. Paradoxically they deliberately choose not to move from one Muslim country to another within the world Umma. Instead they prefer to seek the intellectually more liberal and free, and materially more advanced, spaces of the secular democracies flourishing in the Judeo-Christian West. Following the end of the Second World War, the successive decolonizations, aided by the establishment of the United Nations, lulled the world into believing that there was no more any empty space where new conquests followed by domination and enslavement could be indulged in, as they happened to be, till the nineteenth century. But suddenly the European continent finds itself in the predicament of being a new vulnerable territory succumbing to Islamic hordes who, as migrants, do, as if as a matter of right, practice a preponderance against which the former sophisticated imperial powers, but now as hosts, do not have an adequate defence.

Mobility as a violent expression of religious duality. Mobility is a potent characteristic which distinguishes the societies animated by supernatural, divine revelations, is evident also in the history of Christianity. This question never stirs the imagination of the Christians: if they believe that they are the only ones for whom God came down, into History, as Jesus, why then would they display so much energy, so much passion, in the search of distant countries where they displayed the special benediction of having God. Immensely proud of their wealth and of the claim to own a sophisticated mode of living, they relied on their prestige as a divine right to impose their culture of Force to the detriment of the colonized inhabitants with the sinister haughtiness of dominating, exploiting, impoverishing them and by stopping the evolution and growth of their indigenous cultures? Why would a society, blessed with God coming down to be with them, find it wanting and consequently conform to their conscience the violences of the practice of slavery and of the colonizing expropriation of the wealth of conquered peoples. It is the similarity of brutal policies enforced by brutish force in both the Christian and Islamic histories which tempers the main Christian Churches, the Catholic and the Protestant, from censuring the Muslim violences in the XX century and onwards. The Christian and the Muslim do not have the moral viewpoint favoring their exerting a mutually effective disposition for either to preach peace to the other.

Further it is significant that, with its mobility, Sikhism, as a violent exception to the peacefulness at the heart of the Indian Dharmas, evinces its violent strain as an expression of the dualism at the heart of the faith, characterized as a syncretism of Brahmanist lore and Islamic monotheistic absolutism.

The beneficence of the ancient Hindu aversion to visiting non-Hindu countries. On the other hand, historians and westernized elites, especially in India, used, during a long time, to ridicule the superstition of the Hindus who, in an earlier period, frowned upon anyone visiting a foreign land as an action entailing a loss of the personal purity and a corruption of the

traveler's caste. Yet today most Brahmanists take pride that, in ten thousand years, no one crossed the borders of India to invade another country and exploit and impoverish its people, even during those many centuries when they had the wealth, the means and the manpower to do so.

It is due to the philosophical temper of the native Indian people that explains the collective satisfaction of the early Indians to stay within their frontiers. The philosophical maturity coupled with the existential feeling of completeness which filled the Indian people with the contentment with their living without the excitement of going to a land beyond their own territory. This collective contentment is akin to the Chinese elite also not having ever had the desire to go beyond their borders in search of complements to their own territorial fullness. Further to the north, a little further away from the East, the Europeans, all the time claiming that, for their sake, God had come down into their History, nevertheless felt the spiritual emptiness, to compensate which they felt inspired to seek material additions and satisfactions at the expense of those who were living quietly, satisfied with the security of their paganisms.

In contrast, despite the revelations coming down directly from the unitive, absolute Deity, the Christians and the Muslims have not yet brought their specific mobility to an end. The main reason of their mobility lies in the absence of ontological finalities in their respective cultures. It is an absence which they fill with the belief in the Day of Resurrection, with faith in the revival of the material body from its tomb. And there lies the paradox of their cultural dissatisfaction: their mobility being fixed to the non-extinction of the body and to the hope of its rising from its grave on the Final Day.

Indeed however much the sub-continent would have been a huge space inhabited by a small scattered population, it did not bear comparison, for example, with the beginnings of the history of Rome wracked with raw violence within and around the small space of the area where Romulus set himself as the first King. Today the Indian diaspora of about twelve million living and prospering abroad has been facilitated by the knowledge and

the use of the English language as a consequence of the British paramountcy over the sub-continent. The non-resident non-Muslim, native Indians do not disturb the culture of their host societies, while adapting themselves to the mores and the laws of the Prince. For wherever he finds himself, the native Indian feels the stability of being co-essential with the cosmic Oneness. The Law of Karma confers freedom upon the non-resident Brahmanist Indian in the choice of a free, independent and responsible *modus vivendi* in Harmony with the host society and its mores. His mental attitude and the practical use of his education marks off the independent fullness of his psychological distinction from the Muslim who, in the same socio-political environment, submits to the belief in the security of every thought and action of his being determined as a fraction of Allah's exertion of His *Taqdīr.*

The Muslim's feeling of alienation for living in a Harbi space. The Muslim is anguished when he has to live in a state of estrangement by feeling trapped by fate to live in a space ruled by a Kaffir authority. The Indian Muslim is weighed down with a sense of inferiority with regard to his co-believer living in Pakistan or in Bangladesh, that is, in countries which are governed by Muslim authorities. It is this subconscious drive for mobility and the atavism of spiritual incompleteness which explain the exclusiveness, the self-righteous dissatisfaction, the edginess, the cry for privilege as a minority, in the sensitivity of the Muslim, wherever he settles, willingly or unwillingly, within a non-Muslim environment. He entertains this sense of alienation, even when he settles among Judeo-Christian societies, in spite of the Quran assuring validity of the Jewish and Christian faiths on account of their belonging to the tradition of the Holy Book.

Yet, in spite of this orthodox recognition of the Jews and the Christians belonging to the Book, the Muslim conquerors, for example in Spain, treated their Jewish and Christian subjects as hypocrites and as *dhimmis*. In India, following the obliteration of the Buddhists, the estrangement from the Hindus, in particular, is total. This alienation is due to the reality

of all the indigenous cultures happening to be products of inspiration and of exertion related to the different strivings for the Humanity immanent in a civilization adorned by the interaction of the three Dharmas. The psychology of the leaders, who did not flinch in having recourse to the most murderous violence to bring forth the Partition of India, is qualified – most ironically - by their *not* claiming any privilege or right to migrate to the available space *of the wealthy Arab States*. In the entire Umma no one raises the voice in favor of Muslim migration to the vast empty spaces of the wealthy Arab states. They find it easier and more attractive to migrate to Europe where, in order to be more Muslim, they deliberately choose to have no scruple in destabilizing the well-established liberal societies.

The befooling claim of the Indian Muslim minority. *That is why, despite their demography being larger than either that of Pakistan or of Bangladesh, greater even than the population of any of the European countries, the Indian Muslims do nevertheless feel ill at ease and alienated enough to burden the Indian polity with their cognate mobility channeled into dissatisfaction*. They cunningly pretend that they are not aware of the smaller communities ruling Pakistan and Bangladesh, that, as Bihari and Uttar Pradeshi Muslims, they provided the maximal support to the demand for Partition. As a minority they have a demography immensely larger than the population of Japan which sustains a brilliant, wealthy civilization which has an unbroken, continuous history of three thousand years. In India the Muslim community acts, with its conservative exclusivism, as an impediment to the Brahmanist community returning to its authentic constitution after the ravages which it has suffered from the iconoclastic forbears of the present Kaum.

Furthermore the Indian Muslims choose to maintain their feeling of alienation by projecting themselves as a minority entitled to having madrassas and the constitutional right to the privilege of adhering to the civil law of the Sharia. As supports to their exclusiveness these privileges constitute one factor which handicaps the fullest realization of the republican vision of a peaceful, pluri-religious polity. A Muslim Robinson

Crusoe on a desert island would still feel self-alienated. He would have no one to hate in order to preen himself with the belief in his faith being the only true one. He would be reduced only to perform namaz five times during the day, without having to fulfill the other four obligations. He would feel lost without the accessibility to the Umma. The Sharia indicates the separateness of the Muslim community; the individual Muslim feels an affinity with the extra-territorial Umma, in preference to the native population in the midst of whom he has been living for a thousand years. Otherwise he would have, on his own initiative, sought harmonization by adhering to the common civil code prescribed by the Constitution.

The present ambiguous *status quo* of the Indian Muslim persists while no one, *neither Believer nor Kaffir, questions the Muslim not asking for his identity in claiming for a complete Sharia with the inclusion of its penal laws*. Why does the Indian Muslim not ask for the right to have the *lex talionis*, for example, as pertaining to the Sharia which he insists on keeping as a privilege? No one, either Muslim or Hindu, asked why cannot the Muslim surrender the privilege of separateness with the civil law of the Sharia and thereby demonstrate his willingness to belong to the nation as a member of a unitive people, with the same measure of experiencing the comfort of the exclusion of its penal law. Yet, during more than seventy years after Independence, with the ease of living with contradictions, the Muslim citizen has preferred to divorce his wife with the mere utterance of the word "Talak" three times. It was a Brahmanist majority government which has prevailed, in favour of Muslim women, to eliminate the Sharia dispensation of the "triple *talak*" as sufficient justification for a Muslim husband to divorce his wife.

The preponderant influence of minorities. That, after Independence, India would yield to the subversiveness of the Indian Muslim community asking and obtaining minority status is a scandal the like of which there is, and there has been, no previous example in world history. A minority is exclusively a matter of number. Yet it is a fact, however ironical it may now seem to be, that Indian civilization has had to suffer the ignominy of being

lorded over by the Islamic and the British minorities for about a thousand years. Corresponding to the time frame of this study, a realistic definition of a minority would apply to the Parsis, the populations of the ancient native tribes, such as the Santals, the Nagas, and certain 'low' castes. But the monumental fact of their Himalayan proportion of their demography gets wrested as a minority by the Indian Muslims who even today never lose the opportunity to take pride in recalling their hegemony over the vast territory of the Indian sub-continent. It was as a minority that, after centuries of iconoclasm, they could furthermore break the cultural and geographic integrity of the continent into three fragments. It is worth remembering that it was the minority of the merchants of the East India Company who came to trade and found it easy to "steal" the country under the rule of a Muslim hegemony. Later, after 1857 and the first War of Independence, the Minority British power could assert imperial authority over the Muslim hegemony by the exertion of military power. By that time, the once mighty Mughal empire had degenerated and grown decrepit. It collapsed and disappeared into an irrevocable extinction. It was the successful British minority which could thence rule over both the Muslim and the native populations. Yet, it is as a minority that, ninety years later, the Muslims, with the British colluding with them, could, with a revival of their brutish mode of violence, extract two Islamic Theocracies from the sub-continent. And it is as a minority that the post-1947 remaining Muslims continue to persist in acting as a chain on the feet of Mother India. And it is the present Muslim minority which, in its near totality, cunningly cultivate the oblivion of their agency in the implementation of partition. The Kaum of the Remainers now commands authority to claim presumptuously the privilege of being on a par with the other minorities, such as the Parsi community, or the traditional deprived castes, or the Santals or the Nagas. In reality the Indian component of Islam has a demography capable of issuing a threat of catastrophic mayhem in continuation of using demographic pressure upon the Brahmanist majority to the extent of forcing it to adopt an attitude of quiescence based on fear. They did indeed manifest the willingness and ability to engage in a mass

protest against the Citizenship Amendment Act, duly voted by Parliament on 19 December 2019, without any Muslim leader intervening in favor of it, by acknowledging the genuine reason of non-Muslim minority citizens fleeing on account of their suffering ethnic cleansing and enduring second class citizenship by the Sunni Muslim majorities in Pakistan and in Bangladesh.

The collective neurosis of Indian Islamic society. Hence it is important, in the contemplation of the communal complexity of Indian society, for the Brahmanist to acquire due cognition of the 'outsider' particularities of the Muslim's self-awareness. Despite appearances, the Indian Muslim's relative quietness and the affirmation of his harmonious collaboration, his sense of separateness remains alive as a subconscious tension. In more than a thousand years, no Indian Muslim has ever expressed the slightest disapprobation of the choleric verses of the Quran advocating contempt and hostility in regard to the non-Believer. The Muslim's zeal to preserve his distinctiveness, as the necessary foundation of his identity, buoys up the feeling of a security assured by the habit to believe, with a mind unburdened by any effort of independent reasoning, in his spiritual and moral superiority based on the adhesion to the divine Revelation. With the assumption of Allah as a physical reality, to which he submits, the Believer hails himself as standing above all the legal compulsions of civic homogeneity with the surrounding humanity of Kaffirs. In brief, stressed by fidelity to the rules and principles of the Quran, as the adjuncts to the absolute eternal Truth, simultaneously to the obligations of a secular democracy, the Indian Muslim Kaum of the XXI century finds itself locked up within a collective neurosis.

The predicament of the Muslim in an alien Harbi environment. In the present socio-political environment the Brahmanist happens to be not normally aware of the pathos of the Muslim feeling trapped in the obligation to inhabit his private Islamic space which happens to be lodged in the mass of his iceberg personality hidden below the surface of the Kaffir Ocean. The Muslim neighbor or colleague retreats into an ambiguous

neutrality in the face of the ceaseless intervention of Pakistani terror in Kashmir. He observes a studied indifference to the separatist movement of Kashmiri Muslims. He does not deem it behooves him to denounce the second class citizenship allotted to minorities in Pakistan or Bangladesh which his elders, three generations earlier, passionately strove to create. He chooses to be a member of the Umma at large, while claiming to be Indian citizens. Most importantly, the "minority" Indian Muslim does not question the unambiguously earnest revealed injunctions to abominate the DisBelievers, who have been where they are during the millennia hallowed with ennobling accomplishments before the advent of the Messenger. He commiserates with himself while knowing that beneath his forced civility lies the silent store of a volcanic potency.

The psychology of the Indian Mussalman living in a Harbi society. Over the inhumanity of the ethnic cleansing of the minorities in Pakistan, he does not see, or rather feigns not to see, the analogous behavior of the minorities of his co-believers in Europe openly undermining the peaceful function of the Western European secular democracies. Nor is he moved by the slightest incentive to seek an amicable way to collaborate in evolving a creative, durable partnership. For, in 1947, compelled by geography to remain in India, the Indian Muslim Remainers bequeathed, in the artificial Vote Bank, the legacy of the burden of a psychological sense of incompleteness. The Vote Bank failed to be the replacement of the autonomous fullness of the identity which he sought in joining the Dajjalic campaign for Partition.

The insensitivity of the Indian Muslim. In India the Muslim, as a member of the Umma, feels justified in not having to be concerned with the civic inferiority of the non-Believers who, in the Pure State, do not have the same rights equal to the majority Sunni Muslim population. With his submission to the Absolute Truth lodged in the submerged mass of the Islamic iceberg, the Indian Muslim does not share the revulsion over the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in 2002, by the Taliban government in Afghanistan. He did not refute Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Indian Prime

Minister who, in a resounding speech, argued - against the abundant evidence of Islamic iconoclasm having ravaged so much of Indian civilization - that the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas was a violation of the spirit of Islam. Thinking that he would ingratiate himself with the Indian Muslim electorate, Vajpayee inveighed against Mullah Omar's decision, despite the latter, realizing his duty as a faithful submitter to the Quranic injunctions, could carry out the demolition of the Bamiyan Buddhas against the appeal of the Organization of Islamic Countries. Moreover Mullah Omar must have felt justified in the face of the culpable silence of the United Nations with its vast culturally composite bureaucracy! In reality Vajpayee had the temerity of indulging in a *reverse reading of the history of Islam and of its traditional iconoclasm*. Fate offered him a unique opportunity to impugn and denounce Mullah Omar's challenging the visiting delegates of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation when they went to Kabul to argue for the preservation of the Buddhist monuments. They failed to prevail over Mullah Omar's fanatical argument that the tenets of Islam do not allow the presence of pagan statues in a theocratic Islamic country. *In order to please and humor the Indian Muslims, Vajpayee chose to invert the history of Islamic iconoclasm in a vain attempt to win over the Muslims to the Bharatiya Janta Party*. Despite his wide learning and his political generosity, Vajpayee misrepresented Mullah Omar's faithfulness to Islamic Orthodoxy to the Indian nation and to the world at large. He missed the unique opportunity to animadvert on the ravages wrought upon thousands and thousands of indigenous religious monuments in iconoclastic furies sanctioned and carried out as Islamic piety. *Yet no voice was raised among the Indian Muslims, none among the Theologians of the Deoband School and other Islamic institutions, to correct the Prime Minister's preposterous defense of an inexistent, idolatrous Islam in utter defiance of the fact that the dynamiting of the Buddhas ordered by Mullah Omar was in authentic concord with the past practice of iconoclasm as sacred Islamic duty so abundantly practiced in medieval Hindu-Buddhist-Jaina India*. Contrary to Vajpayee's expectation the Muslims, in prudent silence over Mullah

Omar's view of Islam, did not vote for the Bharatiya Janta Party. Two years later, at the 2004 election the Congress Party came back to power and stayed for a whole decade punctuated by scams for which no one was found to have any iota of guilt!

The failure of the Brahmanists to understand the specificity of the Muslim mind. A significant trait of the psychology of the Indian Muslims was manifest in their failure to demonstrate publicly their intellectual integrity by correcting Vajpayee's distortion of the iconoclastic history of Islam. It then seemed that the Prime Minister was attributing a false merit to the history of Islam by winking at the enormity of the history of Islamic iconoclasm especially in India in order to ingratiate himself with the Muslim Kaum. But the leadership of the Indian Islam demonstrated its incapacity or unwillingness to manifest its intellectual integrity in a heroic élan for the correction of Vajpayee's monumental infringement of historical veracity. Such a communal silence reinforces the thought of the Muslim community's strategic cunning of turning its history upside down, with the aberration of the Brahmanist Prime Minister condemning iconoclasm as being contrary to Islam, when it has in reality been enjoined by the scripture and, throughout the past centuries, by the Caliphs, urged on by the encouragement of the Orthodox Imamate. The banal truth consists of iconoclasm having been abundantly practiced against the native cultures of Harbi India, as an affirmation of the very essence of the Islamic Revelation. The Biblical command condemning all forms of images was obeyed with a blazing Taliban faith in the dynamiting of the Bamiyan Buddhas, in 2002 A,D. Vajpayee certainly knew all about the demolition of the Somnath temple by Ghaznavi Mahmud, and about the Kawatul Islam Masjid, the first Mosque in Delhi, which was built with the stones from broken Hindu and Jaina temples. Above all, Atal Bihari Vajpayee failed to say a simple good word in favor of the transcendent spiritual splendor of Buddhism which the Muslims had obliterated out of faithfully abiding by their belief and the corresponding submission to the obligatory ukases of Allah!

There is something lacking in the Hindu's perception of the Muslim. The particular gesture of Vajpayee illustrates the temperament of the Hindu elite underlying the Independence movement: it was, and still is, an attitude of either prudence or fear. The past prudence was a constant repetition - rarely if ever, reciprocated by the Islamic theologians or intellectuals – of the fruitlessly sterile desire to exert a harmonious adjustment of the violent and intolerant revelation of the Islamic scriptures to the ideals of the native Indians seeking to liberate themselves from the yoke of British rule. Or, the Hindu leaders would unconsciously allow themselves to be victims of their tolerance as the result of a long experience of the fear generated by the brutalization concomitant with Muslim hegemony. As the atavism of fear, this sense of victimhood would have expressed itself in the politics of striving for communal togetherness. It got internalized with a subdued memory of the past depredations wrought against the native communities and their artistic and intellectual refinements.

The entrenched Brahmanist collective pristine, proud tolerance got altered by the silent witnessing of the unchallenged practice of iconoclasms, of catastrophic destructions of Buddhist and Brahmanist centers of learning. The arrogance of the Muslims and their pride in the spoliation of Indian civilization as the expression of their hegemony, *were passed over subsequently as a hostage to the idea of opposing a common front of opposition to British rule.* The near unanimous hatred of India which runs today through the whole of Pakistani society stems from this inversion of the history of Indian Islam which paradoxically bears the pride of brute power which once prevailed over a militarily weaker Kaffir population. The Muslim in Pakistan and in Bangladesh have institutionalized their theocratic constitutions as statements of their hatred of the Hindu who was once forced to endure *dhimmitude*, the levy of *jaziya* and mass conversion. But for both the singular citizen and the Indian secular Republic, the present consists of the totality which comprises the unaltered history of the past anti-Harbi hatreds and ravages, and the

relevance of their meaning maintained by the sudden unexpurged innocence stored by the Muslims in their Vote Banks and in the Sharia.

The result is a matter either for weeping or for laughing: the present predicament of the constitutional secularism gets characterized by the paradox that it had become incumbent upon the Hindus constantly to defend and prove the reality of the beneficence of their proverbial tolerance to the Muslims who do not show any inclination to acknowledge their bellicose religious exclusivism and its radical diminution of the Indian civilization and culture. The present and the on-going history of the Indians will inevitably incorporate the memory and the evaluation of the past, in relation to which the beauty of the Taj Mahal mausoleum will never be an adequate compensation for the tamas of iconoclastic Islam. A monument as a homage to erotic love and to death cannot ever be worth the metaphysical grandeur illustrated as Beauty in the Trimūrti of Elephanta or the damaged marvel of the Ellora Temple or the wonder of Konarak or the splendor of Vijayanagar told by the ruins of Hampi.

India as a land of pagan tolerance and of revealed religious intolerance. From the hidden mass of the Islamic iceberg not a single heroic representative has hitherto come forth to protest against the deceitful attribution of tolerance to the History of Islam.[44] On the contrary, the characteristic feature of Islam, during fourteen centuries, has manifested itself in the active withering of Pagan civilizations. More: Muslims have extinguished the Christianities of the Middle East, the Christian Kingdoms which had been in existence for several centuries before the advent of Muhammad, the active Christianity along the whole stretch of North Africa. The Ottoman Muslims obliterated Byzantium, and held on their colonization of the Arab Muslims during six centuries. The disappearance

[44] This side remark refers to the claim of Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad claiming tolerance as an essential feature of Islam. Vide the chapter on the Quran with reference to his interpretation of the revelation.

of the Bamiyan Buddhas, as a reminding continuation of a well-established genocidal tradition, brings forth the reality that defines the Muslim resident in the hidden part of the Iceberg: he prides himself, with psychological self-sufficiency, in living as the 'outsider' saddled with the burden of sustaining his supreme identity with the implacable, mortifying intolerance of the Islamic revelation, despite living in a Harbi polity ruled by traditionally tolerant Kaffirs. Nevertheless the future confronts the Indian Muslim community with a paradoxical challenge: winning the affection of the majority Hindu population's trust in a Muslim acceding to the position of power as the Prime Minister of pluri-cultural Harbi India.

The self-satisfaction of the non-Believer and the Believer burying their heads in the sands of mutual misunderstanding. However, the present socio-political configuration of the Indian polity is clouded by the self-indulging delusion evinced by both the Muslim and the Brahmanist, with each adhering, according to his specific predilection, to a comfortable ostrich-like attitude. The unwillingness or refusal, on the part of both, to raise the head and stare at the realities of their respective histories, prevents each from having to confront the repercussions stemming from the religious and political divergences which sustain the chasm between the two large communities. The Brahmanist deliberately chooses to ignore the iconoclastic history of his Muslim neighbor and keeps harping on a vacuous *bhai-bhaiism.* This crude slogan, culturally devoid of any effective historical justification, gets popularly accepted by Brahmanists in their assumption that the only difference between the two communities consists of the practice of one going to a Mandir, while the other attends a Mosque. *The Brahmanist non-Believer abstains from making the effort to recognize the dominant feature of Islam being more a violent totalitarian political force than a peaceful religion encompassed by only the five obligatory duties*. To begin with, there is no Hindu equivalent of the Islamic Friday noon prayer when the presiding Imam would be free to make a speech calling for violent rebellion. Neither is there sufficient space in a Hindu or Buddhist temple for a congregation, nor does ever the Pujārī or the Monk have the duty to deliver political speeches, less so to call for

violent hateful violence against any "enemy". It was at a Friday noon prayer that Jinnah's appeal for Direct Action got transmuted into an immediate transformation of Calcutta into a field of murderous mayhem directed against the Hindus.

The explanation of India surviving Islamic hegemony. Above all the Brahmanist ostrich refuses to see that at all times during the past millennium of Indian Islam, the Muslim powers have persistently contemned his long, well established tradition of a peerless tolerance. *He ignores, or chooses to ignore, that throughout fourteen centuries Muslims have prevailed by acting as intolerant majorities and as turbulent minorities*. As minorities they remained silent, quiet under highly centralized absolute authorities as in Tsarist or Stalinist Russia, and in Imperial China. As a minority, the Chechens revolted against Russia administered by the corrupt Eltsin and reverted to a peaceful co-existence under the stern rule of Putin. The corresponding example of Uighur tranquility imposed by the centralized Communist rule further illustrates the functioning of Muslim minorities. As majorities, Muslims simply obliterate the pre-existing cultures. *India is the sole exception to the historic "rule" of Muslim majorities blotting out their defeated victims*. Egalitarian Islam has effectively replaced the *egalitarian* Buddhisms of India, of Indonesia, of Afghanistan, of Gandhāra, of Central Asia and of North-Western China, of Byzantium, of Zoroastrian Persia. The India of the large *hierarchical* Hindu majority is the only culture which has survived Islamic hegemony with the integral, vibrant retention of her pluri-valued culture. It is a UNIQUE civilizational chapter of world History which has not been adequately noticed by academic historians, including those who have been active since Independence. It is moreover absent in the politic sensitivity of all the post-1947 parties. One may even surmise that the Hindu elites have not till today acquired an adequate measure of the recognition of this superlative civilizational accomplishment which has been made possible by the auspices of the spiritual strength bequeathed by the Sages who wrote their wisdoms and by the forest-dwellers who transmitted an adamantine mystical *modus vivendi.*

The ingratitude of not recognizing the infinite beneficence of the "caste system". And India is afraid to acknowledge the reason of her survival, as the triumph of her civilization, due to the preservation of its hierarchical society which, in the vulgar idiom, goes under the rubric "caste system". All the cultures which have been replaced by egalitarian Islamic hegemony were also egalitarian. The sole exception is hierarchical India. Yet, almost every Brahmanist is afraid of saying it. The questioning and the evaluation of the political distortions of this fear fall within the critical purpose of this essay. Its purpose is certainly not to reconstruct the caste system which has been vilified by mostly Dalit power following the Independence. This essay does not advocate a return to a social hierarchy which was already under attack with the evidence in the *Bhagavad Gītā* already expressing displeasure over the fact of *varṇa saṅkara* (mixture of castes). It is thought provoking that India has not entrenched the Communist ideology into her socio-political consciousness. Most Hindus still vote with the feeling of affinity to his caste. It requires the wisdom of the politicians to use the *strength* of the caste system for the needed repairs of the Indian civilization and for the realization of the integrality of the only universalist civilization that has ever been fashioned by Man.

The tragic failure of the Brahmanists to estimate the *asurika* power of political Islam. With hindsight the mind is bewildered by the fact that the Hindu leadership in the first half of the XX century failed to take full stock of the swelling tsunami of the political Islam swirling across the sub-continent. The Hindu leaders obstinately, or innocently, trusted the security of their struthious self-confidence resting on the belief that the totality of Islam, co-extensive with *namāz* in the Masjid, is symmetrical with Brahmanist *darśana* of the idol of his favorite deity in the Mandir. Most irresponsibly the Congress Party ostrich could not raise its head above the sand of its ignorance, even when the Direct Action rushed out as the tidal wave of Dajjal's tsunami swelling and rushing out from the fervor of the Friday noon *namāz*, in mid-August 1946.

The dramatic failure of the bhai-bhai sentimentality. On the other hand the psychology of the Outsider is brazenly displayed without any concern for the disturbance of the Kaffir communities with the haughtiness of the Believer fulfilling his sacred obligation as the proxy of Allah. Inspired by a high sense of rectitude the Believer does not have the least scruple of generating an extreme loathing of the Hindu and of all that he stands for as an act of faith, with the conviction that it is his religion transfigured as politics which constitutes the raison d'être of the two-nation doctrine. Even when the convulsion of the Partition swept across much of North and Central India, it defies the imagination to grasp the full measure of the Brahmanist ostrich not being able or willing to internalize the murderous rejection of the indigenous pluri-religious tolerance as the defining attribute of Indian civilization. Caught with, and weighed down by, their loyalty to the smaller number of their Muslim companions in the nationalist struggle for Independence, they kept hurling their *bhai-bhaiist* straws at the monstrous tornado raging against them. The Indian Muslims never cared for, nor did they ever reciprocate, the *bhai-bhaiism* fondly believed by the Brahmanists.

The case of the Muslim ostrich. Yet, at the same time, confused by the fury of the politics of Islam on the move, the Indian Believer too acts like the ostrich with his head buried in the sand of Quranic disparagement of the Other. In reality the Quran deadens the mind of the Believer and the heart to the extent that he becomes utterly dried up and impassive in the presence of his innocent victim, who happens to be simply different from him. Willed by Allah an extreme inhumanity gets lodged in the sensitivity of the Believer, especially in his relation to the non-Believer. In India the ruins of the monuments – most dramatically eloquent those of Nalanda and of Vijayanagar – speak loudly of Muslim hatred inspiring the inhumane devastations of high learning and of high beauty. Characteristic of Islam laying its mark upon all the regions of its presence from the Pyrenees to the Bay of Bengal these ruins still evoke the consequences of the Force of the contempt of the Other which the only God so meaninglessly deemed

necessary for the well-being for His Creation, if indeed the story told in the Book of Genesis be held to be materially true.

The Muslim perception of difference as a death sentence. In his submission to the Quranic revelation, the Muslim offers to Allah his mind as a *tabula rasa* on which He imprints His commands. Indeed the Muslim lives freed from the burden of the *samskāras* (*impressions*) of his past lives, the existence of which he denies owing to his belief in the Revelation. Hence, as such, the Muslim is never a genuine intellectual, free to have and own his personal thought and feeling untrammeled by any external force, however exalted it may be. Liberated from the belief in the accumulation of the impressions of his past existences, the Muslim gets confronted with a mind unburdened by scruples arising from his past existences and accordingly feels exhilarated in assuming that he born for the only time as a *tabula rasa* which, by means of his submission, is governed only by the revealed injunctions. Such a belief lends a particular weight to his hostile attitude towards the Other, the Kaffir.

Moreover, historically, the Revelation comes down as a substance adjusted to the material conditions of the Arabian desert, in a land bearing a largely mercantile people where the ways of thinking and of feeling are framed within pairs of stark opposites: profit and loss, crime and punishment, foe and friend, clean and unclean, aridity and wetness. More importantly the Revelation descends in an environment where forgiveness, renunciation, equanimity, charity, compassion, magnanimity, humility, detachment, are almost, if not totally, absent. Correspondingly it was natural for the Arab Believer to devise an ethos without any trace of the mental disposition or inclination to understand and respect the mores and aspirations of men and women living differently. The Islamic scriptures mention no incident or story of love as it is represented in Christian history, in the story of Heloïse and Abelard (XI century), in fiction the love of Romeo and Juliet, even in Islam, the story of Laila and Majnu. Muhammad had eleven wives, including the favorite young Aisha being the youngest whom he married when he was fifty-three and she was only six. The Hadiths

contain no reference to a celebration of love as a sacred bond in the story of Muhammad and of his immediate companions.

Indeed, how can these lofty virtues prevail or have any authentic meaningfulness in the mind of the Muslim, when he believes that he is notably superior to all Non-Muslims for believing in the only Truth, which is eternally perfect? How can he be compassionate or loving in his social intercourse, or even friendly, for that would be a negation of, or a departure from, Allah's injunctions? Friendliness with a non-Believer is strictly prohibited by the Quran.

Closed-mindednes fostered by the Revelations. The restricted attitude generated by apparently a conscious closed-mindedness characterizes the three revelations. The Christian too adopted for nearly nineteen centuries a closed-mindedness like the Muslim's. Israel is a country endowed with a constitution crafted ideally for Jews. All the major Muslim countries have purified themselves of their minorities; those which still have non-Muslim minorities tolerate them as second class citizens. Pakistan, for example, took seventy-three years to pass legislation recognizing the validity of the Hindu marriage. Even then the law has a sub-clause which states that the marriage is automatically dissolved if one of the partners converts to Islam.

The Revelation was specially designed and sent down with Angel Gabriel bearing the message which was recited word for word to Muhammad. The history which began almost immediately after the death of the Prophet was characterized by the passionate zeal to reduce the conquered to the new faith. It was, and still is, a faith which was absolutely impermeable to Jesus rejecting the law of talion, preaching the advocacy of forgiving and, as the feature of a sudden moral evolution, the emphasis on turning the right cheek to the offender striking the left cheek, and above all recommending mutual love as a disinterested social behavior. Infinitely different Muhammad gave priority to enmity, to vindictiveness, to intolerance, to the elimination of anything and of anyone which would intimate a difference to the ethos of the Islam which he presented and imposed as God's rules and commands. It is beyond comprehension that

for more than fourteen centuries Muslims, pertaining to all varieties of thinking and feeling, would have endorsed the totality of the revealed verses without any alteration in favor of humaneness and of universal amicableness. Muhammad's dominant originality consists of his having introduced a permanent, invincible ideology secured with an adamantine sheath of intolerant violence prized and exalted as a sacred duty and as a personal virtue. Hence there can never be in the future any argument to dislodge from the world which, since the very first moment of its being created, has been infected with God's gratuitous cataclysmic intolerance and the Believer's immunity from censure or condemnation for acting as His proxy.

Islamic Might as Right. The sudden application of Force in the military success of Islam helps to understand the raw, Muslim barbarian invader of India being disposed, with a mind devoid of any cultural sophistication, to see the Brahmanist as the enemy driven by a deviant ideology contrary to the Straight Path indicated by Allah. In the Arabian environment already inhabited by the Jews and the Christians living lives determined by submission to the Divine Revelations, the fundamental virtue of the Believer leaves no space in his mind for any incentive to recognize the merit and virtue in the Other. Today, there are more than seven billion non-Muslims who are the targets of the Muslim fundamentalists' contempt and against whom they, like the adherents of the Muslim Brotherhood, feel themselves duty bound to wage war.

Hence, with the hindsight which, like a fog blowing up the dimensions of faintly visible objects in the distance, it is incomprehensible that the Muslim scholars and intellectuals who, clustered around the Hindu leadership of the Congress Party, would have remained unmoved by the lethal violence bursting from the womb of their own faith. They displayed an utter inability to stem the storm, due either to their political weakness or to their wile of not declaring that the Muslim League's indulgence in acts of brutishness was a monstrosity contrary to the *Rahmat* (mercy) of Allah dear to Mawlānā Azad, the President of the Congress Party. When

the flames of the Islamic volcano died down, and the lava cooled off into the two wings of Pakistan, the Nehru government of Independent India chose to uphold the maintenance of its struthious head in the sand of the Constitution. They were blissfully unaware that the very liberal 1950 Constitution validates Islam as a religious dispensation, without any qualifier guarding against its having been since its birth in Medina an intolerant, violent, totalitarian political ideology with its conquering history as its predominant affirmation. The Islam engaged in the Vote Bank politics of the Nehru Congress Party was in reality the corresponding violence-laden fundamentalism at rest. It repeatedly manifested itself like communal geysers bubbling up now and then through the miry Vote Banks of Congress rule, with the vehemence inaugurated by the Prophet at the Battle of Badr. Indeed at Badr the Prophet told his men that it was not they, but it was in reality Allah, who intervened to bring about the first victory won by Islam.

The Congress Party, with Mawlānā Azad as the President, did not, or could not, "see" that Allah was the commander of the raw violence of the Muslim League, led by the educated Middle Class using the English language as the camouflage! During the half century of the Congress rule, Commissions of Inquiry would be set up to sort out the causes of every major social or communal disturbance which, really as a mini jihad, was conveniently labelled as "riot". The reports were subsequently classified without any action being taken according to the recommendations of the appointed commissioners. What was regularly lacking in those recommendations was the absence of the recognition that the 'riot' derived its raison d'être as the street vindication of the reality of the essence of Islam as a compulsively mobile violent politics. It was logical that, as a consequence, the reports of the commissions of inquiry would end up as exercises of bureaucratic futility, as a voluntary myopia which diminished the ability of the weak government of the day, in fact of any weak government, to bring forth the apt theological remedy for the recurring disease of "communal rioting" as an Islamic compulsiveness, most particularly in Harbi India..

The ambiguity latent in the Constituional provision of equality of the major religions. Since 21 January 1950 the Indian mind has been tempted to believe that the authors of the Constitution would never have seen a Church, a Mosque, a Mandir or a Śivālaya. Even if they had seen them, the question would still arise as to whether they had discerned that their respective architectures serve widely different spiritual and, most particularly, socio-political purposes. The abstract assumption of these purposes being equal does not bear out any correspondence, in their respective histories, conforming to their specific and mutually exclusive manifestations and uses of their doctrines. The wide, empty spaces of the Church and of the Mosque have, since the beginning of the history of their corresponding religions, lent themselves to the consolidation of the politics of their followers assembled as *congregations*. In a downright difference, the classic architecture of the Hindu temple has always served private, *individual* devotions, with the priest or *pujārī* acting throughout his life as a non-political personality. The large empty space of the Church or Mosque lends itself to orison as well as to political indoctrination, with the sermon delivered by the Priest or by the Mullah, in concordance with the political duty of the congregation being inclusive of the obedience to the ruling Prince. Moreover the fundamental structure of the Church bears the trace of the Cross; the Hindu temple has the classical architecture symbolically representing the whole world. In the Church the faithful attendant worships the transcendental Deity. With the *darśana* of the idol the Hindu reminds himself of the homogeneity of his personal essence and the essence of the Deity with awareness of the symbol stimulating the vivid sentiment of the perennial plenitude of the ONE.

The irony of the basic constitutional pronouncement of the equality of the religions active in India. The banal notion has acquired credence, in India and in the Western Democracies, that the 1950 Constitution has provided the beneficence of a peaceful national unity upheld by the well-ordered representation in the freely elected Parliament. Tolerance and social justice have been assumed as the pillars of the Constitution with its

provision of the indigenous religions having *equality* with the three *supernatural, revealed* religions: the fact is that the latter have each its specific history and theology born and developed in regions beyond the borders of India. The Constitution takes a leap of confidence in its putting the latter on a par with each of the three indigenous, *natural, human-designed* ways of life, or Dharmas. However, in terms of their specific doctrines and of their consequent influences, the histories of the revealed, supernatural religions do neither reflect or nor justify the fundamental constitutional proclamation of the equality of all religions, with the assumption of its accordingly assuring a conflict-free, pluri-cultural commonwealth. Seemingly unknown to the authors of the Constitution, the reality is, in the minds of the religious followers, that there is no equality or homogeneity even among these three revealed religions themselves and essentially more so in regard of each of them to the three indigenous Dharmas. Despite the constitutional fiat of the equality of the religions, the facts, on the ground, of the respective beliefs and histories, particularly of the three revealed religions, do expose each its specific, autonomous exclusiveness, contrary to equality. The scriptures of Islam do, with perfect clarity, pronounce it to be the only Truth, to the exclusion of all other religions, including the revealed supernatural Judaism and Christianity. In India the mobility and the exclusivism of each of the revealed dispensations constantly force socio-political adjustments contrary to a lasting tranquility reflecting a well-adjusted pluri-communal pleasantness.

The differences of the religious finalities. The different forms of exclusiveness derive from their histories, from their fundamental postulates, from their social outlook, from their respective guiding ethos of private and collective behavior and, above all, from their definitions of the finalities of human existence. For example, the definition of the "Other" relative to the Brahmanist humanism, according to each of the alien Christian and Islamic dispensations, provides an insight into the fundamental differences between the Dharmas and the Revelations. But radically different is the Other in the Brahmanist's View of the World is

included in the I-Thou homogeneity expressed by the Upaniṣad pronouncement (*mahāvā*kya): *tat tvam asi* (thou art that).

It is most disconcerting when one has to confront the corresponding divine calls, in the revealed religions, so openly declaring that the Only God prescribes the high duty of physically liquidating the Other for the simple fact of the latter being different. The revealed faiths postulate difference as Evil which calls for its elimination. The native Dharmas, co-existing, respect "difference" without feeling any negative sentiment. All the Oriental cultures have flourished as pluri-religious cultures. The lethal intolerance of the Difference of the Other happens to be a unique feature of the Biblical ethos, endowed with the precept barbed with the injunction to liquidate and erase the Other from the surface of the world. This life-denying intolerance has been internalized by the Jewish, the Christian and more ferociously by the Islamic traditions. In truth, why would no Rabbi, no Imam, no Catholic or Protestant Theologian, would have till today written or spoken a single word to express the slightest concern with the fact of their GOD proclaiming and urging the obligatory genocide of the peaceful Others as abominable creatures worthy of being exterminated? That the God given religions would be the only ones, which have genocides as a necessary triumphal feature, is most paradoxical in view of the Supreme Deity being all the time invoked as a savior and the unique beneficent recourse for the Believer to receive help in distress, or forgiveness of sins and wrongs, or consolation in times of grief. It is a contradiction at the heart of the concept of Revelation which, most strangely enough, has remained beyond the intellectual concerns of the Rabbi, of the Theologian, of the Imam!

The contrast with the native Indian Humanity. Nevertheless the proclamation at the heart of Brahmanist's Humanity represents a monumental difference, consisting of spiritual superiority, in comparison with the Quran earnestly enjoining upon the Believer the sacred duty to

abominate the Other, to avoid befriending him, even to kill him.[45] It would require a lot of hermeneutic casuistry for an educated Muslim to see in such a revealed verse any semblance of a moral or spiritual basis for communal concord. The history of Indian Islam is replete with the realizations spurred by the many choleric verses such as the one mentioned in **Quran, 9. 5**.

Coterminous with the history and the civilization of India, the Dharmas project a *Weltanschauung* which is substantively different from the world-vision of the revealed alien dispensations with their roots in the Old Testament and their histories having originated and been nurtured in regions beyond the frontiers of India. The Dharmas attract the mind and the heart of their devotees with the prospect of finalities realizable, by means of self-effort, in the living body of flesh and bones, on Earth. The revealed religions prescribe the finality of human existence with the bodies, physically resurrecting from their graves on the Day of Judgement to appear before God who will adjudicate rewards and punishments corresponding to their deeds and misdeeds.

The different views of Death in the light of the Law of Karma. The qualitatively immense difference between the three revealed religions and the Dharmas consists of the fact that in the latter, the present life is one link in a series of rebirths, with death having occurred in a previous life and the death of the presently living will be followed by another rebirth. The emphasis of the Dharmas consists of representing living as continuous, with interruptions Now and Then, qualified as Deaths. The revealed religions – Judaism, Christianity, Islam – postulate the living body as the only existing one, without any assumption of a pre-birth existence: such a view assumes the absence of the belief in the Law of Karma. Instead it

[45] **Quran, 9. 5:** Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever ye find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush. But if they repent and establish worship and pay the poor-due, then leave their way free. Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

commands the belief in the present material body itself being immortal: the burial in the grave is only a resting in peace signified by the letters R.I.P. (*requiescat in pace = rest in peace*) engraved on the tombstone. It affirms the creed of the body rising from the grave to appear before God on the Day of Resurrection. On the occasion of the Sunday Mass, the assembled Catholic congregation reiterates the belief in the resurrection of the body, as an article of faith. However different, or strange, may the concept of the dead body rising from the grave be, to the followers of the Dharmas, the fact is that highly cultured, intellectually refined men and women see in the doctrine of Resurrection of the Body a consolation with the prospect of a reunion with the dear ones who would have left earlier. It would require a supernormal heroism to confront the consolation with believing it to be an attachment, a hurdle to the attainment of the summit, the transcendence of all Thought Process (*citta vṛtti nirodha)*!

The different views of detachment. The perfection of detachment, as a virtue prescribed in the Dharmas, is not an obligation in the ethical teachings of the Revealed faiths. The end of life with the prospect of a permanent residence in Heaven as supreme bliss is an unending *attachment* which denies the very transubstantiation symbolized by the absorption of the host and of wine during the Roman Catholic Mass. The comparison forcefully leads to the conclusion of the dualism of Heaven and Earth in the revealed religions as an end lower than the mystic bliss prescribed as *nirvāṇa* or *mokṣa* or *kaivalya.* However it does not prevent the due recognition of the spectacular genius of the Judo-Christian civilization and its abundance of aesthetic and intellectual splendors. The recognition of the refinements which are indeed justly attributed to the influence of Islam does not compensate for the destruction of the many cultures which had the misfortune to fall victims of Islamic hegemony and its iconoclastic passion.

The ubiquity of genocides in the revealed religions. In view of the cursory comparison of the importance of the finality of human existence as prescribed in the native Dharmas and in the Revealed religions, it is

germane to the examination of the Idea of India to wonder at the indifference of the writers of the 1950 Constitution being evident in, at the very least, their not having considered the history of the genocides and the numerous internecine wars which have characterized the history of the revealed religions. In particular, they ignored or failed to take into account that fragment of India which is the fertile womb which gave birth to the brutishness of the Muslim League's *jihad* for Partition. It is certainly not the constitutional provision of religious equality which has maintained the peaceful continuity of Indian civilization after Independence in 1947. Indeed it is the *dhārmika, inextinguishable* tolerance of the Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jain majority which has ensured the harmonious cohesion of the Indian nation. And to this tolerance, it is meet to supplement it with due stress on the other salient feature of the cultural history of the Indian people: its capacity to absorb collective suffering.

The relevance of the primacy of universalism in the Dharmas. According to the ideology of the Upaniṣadic *mahāvākya "tat tvam asi",* the *tat* does not refer to only the Indian. It states the essential reality of any sentient being. It is not limited to the history and the geography of India. It is universally applicable to all human beings. Mahatma Gandhi never, in all his speeches and in all his writings, used a word of abuse, of hatred, directed to the British rulers, as persons. He saw the singular British "enemy" *as* a 'tat', with its meaning in the *tat* tvam asi, being *homogeneous* with *his* 'aham', in the cryptic statement of the *aham brahmō'smi*. The Other as '*thou' or "tvam"* in the "*tat tvam asi"* (thou art that) has the same essence as the essence of the "I" who utters the statement. Both have the same essence as the essence of the ONE, Brahman. It was on the foundation of the universal essence of the ONE, of the Plenitude of all that exists, that justified the conscious reason for the Indian to have never entertained even the thought of subverting the life of the Others with slavery or with colonization.

The unbridgeable chasm between the Muslim and the Brahmanist. The nobility of the persuasion of the *tat tvam asi*, justifies the Brahmanist not finding it repugnant if the *tat* be applied to the life of the fish, of the

bird, of the plant. The Brahmanist has no choice: the *tat* applies also to the Muslim who hates him! It must have been such a vision which would have prompted Jesus to break the spirit of the prevailing *lex talionis* with the revolutionary recommendation of turning the right cheek when the left is slapped! Actually viewing the Muslim as the *tat* is further co-extensive with the pronouncement: *sarvam idam khalu brahman* (all this indeed is Brahman).[46] Such a universalist perception of the One, of the Plenitude immanent in all that exists, in all forms of life, lies at the antipode of the Quranic denunciation of the Other, of the Kaffir, to whom Allah reserves a 'painful doom'. Verily, according to Islamic orthodoxy, it would be a *ne plus ultra* irony for the sincere Hindu to see the Muslim neighbour as a *tat* in the *tvam asi* being equivalent to his *aham in brahmo'smi*! Such a vision would be enormously blasphemous for the Muslim: it would be enormously blasphemous for him to contemplate his internalizing the essence of his unitiveness with God, for Allah cannot be, in any way, be associated with any form of worldliness. Thereby He would lose His absolute purity with any contamination, however small or insignificant, with anything or anyone pertaining to the world, laden with impurities. Only in Brahmanism can it be possible for compassionate Mahādeva Śiva to hold the cosmic poison in his throat! Jehovah or Allah, as the only God, is infinitely pure and devoid of any worldly blemish. The contrast, the difference i infinite in consideration of the cosmology of the Brahmanist being the ONE, easily translated into God being all-pervasive. Indeed all that IS is pervaded by the ONE, the ever existing Plenitude which has always been for there was never any time when the ONE was not present. The concept of the ONE supersedes the view of the individual soul existing separately *outside* the One. It does squarely postulate that the individual soul participates fully in and with the universal Plenitude which does not contain the physical world *here* distinct from the *meta-world there.* There is simply no *metaphysics* in the Dharma *bhakta* (devotee)'s View of the

[46] As the world stands today, such a hope or vision will never become a reality – unfortunately!

World. The *bhakta* strives for the realization of the *meta-psychic* self-enlightenment in co-existent self-fulfillment with the ONE. The chasm which separates the Hindu from the Muslim will remain unbridgeable, in the vision of the world as One. There is no room for a chasm. It is all fullness. There is no need to ride on a flying horse to meet any anthropomorphic Almighty. The ONE is immanent in the space all around, in each breath. And this *fact* has been proclaimed by the Īśa Upaniṣad: "*Aum! That is full. This is full. This fullness has been projected from that fullness. When this fullness merges in that fullness, all that remains is fullness*." [47] Mahatma Gandhi argues that if the entire literature of Hinduism were to disappear, with the exception of the opening verse of the Īśa Upaniṣad, it would be possible to restore the whole of the contents of the Hindu tradition.

The Indian origin of the concept of universal salvation. Furthermore, the exclusiveness inherent to Christian orthodoxy remains valid with the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Church. A scruple of fairness suggests the recognition that, within the educated middle class Christian society, this dogma has today almost lost the appeal and meaningfulness of its stricture. However, it behooves the Brahmanist, in particular, to shout from roof tops that the idea of universal salvation is Indian, in the prescriptions of the mystical finalities pertaining to the indigenous Dharmas.

It makes sense to postulate that Jesus obtained his universalism and his concept of the mystical Kingdom being present in everybody from the Mahāyāna Buddhism and from its doctrine of the Bodhisattva, the universal Savior. There can be no more magnificent concept of the universal salvation signified by the Bodhisattva (Intelligence Being) who resolves to forego the attainment of the perfect nirvāṇa and consciously

---

[47] Swami Nikhilananda, *The Upaniṣads,* Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center, New York; 1948; p. 200.

denies to himself the one small step into the never-return from the summit of the self-perfection, in order to be reborn and to be reborn, until the last blade of grass attains salvation from suffering. It is a matter of immense glee that this ideal be consigned in this essay which exalts, as is their due, the unequalled excellence of the Dharmas which define the totality of self-perfectioning as the purpose of laboring for the spiritual welfare of all that lives. This statement proceeds from the obligation to state the Truth, without any trace of cultural prejudice in favor of the Dharmas.

The absence, in the Constitution, of a definition of 'conversion'. The preamble of the constitution does not, in view of these theological differences, provide, for the guidance of the government and of the people, a definition of *conversion* specific to the pluri-religious configuration of the nation. This lapsus is all the more troubling considering that traditionally the Brahmanists, in particular, do not – in fidelity to the fundamental universalist conception of the all pervasiveness of God - entertain any obligation, or any reason, to convert non-Brahmanists. In the very first instance, the reality of the caste system does by itself present an impassable block to any one possibly seeking conversion to the Brahmanist society! Still less is the Brahmanist tempted to adopt the mimesis of the perverse proselytizing technique indulged in by Christian and Islamic missionaries. It is central to Brahmanism that the Upaniṣadic pronouncement of the essence of God being coterminous with the essence of Man. As the in-dweller (*antaryāmī*), God (*Īśvara*) motivates the striving for the experience of self-perfection as *Sākṣāt Īśvara*, which literally means "seeing God in person". Briefly, the Constitution does not distinguish the fundamental, ontological difference between being faith-full as a *Noun* and being faith- full as *Adjective.* The *I am Brahman* (*aham brahmo'smi*) is *Adjective,* it indicates the transubstantiation of the individual in unitiveness with the Absolute Reality. On the ground the Christian missionary converts the Brahmanist to a *Noun*, as a bodily addition to what Swami Vivekananda aptly termed the ''Churchianity'', without any reference to the qualitative transformation advocated by

Thomas à Kempis in *The Imitation of Christ*. The great Swami's criticism of fake conversion is equally applicable to the Brahmanist being alienated in his being (mis)led to adopt Islam as his straight path, as a Noun, especially as, under Muslim hegemony, the defenseless Hindu converted, for his self-preservation, in order to avoid paying the *jaziya* or the *dhimmi* tax, or to be forced to opt for either death or conversion. In India, of all places, the conversion of a Brahmanist to Churchianity or to Islam is a misfortune for two reasons: the convert from the Brahmanist or Buddhist Dharma experiences a spiritual descent to an inferior intransigent, intolerant and violent ideology. The perverse irony of Christian Missionaries converting the illiterate Indian, impoverished by the abusive exploitation of the people by a Christian power, provided the measure of the absence of a moral conscience among all of them. They took advantage of the extreme poverty of the largely illiterate masses with the attraction of petty material advantages as the price of the soul of the pauperized individual. The conversion to Islam was worse, for it further entails the convert having the obligation to hate the non-Muslim, in accordance with the Quranic injunctions. In particular, by getting converted the Hindu suffers the curtailment of his psyche into becoming the hater of the family, of the original community and its culture, which he has forsaken. There cannot be any spiritual promotion in a Hindu leaving the heights of the Upaniṣadic mystical universalism, or the noble compassionateness of the Buddhist elevated and humane *Madhyama Pratipad* (Middle Way) teaching, for an association with either of the two religions with their histories of genocides as one of their distinguishing potentialities.

The despiritualisation of the Buddhist converting to a revealed faith. It is an immense dereliction of his moral culture when a peaceful Buddhist is lured, in conversion, to identify with the dehumanizing history of Islamic or Christian genocidal violence. It was the ultimate cynicism on the part of the Christian missionaries to indulge in converting the "natives" to their faith when they never said a word of protest or of commiseration in the face of the regular man-made genocidal famines caused by an absolute

Christian power administering the sub-continent.[48] It is further astonishing that the leaders of the Indian Christianity would have remained impassive in the presence of the harsh rule of the Christian power generating genocidal famines every four or five years of its rule. In this context an infinite homage is due to those mostly American Theosophists who labored to save the Buddhism of Sri Laṅkā from the verge of complete obliteration by the action of Christian missionaries.

The Indian origin of genuine conversion: In this context, it is worth recalling that the Idea of conversion was born on Indian soil, when, for the first time in History, Emperor Aśoka sent his son and his daughter as missionaries to spread Buddhism among the people of Laṅkā. The conversion to Buddhism was not conceived as a political activity of adding subjects to the Mauryan Empire. It was motivated by the certainty of enabling the individual Buddhist to promote his personal, individual striving along the Middle Way towards the attainment of Nirvāṇa, in the favorable atmosphere of a peaceful society. It is worth emphasizing that, in the Sangha, the Buddhist seeks his personal attainment of the Arhat state, which includes the loving-kindness to facilitate the effort of any other seeker desiring the same self-fulfillment. In the Sangha the rules are designed to guide the individual's contemplative activity, under the guidance of a preceptor, in a freely accepted discipline which is at the antipode of the Believer who, as a member of the Umma, has to submit and obey the revealed laws enunciated for the entire community and are prescribed *externally* for its guidance. The communities formed by the revealed religions have absolutely nothing in common with the Sangha animated with the purpose of enabling the essence of the Arhat to emerge from the *interiority* of the seeker. In Islam the Believer submits to a

---

[48] There apparently exists no research in the reports which the different Protestant and Catholic Christian Missions would have sent from India to their main administrative centers in London or at the Vatican.

legalistic discipline and to a jurisprudence which, by Itself, does not harbor in its core any intimation of an ontological transcendence as the individual's destiny. Islamic Law is, without any qualification, designed for a collectivity, like the Umma or the Ecclesia. In the Buddhist Sangha the monk undertakes the self-searching by means of his individual meditative practice. He lives a singular, heroic striving with exclusively his own strengths and deficiencies. The Buddhist develops the enlightening knowledge arising and growing within *his* particular consciousness according to well-tried contemplative disciplines. The Buddhist converting to Islam suffers the extinction of the promise and the certainty of the intimate psychological process of the self-perfectibility towards the culmination of the state of Arhat.

Conversion as a self-inflicted evil. The Buddhists and the Hindus suffered a backward retreat into Islam when they were forced to convert. Such a conversion was evil, because it augmented the number of haters and of their permanent partiality for violent intolerance which, commanded by divine revelation, is tantamount to the ultimate moral perversity. It is no wonder that the conformity to the external revealed legalism would have left the raw psychic essence lying unchanged in the depths of the Buddhist or Hindu converted to Islam, without the exercise of eliminating the negative passions for inflicting pain and torment to the innocent non-believer. This mass psychic rawness exploded when, inhabited by the converted former Hindu proletariat, it got triggered by the Direct Action (*Jihad*) launched by Jinnah on 15 August 1946, when, sufficiently worked up with raging violence, during the Friday prayer, they rushed out to kill Kaffirs, who earlier belonged to their own social milieu. It provided convincing evidence of unbridled hatred exacerbated by the external source of divine authority claiming obedience to the law which pronounces eternal anathema to all Others. The murderous members of the Muslim League were the descendants of those Hindus and Buddhists who became Islamic converts with their psyche remaining in its raw, primitive condition but attuned to obey the laws of revelation. They supplied the violent mobs whom the educated Middle class used as storm-

troopers to assail mostly Hindus trained during two generations in the political discipline of *satyagraha* and *ahiṁsā.* Conversion to Islam had nurtured the primitive rawness of feeling and the backwardness of an insensitivity covered with the veneer of a *namaz* habit. It was easy for the Imam who, on that fateful Friday, could transform a prayer meeting into a human volcano exploding with the vehemence to act like true murderous proxies of Allah. How indeed did they, the storm-troopers of Jinnah, get inflamed with the confidence of being Allah's proxies going out to kill and burn Kaffirs, with the fullest conviction of their being innocent![49]

The moral difference between Buddhist missionary zeal and Islamic conversion. A Buddhist missionary carries out a work designed for the autonomous spiritual training of the *individual* by means of the study of the relevant texts, accompanied with reflection and meditation undertaken for his voluntarily practicing the eight-fold path in the striving for his ultimate self-perfection as an Arhat. The Muslim or the Christian missionary were each concerned with adding bodies to the demography of his respective community. The Buddhist impulse for converting was strictly a compassionate sharing of a practical way to the attainment of a personal ontological experience leading to the attainment of *Nirvāṇa*. In the initial Sangha of monks as established by Gautama Buddha, the monk practiced the meditation as an individual. Prayers can be said in groups. But the contents of meditation are private and depend on the individual's private effort. There is no Umma or Ecclesia in Buddhism. In Islam and in Christianity all the members of the Umma and of the Church (Ecclesia) collectively follow the same laws or dogmas. In the Buddhist Sangha each Monk undertakes a private, silent, individual self-searching by means of meditation and contemplation, according to the recommendations of the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. That the Buddhist monk maintains his individuality is further strengthened by the fact that the Dharma is not a Law designed

[49] That the killers are the innocent proxies of Allah is given in **Quran 8. 17**

for a uniform, univalent crowd or collectivity. These institutional religious differences have remained active till today!

The good fortune of all the Buddhisms being each independent of the others. All the Buddhist states in Asia are each independent, without their constituting an Umma or an Ecclesia as in Islam and in Christianity. Disseminated all over the world, all the communities belonging to the Umma and to the Ecclesia abide by their respective rules, principles, dogmas. Such a uniformity does not exist among the different Buddhisms still extant in Asia. Each national Buddhism owns its own particular cultural distinction. Within each, the individual Buddhist, monk or layman, quietly explores his own psychic territory in the search for the experience of being an Arhat.

A neglected feature of the effect of conversion. Above all, irrespective of this brief analysis of the contents and the generally abject forms of conversion in the context of Indian history, the brutalities of Partition should have alerted the writers of the Constitution to recognize the repetition of the violent delirium, manifested on the vast scale of the sub-continent, in the well-known history of converts hating those, whom they have abandoned or rejected, with the adoption of a revealed religion. It bewilders the imagination that the writers of the Constitution, in promulgating the equality of religions in India, fatefully ignored the abundance of explosions of communal hatred, spurred by conversions, which had proliferated before 1946, as a particular feature of Indian history. In September 1946, during the talk which he had with M. A. Jinnah, Mahatma Gandhi, in expressing disagreement with his two-nation doctrine, told him that it was the first time in history that a community of converts would claim to be an exclusively different Kaum.

Endowed with an infinite goodness, the Mahatma was surprisingly unaware that Jinnah was right. He should have known that it was precisely *because they were converts* that the Muslims hated the Hindus. They still do. The realization that conversion generates hatred did not seep into the minds of B. R. Ambedkar and his two Brahmin colleagues who wrote the

Constitution. Both Mahatma Gandhi and B. R. Ambedkar failed to notice that in the Hindu-Muslim territorial space, *hatred* indeed *was* more potent than any *ethnological similitude* as the motivating power of the Muslim's will to be hatefully distinct from the Hindu.

This fake racial distinction and its still energetic relevance, in the undying hostility between Sunni Muslim Pakistanis and Hindus, still hogs the politics which keeps the chasm separating the two peoples unchanged. It still escapes the attention particularly of the leaders of the Congress in particular, as well as of those who lead the other parties. It pervades the minds of most, if not all opinion writers, especially in the English language media. The Mahatma did not realize that he was facing the son of a Hindu converted to Islam when Jinnah was speaking in English with the hate-filled passion of the convert animating the thickened sentiment that he had displayed during the years of his association with the Congress Party. Mahatma Gandhi was seemingly not cognizant of Solomon Reinach writing, in his book *Apollo*, that in France, in particular, the worst anti-Semites had been converted Jews and the sons and daughters of converted Jews. It was the hatred, which the majority Muslims harbored for the Hindus, that raged so freely during the months of the murderous *jihad* which prevailed over the Ahiṁsā politics of the Hindu parties, especially of the Congress. It was the violence which gave birth to the Partition and its undying inimical legacy violence. The hatred for the majority Hindu India even now constitutes the national ideology of theocratic Pakistan, more intensely than does its Sunni religiosity. Hatred of the Hindu pervades the attitude of the majority, if not of all, the Anglophone Pakistani middle class, as the articles and blogs published regularly in the media, such as the Dawn newspaper, for example, abundantly display with a matter of fact self-righteousness. Indian Muslims are aware of this visceral hatred of the Hindus and impassively observe a judicious silence, without any commiseration for the victims of this hatred. The Line of Control, which demarcates one country from the other, lends itself to providing a psychological justification for Pakistani Muslims fulfilling Allah's commands to his believing proxies exerting the

due hatred for the Kaffirs. So Jinnah was right in not replying to the Mahatma's remark about the converts claiming to be a different Kaum. The difference was not ethnological. It was psychological. The hatred was magnified with divine sanction. Islamic hatred generates the exhilaration of violence in which the Believer revels with the conviction of carrying out a sacred duty with the assurance of being innocent. It is an ethos singularly characteristic of Islam, to a degree more intense than it has been in the histories of Judaism and of Christianity.

In India the chasm between the two communities, the Brahmanist and the Islamic, has always consisted of the huge chasm of hatred separating them and will maintain itself as such till the Day of Resurrection. Even if the Constitution were right in pronouncing the equality of all the religions obtaining in India, the equality nevertheless does not signify any corresponding religious and ethical equality or sameness. The difference is religious and each religion will maintain its specificity for ever. The difference between the Hindu Dharma crafted by Man and Islam, as politics in the third, final, revised version, of Jehovah's revelation, was dictated word by word by Angel Gabriel, to the Messenger, for the misfortune to the nature of Humanity.

The definition of an authentic conversion. In relation to the particular socio-political configuration of India, Mahatma Gandhi did provide the norm of genuine conversion applicable to the specific composition of the Indian society.

He wrote: "I disbelieve in the conversion of one person by another. My effort should never be to undermine another's faith but to make him a better follower of his own faith. This implies the belief in the truth of all religions and respect for them."

The Mahatma was against the propagation of religion: "But no propaganda can be allowed which reviles other religions. For that would be negation of toleration. The best way of dealing with such propaganda is to publicly condemn it."

Further he wrote: "If I had the power and could legislate, I should stop all proselytizing". (Harijan, 5 November 1935).[50]

He advocated that the Christian Missionary or the Mullah trying to convert the Hindu should, in reality, in strict fidelity to the fulfillment of his desired way of living, ask him instead to abide by his own faith and seek within his own scriptures for further inspiration and renewed strength in order to become a more authentic Hindu. If a Christian were to meet the Mahatma and tell him that he had read the *Bhagavad Gītā* and wanted to convert to Hinduism, the Mahatma would ask him to read the Bible and discover its many splendors and thence strive to become a better Christian, as *adjective*. On his own independent initiative Swami Vivekananda, who was in no way hostile to any Judeo-Christian religion, referred to the inauthentic Christianity of the converting missionaries as "Churchianity." He asked the Hindus to read Thomas à Kempis's classic *Imitation of Christ* in order to be acquainted with what being *Christian – as adjective,* should be, in contrast with the perversion which the missionaries were proposing by degrading the Hindu into being, *as a Christian, a noun*. There is an infinite difference between *being Hindu*, as adjective, and being *a Hindu*, as a noun. All the Hindus who became Muslim and Christian *nouns* got altered by the corruption of their adopting violent ideologies as a way of living. Throughout this essay the underlying sentiment of the comparison has been based on the consideration of the followers, as *adjectives,* of each religion being studied and commented with the intention and the spirit of viewing the related doctrine, ethos and history with attention to fairness and objectivity, with loyalty and respect owed to the prospective reader.

The fateful ignorance of the authors of the Constitution re. the violent ideology of Islam. In the wake of the Partition the subsequent violent social conflicts have been such as could have been avoided if only the

[50] Quoted by Vivek Gumaste, Freedom of Religion is not Right to Convert, in Sunday Guardian of 1 January 2022.

jurists entrusted with the task of framing the 1950 Constitution had the requisite understanding of the theological subtleties and the political underpinnings of the three revealed religions with their divergences in reference to the Indian Dharmas. The political forces which determined the contents, the organization and the constitution of the Christian and Islamic ideologies evince a colossal difference in regard to the birth of the Hindu civilization. Only India has given to Mankind the eminently humane religiosity fashioned and bequeathed by the learned forest-dwelling contemplatives of yore. Indian civilization is a gift of the forest, not of a city like Constantinople where Emperor Constantine made the teaching of Jesus the ideology of the State in 323 C.E. It was a dramatic alteration of the Christian faith when politics prevailed in displacing the centrality of Jesus appealing for the belief in the Kingdom of God within every individual person and putting in its place an ideological theology drawn up for the entire population of Byzantium. Nor did Indian spirituality arise in the way in which Islam grew in Medina by the efforts of Muhammad, the aggressive politician dedicated to using the sword as the convincing argument to establish the new Revelation. In particular reference to the Indian society, the constitutional jurists ought to have evinced due concern with the Muslim never acknowledging any equality between the revelation of the Quran as the only Truth, directly communicated to Muhammad by God (Allah) Himself, and the Vedas or the *Bhagavad Gītā*, for example, and the Torah or the Talmud, or the Gospels bequeathed by men. The Quran with Allah Himself as the author, and accordingly venerated by the Believer as God, cannot be placed on the same level of consideration as any other scripture, in any other religion or Dharma. It is a simple fiat proclaimed by Muhammad that the Jews had neglected the first revelation which Jehovah had given to them. Now, imposed by the sheer force of his personality, he claimed that he was the recipient of the Original Revelation, bestowed by the Only God, Allah, as the last chance for ALL humanity to follow the Straight Path!

Indeed it is surprising that, while allowing to each religion the unrestricted freedom of its practice, the authors of the 1950 Constitution would not

have been aware of the enormous difference between the majority Brahmanists, as well as the minority Jainas, who do not as a rule practice proselytism, and the Muslims who, with the right to adhere to the Sharia, hold the view of conversion from Islam to another religion as apostasy punishable with death. Nor were the authors of the Constitution seemingly aware of the opinion of Montesquieu that it was a misfortune for the nature of Humanity that a Conqueror would give a religion.

The learned ignorance of the authors of the Constitution. Furthermore it strains the imagination to grasp that all the wars, all the *dhimmitudes,* all the *jaziyas*, all the iconoclasms, all the communal explosions, all the devastations of high learning and great art, during a thousand years of Muslim presence on Indian soil, would have escaped the attention of the jurists who nevertheless wrote one of the best, enlightened and enlightening democratic constitutions in the XX century. The continued adhesion to the Sharia, as a constitutional provisional privilege, signifies the absence, on the part of the Indian Muslims, of a moral reciprocity to the immense generosity and kind-heartedness which the Brahmanist majority immediately evinced towards them, despite the horrors initiated by the majority of the Muslims in their enactment of the demand for Partition.

The significant difference between the architecture of the Judeo-Christian faiths and the architecture of the temples pertaining to the indigenous Dharmas. Additionally, however monumental may be the structure of a Brahmanist or a Buddhist temple, its architecture makes no room for a pulpit, or for adequate space to contain the entire surrounding community of devotees. The pulpit in the Christian church was designed to foster and cultivate the spirit of the Faith as well as the acquaintance with, and submission to, the policy of the State, presided over, during its history, by the Prince or the King anointed as the sole representative of God. In a Masjid the Mullah has the fullest freedom to present the Faith as politics, in conformity with the rule of the Caliph, from the time of Muhammad to the abolition of the Caliphate in 1923. It has become a well-

established custom for the Imam to deliver political speeches especially on the occasion of the Friday noon prayer. For example, the Direct Action decreed by Jinnah, in mid-August 1946, was inaugurated by the believers rushing out as killer goons immediately after the Friday noon *namāz.* Even in the monumental temples of Brahmanism, the Brāhmaṇa priest, stationed in the limited space of the sanctum holding the idol, can guide the service of only a few worshippers.

In its proclamation of the equality of status pertaining to the different "religions", the 1950 Constitution ignores the different purposes served by the variety of the architectures required and defined by the different faiths. It would seem that the learned authors of the Constitution were not aware of the meaning of the difference between the vast emptiness of the interiors of Church and Masjid providing space for the gathering of large congregations, in contrast to the limited space allocated in a Mandir where a small number of devotees worship during a brief moment while standing in front of the idol. The Church and the Mosque are designed to serve the obligations of the State political ideology. In a Brahmanist or Buddhist temple, the priest or the monk does not act as an agent abiding by the ideology sub-serving the national policy. In the Buddhist countries, the monks do not bow to the Head of State. In Thailand the King salutes with folded hands the monk, irrespective of the latter's age.[51]

The impassivity of the Indian Christianity. Concomitant with the theme of the distinctiveness of the "religions" active within the Indian territory is the absence of any reliable study of the smug neutrality of the Christian community, in particular, of its Roman Catholic majority, during the entire

---

[51] At a ceremony at the Banaras Hindu University, I have witnessed the Vice-Chancellor, with folded hands signifying respect, passing by a row of Sri Lankan Buddhist Monks who stood erect in silence, without making any sign. In a class-room a young Sri Lankan Bhikku, in an M.A. seminar, regularly remained sitting while all the other research scholars stood up whenever the eminent Professor T. R. V. Murti came in to lead the study.

period of the catastrophic barbarism of Partition. In relation to the orgy of carnage, of destruction of life and of property, disbelief becomes the measure of the silence, of the indifference, of the absence of any emotion, on the part of an entire community of lay and ecclesiastical believers in the suffering of Jesus as the centrality of their faith. The question inevitably arises as to whether the studied neutrality of the Indian Christians, in particular, the Catholics, was commanded and supervised by the Papal authority seated in Rome. This footnote aspect of the Partition story has bypassed the attention of the historians and of the sociologists. But it is worth drawing attention to it as a tribute to the capacity of the Brahmanist community to have absorbed, without anger or resentment, one more in the catalogue of iniquities and sufferings which have befallen its history.

The pathetic ineffectiveness of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* motto. However, with the *bhai-bhai* sentimentality not having, in the *modus vivendi* of the Brahmanist, any scriptural justification of the "*sarva dharma sama bhāva*", no Believer can ever, in his conscience, commit the blasphemy of extending relevance of these four words to the Quran. The pious Muslim believes that the words of the Holy Book have been concretely written, before the Creation of the world, by Allah Himself. They are indeed *that* pure, without their having been conceived in the atmosphere of the World! The words of the Holy Book are held to be perfect and will retain their unmodified validity for all time. Crafted by Allah Himself the verses of the Quran will never have parity with any statement conceived and written by human beings, particularly by the Brahmanist Kaffir however saintly he may happen to be.

No one has ever asked what, in the prayer so cherished by the Mahatma, do the words *san mat de bhagavān* mean to the Muslim who already owns the very words which Allah has written and transmitted to him through the Prophet, words which contain the totality of all that is needed for the plenitude of living while walking along the indicated Straight Path. There exists no record of what Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, for example, felt in listening to those words pronounced at the prayer meetings conducted by

Mahatma Gandhi. Nor is there any evidence that the Mawlānā ever told a Muslim audience his agreement or disagreement with the words *Allah Īśvara terā nām*. For it would be blasphemous on the part of the Muslim to identify Rāma as identical with Allah. No evidence exists of any Muslim in any mosque, or in any private gathering, or even among his household, ever claiming that all religions share the same essence. India has not produced a Muslim thinker who would have published his version equivalent to Bhagwan Das's *The Essential Unity of the World Religions*, or to S. Radhakrishnan's *The Soul of a World Unborn*, the first chapter of his *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*.[52]

In truth, neither in their origins, nor in their respective histories, nor in their philosophical anthologies, nor in their definitions and determinations of human finalities, nor in their aesthetic and iconographic manifestations, is there any denominator common to the major world religions. The feely-feely goody-goody notions of simple social do's and don'ts do not qualify for the ineffective claim of '*sarva dharma sama bhāva'*. Nor have the Theosophical universalism of Bhagavan Das's *The Essential Unity of the World Religions*, and the mystical catholicity proclaimed by S. Radhakrishnan in his original *The Soul of a World Unborn*, generated even in India any amicable convergence among the different communities.

The transcendence of the word. However, all the different dualistic theological pronouncements, with words written or oral-aural, in particular, those related to the three revealed religions, yield to one superseding transcendental finality, at an existential metaphysical level. All pretentions, that this or that revealed doctrine is the only Truth or not, disappear in the transcendental experience of the *nirvikalpa samādhi* according to the *Yogasūtras* of Patañjali who, for the first time, trumpeted

---

[52] Actually, Pope Benedict XVI, in the Chapter 2 of his Truth and Tolerance, vigorously rejects the mysticism advocated by S. Radhakrishnan in the first chapter of Indian Religions and Western Thought.

the reality of the universal salvation in the experience of the silence as *citta vṛtti nirodha* (cessation of the thought process). It is at the level of the experience of the *nirvikalpa samādhi* that all conversation, debate, doubting, use of words, imaginations of forms, cease vanish in the full light of the ontological experience of self-perfection. In such a state, which is the experience of the ultimate reality of one's self, there simply cannot be *any* word or sign capable of conveying what lies beyond all formal expressions, with the sole sign of the knower's smile conforming to the time, the place, the moral and spiritual worth of the questioner. The closest comparison which can be made for the correct grasping of the ultimate knowledge of self-enlightenment is evident in the experience of the sunlight. The light of the sun is known as such, directly, without the need of another entity by means of which the sunlight has to be understood for what it is. There is nothing outside or beside the Sun which one must use to graspa the knowledge of the Sun's existence or of its Truth or Reality. It is grasped "as such", it is its own explanation. So is the Light of Transcendental knowledge experience as *ānanda* (bliss), as the One declared with the expression necessitated for the task of transmission, with the compound *sac-cid-ānanda* (Bliss of Being as Knowing). The 'bliss' explains itself as–such as wonder; it is supremely knowing without any secondary accessory enabling its understanding.

The definition of Yoga relativizes the dogma which, implicit in the Quran, claims that it will remain *as such* for all eternity. And because the Quran will remain *as such* as an ideology corresponding to the indefinite exertion of iconoclasm, of intolerant violence, it elevates the faithfulness of the followers of the Dharmas with the conviction that the mystical perfections, which they prescribe as finalities of human existence, apply also to the Muslim willing to forego submission in preference to self-effort and searching for the ultimate humane goal within his own self. But the reader may concede that there is a lot of method in the bravado of the Muslim believing in the eternal Truth of the Revelation, because it rests on the hatred of the Other. Goodness as a perfection requires more than an

abundance of effort to quell all the passions and psychological deficiencies with which one is born. Such deficiencies can be discerned in the inclinations to hurt, to lie, to be angry, to be jealous, to be unclean, to indulge in slander, to be vindictive, to be lacking of gratitude or kindness, to be lazy, to be indifferent to the miseries of others, and a lot more of moral weaknesses and foibles, detrimental to oneself and well as to others. At all times only a few men and women have succeeded to reach the summit of the goodness which accompanies the state of being Truth-full as Beauty. During his rule (*rājya*) Rāma suddenly discovered that some of his subjects still believed it was sinful for him to continue living with Sītā as his wedded wife. And he felt himself obligated to exile her. The story means that the perfect civil state of a people, or nation, is only a dream, a fiction, an infinite continuation of striving for the ultimate good, an ever receding end of the process to work for the establishment of a citizenry of universal attainment of Goodness.

That is why the Quran, with boundless irony, claims its eternal validity: because it requires its faithful, admiring devotees to Hate and to wreak all manners of violence against the Other. In the "normal" state in which Muhammad lived, as well as the normal state of the present world, the exceptionally good Man or Woman good is just rare. As a rule the Individual Wise Man is known by the power of his effortless attraction, by simply Being. Such individuals lead by example, by silence, by the wordless radiating of the light projected by their inner perfection. There is no common measure between Muhammad and Jesus or Gautama Buddha. Jesus did not defend himself when the Roman soldiers went to arrest him and he told Peter, who made a gesture to draw his sword, that he who uses the sword perishes with the sword. But Muhammad owned nine swords and he used them in the thirty two wars which he fought. As a religious founder he has nothing in common with Gautama Buddha who taught, preached, for forty-five years and died peacefully in his eightieth year, after leading the peaceful life of a mendicant and teaching how to end suffering and attain the sublime state of being an Arhat (*The Worthy One*). He is unique in world history for having built the Islamic way of life,

as a Straight Path, with a religion consisting of laws among which are those which enjoin the hatred of the Other and the free use of violence against the Other as a virtuous act dear to God. That was how he established the perennial foundation of the Islamic faith, on the natural certainty of the perfection of goodness being an uncommon social reality requiring ceaseless teaching and learning, searching and striving. Nobody before Muhammad, nor after him, has established a way of life and a doctrine resting on the hatred of those who live beyond the pale of his legislation. Indeed such is the reason for the indefinite duration and expansion of Islam. Muhammad is the author of a religion which makes his believers submit to God as the Hater of the Other. And he vigorously initiated it with the use of the sword. That is a good reason prompting his Believers qualifying the mention of his name with the blessing of "Peace Be Upon Him." Pacifism is the natural, effortless way of the Buddhist. There has never been a Conqueror in the history of the Bauddha Dharma.

It behooves the Brahmanist to know well the fundamentals of Islam. It is therefore incumbent upon India, and particularly upon the Brahmanist intellectual and political elites, to cultivate an accurate perception of the Islamic culture, with the right understanding of its scriptures, its history, its jurisprudence. Above all, the Brahmanist owes it to himself to acquire an unprejudiced knowledge of the history of Indian Islam. The way in which the Muslims as outsiders have acted with a relentless intolerance against the peaceful Indians can be assessed by means of an acquaintance with the conflicts which, since the end of World War II, Muslim minorities have been generating against the well-established, sophisticated national cultures of democratic, secular Europe. With its twenty-seven different nations legally bonded as the European Union, including the plurality of their languages, ethnicities, cultures, the Old Europe finds itself in a predicament similar to what India has experienced for nearly a thousand years up to 1947. The significant difference between India and the European Union will be whether the latter, with its *egalitarian* polities can successfully repulse the growing hegemony of Islam, in a duplication of the resistance and triumph of the *hierarchical* Indian civilization. Brahmanists,

more than any other community, ought to ponder on the fact that *egalitarian* Islamic hegemony has obliterated the *egalitarian* Buddhisms of India, of Indonesia, of Afghanistan, of Gandhāra, of Central Asia, of Den Huang in North-West China; it has further wiped out the *egalitarian* Byzantine Christianity and the pre-Islamic Christianities of the Middle East, the *egalitarian* Zoroastrian Persia. But only *hierarchical* Brahmanist India has survived the *dhimmitude* and the *jaziya* and all the intolerances of *egalitarian* Islamic hegemony. Why? How has Indian civilization maintained its continuity and survived the iconoclastic stranglehold willed by Allah?

The need to relinquish the ineffectiveness of the *"sarva dharma sama bhāva"*. This search for the Truth must begin with relinquishing the Brahmanist mirage of *sarva dharma sama bhāva*. Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism are Dharmas. The dualistic revealed dispensations pertaining to the Biblical and prophetic tradition are religions revealed by the Only God and bestowed to the inhabitants of the Middle East. These are indeed religions and have always been so designated, despite Pope Benedict XVI claiming that Christianity is not a religion, but that it is a Faith. Even if all the revealed religions be "faiths", they do not thereby own homogeneity with the indigenous Dharmas. The latter are truly eternal (*sanātana*) with their transcendental finalities of mokṣa, nirvāṇa or śūnyatā, kaivalya, all designations of the plurality of mystical experiences realized in the living body, on earth. They are transcendental in regard to heaven: they are singular finalities of perfection which have no trace of the materialist sensualism of heavenly delights as permanent or eternal attachments. These mystical self-perfectibilities are trans-cultural, unlimited by History and by Geography, that is, they are eminently and supremely universal. These mystical finalities, unique to Indian civilization, constitute the eschatological fulfillment of the faithfulness to the Dharmas. The revealed religions - Jewish, Christian, Islamic - do NOT have an existential eschatological fulfillment occurring in the individual lives of their proponents. They have the common eschatology of the Day of

Resurrection, including the belief that the dead will rise from the dust and the sod of their tombs and appear on the Final Day for the Judgement by Jehovah, or Allah, or Jesus Christ. In simpler terms, the Dharmas prescribe an Ontological fulfillment as the ultimate destiny of the individual Man in one or other of the prescribed mystical self-fulfillments realized in the living body, on the surface of the Earth. There is no Ontological perfection promised in any of the revealed religions. Yet , faithful to the contents of their *raison d'être,* they could, with the crude use of military force, dominate and reduce, particularly, the Oriental civilizations endowed with their respective culturally defining belief in the beneficence of their mysticisms. History as imagined and cultivated by the intellect of the Western Judeo-Christian Man has never attributed importance or sanctity to the value of the mystical finality of human existence. Islam too partakes of the belief hostile to the ideal of the mystical finality of existence, and opts for the adoption of the Judeo-Christian concept of the Day of Resurrection. It is a happy mystery that very early in his history the Indian Man had the genius to grasp that not History, but Myth, is the appropriate vehicle to convey through millennia the *sanātana* truths of the Riṣis and Ācāryas bequeathing the scriptures: the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, the Darśanas, the Grammars, and particularly the Purāṇas and the Epics.

If there is one, and only one, categorical compelling difference between the three revealed religions - Judaism, Christianity, Islam – and the three indigenous Dharmas – Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism – it is this, it is this, it is this, that, with their being bestowed by the Only God, the revelations *have the one common characteristic of generating genocides*, a murderous trait which the Dharmas never had and, in terms of their constitutions, will never have. This is one portentous difference which escaped the writers of the Constitution of 1950 and of all the jurists responsible for the subsequent amendments. The exception to the attribution of genocide to Christianity does not apply to the Indian Christianity. It is germane to argue that the Indian Christians did not have a reason to manifest their faith with

a genocide most likely due to the credit of their being surrounded by the humaneness of the indigenous Dharmas.

The blessings of the mystical Dharmas for Humanity. The three indigenous Dharmas are based, in a variety of ways, on the Immanence of the essence of the Supreme Being, or Absolute Reality. More: they define the totality of Indian civilization as the only one in the world that has arisen, grown, and lasted till today without any interruption, without being animated and maintained by the dehumanizing attractiveness of the use of force. Homer's *Iliad* as a testament of Force is the emblem of Western civilization. The eighteen-day battle on the Field of Kuru, between the two Bhārata factions, is fought with no holds barred by the warriors on both sides, but with the author regularly reminding the heroes and the reader of the text that the two absolute values of life on earth are Truth and Ahiṁsā. The *Mahābhārata* concludes with qualifying itself as a work on Dharma resting on these two absolute values, as the transcendent negations of Force. [53]

It is true that the latest Indian Islamic 'apotheosis', as the Partition cataclysm, did exhibit stray examples of Muslims protecting Hindus and Sikhs against Muslim killers, and Hindus and Sikhs protecting Muslims against Hindu and Sikh killers. But these cases of stray swallows on both sides of the divide do not make a summer of *sarva dharma sama bhāva.* They were a few trees which did not suffice to make a forest.

The fateful ignorance of the Hindu and Muslim leaders of the Congress Party of each other's religious faith. In India, in particular, the future of

---

[53] The *Mahābhārata* offers these exceptions to the use of force: to protect an innocent defenceless person who is under attack when other means are not available, to protect the means which are necessary for those living without any protection. The war itself became inevitable when even Śrī Kṛṣṇa Himself failed, in his visit to Duryodhana, to win him over to yield to a reasonable, peaceful compromise to avert a military solution.

the possible harmony between mainly the Brahmanist community and the substantially large Islamic "minority" requires a correct understanding of the specifics of Islamic culture, with particular reference to the Indian Muslim's characteristic singularity. It is most unfortunate that there exists no record of informal conversations among the central leaders of the Congress Party, for example, engaged in free exchanges of opinions and reflections on the psychological differences between the Hindu and the Muslim, about the theological divergences obtaining in the two major traditions, about the difference between the two rationalities. Little is known about what the Mahatma, Nehru, Patel would have asked Mawlānā Kalām Azad, Zakir Hussain, Humayun Kabir, and others among the Muslim elite gravitating around the Nehrus, about the reason of the long history of Muslim hatred of the Kaffir. No one knows what kind of discussion would have arisen among the Hindu and Muslim leaders of the Congress when their non-violent helplessness got struck and overwhelmed by the Direct Action of Jinnah. There is no document showing the apparent ignorance of the Hindu leaders in the first half of the XIX century being unaware of the reforms initiated by the fundamentalist Islamic preachers like Afghani and Ibn Saud. Yet despite the catastrophic upheaval which shook the Indian sub-continent there is no evidence of the Congress leaders, on both sides of the religious divide, having an accurate understanding of the Quran and of the Upaniṣads, in order to grasp the respective mentality animating each community. Uprooted from the traditional Indian culture due to their English education, the leaders on all sides failed to see that, what was happening was not a struggle between Good and Evil, but *between what was right according to the Bhagavad Gītā and the Ācāryas* and *what was right according to the Quran and the Hadiths and the interpretations of the Mullahs.* Both "rights" were antipodal to each other. Most importantly, all the Hindu leaders, even those pertaining to the Hindu Maha Sabha, did not effectively denounce the claim of the Muslim League's propaganda of Muslim victimhood when it is they, the Muslims, who had ravaged, with mostly irreparable damage, the civilization of the indigenous population. This historical weakness of

the Indian elites proved to be such a crucial weakness that, even after the Partition, there has been no analysis of the failure to use the resources of communication to refute such potent misrepresentations of Indian history by the intellectually fundamentalist leaders of the Muslim League and their allies.

The impact of Muslim exclusiveness in contemporary Europe in relation to India. What the Muslims did to India is now being repeated, with the fullest knowledge of the world community, by Muslims in Western Europe. In sophisticated and highly cultured France, for example, a fundamentalist Imam did not hesitate to declare with limitless bravado that Muslims would defeat the French by using their laws, and after they would have defeated the French, the Muslims would subjugate them by means of the Sharia. Muslims in Europe further do not hesitate to proclaim loudly the Quranic declaration that only Islam is Truth, and all other religions or philosophies are errors. In the response to this cultural assault on European civilization, it is accordingly significant that Western European intellectuals, particularly in France, have produced an abundant criticism of Islam which is wanting, to a corresponding extent, in India, as well as in Pakistan and in Bangladesh. The lively debates in France, about the replacement of large segments of the territory by migrant Islam, contrast vividly with the absence of a right appraisal, on the part of the native Indian leaders, of the storm brewing during the 1930s by the Jinnah-led Muslim League. There was no consciousness among the leaders, mainly in the Congress Party, of the inadequacy of the *Satyagraha* and *Ahiṁsā* ideology against the stark violence of a movement which had, and still has, its roots in the swords used by Muhammad to impose the totalitarian ideology of the religion which he invented for the purpose of conquest. None of the Hindu leaders grasped the fact of violence being, for the submitting Believer, an obligatory moral mode of expressing the spirit of Islam in his commitment to conquer the world and elevate it as a *Dar-ul-Islam.* It is true that the elevated moral values, associated with the Mahatma, could prevail upon the British. The Congress could uplift the vigor of the trampled masses and lead them into manifesting the political force of non-

violent strikes and of paralyzing the functioning of the imperial state. But the peaceful practice of disobedience, by means of disciplined strikes (*hartal*) did not settle in the minds of the Muslim masses, who held their hidden hatred of the Kaffirs who are, by the force of the Revelation, demeaned by the Quran and by the Mullahs. Nearly ten centuries of co-existence interspersed with countless depredations perpetrated by the Muslims did not produce in the minds of explicitly the Hindu elites, a critical understanding of the totalitarian character of Islam to a measure comparable to the West Europeans' quick response to the assault on their liberal, secular democracies by fundamentalist Islam, within the last four decades. The post-Partition liberal, secular Constitution has not brought the respect of Pakistanis who have till today pursued a genuine Kaffir-hating policy towards India. They did so even during the years of Jawaharlal Nehru's Prime Ministerial policy of appeasement towards the Indian Muslim community. Partition did not bring an assuagement of the Muslim proclivity for murderous communal riots, nor of Pakistan to launch three wars against India led by the Congress Party in power. Nor has Pakistan desisted from extending the atavism of Islamic iconoclasm to its avatar in the collective passion for terrorism sponsored openly by the state against the Harbi India.

The cultural difference between the Arab Muslim Intellectuals in Europe and their Co-Believers in Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. In both the two Islamic theocracies generated by Partition, no Muslim intellectual is moved to reflect on what, in Islam itself, does so persistently generate hostility and fear within the Judeo-Christian communities of Europe in relation to Muslims and to Islam. In France the criticism of the deficiencies and blemishes of Islam, in conjunction with the recognition of the moral and aesthetic excellences of French culture, is often led by ethnic Muslim intellectuals reared in their adopted secular environment. With their knowledge of Arabic and of its nuances and subtleties, they do mostly belong to the Arab Muslim cultures of North Africa and zealously preserve their bi-cultural formation and outlook. The Arab Muslims in Europe have over the Indian Muslims a psychological and ethnological advantage with

their knowing that the Quran confers legitimacy and recognition of their common appurtenance with Christian and Jewish believers in the tradition of the Book.

In contrast the Indian Muslim finds himself confined in the midst of Kaffirs, governed and ruled by Kaffirs, in a Harbi State. In France, even the Atheist is not a Kaffir. With this assurance of a religious security the French Muslim citizen derives comfort in his attachment to and adoption of what he learns to appreciate as valuable and relevant in European mores, learning and wisdom, as an enrichment of his Islamic identity.[54] In India the Indian Muslim finds himself doomed to contemplate his future in the company of a community who is abominated by Allah as a crowd of disbelievers irremediably corrupted by their books replete with errors and falsehoods. It is believable that such a Quranic condemnation of the devotees of the three indigenous Dharmas could have been borrowed by Muhammad from the Christian dogma of the non-availability of salvation outside the Church. This dogma does not seem to have, during nearly two thousand years, warped the rather uneventful relationship of the Indian Christians with the general Indian population. In the West too Christians would nowadays be loath to say in polite society that their non-Christian friends would go to hell.[55] But in the Indian sub-continent the Muslim still believes

---

[54] The Hadith that Muhammad advised the Believers to learn from China bears no historical correspondence. Nor has China integrated anything from the Quran in the wealth of its high culture.

[55] During the mid 1950s, when I was studying Indian Philosophy at the Banaras Hindu University, I met the Belgian Jesuit, Father Camille Boulqe who said, during a private conversation: "Certainly Mahatma Gandhi is a great man. He is eminently moral. But I have no doubt in my mind that he will go to hell!" Fr. Boulqe was at that time teaching Hindi Literature at Allahabad College and was highly regarded by his Hindu colleagues. He was visiting the B.H.U. to consult with the specialists in Hindi literature, in particular, the distinguished Professor Hazari Prasad Dvivedi. One so learned and intelligent as Fr. Boulqe, would have had a peculiar intellectual and moral formation indeed in order to be able to live, without feeling any stress, in the midst of hundreds of millions of Hindus

that the Brahmanist's idol-worship is an abomination, while Islam is the only Truth which guides the Believer safely along the straight path enunciated in the very first Surah of the Quran. The Muslim abominating the Hindu for being an idol-worshipper is not mentally exercised by the prestige attached to the Hajj pilgrimage which includes the obligatory circulation around the Kaba, which is a meteoric stone which happened to fall in Mecca. No Hindu worships his favorite idol to the same degree of fervor as the Muslim who reacts with earnest violence against anyone who manifests the slightest hostility to a copy of the Quran. The Muslim does not consider the Quran as a book as an idol. But he feels good with the easy righteousness of demeaning, with a haughty conscience, the Hindu who evinces reverence for a favored idol. The Muslim thereby exhibits his ignorance of the subtlety of the thought which informs the psychological profundity of the reverence for an idol.

The reasoned self-alienation of the Muslim. Indian Muslims, as members of the world Umma, hold on to their communal distinctiveness having its spiritual center of gravity in the Kaba situated in distant Arabia. Furthermore the cities of Mecca and Medina exert a strong emotional appeal, as geographical bonds to their faith. To the Muslims of the twenty-first century the first government headed by Muhammad represents the ideal State to which they would like their own present country to conform. During the years 2021-23, Imran Khan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, declared his desire to transform his country into a replica of the first Muslim state ruled by the Prophet. He did not seem to be aware that a clone can never be an exact reproduction of the original, for the world which favored the birth of the original is not the same world which imposes itself on the clone. But the attractiveness of the first Muslim state ruled by the Prophet still educes from the Muslim of today admiration and yearning, despite the reality of the extremely violent blood-letting caused

---

who, even if they were to be, and to live, like the Mahatma, would nevertheless be destined to spend their *post mortem* existence in Hell.

by the many factions tearing one another around the Prophet! The three of the first immediate four Caliphs, who undertook to lead the Muslims following the death of Muhammad, were murdered. Nevertheless, locked within the bubble of their Sharia-centric exclusivism, the Indian Muslim dwells incapable of contemplating and internalizing the merit of the enlightenment of the growing number of his Arab co-Believers embellishing their inherited tradition with the refinement of European humanism, while remembering the brilliance of Baghdad during the first two centuries of the Abbasid dynasty. For the Indian Muslim the humanism of the Dharmas is only error and untruth, the followers of which earn Allah's inevitable doom![56]

Such an Islamic vision of the world is at odds with the Brahmanist having over the centuries transformed the entire geography of India as a network of *tīrthas*, of centers of pilgrimages, which have enchanted the land to the status of a homogeneous sacred space. As such, the Indian space has thereby become a transfigured portion of the world defined by the Upaniṣadic pronouncement: *sarvam idam khalu brahman* (all this indeed is Brahman). This transcendental vision of the Bhārata Land remains totally alien to the understanding of the Muslim who installs his ontological finality in the Day of Judgement, at the end of Time. Nor can the Muslim, endowed with iconoclastic fervor, understand the Brahmanist's demonstrating his gratitude and love for the land which nourishes him and demonstrating this filial affection with the consecration of the Bhārata Mātā Temple in Vārāṇasī. The veneration of the country as a Mother is an extension of the veneration of the world of Matter to which gratitude is due because it produces food for the sustenance of life. The world as such

---

[56] All the monotheistic cultures have, at all times, been productive of internal, lethal violent conflicts. Social quietude is characteristic of peaceful coexistence of a plurality of religions coexisting in the same space. The historical examples are India, China and Japan which have since the earliest time been distinguished by the peaceful, creative co-existence of several mutually exclusive religions.

is consequently venerated as a Goddess, as Bhū Devi. For the Muslim such a reverent feeling towards the World as Bhū Devi is in a marked contrast with the vision of the Book of Genesis which celebrates Jehovah creating a *disenchanted* world.[57] With the effusion of pride in, and love for, the land rising from the *tamas* of colonial oppression the temple was inaugurated by Mahatma Gandhi.

The wrecking of Indian civilization by the invasion of a religious duality. With geography aiding, India has suffered the misfortune to endure the aggression of hordes motivated by the arrogance of an effortless submission to a revealed Law which had nothing in common with the sophisticated sub-continental civilization. It was the calamity of being struck by an influence of hordes who claimed an irrefragable Knowledge of what is right and what is wrong, of what is true and what is false, in the words of Allah descending from Paradise as words settled and codified as the Quran. In the academic program of the study of Comparative Religion, as taught at the Centre for the Study of the World Religions, Harvard University, the Holy Book is viewed as the theological equivalence to Jesus who, as the Word born as Flesh in History, is venerated as God. Islamic faith regards the Quran with the same sacred awe as it evinces in regard to its author, Allah, living in Heaven. In the same vein, theologically Muhammad, as the Messenger, or as the vehicle which conveys the Truth to mankind, is equivalent to Mary who ushers, thanks to the Holy Spirit, Jesus to the world and to History. Unique among all the existing religions, Islam claims the exalted privilege of having come straight from Heaven down to Earth by the mediation of the Angel Gabriel who communicated the divine words to Muhammad when he was about forty years old.

---

[57] In *The Cunning of History,* Rabbi Richard L. Rubinstein, courageously writes that one of the three conditions which made the Judeocide possible, is precisely the concept of the disenchanted world according to the Book of Genesis. The other 2 reasons marshalled by him are: (i) the stark distinction between God and the World of Man, in the Protestant Cosmology, with nothing sacred in between; and (ii) the uses of the industrial sophistication lending themselves to the manufacture of the instrument designed for the mass killing of the Jews and the Gypsies.

Muslim pride, with the enormity of its concomitant violence, rests on the persuasion that they are the only Believers who have the privilege of being guided by laws, rules and principles given to them directly by God, endowed hence with supreme moral authority, and with the claim to having an unqualified, eternal superiority over all philosophies and religions. The Muslim lives with the self-assurance of being born with the proud privilege of having a life willed by God. Accordingly he asserts it as being devoid of error, with compliance to the words of the Almighty. By so doing the Believer naturally translates the purity of his religiosity into a corresponding unmitigated violence such as he practiced with unbridled fervor across the entire range of Muslim predominance. This feature of mortiferous violence is an organic component of the Revelation and *as such* does not disturb the conscience or the aesthetic disposition of the Believer, however much such a personal, and collective endorsement may disturb the peace-loving DisBeliever. However it is fortunate for the world at large to be moved by the advantage of the cultures hinged to non-revealed ideologies which preserve the sensitivity to peacefulness as an elevated ideal unshared with Islam and its naturally harboring violence as coterminous with its essence. Otherwise the world would be perpetually racked with universal raw internecine violence, of which the constant violent mobility of the Muslim "democracies" do all the time expound in full view of all Humanity, in the XXI century. Further the obligation and the obedience to the Revealed precept of personal and collective purity is always associated with extreme violence in countries ruled with ideologies which have had their sources in the Old Testament. The politics of national purity pertains to Islam and to Judaism. It motivates the rulers of Christian Theocracies and of Fascist societies. In particular purity is a strong social requirement also in the offshoots of Christianity: Fascism and Communism, characterized by the forceful physical elimination of opponents who get thoroughly rubbed out of existence. The combination of purity and violence has been, throughout history, the common feature of all the intolerant religious and political ideologies.

The impossibility of a rational dialogue with the Muslim. The title calls for tolerance for it tells of a defining feature of the history of Islam. In its spread across the continents one does not come across of the publication of an in-depth dialogue between Islamic scholars and theologians and philosophers pertaining to the other two revealed religions, of to the proponents of mystical and philosophical intellectuals of the Orient, more specifically with the Indians. As a matter of Faith, of being in physical contact with God who literally dictated the words of the Holy Book, the Muslim claims the unique privilege of being a physical conveyer of the Divine knowledge. It is a claim which no follower of any other religion can marshal against the belief of the adamantine fusion of ordinary living with the words of God being immanent in the thought of the Believer. He holds Truth, rather *The* Truth, with a finality which nothing and nobody can ever controvert, all the more as it is a projection of Allah's *Taqdīr*.

That is why an in-depth dialogue with a Muslim is quite impossible: for indeed a dialogue can mean little, if anything, when one of the interlocutors, the Muslim, assumes that he is incontrovertibly right all the time, in tranquil concordance with his conviction that no debate or discussion can have an effect on his thought or belief as an expression of Allah's dictates. In addition to the assumption of being all the time right with his possession of the divine wisdom bestowed for the last time to Muhammad, the Muslim feels free to emulate the example of the Prophet with the free use of the *Taqiyya* in order to mislead the opponent. The word "taqiyya" does not appear in references made in the speeches of the Hindu leaders during the Independence movement. They were frequently frustrated by Jinnah's changing his ideas and his conceptions of the State of Pakistan, without any of his opponents being aware of his using the "Taqiyya" in his convoluted statements, in addition to his knowledge of British jurisprudence. Nor did Indira Gandhi realize that she was being opposed by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto in their discussions following the liberation of Bangladesh. She got outwitted by the *taqiyya* used by Bhutto who got the concessions which he desired, including the liberation, without any return compensation, of the ninety thousand Pakistani soldiers as

prisoners of war. Subsequently the several diplomatic agreements between the two countries got unraveled due mainly to the weakness of the Indian diplomats being unskilled in the use of *taqiyya* which comes easily to the Muslim as a legitimate 'moral' use of misrepresentation of the reality in a discussion or conversation with an opponent. In fact the history of Brahmanist India is replete with the weakness of the indigenous elite to deal the Islamic enemy using *taqiyya* and the British Christian using *duplicity* as a form of reasoning, in their respective encounters with the indigenous elites. British and American indologists have recorded the simplicity, the spontaneous honesty of the Hindus not disguising the amounts of the agricultural produce when the British collectors arrived fort the assessment of the taxes. The rural peasantry did not think of hiding the amount of agricultural produce in order to have any abatement of the heavy taxation, even in times of scarcity caused by climatic misfortunes. The spirit of thinking and speaking the Truth was deeply anchored in the minds of the common people. It was that vast stratum of Truth which responded to Mahatma Gandhi's *satyagraha* as s political force directed against the might of the British Empire.

In the Indian soldiery opposing the conquering force of the British army , the native military elite, in particular, proved to be defenseless and already half defeated, in particular, by their using a language utterly devoid of Machiavelian ambidexterity against the British forces manned by officers used to the effectiveness of duplicity in their mode of both civil and military operation. Moreover the history of the British prevailing proved their duplicity to be more effective against the Islamic *taqiyya*!

The rationale of the Muslim believing in his indisputable superiority. Certainly it is this sentiment of holding a set of absolute truths, of coinciding with the thought of the Supreme Deity, which confers upon the Muslim the independence, the unquestioned confidence of being right and, consequently, having as a matter of fact an insuperable superiority, in all situations, over the Disbeliever, over even the believers in Judaism and in Christianity. In addition the Muslim guards his claim to superiority

with the willing ignorance of his 'unbelieving' opponent's principles and ideals. Moreover he refuses to acquaint himself with the contents of the tenets of the Other. In the context of Indian history, Islam has been characterized by the Indian Muslim maintaining a righteous innocence in the face of the ravages he has wrought by the countless acts of iconoclasms and other cognate forms of spoliation carried out as acts of piety, in fealty to the injunctions of Allah.

The insensitivity of the Muslim against the totality of the indigenous civilization. In India no Muslim, learned or untutored, poet or historian, academic or politician, scientist or newspaper editor, has ever expressed the slightest regret, or any kind of painfulness, or remorse, for the immense loss of native Indian high art and architecture, for the destruction of all the centers of high learning and of thousands of temples. For such actions were determined by faithfulness to the injunctions prescribed by Allah. They were carried out by His proxies confident with the assurance of His assuring them of their innocence (**Quran 8.17**).[58] As a proxy of Allah, the killer or the destroyer acts with an unquestioned obedience steeped in innocence. He is not affected by the sufferer's pain. He exults in the execution of Allah's will. On the contrary, he feels assured of the reward which Allah keeps in store for him. With such a revealed verse conferring innocence upon the killer, the destroyer of temples and centers of learning, the arsonist of libraries, the perpetrator of genocides, the annihilator of pagan virtues, are shielded from any feeling of guilt. On the contrary, they are assured of a reward awarded by Allah. The proxy of Allah who kills innocent, defenseless men, women and children, while screaming *Allahu Akbar* is a banal murderous barbarian. He acts in imitation of the Nazi killer of Jews who, for the sake of keeping the pure Aryan State, advocated and willed by the Fuehrer Hitler, was not doing any high universalist

---

[58] **Quran 8.17**: "It is not ye who slew them; it was Allah; when thou, (Muhammad) threwest, it was not thy act, it was Allah's; in order that he might test the Believers by a gracious trial from Himself; for Allah it is who heareth, who knoweth."

benefaction. He was actually committing an abhorrent criminality, camouflaged as duty, as a rational loyalty to the State, as a nationalist service, as patriotism. The invincibility of the Allah-filled obdurate mentality, heartened by learned Imams, provides the pattern for the mimesis of that rationality which presided over what was practiced by the Nazis. Indeed in 1933 while serving as a junior assistant at the French Embassy in Berlin, Paul Claudel, who later became a most respected poet of France in the XX century, wrote, in his diary, after witnessing the rise of Hitler and the violent street movement of his followers: "C'est l'Islam!" (It's Islam!).

The difference between Islam and Nazism. The enormous cultural difference, between the action of the proxies of Allah and the dedication of the German people to the Nazi cause, consists of the perennial self-righteousness of the Muslims, in a vivid contrast with the elites and most of the population of Germany experiencing the cultural shock on being forced to confront the enormity of the national crime. Today ordinary Germans do not flinch from evincing a feeling of contrition and shame, in addition to the spirit of the public repentance expressed by several Heads of the Federal German Republic, in their expression of national atonement for the Judeocide perpetrated during World War II. In India, from within the Vote Banks and particularly from the Congress Party, no Muslim has expressed any remorse for all the devastation which the Believers have inflicted upon the civilization in the midst of which they chose to settle down. As invaders who did not settle in India, the British, who took a lot of wealth out of the country did, on the other hand, bequeath a lot of cultural beneficence.

Vice-Roy Lord Curzon, in the early years of the XX century, took pride in beautifying the sub-continent, in repairing the old broken down monuments, with the expectation that the Raj would last a very long time. He worked with the passion of leaving a legacy which would last for ages. He wanted India to be beautiful. No Muslim monarch, not even any of the three significant Moghuls, did ever muster so much as an iota of the high-

spirited idealism of Curzon. The Muslims settled in the sub-continent and lustily chose to *diminish* its sophisticated culture and, in particular, obliterated the wonder that was Buddhism. The monstrous inhumanity of Partition defined the spirit of Indian Islam for all time. The Germans have Meister Eckhart, Kleist, Rilke, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Schiller, Goethe, Beethoven, Brahms, Mozart, Richard Wagner to name only a few, to recover the pride and to atone for the crime of the Judeocide. What does Indian Islam and the proxies of Allah have to offer as a consolation and a compensation for all the destruction of so much Beauty, of so much Learning, of so many treasures built and accumulated with the inspiration of the loftiest thoughts of *Satyam, Śivam, Sundaram*?[59]

The psychological and rational differences between the Muslim and the Kaffir. It is consequently important, in the context of an appropriate view of Indian history and of the Indian people, to take cognizance of the consequences of the implementation of the Islamic Faith, in order to understand the psychology of the Muslim undergirding his Quran-centric contempt for the indigenous spiritualities and his indifference to the mystical finalities of human existence which they prescribe. For it would be on the vantage ground of such a knowledge that the Brahmanist can be entitled to demand from the Muslim the imperative to cultivate a symmetrically commensurate perception of the merits and virtues inherent to the indigenous Dharmas: the Brahmanist, the Buddhist and the Jaina. Concurrently the ostriches pertaining to the culture of the indigenous Dharmas would need to lift their heads off the sands of *sarva dharma sama bhāva* and patiently delve into the studies of the Quran, of the Sira, of the Sharia, of the Hadiths. In the "normal", quiet, social

[59] Ever proud of all the ravages and the humiliations barbarously inflicted on the indigenous cultural institutions of India, including the many Universities of the Hindus and the Buddhists, the Indian Muslims, finally compelled to own their cultural deficiency, appealed to the British Empire to establish the Aligarh Muslim University in 1920.

surroundings, the Muslim is verily like an iceberg floating on the surface of the ocean. Most of the time, the Harbi Kaffir comes into contact with the small part of the iceberg above the surface of the sea. That is why the task of being acquainted with the content, the ethos, the gratuitous claim of Islam's theological preeminence, pertaining to the fundamentals of its scriptures, calls for the native Indian, most responsibly the Brahmanist, to acquire the knowledge, the will and the ability to delve below the *bhai-bhai vote-bank-vote-bank* pro-Muslim jargon favoring the visible top floating over the ocean which hides the real mass of the Islamic iceberg where are stored the exclusivism and the contempt for anything related to the Kaffir. Only then can the right cognizance of the hitherto hidden mass of the Muslim Iceberg be felt to be complete with the conviction that it shelters the lava and the fire which explodes with Allah's lighting the fuse with the promise of heavenly delights, when the occasion demands it, either for the exertion of iconoclasm, or of a riot, or of a Partition, or for the Allah-sanctioned violence against the Other on all occasions. In the mass of the individual Muslim Ice-berg, there is absolutely nothing from which the native Indian can draw as a desired addition to the Beauty, the Goodness and the Truth legacy bequeathed by the noble contemplatives and sages of yore.

Yet in more than a thousand years the Brahmanist, the Buddhist and the Jaina, have still not grasped that the tip of the Iceberg has always been a mirage, a component of *Māyā,* which screens off the curiosity to discover the womb which gives birth to the political Islam of iconoclasm, intolerance, ignorance, of the perverse will to wage war on *Dar-ul-Harb*, of the obsessive desire of Allah to inflict painful dooms on Kaffirs.

The tragic self-delusion of the Brahmanists in seeing a snake and calling it a rope. The Advaita Vedānta concept of *Māyā* is undoubtedly the most felicitous category of Reason in the history of all Oriental and Western philosophies. The best example of a highly educated, immensely idealistic Brahmanist, who, despite his *Discovery of India,* entertained his unconditional affection for the Muslims, and lately despite the wars which

the Muslim power waged against his government, did till the end hold on to an inverted *Māyā* and, till the end of his existence, kept seeing oand calling the snake as a rope. This perception of Jawaharlal Nehru, the illustrious hero of the India of the XX century, is a sincere tribute to the nobility of his character and of his politics. In reality it is a reflection on the shabby level of Muslim insensitivity. The three wars waged against the India led by Nehru testify to his singularly elevated virtue being unrewarded by the largely ungrateful and undeserving Islamic community unmoved by so much tolerant generosity.

When Brahmanists inverted the Māyā in their vision. Yet, in their history, mainly in reference to their interaction with the Muslims, the Brahmanists have failed to acknowledge their own self-delusion, in their reverse *Māyā* which, lasting for about a thousand years, led them to repeatedly see the snake and to obstinately call it a rope.

It is evident that the Indian educated middle class offers the spectacle of agreeable social communication, of collaboration, of exchanges of the graces of polite, refined activities marked by the elegance of behaviour, of the humane sharing of the pleasures of material conveniences as well as of the generosities of shared obligations. In particular Muslims are always prompt to emphasize their contributions in the military actions against their co-believing Pakistanis as proofs of their loyalty to the Indian state.[60] But, unfortunately, there is always the lingering dubiousness in the mind of the indigenous Indian who feels that there is something missing in the cordiality, in the collaboration, in the sharing of danger as well as of

---

[60] In such cases the Muslims who die in wars against Pakistan do so as protection, not only of the Hindu majority, but also of the Indian Muslims who outnumber their attacking Pakistani co-religionists. The question still nags the Indian Muslims who, in a war with a Muslim country like Pakistan, ought, according to Islamic jurisprudence, to take up arms against India. Such a Muslim obligation has not been a subject for a theological debate in India.

comfort, in the psychology of his Muslim neighbor. After all, after more than ten centuries of co-existence, neighbors did become enemies suddenly when the time came for their trisection of the sub-continent. If indeed *that co-habitation was genuine friendship*, then the sudden vanishing of neighborly fellow feeling at the time of Partition belied the traditional conviction that authentic friendship never dies. This ideal of eternal friendship which eludes the right understanding of the Muslim is often ignored. Otherwise, if ever such a friendship did exist, no explanation has been forthcoming to explain why and how it got so easily discarded from the Muslim's mind during the first half of the XX century. And what assurance given by the Muslim mind can fully impart confidence and trust in social interactions, in the habit of cordiality and of the assumed friendship availing today with the certainty of lasting forever? And those who stayed in India, after the Partition, did not stay out of friendship with, or love for, their Hindu neighbors. They stayed because they suddenly found it difficult or physically impossible, or too onerous, for them to leave and settle down in an unknown spot, in the distance where a different social economy prevailed. They felt constrained to remain with the Congress Party, which they had earlier abominated, but now, ingesting their self-defeat, they found it possible to park their hypocrisy, mingled with consolation and self-pity, in the Vote Bank in order to preserve their lasting exclusivism.[61]

Meanwhile the superficiality of social concord consists of the veneer of *Bhai-Bhaiism* which, with the seductiveness exerted by the tip of the Muslim iceberg, obstructs, in the Other who is beguiled by appearance, the perception of the hidden realities in the bulkier, submerged mass of the iceberg. It is this hidden allotment of Muslim sharia-centric political authenticity which lies unseen and ignored in the background of social

---

[61] The film *Garam Hawa,* based on a script by Kaifi Azmi, persuasively describes the opportunism of the disconcerted Muslim League masses opportunistically joining the Congress Party.

grace and amicable concurrence. The hidden mass of the iceberg has always been the dormant volcano with its lava always ready to burst forth with Allah intervening and calling. Otherwise today one would not be able to grasp the fact that a community which, in its vast majority, is composed of converted Hindus, would, despite an Islamic-Kaffir cohabiting presence spanning a period of about twelve centuries, suddenly explode with volcanic hatred into a Partition characterized by the most brutal and destructive violence upon, and by, neighbors who get displaced to the order of fifteen million men, women and children, in addition to a million killed and tens of thousands of women getting raped.

The question of Muslim identity. After twelve centuries the reality of the specific, genuine Indian Muslim identity revealed its reality when it burst forth with a volcanic force in 1946-47. It proved, once for all time, that Islam cannot generate, and indeed has never generated, a creative and peaceful legacy of concord and lasting tranquility in its contact with a community, any community, living according to different aesthetic and moral standards and imperatives. Islam has established this exclusivist reputation and maintained it during the past fourteen centuries. It could not do otherwise, since the Divine Revelation is and remains perfect for all time irrespective of the changes born from the womb of Time.

Ironically produced by Time, this inadequacy has, during the last four decades, further manifested itself, within European host societies, in a whole spectrum of terroristic acts and of the novelty of legal jihadism against intellectuals resisting assaults against their traditional, national identity. The Islamic minorities do not have any legal justification to protest against the intellectuals of the European host societies using the freedom of expression, guaranteed by their national constitutions, to criticize certain Islamic practices, like the consumption of *hallal,* and the wearing of the *burqa*.

But the same European societies do have stern laws against offences related to race and racial prejudice. The Muslim groups seize upon these anti-racial laws to accuse their critics of racism by the turning of Islam into

a *race,* and, as they are well funded, do not hesitate to harass their critics and accuse them of racial hatred as Islamophobia, as hatred levelled against Muslims as a people. By interpreting, for example, the law against racism, deliberately twisting it into law against racism, and replacing the word "racism" by Islam meaning a people, they acquire a legal tool to harass the critics, mostly journalists, by accusing them of "islamophobia", that is, of hatred against the Muslims. By using the Law against racism they deliberately twist the criticism of certain Islamic religious practices, and represent it as a criticism of the Muslims practicing their faith. France has stringent anti-racial laws. But the criticism of religious ideas is allowed as a freedom guaranteed by law which, however, condemns the criticism of the Believer's personal practice of his belief. The fundamentalist Muslims seize upon this law and interpret the criticism of the religious ideas as contrary to the Muslims as persons practicing their faith. The law favoring the criticism of religions is turned upside down as a law against Muslims as persons, as an *islamophobia*. Invariably the cases brought to court end up with the acquittal of the journalists or writers accused of islamophobia. But the harassment by means of repeated litigation takes a toll on the defenders, especially on account of the legal expenses incurred for the defense, while the Muslim groups are funded by overseas donors. The legal costs which the wrongly accused have to bear do constitute an obstacle to their determination to preserve the freedom of free criticism so long as it does not cause any moral or material harm. Hence, particularly in France, the expression 'legal jihadism' has become a commonplace in newspapers and in ordinary civic discourse.

Europeans did not imagine that Islam would pose a threat to their cultures when they allowed migrant workers in for the post-World-War-II reconstruction. The installation of a rough form of rotten decadence emerging from the presence of a lumpish community of Muslims driven by the call of a fundamentalist Islam has slowly, but irremediably, wasted old respectable neighborhoods in France. These wrecking minorities hail from Africa, the Middle East, South and East Asia: they enact the traditional Muslim mobility paradoxically inspired and maintained by the obligation

of the Haj to the sacred Kaba in Mecca. The pilgrimage sets the spiritual center of gravity of the Muslim, not in his individual self, but in distant Mecca. Accordingly the Believer lives with a constant feeling of an incompleteness which stirs his wandering, which he effects, not within the Umma, but outside it, towards non-Islamic ''empty'' spaces.

No one in Europe today seems capable of envisaging a repetition of the victory at Poitiers in 732 when Charles the Hammer stopped the invasion of France by the Arab army led by the Omayyad Abder Rehman. The insidious cunning of the present mobility consists of the Muslim using the laws of West European democracies against their own native defenders and protectors. Europe is defenseless against the novelty of a juridical Judo invented by its Muslim minorities. The Imam who said: *''We shall defeat you by using your laws. After defeating you, we shall subjugate you by using our Sharia!*'' was not entirely wrong. His fierce statement was the equivalent of the fundamentalist Pakistani Muslim jubilating, after Partition, with: *''We have got Pakistan by laughing; we shall get Hindustan by fighting!*''

The concomitance of state purity and ethnic violence. Certainly it is more than the intolerance resulting from their religious belief which required the Pakistanis to maintain, as a natural necessity, the purity of their State. The name Pakistan itself means "Pure State". It required the cleansing, in particular, of the impurities of their Hindu and Sikh minorities and reducing the latter to near extinction as minorities. The purification campaign started almost immediately after 14 August 1947. Independently of any Kaffir influence the ethnic cleansing of the minorities was carried out by the educated, anglicized elite of Pakistan, as a perfectioning of the Theocracy for which the majority had led the movement for the Partition. The latter acted with the same preoccupation with social and state purity as did the Nazis in Germany with their glorification of the Aryan race. Of the nine members of the committee of high Nazi officials who met in the Wannsee Conference, in Berlin, in 1942, to discuss and plan the extermination of the European Jews, six were holders of Ph.Ds. They

represented a compelling example of a universally recognized level of high knowledge having absolutely no Compassion as a corresponding concomitant. In a terrible imitation of the Nazi Germans, the Khmers Rouges of Communist Cambodia methodically and with unencumbered zeal eliminated all bourgeois impurities. During the 1950s the Fascist regimes in Latin America were motivated by the urgency of exterminating the communist virus. An earlier example of ethnic purification consisted of the elimination of the aristocracy in Russia by the followers of Lenin in the Bolshevik revolution. In China the great Leap Forward of 1959-1963 resulted in a famine which made forty-five million victims. It was an inhumane disaster imposed ruthlessly on the dispensable proletariat in China by the despotic will of Mao Tse Toung, who imagined his country to be a canvas on which he had to paint the original pure State of his imagination. The criminal feature of national purity has been the characteristic mode of functioning of absolutist regimes dispensing Fascist and Communist ideologies. The minorities have almost disappeared in Pakistan (Pure State). Even the few who remain are classified as second class citizens according to the constitutional jurisprudence. In the Pure State a non-Muslim does not have the right to hold the supreme position of national state President. This exception prevails also against the Ahmadiyas who have been legally deprived of their claim and of their status as a Muslim community. For the Ahmadiyas it has been a galling irony, for they were ardent advocates of the Partition of the sub-continent and for the establishment of an independent, pure Islamic state. The second class status of the Brahmanists and of the Sikhs in Theocratic Pakistan will always remind the non-Muslims of India of the deluding frailty of any social benefit assumed to result from the vacuous *sarva dharma sama bhāva.* If the uses of History are welcomed as lessons for avoiding the repetition of past errors, it then behooves the contemporary Indian to remember that the cleansing of minorities in Pakistan has been carried out by those who were communally homogeneous with the Indian Muslims who did not, or could not, leave. The frontier, does not, and has not, in any way, suddenly generated a sea change in the mentality and the religiosity

of those who live on its Indian side. In reality the Minar-e-Pakistan in Lahore stores, without any diminution, its relevance as a pawn held by the Muslims of the three countries: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh.

The fake existence of a moderate Islam. The above mentioned minorities leave to posterity, in the present state of the world, the example of Muslims being unable to foster and develop intellectual categories and emotional modes of creative co-existence with citizens belonging to a different culture and way of life. The case of Pakistan is all the more striking for it is constituted of a population composed, in its vast majority, of Hindu converts and descendants of Hindu converts. Despite its having assumed an irreversible demonic intensity, the hatred of the Hindu practiced by the Muslim, as the convert from the Hindu culture, has not been deemed sufficiently worthy of study by Indian academic sociologists. It is a fact which is historically vindicated in other cultures too. The harshest fanatical, unforgiving inquisitor of the Spanish Inquisition, Torquemada, belonged to a family of ''reformados'', that is, of converted Jews. Hindu-hating Muslim leaders like Aurangzeb, Bhutto, Jinnah were children of Hindu mothers. It stumps the mind that this banal fact has not been internalized by the Hindu elites, even after the storm of collective frenzy swept across most of northern and central India one more time in 1946-47.

The discordance between the acclaimed perfection of the Islamic revelation and the practice of hate-filled belief. The commitment to the Believer's Covenant with God is further strengthened with the compliance with the Surahs of the Quran being assumed to have been physically written by Allah before Creation. With the unquestioned conviction that the contents of the Book are eternally true, perfect and unchangeable, the Muslim feels eminently superior to the 'pagans', to the Kaffirs, that is, to

the totality of all the Indians who adhere to the teachings conveyed by scriptures written, orally taught and transmitted by humans pertaining to the Brahmanist, Buddhist and Jaina Dharmas. In fact in all the lands which they have brought under their political domination the Muslims have treated the Christians and the Jews with as much frenetic contempt, as unbelieving hypocrites, as they have towards Kaffirs, like the Indians. That is one more reason for Indians to be sufficiently acquainted with the historically unverified assumption, that all that needs to be known for the good life is contained in the pronouncements of the Quran, which close the Muslim mind, not only with indifference to, but more so, with contempt for, the beliefs of all Others. Throughout the history of Islam this contempt has been expressed with raw violence, expulsion of non-Muslim minorities, by wars, by physical liquidation. The elimination of minorities or of non-Muslims is invariably total, leaving no possibility to the victims for a return or a rehabilitation.

The definition of morality. In reality, the exemplary norms of a sophisticated civilized nation confirm that the individual human being's action cannot be genuinely moral when it derives, not originally from within himself, but from the obedience to a source external to the individual's consciousness. It is not originally, authentically moral, even if this source be the Quran, as the source of Allah's commands and laws designed for the submission of the Believer's to walk along the Straight Path. The Believer who expresses his thoughts and actions, with approving reference to the revealed verses of the Quran, does so as a repeater of words written in a Book. He enacts similitude in reference to an already principle or law. He does not express his own original thinking and acting stemming from his personal conscience. He does only transmit to the relevant particular occasion words written by the author of the Book. He thereby abdicates personal responsibility. The act of remembering or repeating of the related contents of the Book do not constitute a personal moral action, however much it may win the approbation of the multitude. It cannot be otherwise for the laws, rules and principles prescribed by the Quran are designed for the Umma and for collective practice, not for the

individual guiding himself with the autonomous direction of his individual conscience.

According to the Dharmas, the moral act derives from the individual's responsibility for the moral content and awareness of his action in sitting, in walking, in speaking.[62] The Dharmas are not collections of dogmas erected as calls which the devotee has to *obey* and to which he has to *conform*. He is the sole, independent, autonomous generator of the morality of what he does and does not do, of what he becomes and does not become, of what he is and what he is not.

The contrast becomes immense with the Holy Book vehemently enjoining upon the faithful to wage war against the Disbelieving Infidels, who, as such, are decreed by Allah as being irrevocably wrong and do not deserve to exist. The Muslim does not adopt an attitude of indifference towards the behavior or belief of the Other. He is enjoined to physically eliminate the Other by force, not by persuasion. Before Muhammad claiming he had received from Angel Gabriel the new, perfect revelation, the three communities, that is, the Jews, the Christians and the polytheistic Arabs, had been living in a relatively peaceful co-existence. The social violence suddenly bursts forth with the arrival of Angel Gabriel and his murmuring in the ear of Muhammad and his implementing what he announced to be the genuine revelation being imparted for the last time for the benefit of all Humanity. The zeal for the purifying of the whole world with the establishment of the laws of Islam still animates Muslims, particularly these days, the Believers following the Muslim Brotherhood. Indeed the Quran teems with verses spelling a doom to the unbeliever. Yet with the availability of a doom being assured to the unBeliever, it makes one wonder why this assurance would not infuse the Muslim's mind with a

---

[62] These three activities refer to the *Bhagavad Gītā* (**2.53**) where Arjuna asks Śrī Kṛṣṇa how does the perfect moral man sit, walk, speak. The answer lies in the following eighteen verses.

contemplation of Allah quietly exerting, by using His own cosmic resources, the necessary doom as His sole responsibility. By so doing Allah would leave the Believer solely responsible to implement his own moral act and leave it to the sovereignty and the *Taqdīr* to Allah hurling the deserving doom to the non-Believer. Instead the Believer justifies his faith with the physical liquidation of the Infidel's presence in his neighborhood, as occurs in such pseudo-democracies as Pakistan and Bangladesh. But, the evidence of history aiding, the indifference to, and the patient waiting for, the divine doom, does not restrain the hand of the believer who revel, as the proxy of God, in the exertion of his iconoclastic and violent *Dīn*. In brief, Islam is the only religion which advocates, with faithful implementation throughout History, the unprovoked, obligatory liquidation of the Other, as a sacred duty. Such a religious disposition is fundamentally evil.

The reversal of the concept of Islamophobia. Today, in principle, the revealed command still binds the Umma to wage war against the seven billion of Harbi non-believers with the purpose of converting the world into a *Dar-ul-Islam*. It is immaterial whether such a goal is or is not realizable. Nevertheless it is taught in the tens of thousands of madrassas active among the number of Muslim communities which comprise the Umma. They nurture the vision of a world Islam by means of the appropriate training of the minds of the madrassa alumni for readiness to manifest itself in jihadic violence as devotion to the will of Allah.

Muslims nowadays pretend not to acknowledge the purport of this divine expectation in the ever ready hatred of the Other in their collective psychology. But while not feeling the need to examine why, of all minorities, it is only the Islamic which provokes conflict, anger, fear, hostility, among host societies, Muslim intellectuals, academics, historians, journalists, do not hesitate to oppose valid criticism of their hostility to the laws and mores of their host societies by construing it as Islamophobia. Indeed they prevail against their host society by raising the outcry of a reverse self-righteous indignation. It is astounding to witness

the Muslim cunning of inverting the laws and subverting the culture of their host society into their victimhood. The banal fact of the Quranic xenophobia which has inspired the countless acts of iconoclasm in all the cultures destroyed by Muslims, wherever they chose to settle, still remains unstudied, unreported and unexposed to the reading public across the whole world and most importantly in India.[63] While, of all past and present Scriptures, it is only the Quran which earnestly instructs the follower to hate and harm the Other, it is paradoxical that it is the migrant, guest Muslims who do not hesitate, with unlimited self-righteousness, to denounce as Islamophobia the mildest criticism of their disturbing the quietude of their host societies. They do so despite, or rather because they have, the easy access to newspapers, to the oral and visual media, and to all the freedoms guaranteed by secular, liberal constitutions.

There is only one Islam. Ferhat Mehenni, the Kabyl Poet and President of the Provisional Government of Kabylie, and now living in exile in France, says: *''Islam is Islamism at rest, and Islamism is Islam in motion*.''[64] This critical observation by a believing Muslim living in the midst of the secular French society throws light on the attitude of the believer towards the Other. Traditionally, in the perspective of an interreligious encounter with the non-Muslim, the faithful Muslim remains impervious to the sentiment of the non-Muslim, often without being in the least aware of the latter's indifference to his monotheistic faith. Yet, however exalted may be the Believer's view of the divine injunction for him to manifest, as a sacred duty, hatred and to exert corresponding violence against the Kaffir, the Brahmanist, for example, out of a culturally inherited loyalty to his conscience, would remain unaffected, in thought and in deed, by the antagonistic Islamic pronouncement. The Brahmanist does not feel the

---

[63] It is deplorable that no standard history of the Buddhism of Bengal is available.

[64] Hamid Hanaz, Islamisme. Comment l'Occident creuse sa tombe. Les Editions de Paris, Max Chaleil, 2013. Collectif, p.10. Ferhat Mehenni: *"L'Islam, c'est l'Islamisme au repos, et l'Islamisme, c'est l'Islam en movement."*

need to refer to his scriptures in order to refute the revealed injunction for violence against him. He finds solace ordinarily in the common sense of what is right and what is wrong. Besides he would indeed consent to go to Hell as a punishment for his evil Karma.

But he will not find ground to go to Hell just because he happens to be a Kaffir in the eye of the Believer or of Allah, all the more if he happens to lead a life of beneficence in the service of all Humanity. The Indian Muslim never became fully cognizant of Mahatma Gandhi's *satyagrahis* accepting blows and broken bones without manifesting any anger against the servile upholder of British rule. Indeed what resource is available to the Muslim for enabling him to understand the Gandhian way, unique in world history, of doing politics without violence or war? The Quran and the Hadiths do not provide any instruction to the Believer for the practice of the virtue of self-denial or of self-sacrifice as a reminder to the oppressor of his evil conduct. Nehru writes movingly when he saw his mother being ill-treated by the slavish armed Indian policemen while she was taking part in a procession protesting against the British rule. He quelled the raging anger rising within him and remained silent by reminding himself of the obedience to the directive issued by the Mahatma that the *satyagrahi* should not show any anger in any circumstance. Nor did the majority of the Indian Muslims ever could express any appreciation of the Mahatma never saying a word of hatred, either in writing or in a speech, directed at the British. The Muslim League leaders, with the backing of the heavy majority of the Indian Muslims, poured contempt on the pacifism of the Congress Party led by Mahatma Gandhi who was only implementing the humane values of the indigenous Dharmas as his political ideology in response to the prevailing circumstances. The League leaders were acting like authentic, faithful Muslims in accordance with the spirit of the revealed laws and principles which naturally advocate violence as a compulsory duty against any form or nature of the Other, however genuinely moral and peaceful it can be.

The absence of records of any possible conversation between Brahmanist leaders and Muslim theologians. But the absurdity of the revelation impelling the Believer to exert hatred and hostility against the non-Muslim, as rectitude maintained in abiding by the Straight Path, lies beyond the pale of the Dharma on which the Brahmanist settles his consciousness. In India today most of the time the common sharing of secular values appears, as a matter of habit, in social intercourse. Yet there is no recorded and published evidence of any in-depth dialogue or debate between proponents of the Dharmas and Islamic theologians. This is astonishing in consideration of the perennial antagonism having its origin in the Quranic polemizing exclusiveness and in the vehemence of the obloquy of the indigenous spiritualities.

In particular relation to the history of Islam, the absence of the use of moral and intellectual persuasions hides the ideas, feelings, reasons, which, in the depths of the Muslim's consciousness, constitute the volcano which erupts with murderous violence as the resolution of a politico-theological dilemma. Moderate Islam, as the veneer of politeness and of socio-political cooperation does, most of the time, maintain the illusion of friendship, of mutual understanding; it fosters a working sentiment of being together, without any thought or suspicion of estrangement. But it is only a veneer. For, on the ground, allied to the "*allah Ishwar terā nām*" Hinduism, the Moderate Muslim, if such an individual ever existed, did not stop the juggernaut of the Muslim League led by Jinnah arbitrarily claiming to be the sole genuine leader of all Indian Muslims.

The characteristic lack of curiosity of the Muslim mind in the culture of the Other. But the ethic of civility does not truly express the existential wholeness of the Muslim's civility. For his primary loyalty consists in never wishing the abrogation of any of the choleric verses that the Quran prescribes, in utter disregard of his Kaffir neighbor or friend, or colleague. It is the harsh scriptural Quranic insensitivity which constantly tests the patience and the tolerance of the practitioner of the indigenous Dharmas. It baffles the mind that even the elites of the Sangha Parivar restrain

themselves from engaging in in-depth studies of Islam in their dealing with Muslim conservatives who base their identity on their right to own the Sharia. It is significant that no Brahmanist intellectual has deemed it necessary, even after the storm of the Partition, to study the Arabic or Persian language in order to engage in fruitful debates with Islamic theologians. Of a political and moral necessity it behooves the Brahmanist, above all, to be duly conversant with the Islamic totalitarian intolerant political ideology cloaked with the gossamer tissue of a revealed religiosity. Indeed it is incumbent for him to fulfill this responsibility although the Muslim be expected to dwell within the cocoon of his persuasion in the perfect boon received as the revealed laws and principles of his conduct and the promise of unlimited sensuous delights in the Islamic Heaven.

The substantial difference between the Muslim hegemony and the British supremacy. The striking difference between the Muslim hegemony and the British supremacy over the Indians consists in the curiosity manifested by a long line of Directors of the East India Company in the study and the revival of Sanskrit and in the exploration of the history of the country and of its indigenous population. Apart from the very few exceptions which did not establish a continuous, identifiable cultural strain, the Muslims did not, in like measure, elicit any curiosity to understand the indigenous cultures. On the contrary the Muslims viewed the stupendous spectacle of the fully developed plurality of cultural perfections as desirable objects calling for their immediate disappearance, in the execution of which, the Muslims directed themselves with the exhilarating effusiveness of wielding their sword followed by hammer and torch for the perpetration of iconoclastic frenzies.[65]

---

[65] The chasm which separates the Indian Muslim from the British can be measured by the Indian Mussalman who, after having obliterated all the Universities of the centuries old vibrant universities of the Buddhists and the Hindus, suddenly feeling the anguish due to the absence of culture within his community, sought the help and the favour of the British power to confer the benefit of an educational institution as the Anglo-Oriental College in 1875, elevated in 1920 as the

The popularity of the closed-mindedness of the Muslim community. The trait of closed-mindedness is evident also among the Muslim minorities settled in the midst of secular, liberal democracies of Europe. In addition to their lack of intellectual curiosity, the Muslims, with few significant exceptions, do, in their majority not experience any affinity with the beauties of the arts and literatures of the Disbelievers. Not only do they characterize themselves by indifference to the aesthetic products of the Others, the Muslims actually feel an immediate revulsion for the Beauty and the Goodness associated with the Other's heritage. Moreover they willfully comply with their own unfeeling by the obliteration of what offends their in-drawn Islamic sensibility and its correspondingly narrow *Weltanschauung*. In India no Muslim has published a book on the pre-Islamic arts and literatures of the sub-continent. Still less have the Indian Muslims written anything which could be viewed even as the expression of their iconoclasm.[66] As an ingredient of their culture, the lack of curiosity in the Other's way of life has been the product of the collective feeling of self-sufficiency in the submission to a God-indicated way of life. Throughout their history they have affirmed their religious preponderance by surrendering to the exhilaration of iconoclastic enthusiasm against the Kaffir civilization. On the other hand, in a revealing contrast, the British did generate the intellectual curiosity and passion for archeology and actively undertook the revival of the Sanskrit lore which had been driven underground by the Quran inspired intolerance. It was an intolerance which was enforced by a militarily strong minority imposing *dhimmitude* and *jaziya* upon the defeated majority. Fate acted with similitude when

---

Aligarh Muslim University. The AMU proved to be an active center of activity promoting the Muslim popular demand for the Partition.

[66] Up to the year 1960, the Library of the Banaras Hindu University did not have, on the shelves reserved for Philosophy, a single book on Indian Philosophy by an academic Muslim author. Till that time no Muslim scholar in Philosophy took part in any of the regular national Philosophy conventions.

the militarily strong British power subjugated and curbed the power of the effete Muslim majority power in the XVIII century.

The mutual ignorance of each of the two communities. The Brahmanist's ignorance of Islamic scholarship and of Islamic scriptures, symmetrical with the Muslim's ignorance of the fundamentals of the indigenous Dharmas, represent the double layered chasm which keeps apart the two major communities. The Brahmanist may claim innocence for his ignorance of Islamic lore because the learned class, composed mostly of the Brāhmaṇas, got driven underground by the forces of persecution. Hence human ostriches proliferated, and still do so, on both sides of the divide. This mutual ignorance contrasts with the curiosity of the directors of the East India Company who, on their own, decided to explore the fundamentals of the original culture and the history of the sub-continent going back to even the pre-Vedic Time. It was the dedication of the British archeologists which led to the unveiling of the Harappan civilization. [67]

Common to both breeds of Ostriches the Kali Yuga unfurls centuries of social intercourse while, with each depending upon its specific independent reason, they keep their heads stuck in the sands of their respective intellectual self-sufficiency. The present essay is an attempt, and more so, an invitation to the Brahmanist, to address the need for the study of the Theology and Jurisprudence of Islam, in order to acquire the right knowledge and the right perception of the divide needed for the right organization of the future of the Indian civilization. To do justice to the history of Indian Islam in relation to the Kaffir Dharmas, it is not sufficient to rely on the discourses of the politicians on both sides of the divide, especially so long as these exchanges are carried out in electoral, parliamentary and media debates. The need is to gain access to the

[67] It is indeed ironic that Pakistan would claim historic filiation with the Harappan civilization. It offers the evidence of some space for absurdity in the fundamentalist Suni Islamic mind.

fundamentals of Islam and to bring forth to what extent it is not theologically possible to bring about a lasting harmonious co-existence when Islam, the Islam of the Quran and of the Hadiths, remains a set of doctrines which, conceived and transmitted by Allah, expressly enjoin upon the Believers to abominate the non-Believers. All forms of social congeniality, like participation in festive celebrations, may be indulged in without the participants forgetting the revelations for hatred of the Kaffir, to which the Indian Muslim submits faithfully. **Quran, 9.5** expressly, unambiguously commands the Believer to slay the Disbelievers immediately after the period of the Fasting during the Ramadan! Most Hindu writers in the English language media project most of the time a near total ignorance of the Revealed verses in the Quran and of the Hadith and the Sira of Muhammad. It is an ignorance which is matched by the Muslim's ignorance of the fundamentals of the native Dharmas.

The advantage of the 1950 Constitution. The freedoms which the Constitution guarantees provide to the Kaffir the right to the free exploration and criticism of the totality of the Islamic scriptures and of the politics of the Prophet determined by the revelations. A very large part of the Quran is directed to the Disbeliever and to the doom which Allah reserves as punishment of anyone who does not recognize the authority of the laws required for walking along the Straight Path inscribed in the very first Surah of the Quran, which constitutes the beginning of the obligatory prayer said five times every day.

The Constitutional protection of the freedom of expression and of belief extends to the criticism of the Constitution itself. In particular the citizen owns the fullest freedom to argue in favor of the belief that there is no equality among the indigenous Dharmas and the three revealed dispensations. Primarily there is no equality with the man-made Dharmas and the Divine Revelations of the three religions which have their origins in the Old Testament of the Bible. The freedom to explore and accordingly to express critical preferences and convictions must not be qualified as prejudice or phobia, or as a contravention of the constitutional right of

belief or of expression, or of conscience. The criticism of religion and of theology falls within the purview of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, with the proviso that these freedoms do not extend to the criticism of the citizen's practice of his faith.

In this regard the Quran, arbitrarily claiming perfection and superiority over all extant philosophies and theologies, confers upon the Muslim the privilege and the right to believe that, in India, only he knows the Truth, compared to which all other claims to truth are errors and lead to sinful conduct, offensive to Allah-Jehovah. But, according to the provisions of the Constitution he would not be able to act accordingly to the detriment of the person of the non-Muslim and of his dependents. Nor does the Constitution allow the Muslim to put to practice his iconoclastic fervor in deed and in speech, according to the prescriptions of the Islamic scriptures. The Constitution grants freedom to the Muslim to believe according to the Revelation, so long as this belief does not cause any prejudice to the Non-Muslim. Further there is no equality in the moral and spiritual cultures obtaining within the Indian nation which harbors the two main religious communities. The lives of the Jewish, Christian and Islamic communities are determined in harmony with their common dualistic cosmology corresponding to their specific psychology and philosophical anthropology and, prescribed by each, to the finality of human existence.

On the other hand, the individuals - the Brahmanist, the Buddhist, the Jaina - belonging to the indigenous Dharmas happen to be endowed with a distinctive mystical anthropology corresponding to their unitive cosmology, to the One, that is, the view of all that exists is the One, beside which there is no-thing whatsoever. These differences determine the behavior of the individual in the family and in the social environment. They regulate the moral presupposition and the interpretation of civic duties, the perception and the effectiveness of the State, the eschatology of the inhabitants' ways of living. In a broad perspective, the complexity of the divergences, prevailing among the dualities rooted in the Biblical prophetic traditions in contradistinction from the monistic mysticisms of the

Dharmas, functions most of the time with a measure of give and take, with a habit of social harmony which nevertheless hides the hidden undercurrents of absolute irreducible, silent certitudes.

The eternal duration of the chasm separating the two main communities. In the present socio-political climate there is no internal resource within the Islamic dispensation and in its history to lend credence to the hope of an amicable relationship with the unrevealed mystical traditions of the Kaffir Devotees to the One. In India the believer in the Quran, which God revealed, cannot in practice consent to his faithful submission to Allah being equal to the belief of the native follower of a Mythic Deity or of the contents of sacred texts written by human hands. In a court of law, the witness who swears on the Quran cannot, and will never, in his heart, consent equality of his conviction with the belief of the Kaffir who swears on the *Bhagavad Gītā* which has been written by a human being. It would be a blasphemy for the Muslim to grant equality of the prestige and authority of the *Bhagavad Gītā* to the Quran and the Hadiths. Mahatma Gandhi's singing *''Allah Ishwar terā nām*!'' in his regular, afternoon prayers, never had an echo in any Masjid. There is no historical record of any of his Muslim collaborators singing his refrain in public, with the assurance and self-confidence of not committing any blasphemy.

Since the 1970s it teases the mind that, while the Muslim minorities willingly beleaguer the national cultures of Europe with enormous stresses and strains offending the identities of the host peoples, the ethnocentrism of the European elites ironically persist with a myopia which blankets their curiosity from grasping the case of India which earlier had suffered kindred diminution and inferiority under the domination of Islamic rule. Today the historian and the sociologist can contemplate the unique spectacle of the creeping encroachment of an inferior Islamic presence, which culturally has little to offer beside *hallal* and *burqa,* successfully writing one sorry embroidery more on the tapestry of the superior, secular, democratic, Enlightenment which, with immense labour and sacrifice, still adorns the continent of Europe.

When and where a minority prevails in reducing a majority to an inferior status. In *Le Mal Français*, (The French Sickness), Alain Peyrefitte, the Home Minister in the Government of General De Gaulle, correctly analyses the history of Quebec and concludes that the *majority* Francophone province was *infériorisée* (reduced to an inferior status) and kept backward by the domination of the English *minority* community which prevailed by means of its economic superiority in alliance with the collaboration of the Roman Catholic Church. That is also what happened to India with the Muslim *minority* successfully ravaging the *majority* indigenous civilization, to which the stone ruins which litter the Indian soil bear abundant mute testimony. In a similar fashion the Muslim minorities in Europe have already established in the mind of the elites of their hosts a widely shared feeling of gloom and an apprehension of their culture being under siege. The apprehension results from the emerging awareness of the hitherto unforeseen prevalence of a fundamentalist, Sharia-centric Islam rising unexpectedly, like a monstrous deformity, from the generous, but self-interested, welcoming, during the decades following the World War II, of Muslim migrant workers and professionals from Africa, the Middle East, and from South Asia.

The comparative approach which constitutes the fabric and the purpose of this essay will necessarily expose the reality of the displacement, *of the retreat and of the diminution of sophisticated cultures resulting from the demographic and socio-political pressures exerted by culturally inferior minorities*. While Jean Jacques Rousseau asserts that the immigrant is duty bound to abide by the laws of the Prince, the Islamic minorities in such countries as France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Great Britain, claim that the Quran and the Sharia constitute a more moral and spiritual foundation than the secular laws of their host societies. In Europe the Muslim minorities have no hesitation in proclaiming, with limitless brazenness, the superiority of their belief and their way of life in regard to which the decadent West deserves to be replaced and elevated by conversion to Islam.

Renowned fashion designer Christian Dior once observed that a beautiful woman is a woman who is well dressed and walks well (*"Une belle femme est une femme bien habillée qui marche bien!*"). To Dior's definition of feminine elegance, a fundamentalist Imam would proffer the rejoinder that the superior Muslim woman wears a flowing black *hijab* or a *niqab*, which hides the whole body with the sole allowance of a slit at the level of the eyes. With the complexity of its national cultures, Europe ought to take stock of the Indian example of the experience of subjugation by a minority predisposed by the arrogance of a power founded on a violence which, urged by Allah, has always, with its tragic consequences in the diminution and extinction of sublime cultures, been the compelling determination of the inferiority of Islamic religiosity and culture.

CHAPTER THREE

The Kaffir

Fanatics are usually guided by rascals,
who put the dagger into their hands.
they resemble that old man of the mountain
who, it is said, made imbeciles taste the joys
of paradise and who promised them an eternity
of the pleasures of which he had given them
a foretaste, on condition that they
murdered all those he would name.
Voltaire[1]

The freedom of the Kaffir to criticize the Quran in unison with Biblical criticism. Throughout this work we have used the words "Disbeliever", "Non-Believer", "Unbeliever" as they appear in the English translation of the Quran. These are the words which the translator Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall uses in the bilingual edition of the Holy Book. They represent the ordinariness of the person who happens not to belong to the community of the faithful. The reader needs to know at the outset that the synonym "Kaffir" does more effectively convey the vehemence which Allah urges towards the merely different Other. That is, however much the Other may be innocent and virtuous, while living according to the ethos of his tradition, he is, *as such*, merely different, the object of Allah's abomination and of His calling for his extermination. The Kaffir is naturally an abject object which does not deserve to exist in the presence of the Believer. Such a narrow perception of the Other substantiates the reason of the divine commandment of the Believer's obligation to wage war on the pagan world (*Dar-ul harb*) until its transformation into the perfect World of Islam (*Dar-ul-Islam*). From the evil gratuitously attributed to him - in the perspective of the Believer's submission to Allah's injunctions - the Kaffir owes it to himself the duty and the task to measure the purpose and the intensity of the hatred as the divinely enjoined piety of the Muslim. As a world religion, Islam is unique with the singularity of its metamorphosing the Believer's hatred into the substance of his submission..

The unholiness of the Kaffir. The Kaffir is evil, he deserves no consideration whatsoever; he is the object of Allah's malediction in all

---

[1] *Philosophical Dictionary*, p. 205

circumstances. He is the vile object of Allah's abhorrence. The nearly one tenth of the Quranic verses related to the Kaffir provides justification for a judicious examination of the Muslim's perception of the object of Allah's unmitigated loathing. In particular, in India, scant exploration has been carried out in the study of the psychology of the Muslim and of its specificity rooted in the authority of his scripture. Whatever may be the failings, or the lacunae, of this study of the political influence which the Quran, the Sirah, the Hadiths, have exercised, successive Kaffir studies of Islam will hopefully carry further the endeavor to promote as thoroughly as possible a trustworthy appraisal of the chasm which lies between the Indigenous Indian civilization and the alien exclusive Islam with the legacy of its violent ideology. *In the sub-continent, the exceptional intrusion of divine hatred, coupled with its concordant intolerance, has been the incurable, enduring sickness of Islam affecting the totality of the Indian civilization*. Even the original Indian Christianity, which Arnold Toynbee qualifies as a fossilized ideology, never displayed that characteristic feature of its European magnificence marred by the savageries of its conflicts and wars, its *auto-da-fés* and genocides. But in India, the history of Indian Islam has followed the Straight Path marked with the innumerable sign posts of the inhumanities concomitant with iconoclasms, destructions of temples and monuments, of centers of learning, burnings of libraries, in imitation of the Mongols destroying the glories of Abbasid Baghdad.

It is with such a loathing of the Kaffir in the *Weltanschauung* of the Muslim, and of his fate under the latter's Minority hegemony, that the reader may appreciate, in the more than ten centuries of the history and politics of Indian Islam, the conformity of the Indian Muslims with the Quranic revelations which dictate his behavior towards particularly the Brahmanist community. It is a perception which underlays the day to day *bhai-bhaiism* of social intercourse determined by the reverse Māyā of *sarva dharma sama bhava,* according to which the snake is mistaken for a rope. In its activities as wars and as communal riots, the Islamic volcano had been erupting in a number of times in the past. It is the subterranean lava which erupted with horrendous force in 1946-47 with the brutalities of Partition. The volcano did erupt on many occasions in the pre-Partition past, for otherwise there would not have been any necessity for the emergence of a Sikh military response to the manifestations of Islamic murderous intolerance. With Islam in motion as violent Islamism, India has by now been sufficiently conditioned into adopting a live vigilance as an unwritten mandate of the central government. The post-World War II newness of the socio-political condition of India evinces the novelty of the political integrity of the

entire country and of her resourcefulness to regain and assert the authenticity of her cultural wholeness as the necessary determinant of her national policy.

The fiction of bhai-bhaiism and the Quran's definition of the Kaffir. The Brahmanist may be unaware of **Quran 3.28** which forbids the faithful to be friendly with Kaffirs: Let not the believers take disbelievers for their friends in preference to believers. Whoso doth that hath no connection with Allah unless (it be) that ye but guard yourselves against them, taking (as it were) security. Allah biddeth you beware (only) of Himself. Unto Allah is the Journeying.

Undeniably the many genuine cases of friendship between Brahmanists and Muslims have persisted even after Partition. Nevertheless the revelation in **Quran 3.28** unerringly provides, for the safety of the Kaffir, the categorical injunction for prudence in inter-communal relationship. It exposes with perfect clarity the 'rationality' and the innocence of the suddenness of the Muslim betraying or even killing his Brahmanist neighbor, despite generations of their co-existence in the same socio-economic neighborhood, when the time came for the Partition.

Hypocrites, when so called arbitrarily by Allah, meet a painful doom indeed. Regarding them, this is what Allah decrees: If the hypocrites, and those in whose hearts is a disease, and the alarmists in the city do not cease, We verily shall urge thee on against them, then they will be your neighbors in it but a little while. Accursed, they will be seized wherever found and slain with a (fierce) slaughter. That was the way of Allah in the case of those who passed away of old; thou wilt not find for the Way of Allah aught of power to change. (**Surah 33, The Clans, 60-62**).

It is indeed difficult, if not impossible, to be more unforgiving and unsparing in the treatment of "hypocrites" than what Allah does and prescribes in these Verses. How can it have been that, in fourteen centuries, no Islamic scholar or intellectual has ever expressed any revulsion or pain on encountering such desert aridity in the heart of Allah? And how or why do educated Muslims *today still* refuse to acknowledge that Allah would ask the believer to abide by such hatred of those with whom they live in *apparent cordiality?* How does the Muslim explain his dogged indifference to the venom nurtured in the heart of his religion?

Allah comes down to the level of plotters in association with Muhammad: Lo! They plot (against thee, O Muhammad). And I plot a plot against them. So give a respite to the disbelievers. Deal thou gently with them for a while.(**Surah LXXXVI, The Morning Star, 15-17**).

Shakespeare describes better the plot which Brutus, while colluding with lean Cassius, sets up against his much older friend Julius Caesar. In the present Verses of the Quran one can detect the subtle notion of the

Taqiyya, the indirect, ambiguous communication which the Prophet used against his enemies. The frequent failures of agreements struck in the diplomacy engaged by Indians and Pakistanis, have been due invariably to the *Taqiyya* used by the Pakistani interlocutors. The *Taqiyya* is the wily usage of a distorting slant in the language used in Pakistani peace-talk with which the Indian diplomats were not acquainted. With its *Taqiyya* ingredient in the English used by the Pakistani the corresponding Indian diplomat would be at a disadvantage with the assumption that it is essentially homogeneous with his English. That would be so even if, on both sides, the diplomats would have been former alumni of Cambridge or Oxford universities. The leaders of the Congress Party, confused by the frequent shifting of his political objectives, Jinnah was actually using *Taqiyya* as a category of his political jargon. It is not known if Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, aware of Jinnah's use of *Taqiyya*, would have shared his knowing with his Hindu colleagues.

The Kaffir's response to Allah's loathing is not Islamophobia. The Kaffir, who studies the Islamic scriptures and, with reasonable use of the freedom of expression as guaranteed by the Constitution, censures the ideas, the propositions and the injunctions which contradict and demean values pertaining to established civilized behavior, must remain faithful to his convictions without being visited by any fear, and thereby feeling cowed, with the label of '*Islamophobe*'. It is true that, according to the Islamic tradition and orthodox belief, the Quran has been written effectively by Allah before Creation, and is, as such, vehemently proclaimed to be inviolable and perfect, in a number of its verses. Thereby it depletes the Kaffir of any dignity. Consequently, as the victim of the divine wrath, the Kaffir feels enheartened to assert the moral right to challenge the arbitrary negativities directed against him. Such an action cannot be condemned as intolerance, or as blasphemy, nor even as a contravention of the letter and the spirit of the 1950 Constitution. In reality the Constitution provides all citizens with the freedom of expression to criticize and evaluate any political and religious doctrine, without any intention or expression of prejudicial bias. Islamic politics taking its cue and its substance from the Quran must admit of having legitimate appraisal as does any other political doctrine, on both the right and the left of the political spectrum. It would certainly be a negation of the wisdom and the liberalism of the 1950 Constitution, as well especially of its purpose, if a Muslim were to claim protection, under its provisions, of his rights and then justify his raising any objection to a Kaffir view of the politics generated by the Islamic scriptures. The threat of such a Damocles sword over the Kaffir's head must not have a reason

to be, under the 1950 Constitution. Freedom of expression does not include berating the individual practicing his faith. But the Constitution protects the freedom to criticize any religion or theology and their contents.

Islam is more politics, than religion. However, in regard to the socio-political predicament of the Indian Kaffir, Islam, in its doctrine and in its history, must be viewed as being *also*, if not *essentially* so, a *political* ideology, thinly covered with the veneer of the five pillars of its religiosity.[2] This specific characteristic is vouchsafed by Islamic orthodoxy proclaiming, and history corroborating, its religiosity cohering with secularity, in the unitive coalescence of the religious and the profane, and in the homogeneity of the obligations of religion with the rules of government. As a matter of historical evidence, Islam has been, in the variety of its manifestations in fourteen centuries, substantially *more* politics than its being a religion qualified by the five obligatory duties. Consequently it behooves the Indian non-Muslim Disbeliever to have the fullest freedom to criticize the Quranic choleric and other relevant anti-Kaffir verses on a par with the criticism of the ideas of an opposing political party. Such a criticism must be carried out with due respect for the belief of the Muslim, but without any assent to the condemnation of the non-Believer strictly *for the sole reason of his being a non-Believer*, even if such be the injunction of Allah. Even Mahatma Gandhi can and should go to Hell for any evil Karma which he might have done. But he cannot be attributed such dire punishment simply because some blinkered theologian or fanatic, however eminent, would regurgitate Quranic obloquy with self-righteous, but unreflecting, faith in a revelation delivered in Arabia in the VII century. In the 1930s Maulana Muhammad Ali declared that the worst Mussalman was better than Mahatma Gandhi. According to the Quran he was right. Further he had the right to exalt the spiritual merit of his Holy Book, to which the Mahatma, when asked for his opinion, responded with the banal qualification of the Mawlānā's words as proof of his faith in God. But the Muslim is expected to consent to the Kaffir rebutting, under protection of the 1950 Constitution, any gratuitous indignity levelled against him. In particular the Kaffir is entitled to fearlessly enunciate the sapient conviction that, in the hierarchy of religions, he owns the

---

[2] These are: *shahāda* (testifying to the faith), *salāt* (ritualistic prayer), *zakāt* (purificatory alms giving), *siyām* (fasting), *hajj* (pilgrimage). In addition *jihād* has also been considered, by certain jurists, as the most important function of the Believer as a warrior.

freedom of not believing Islam to be the provider of the *ne plus ultra* way of living. It is germane to recall that Soren Kierkegaard did not hesitate to qualify the Theology of Christianity of his time being, as a Science, on a par with Veterinary Science. Today it is neither a violation of good taste, nor of any violation of a clause of the 1950 Constitution, nor a diminution of the worth of the Believer's faith, to argue that the Islamic Theology as a jurisprudential Science is at best as honorable as is Veterinary Science.

The blessing of being Kaffir. The Indian Kaffir has the good fortune to benefit from being a free non-believer, or better still, from being an Atheist according to his personal conviction and to the freedom to choose his mode of living, without any harm or prejudice to anybody. As an atheist he can deliver a reasoned criticism of whatever he finds offensive to good taste, or to moral propriety, in those Quranic prescriptions which cannot be abrogated or altered. He can pronounce loud and clear, for example, his denunciation of the *lex talionis* prescribing the cutting of a hand as the punishment for a theft, as a cruel denial of humaneness, for the elimination of a hand constitutes the diminution which permanently cripples the body of the offender and the means of his earning a full mode of living. The head spins with a dizziness whirled by the thought of the frightfulness of the penal code which inflicts the severing off of a leg in case the thief, who has already lost a hand, repeats the offence. By adhering to the civil law of the Sharia, under the protection of the 1950 Constitution, and thereby to claim it as the essence of their collective identity, the Indian Muslims significantly, silently, but hypocritically, shed all attachment to its concomitant penal code. Yet one never sees or hears the Indian Muslim raising a voice against the continued practice of the literal application the Sharia penal code in certain fundamentalist majority Muslim countries.

The predicament of the Indian Muslims having to live in Kaffirdom. In this essay, as far as possible, the word "Kaffir" will be used in preference to such other expressions as "non-believer, or disbeliever, or unbeliever", though these words do appear in translations of the Holy Book in its English versions. The dialogue which a Kaffir engages with the Muslim requires at the very outset a clear understanding of the difference which the Quran makes between the faithful Believer and the 'Kaffir'. In the history and geography of India, the foundational indigenous constituents of the native civilization have been the Brahmanist, the Buddhist, the Jaina Kaffirs. To-day the trisection of the Indian sub-continent leaves the Indian Muslims as the only component of the Umma which finds itself locked within a Kaffir

territory, inhabited by a Kaffir majority, ruled by a Kaffir elite.

A comparable socio-political predicament of the Muslim does not occur in any other part of the world. The Muslim minority in a western, Judeo-Christian environment still finds itself surrounded by believers, for the Quran grants itself a religious homogeneity with the Books of the Jews and of the Christians. The grace thus granted is further strengthened with the belief in the Day of Judgement, commonly shared as central to the faiths of the Jew, of the Christian and of the Muslim. Furthermore Islamic jurisprudence views India as *Dar-ul-Harb*, as the Land of War, that is, the territory which needs and calls for being conquered by Muslims and brought within the world of Islam, the *Dar-ul-Islam*. It behooves the Brahmanists, in particular, to be in a state of perpetual vigilance, and never to forget, that the Believer assumes the Sharia, enunciated by Allah, to own a status higher than the Constitution, as a document written by error-prone earthly jurists. This evidently sustains the awareness of the apparently peaceful Indian Muslim to remember, secretly but consciously, with an unclouded conscience, the divine injunction to wage war on the Indian section of the Dar-ul-Harb, which comprises the seven billion men and women living in territories beyond those which are already covered by the Umma. During the decades of the demand for a separate state for the Muslims, the Muslim League was actually waging war against Harbi India. Yet none of the learned Muslims allied to the Congress Party did express a single word of warning against the swelling tide of the tsunami of Muslim violence. They sat smugly back while they let the Mahatma, with his *Allah-Iśhvar terā nām* beguile and mesmerize the mostly untutored Hindu population, while the Muslim League was churning the storm of Political Islam heralded by Islamic Valkyries riding and cheering with murderous hatreds.

The necessity of Brahmanists being fully acquainted with the history of Islam. It is therefore imperative, in initiating the desire to understand the Muslim, to acquire a reasonably well-tested knowledge conforming to the Believer's belief and providing an equitable, dispassionate understanding of his history. The right perception of communal differences need to delve beneath the habit of using superficial perceptions in order to gain an insight into the psychology which undergirds the purpose of the individual and the collective behaviors in obedience to God's rules and prescriptions. Above all it is imperative to the Kaffir to have a reliable grasp with the global history of Islam during the last fourteen centuries, and particularly of its

fragment in the Indian sub-continent.

The recognition of the complexity of the Islamic civilization. The complexity of Islamic culture naturally calls for the desirability of having the fullest grasp of the totality of what Islam has been, is and intends to be. Whatever will be the inadequacies of this essay in implementing its willingness to understand the Muslim mentality correctly and as dispassionately as it can be possible, the reader may thereby be motivated, less to blame the incompleteness of the information, but more so to use it as the springboard for a further investigation in view of a reliably substantial objectivity. A broad view of Islam imposes recognition of the pride which swells in the Muslim's chest when he calls the contributions which the Arab scholars made to the Medieval Christianity with the discovery of the Greek Philosophies and learning and of certain industrial arts. It is true also that these contributions were made possible by Jewish scholars and learned Christian monks who, writing in Arabic, translated into Latin the works of the Greeks. Concurrently the Brahmanist shall have the obligation to be duly acquainted with the latest research, in languages other than English, contesting or mitigating the prevalent praise of Arab contribution to the making of medieval European culture.

The selective mode of Muslims learning from the classical Greeks. Led by their Caliphs the Muslims rejected the lore of ideas which was significantly welcomed by the Christians. Supported by the Caliphs, the learned Muslim elites were judicious in their choice and evinced sensitivity to the discovery of Greek Mathematics and Sciences, Medicine, Astronomy, Maritime and Ancillary knowhow. If indeed Islam did give so much to the Medieval Christianity, in particular, the recovery and the revival of the splendor of Greco-Roman culture – a claim which has recently been challenged by certain recent scholarship, perhaps not entirely without unqualified success – the truth is that *in India Islam has lent itself to the passionate enterprise of the* ***diminution*** *of the Indian civilization*. Nowhere in the world has an iconoclasm wrought so much of a ravaging of great iconographic art, of aesthetic monuments, of thousands of temples, of centers of high learning, of libraries filled with scholarly manuscripts in Sanskrit and in Pali, as in the India of Brahmanism, of Buddhism, of Jainism. To a great extent the mentality of the Muslim can be assessed and grasped by the absence of the least acknowledgement, on his part, of the immense harm wreaked upon the indigenous civilization of India. The Muslim remembers with pride, if not with arrogance, the Muslim Kings, the *Dhimma*, the *Jaziya*. They recoil from the remembrance of their destruction of particularly

the institutions of high learning. They do not show any emotion in the presence of the ruins which litter the soil of India. Instead they gloat over the memory of their hegemony and saw in the story of their ravaging as an honour which gave them the pride of not living under a Hindu authority in a free India, for doing so would be a devaluation of their heritage characterized by *Dhimma*, by *Jaziya*, by the spoliation of high learning and of aesthetic achievements. The Indian Muslims share this trait of their private and collective pride of hegemony, asserted with the use of brute power, with that of the British: the indomitable self-righteousness of projecting military success and domination as the concrete expression of the preeminence of their respective religion and culture. That historical bubble happened to have been burst by the Truth and the *Ahiṁsā* of Mahatma Gandhi who, for the first time in History, showed that politics, on a cosmic scale, can be practiced without the killing of a single man. Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote that no political doctrine is worth the death of a single man. If ever that could have been a superlatively humane definition of politics, it became a reality, the first and so far the only one in history, with the Mahatma using the *brahma astra (*weapon) of *satya* and *ahiṁsā* against the might of the British Empire and prevailed. To internalize, with sufficient credibility, the Muslim's willful refusal to acknowledge the iconoclastic ravages wrought by his faith on India, the Brahmanist needs to realize the particularity of the Muslim mind's entertaining his past, not *behind* him, but *above* him, in his submission to Allah. All that he does, and does not do, occurs *within* the bond which unites him with Allah, of whom he is at all times a proxy. And that vertical sentiment of the unitive relation with God is unassailable despite whatever misdemeanor or evil the Hindu painfully attributes to the Muslim's dutiful despoiling of his heritage in faith-full obedience to the revealed injunctions.

A timely questioning of the claim that the Islamic is the best of all possible civilizations. Even after the brutish havoc wrought by the inter-communal destructiveness which accompanied the execution of the Partition, no Indian author has deigned to take stock and express the immense irony of a *culturally inferior community of outsiders* having exerted the capacity to inflict irreparable harm upon a superior civilization which has previously brought into being a radiant, prosperous commonwealth which had been in existence during many previous centuries. It happened in Europe, when the Roman Empire got victimized by the invasion of the Goths. It happened in India by the raids of Mahmud of Ghazni, Nadir Shah, the Turkish dynasty in the XIII century, and during the decline of the Mughal era under Aurangzeb. As one more chapter in that cheerless history, the latest ravaging occurred

in 1946-1947 on the occasion of the trisection of the sub-continent. Yet no Brahmanist intellectual rose to speak up to the Indian component of the Umma even to pronounce this one simple word: "Enough!" Of those centuries of Islamic hegemony the Brāhmaṇa punditry has not bequeathed a single page lamenting the huge cultural losses inflicted with sanctimonious arrogance by Muslims drawing the justification of their destructiveness from their faithfulness to divine commandments claiming exclusive possession of Truth, Goodness and Beauty. Above all the Kṣatriya class, subsequent to the Mauryan Empire, seemed to have no vision of a unitive continental authority capable of protecting the entire sub-continent against the invaders. Nor did India had the benefice of an encounter with an enlightened enemy like the Greeks of Alexander and their successors who generated the wonderful Gandharan civilization, unique in History, as the humanely elevated and luminous synthesis of Greek and Buddhist cultures. The Muslims who rushed into India came with the zeal to write an Islamic way of life by the use of the sword. Whatever resistance did the native Kings offer to the conquering Muslim hordes, it did not suffice to preserve the cultural integrity of the Indian civilization. The difference can be measured with the fact that, since August 1947, India is for the first time ruled by a central authority, symbolized by the flag and the army, with three arms, under the supreme authority of the President of the Country and of the popularly elected Government.

The need to understand the fundamental imperatives at the root of the religious question. The present Indian socio-political situation, riven with religious tensions, calls for a right cognizance of the questioning of what Islam is in the words of a distinguished Muslim intellectual writing in French. In a booklet titled: *Open Letter to the World of Islam*, Abdennour Bidar writes: "*My Friend, what do you (the Muslim World) have which is worthy of admiration*? *What do you intrinsically have which generates respect and admiration on the part of other peoples and civilizations in the whole world? Where are your wise men, and do you still have a wisdom which you can offer to the world? Where are your great men, who are your Mandelas, who are your Gandhis, who are your Aung San Suu Kyis? Where are your great thinkers, the intellectuals whose works ought to be read in the whole world?*[3]

Abdennour Bidar goes further in his criticism. He attributes to the Islamic world its wanderings, its contradictions, its inability to find its

[3] Abdennour Bidar, *Lettre Ouverte au Monde Musulman,* Editions Les Liens Qui Libèrent, 2015; pp17-18

place in the human civilization. Bidar castigates the insufficiency of its reaction to the Islamist fanaticism and its propensity to seek a refuge in "*a reflex act of self-defense without at the same time assuming, above all, the responsibility of self-criticism".* And, in a reference to Islamist violence, he asks this sacrilegious question*: 'Why has this heinous monster chosen your face, and not another one?"* Unhesitatingly, the author gives the right answer: "Because the roots of this evil which today has stolen your face reside within yourself, the monster has come out of your womb, the cancer lies in your own body. And from your sick body many new monsters – worse than the present one - shall arise as long as you refuse to face the truth, as long as you shall delay in acknowledging it and to set yourself to uprooting this evil!"

Bidar claims that his Umma is in reality the whole of Humanity, the Humanity of those progressive men and women who evince the vision of the spiritual future of mankind. All those, who are urged by the clarity of their minds and by their courage, have correctly grasped that it is the acute disease of the Muslim world which has given birth to such monsters as Al Qaeda, Al Nostra, Aqmi or the Islamic State. They have fully understood that these are but the severest and the most visible symptoms of a vast diseased body of which the chronic ailments are the following: "incapability of establishing durable democracies which, as a moral and political right, guarantee the freedom of individual conscience in the matters of religious dogmas; the dogmatic, immovable, and sometimes totalitarian moral and social prison; inveterate difficulties to improve the condition of women in favor of their owning their responsibility, and their freedom; the inability to separate, in due measure, political power from religious authority; the inability to foster respect and tolerance, and a genuine recognition of the religious plurality and of the religious minorities; inability to disengage from the unflinching conviction – which is built into the minds of most believers and in such a manner as not to allow any questioning of it – that Islam, as a religion, is superior to any of all the others, that it does not have and shall never have to learn anything from anybody, nor ever to acknowledge any spiritual enrichment from outside its dispensation.[4]

Bidar questions the popular view held among the elites of the Muslim world by asking the direct question: "*Must all this be imputed to the debilitating responsibility of the West?* Stating that his criticism of Islam is not due to the fact of his being a 'western' philosopher, but more so because he takes cognizance of the loss of the past greatness of the world of Islam which is now remembered as a myth: it behooves the World of Islam to own that, since the XVIII century, it has been unable to respond to the challenge of the West. And Bidar isolates the cause of

[4] Ibid, p. 16

the malady and impotence of the World of Islam with a forensic self-assurance. He writes: "You chose to seek refuge, with infantile self-debilitating ardour, in the past, but in conjunction with the intolerant and obscurantist Wahhabism which continues to spread its ravages in all regions within your borders!"

Abdennour Bidar sets his criticism of the World of Islam in a global context in conjunction with a cogent critique of the errant trend of Western Civilization: the Muslim world has succumbed to the temptation of imitating the West in the promotion of nationalisms and the glamour of a modernism which is in reality a caricature of modernity. Abdennour Bidar writes: "I mean this frenzy of consumption and, more so, this technological development which, without any coherence with the religious archaism of these nationalisms, transforms your wealthy elites of the Gulf into mere willing partners in the increasingly universal sickness of the worship of Mammon."

Directing his criticism to the notion that Islam means 'submission', Bidar says, in his "Letter to the World of Islam": You have opted for viewing Muhammad as Prophet and as King. You have opted for the definition of Islam as a political, moral and social religion which must rule like a tyrant on the State as well as on civil life, in the street as well as in the home, even in the conscience of the individual. You have opted to believe and to impose the belief that Islam means submission, when in reality the Quran itself proclaims that there is no constraint in religion (*la ikraha fi Din*). You have turned the call to freedom into the domination of constraint! How indeed can a whole civilization betray its own sacred text to such an extent?

In a reference to the violence of Islamic terror, A. Bidar emphasizes that the malady which he diagnoses would have come to an end. For, regarding the Islam to which he has been referring in his *Letter to the World of Islam*, he speaks of the Islam, which actually is tyrannical, dogmatic, literalist, formalist, male chauvinist, conservative, regressive. Most of the time such is the ordinary Islam, the Islam of daily life, which suffers and causes so many to suffer in their conscious existence, the Islam of the tradition and of the past, the Islam distorted by all those who use it for their political activities, the Islam which always ends up by extinguishing the Arab springs and silences the voices of all those youths who ask for something different.[5]

The urgency of a disinterested, in-depth knowing of Islamic history. Accordingly it is incumbent upon anyone dedicating himself to, as far as possible, a dispassionate understanding of Indian Islam, to

[5] Ibid, p. 20

acquire a reliable knowledge of the totality of Islam spread across the fourteen centuries of its history. The present study does necessarily confine the inquiry into an outline of the specific configuration of Indian Islam. The comparison with the critical evaluations of Islam by European Muslim intellectuals serves two purposes: (**i**) it provides to the non-Islamic citizen the desired objectivity and the assurance of legitimacy in expressing any animadversion of the many inhumane verses of the Quran without any fear of Believers' rebuking it as Islamophobia; (**ii**) it confronts the Indian Muslim, in particular, to own, without any prejudice to his faith, the injurious consequences of an unreflecting obeisance to injunctions of hatred and correlated prescriptions of enmity and intolerance, violence and destruction, directed against the Kaffir as sacred duties.

A great distance separates the liberal, progressive and free-thinking brought forth by the European Muslims in their writings, from the closed-mindedness and the self-satisfied exclusiveness of Indian Muslims. Abdennour Bidar, for example, together with so many other European Muslim intellectuals of both genders do, without any restraint, ardently discuss what they deem undesirable in Islam, out of an earnest zeal to give a humane visage to Islam. Laudably they engage in this reforming passion, from the vantage position of a secular, free, enlightened freedom, without in any manner reneging their faith and their loyalty to what they see as essentially noble and inspiring in their tradition. A lateral observation may help to understand the substantive difference between the reasoned view of Islam entertained by the French and German intellectuals, for example, and the mostly banal observations of the Indian Muslims thinking and writing in English. The European Muslims use languages laced with philosophical sensitivities, while the Indian Muslim's expositions in the English language reflect an Arabian landscape where metaphysics never grew out of any oasis. Besides the English people themselves boast only of the main philosophers who grace their history were the merely empiricist thinkers: Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), George Berkeley (1685-1753), David Hume (1711-76). It is tempting to speculate that the Indian Muslims using the English language do fatefully limit themselves with their using the empirical concepts of British philosophy in their confrontation with the subtleties of Indian native lofty metaphysics. In particular, Pakistan does not have a classic past cultural heritage: it settles its apology of a democracy on the alien Arabic script, for the use of the Urdu language, which actually arose and blossomed in the center of the Indian sub-continent which had been under the Vedic tradition for more than several millennia before the Islamic hordes rushed in. Urdu originally was the

language spoken in the Islamic military camps. It is classified as an Indo-European language. Bangladesh will remain tied, by the use of the Sanskritized Bengali language conveying a certain measure of sharing with the ancientness of Indian culture in the usage of the language shared with the Indian component of Bengal.

The consequence of the closed-mindedness of the Indian Muslim. The ignorance of Sanskrit, the adherence to the Arabic script, the use of the English medium in oral and written communication, leaves the Indian Muslim with few intellectual means to grapple with the profundities of the metaphysical speculations embedded in the literatures of the three indigenous Dharmas. Since the very first wave of their invasion as conquerors, the Muslims have been acting and feeling that they had come to settle in a space without any established civilization. Even on being opposed or confronted with the fact of a highly advanced and sophisticated organized society, they chose to dwell within the enclosed stockade of their belief that there is nothing worthy to learn, or to admire, in the civilization where the word of Allah was absent. This closed-mindedness has persisted to this day. It is fully evident in the exclusive attitude of the Muslim migrants who, in Europe, resolutely cling to their mode of living impermeable to any of the humane aspects of the host cultures. In India, of all places, the native civilization was felt to be utterly different from any of the cultures with which they had till then come into contact. In faithful obedience of Allah's abomination of anything or anyone not belonging to the world of Islam, the Muslims felt it their duty in clearing the space they had invaded for replacement, in view of the realization of the *Dar-ul-Islam.* Partition was a major step taken towards the accomplishment of the world of Islam. However, it is understood that, as the victim of Muslim intolerance, characterized by *Dhimma* and *Jaziya*, and forced conversions by the use of the constraint exerted by the sword, the native Indians would not have felt any incentive to study Arabic or any of the Muslim media of communication. But with the prospect of the future co-existence of the two religious communities, it is imperative for the Brahmanist, in particular, to be decisively acquainted with the literatures, such as Arabic and Persian, in order to grasp the fundamentals of the psychology, the ethics, the exclusive modes of thinking and the history of the Muslim.

The necessary relevance and importance of such a study stem from the prime consideration of the fact that, after August 1947, the Muslim lives with the silent sentiment of unease and of the tension of facing the endless prospect of living under a secular jurisprudence, presided over

by a paramount Kaffir authority. It must indeed have been galling for the majority remnant of the Kaum who clamored for Partition, when they suddenly found themselves compelled, by the circumstances arising from their own use of force and of hatred, to face the physical failure of their share of *"pakistanizing"* the country. It was not so embittering to live under the rule of the British Christian who belonged to the tradition of the same revelation and of the Holy Book. After the departure of the British protectors, the resulting tension within the Kaum will last forever. This will be so, considering that the Muslim has little, if any resource, available in the Quran, for proffering guidance for his peacefully accommodating his own tryst with an Islamic destiny, with respect and tolerance of the freedom of the Brahmanist, the Buddhist and the Jaina to live according to the authenticity of their respective Dharma. Nor, in taking stock of the Muslim's iconoclastic past, must the burden of the reconstruction of the native culture be held in abeyance, or distressed by any imperative of conformity with communal quietude, in submission to, and in its unnaturally being forced to, compose passively with the rigidities of an inferior religiosity. Meanwhile it would be beneficial for the entire Indian nation if the Islamic Kaum were to consider it advantageous for it to devise, for the first time in fourteen centuries, a mode of living amicably with a Kaffir civilization.

The ironic comfort of the Muslim mind the limited scope of the Revelation. With the provision of comfort, the Muslim's self-satisfied, studied ignorance is bolstered by the belief that the revelation contains all that is worthy to be known as wisdom and as the requirements of the best mode of living. This intellectual confidence is not measured by the attainments obtaining in other languages and cultures, but in the brazenly transmitted conviction of a real, physical God having communicated, word for word, the revelations to the Prophet.[6] Such a belief has been the foundation of the Muslim's fanaticism that he is the owner of God's words and of the trust that all his actions and thoughts happen as His *Taqdir*. Such a security in the belief of the Muslim reality makes it impossible that there can ever be any dialogue. Above all, the Muslim claims the pride of the privilege to possess with an untroubled mind the final revelation as the perfect wisdom which is eternally valid. His confidence is fortified with believing that the traditionally established version of the Quran is protected by the attribution of death

[6] It is significant that no one in any of the three Revelations ever raised the question of why Jehovah, the Creator as the Only God, does not mention the creation of the Word, of Language, necessary for telling the story of the Genesis.

to anyone proposing or making a modification of the revealed verses.

Furthermore the deadening of the Indian Muslim's mind gets further layered by the power of the collective belief that the revealed Quran remains divinely perfect despite the inevitability of all things being impermanent in the flow of Time passing. There is no system of logic available which could convince the Muslim, however well-educated he can be, of the inanity of a belief in the Holy Book being eternally valid. Without any critical examination of his own, he inherits the belief that its rules and principles prescribed for his following the Straight Path as the only way to the absolute Goodness. He is not disturbed by the comparison with the religiosities of the Jews and the Christians, and by the evidence of the merits of their histories during the last fourteen centuries. Historically Hanbal and Ibn Tamiyya succeeded in imposing the belief in the absolutely peerless wisdom of the Quran and in sealing the mind to an unquestioning acceptance of the revealed dispensation. In a University Library in India and in the West one does not find a single meaningful contribution to Indian Thought by an Indian Muslim author. In principle the Indian Muslims are warriors against the seven billion men and women Kaffirs. It is quite understandable that the impossibility of a dialogue with the Muslim on account of his closed-mindedness would foster, on his side, the ready recourse to communal violence as a display of his being a faithfully submitting Believer.

The racial and cultural difference between the European and the Indian Muslim. Weighted down by the load of a narrow exclusivism, the Indian Muslim evinces a conspicuous cultural difference with regard to the European Muslim who, spurred by self-confidence, is able to stand back from his tradition and legislate on such interpretations of the sacred lore as would bring forth a desired version of an enlightening Islam. The European Muslims, who avail themselves of the freedoms guaranteed by the democratic constitutions of the European countries, are Arabs, fluent in the use of the Arabic language which enables them to refer to the Islamic classics and to the golden era of their culture, especially during the Abbassid dynasty. In contrast the Indian Muslims are in their vast majority converted Hindus and they cannot transcend the atavistic hatred which they harbor of the culture from which they claim to have been saved. Moreover, in a substantial difference from their European co-believers they do not have the advantage of fluency in Arabic to enable them to explore directly the rich Arab heritage of the VII-IX centuries, in particular the splendor of the period of the Abbasid Dynasty. The European Arab has an affinity

with Harun-al-Rashid which the Indian Mussalman cannot claim.

The cultural predicament of the Indian Muslim. Briefly: the Indian Muslim finds himself corralled within the space of India which has been hallowed by the mystical wisdoms of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism. Though these are pervaded with their sublime humaneness, yet they do nevertheless distill contempt and rejection in the mind and in the heart of the Indian Muslim. It is such a native India which adds essentially nothing to the identity of the Muslim. Mohammed Iqbal in *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* refers, in support of his arguments, to certain American academic philosophers whom no one today remembers. But he does not have a single word to show his ever having evinced any curiosity to explore the lofty metaphysics of the indigenous thinkers. Despite his doctoral study in Philosophy in a German University, he had no clue that the Indians and the Germans are the two races who have excelled in the production of the subtlest metaphysics. In his Sūrah al-Fātihah Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad extols every verse of the Quran without any reference to the scriptures and the histories of the indigenous Dharmas. He does not perceive any of the blemishes which vex Abdennour Bidar, for example, and incite him to write his *Letter to the World of Islam*. The blessing that may possibly urge a step towards a more peaceful universal brotherhood, lies with the European Arab scholars, thinkers and writers joyfully seeking, in the vast landscape of Greco-Roman history of Philosophy, for the intellectual nourishment and stimulation as enlargement of the space within which they hope to settle an Islam purified of its many blemishes. But to such a praiseworthy task envisaged by the Arab Muslim intellectuals of Europe, the Indian Muslims have, till now, little, in any way, to offer.

The absence of a dispassionate study of Indian Islam and Muslim ignorance of Indian culture. Due to India being a Harbi land populated by a majority Kaffirdom, common sense beacons to the mind of the concerned citizen the duty to engage in the exploration of the Indian Islam with what the Quran says about the Kaffir. It is significant that in India, during the decades preceding the Partition and subsequently till the present time, no one has summoned the energy, the intelligence, the courage, the freedom, to express, in terms as clear and vigorous as the *Open Letter to the Muslim World* of Abdennour Bidar, a criticism of Islam, in relation to India, with equal daring objectivity. The relevance of a similar challenging of a petrified tradition, as a cultural responsibility, teases the mind of all Muslims, as well as of all non-Muslims. It would have shed light on the perpetual search, activated by

the emergence of Pakistan, for the intervention of the world Umma and of the dominant world powers, in the never-ending Islamic restlessness as an organic feature of the Indian polity. In comparison with the intellectual maturity and unshackled freedom of Abdennour Bidar, and of a host of like-minded Muslim intellectuals in Western Europe, the absence of Indian Muslims examining the inadequacies of their Islam strikes the imagination. It does further call for an explanation of the obdurate refusal or inability, on the part of the Indian Muslims, to reflect on their faith-centered sentiment of a deficient identity in the prospect of their present and future co-operation with the Kaffir majority. It is disconcerting that there has not emerged a purposeful, sober, balanced analysis of those very weaknesses which, inherent to Islam, have proved to be the bane of India. They zealously exert their coercive power to restrict the efforts of Kaffir India struggling to restore to its fullness the bruised authenticity of her birthright. In truth both in Bangladesh and in Pakistan, one does not find a single Muslim intellectual endowed with acknowledged moral authority to confront the cultural contradictions and conflicts of an Islam entangled with a sophisticated civilization molded by a mystical *Weltanschauung* which has its roots in the Vedic lore and in the *Yoga sūtras* of Patañjali. A light, anodyne remark may suffice to encapsulate the attitude of the Indian Muslim inability to cope with the meaning of the Indian civilization: endowed with the contents of the perfect, *ne plus ultra* Revelation, and with the mind being accordingly closed, *he cannot perceive that the concept and the method of the realization of universal salvation is an original Indian contribution to world culture*. Nor can the Muslim recognize that Islam can pass as a world religion, in its geographic spread, but it does not have, nor can it ever have, as its essence, a *universalist* purport, even if it ever succeeds to conquer the world and establish it as the *Dar-ul-Islam.*

The importance and the limitation of Arabic in the life of the Indian Muslim. All the quotations taken from the Quran are translations of words written in Arabic in the original Book, before Creation, by Allah. For the purpose of this work the English versions of the Arabic original happen to be authoritative, approved by the highest Islamic scholarly authorities. This particular scruple of the perfect correspondence of the English quotations with the original Arabic pronouncements assures to the reader a judicious concern for accuracy and theological authenticity. It must be further emphasized that the pious Muslim believes that, while he may not know how to write or speak Arabic, his prayer must nevertheless be said in Arabic for it to have the expected effect. One stark difference between the Indian Kaffir and his

Muslim neighbor insists on the former having the freedom to recite a prayer in any of the recognized local language, while the Muslim must perform his devotions only in Arabic, for otherwise the prayer or invocation would be ineffective. This particular component of the Muslim's existential situation amplifies his distinctiveness in relation to the unbelieving majority. Such a fundamental prescription does not avail in any of the indigenous spiritualities. Brahmanists, for example, do not make any difference between a prayer said in Sanskrit or in the local regional language. They hold that it is not the linguistic medium, but the personal sentiment, which determines the worth of the prayer.[7]

The significant particularity of the "Shahāda". Since the paragraph refers to prayer in Islam, it is pertinent to emphasize that the Shahāda is the equivalent of the Lord's Prayer in Christianity. The Shahāda consists of the very first, short Surah, the Opening (*Fatihah*), of the Quran. It ends with these words (verses 5 to 7): "*Show us the straight path, the path of those whom Thou has favored; Not (the path) of those who earn Thine anger nor of those who go astray".*

The last sentence refers negatively to the Jews who have earned the anger of Allah and equally negatively to the Christians who have gone astray. Five times every day the Muslims have been praying, during the past fourteen centuries, by casting live aspersions on the Jews and the Christians. And they will continue doing so till the Final Day of Resurrection. [8]

The Kaffir. The Second Surah (Chapter), entitled *The Cow*, contains no less than forty negative, angry allusions against those who do not believe in the revealed statements. The quotations which follow may be viewed against the background of the extracts of Abdennour Bidar's *Open Letter to the Muslim World.*[9]

This is what the **Second Surah** says (the numbers represent the

---

[7] I have no information about the possibility or desirability of a deaf-mute Muslim praying in sign language.

[8] Sami A. Aldeep Abu-Sahlieh, *The Fatiha and the Culture of Hate*, Centre of Arab and Islamic Law, Ch-1025m St Sulice, 2015; 120 pp.

[9] The reader may expect to come across more passages reproducing, or referring to, opinions of Muslim intellectuals expressing themselves freely with the security of living in the secular environment of Western Europe.

order of the verses):

> "*Allah has sealed their hearts and their hearing, and on their eyes there is a covering. Theirs will be an awful doom (***7***). In their hearts is a disease, and Allah increaseth their disease. A painful doom is theirs because they lie. (****10****). And when it is said unto them: Believe as the people believe, they say: Shall we believe as the foolish believe? Beware! They indeed are the foolish. But they know not (***13***). .. Deaf, dumb, blind; and they return not (***18***) And if you are in doubt concerning that which We reveal unto our slave (Muhammad), then produce a surah of the like thereof, and call your witnesses beside Allah if ye are truthful. And if ye do it not - and ye can never do it - then guard yourselves against the fire prepared for disbelievers, whose fuel is of men and stones (***23-24***). Those who break the covenant with Allah after ratifying it, and sever that which Allah ordered to be joined, and (who) make mischief in the earth: those are they who are the losers (***27***)... But they who disbelieve, and deny Our revelations, such are rightful owners of the Fire. They will abide therein (39). But those who did wrong changed the word which had been told them for another saying, and We sent down upon the evil-doers wrath from Heaven for their evil doing (***59***) ....Go down to settled country, thus ye shall get that which ye demand. And humiliation and wretchedness were stamped upon them and they were visited with wrath from Allah. That was because they disbelieved in Allah's revelations and slew the Prophets wrongfully. That was for their disobedience and transgression (***61***). And ye know of those of you who broke the Sabbath, how We said unto them: Be ye apes, despised and hated! (***65***).)......Believe ye in part of the scripture and disbelieve ye in part thereof? Therefore woe be unto those who write the Scripture with their hands and then say, "This is from Allah," that they may purchase a small gain therewith. Woe unto them for that their hands have written, and woe unto them for that they earn thereby! (***79***).* And *what is the reward of those who do so save ignominy in the life of the world, and on the day of Resurrection they will be consigned to the most grievous doom! For Allah is not aware of what you do* ***85****).*
>
> *And when there cometh unto them a Scripture from Allah, confirming that in their possession, though before that they were asking for a signal triumph over those who disbelieved, and when there cometh unto them that which they know (that to be the Truth) they disbelieve therein. The curse of Allah is on disbelievers (****89****). Evil is that for which they sell their souls: that they should disbelieve in that which Allah hath revealed, grudging that Allah should reveal of His bounty unto whom He will of his bondmen. They have incurred anger upon anger. For disbelievers is a shameful doom (****90****). Who is an enemy to Allah, and his angels and his messengers, and Gabriel and Michael! Then, lo! Allah (Himself) is an enemy to the disbelievers (****98****). Lo! We*

*have sent thee (O Muhammad) with the truth, a bringer of glad tidings and a warner. And thou wilt not be asked about the owners of hell-fire! (119). Lo! Those who disbelieve, and die while they are disbelievers; on them is the curse of Allah and of angels and of men combined (***161***). And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus with Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire (***167***). The likeness of those who disbelieve (in relation to the messenger) as the likeness of one who calleth unto that which heareth naught except a shout and cry. Deaf, dumb, blind, therefore they have no sense (***171***). Lo! Those who hide aught of the Scripture which Allah has revealed, and purchase a small gain therewith, they eat into their bellies nothing else than fire. Allah will not speak to them on the Day of Resurrection, nor will he make them grow. Theirs will be a painful doom (***174***). O ye who believe! Retaliation is prescribed for you in the matter of the murdered; the freeman for the freeman, and the slave for the slave, and the female for the female. And for him who is forgiven somewhat by his (injured) brother, prosecution according to usage and payment unto him in kindness. This is an alleviation and a mercy from your Lord. He who transgresseth after this will have a painful doom. And there is life for you in* retaliation, O men of understanding, that ye may ward off (evil) (**178, 179***). And when it is said unto him: Be careful of thy duty to Allah pride taketh him to sin. Hell will settle his account, an evil-resting place (***206***). ..... And whoso of you becometh a renegade and dieth in his disbelief, such are they whose works have fallen both in the world and the hereafter. Such are rightful owners so the Fire: they will abide therein (***217***). Wed not idolatresses till they believe; for, lo! A believing bondwoman is better than an idolatress though she please you; and give not your daughters to idolaters till they believe, for lo! A believing slave is better than an idolater though he please you. These invite unto the Fire, and Allah inviteth unto the Garden, and unto forgiveness by His grace and expoundeth thus His revelations to mankind that haply they may remember (***221***). Fight in the way of Allah, and know that Allah is Hearer, Knower (***244***). Allah is the protecting Friend of those who believe. He bringeth them out of darkness into light. As for those who disbelieve, their patrons are false deities. They bring them out of light into darkness. Such are rightful owners of Fire. They will abide therein (***257***). Nay, but whoever hath done evil and his sin surroundeth him such are rightful owners of the Fire; they will abide therein* **(81***). O ye who believe, say not (unto the Prophet): "Listen to us", but say: "Look upon us", and be ye listeners. For disbelievers is a painful doom (***104***). And who doth greater wrong than he who forbiddeth the approach to the sanctuaries of Allah lest his name should be mentioned therein, and striveth for their ruin? As for such, it was never meant that they should enter them except in fear. Theirs in the world*

*is ignominy and theirs in the hereafter is an awful doom (**114**).*

The Believer must wage war against the Kaffir:

Fight against such of those who have been given the Scripture as believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, and forbid not that which Allah hath forbidden by his messenger, and follow not the Religion of Truth, until they pay the tribute readily, being brought low.(**Q. 9. 29)**

And Allah terrorizes the Kaffir:

When thy Lord inspired the angels (saying:) I am with you. So make those who believe stand firm/ I will throw fear into the hearts of those who disbelieve, Then smite the necks and smite of them each finger. (**Q. 8. 12**) The expression: "smite the neck" means 'behead' in the Quranic terminology. The recommendation to behead the Kaffir is further emphasized: *Now when ye meet in battle those who disbelieve, then it is smiting of the necks until, when ye have routed them, then making fast of bounds; and afterward either grace or ransom till the war lay down its burdens. That (is the ordinance). And if Allah willed He could have punished them (without you) but (this it is ordained) that He may try some of you by means of others. And those who are slain in the way of Allah, He rendereth not their actions vain.* (**Q. 47. 4**)

The possibility of the fossilization of Indian Islam. The above-mentioned passages from the Second Surah of the Quran following the short First with its invocation of the Beneficent, the Merciful Allah, Owner of the Day of Judgement, who shows the faithful the straight path, *"not the path of those who earn Thine anger nor of those who go astray"*. There is no other religion of which the very first words of its scripture refers to the anger of its corresponding Transcendent Deity. The first Surah has only seven short verses. Historians of the Quran have by now established the fact of its definitive version having no strict chronological arrangement of the Surahs. There is a broad distinction between the early revelations which came to Muhammad in Mecca and the later ones which were imparted to him in Medina. At the beginning of the XXI century, it is immensely amazing that Abdennour Bidar's anguished criticism of the Quran, to which he remains devoutly attached, would not, in the past, have caught the attention of the luminaries - such as Avicenna, Averroës, Firdausi, Ibn Khaldun and many more. Why would they not have deemed it necessary to pause and reflect on the intensity of Allah's imprecations and abominations directed against the non-believing? No literary evidence avails of any Muslim thinker or philosopher who would have bequeathed, earlier in the history of Islam, for the benefit of the Umma itself, a salutary emendation, as an

enhancement, of the spirituality of the revealed scripture.

The disconcerting deficiency of the critical sense of the early Islamic elites. What deficiency lies in the psychology and in the intellectual accomplishments of Indian Muslim academics, historians, writers, that they do not, or seemingly cannot, produce critical reflections of their tradition on terms equal to the bold expositions of those Muslim men and women of the present day living as active migrants in secular host societies in Europe? Writing in French, while preserving their roots in the Islam of the South Mediterranean, the French Arab intellectuals openly defend their tradition with a desire to accommodate it to the sophisticated culture of democratic, secular, liberal Europe. Availing of the freedom provided by the secular law and tradition of their host society, they affirm their passion for self-fulfillment in a sincere, creative collaboration in the older culture with its roots in the Greco-Roman antiquity.

However, in the Indian sub-continent, Partition consecrated - murderously, with characteristic brutish force - the Quranic abomination of the Kaffir, consciously, with hate-filled passion, exerted by the educated, anglicized Middle Class Muslim. Paradoxically, with the mirage of freedom from an assumed intolerable domination by the Hindus in an independent India, Partition has thereby entrapped the Muslim mind, in Pakistan and in Bangladesh, within the shell of Kaffir hatred activated by the Imamate Orthodoxy under the protection of their respective national armies. If the Indian Muslims chose to sink their mind into the sand of Kaffir-hating, instead of emulating the examples of the universalist-minded co-believers of Western Europe, Indian Islam would find itself on the straight path to a fossilization in a mimesis of the Indian Christianity. The examples of Muhammad Iqbal in *The Reconstruction of Islam* and Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad in *Sūrah-al-Fātiḥah* give no indication of the possibility or hope of an intellectual development of a Kaffir-friendly Islam. With a record of presiding five times the Congress Party during the crucial years of the Indian Islamic Middle Class demand for Partition, the Mawlānā's fundamentalist interpretation of Islam makes one wonder at the absurdity of his Hindu colleagues being so uninformed of the reasons or incongruities inflaming the murderous claim for a separate Muslim state.

The purpose of this study. The purpose of this essay is not concerned with historical research regarding the wordy authenticity of the Quran the ultimate version of which has now been accepted since 1924. Whatever may be the subtle differences in the different versions

of the Quran, the fact stands out that the essence of the revelations has throughout the history of Islam preserved its authority without any alteration to the text. That is why so many verses at the very beginning of the Quran, in the long second Surah, strain the imagination with their complexity and their fixation with anger and hostility directed to those who refused, and to those who do not stoop, to accept the revelations at their face value, as the only eternal, unalterable Truth. The non-believer is the recipient of an uncompromising divine anger throughout the entire range of the text. In no other religious, or moral dispensation, can one find the equivalent of Allah's anger so laboriously spelled out with such abundance, heightened with passionate exclusivism, as in the Quran. With His absolute Transcendence and Unity, Allah, endowed with unqualified irascibility as one of his many attributes, generates surprise even today, all the more so as His wrath is constantly, universally translated by His followers and believers in acts and thoughts against the different Others who are abominated as Kaffirs deserving Allah's doom. In his private life, the Muslim's self-righteousness in reality vindicates his contempt as Allah's, in relation to the Kaffir neighbor, or acquaintance, or friend.[10] The **Quran in Chapter 8, verse 17**, confers innocence upon the Believer, as the proxy of Allah, in the cold, self-righteous hatred of the Other and in the consequent death-dealing frenzy. It is undeniable that during the long duration of the Partition cataclysm there occurred cases of compassionate behavior of Muslims protecting Hindus against Muslim assailants, and of Hindus or Sikhs protecting Muslims against Hindu or Sikh assailants. But these swallows, on either side of the divide, did not prevent the hot wind blowing one more lethal celebration of iconoclastic hate generated by the sword of Allah forged in the desert of Arabia in the VII century CE.

The persistence of Allah's choleric temper. The reader may be

---

[10]. I have experienced this quiet belief of the Muslim seeing the Other as Kaffir. In my Canadian University an Indian Muslim close acquaintance who worked as a Librarian, and was married to a well-educated Ukrainian Christian colleague, one day, during a conversation over an afternoon coffee on the campus, confessed that he viewed me as a Kaffir, as someone below any Muslim. He said he was superior because he was touched by Allah, while I was not. Of a Pakistani colleague in the Department of Political Science, his Chairman, a well-respected Austrian Jewish scholar, told me: *"S... never gives a chance to anyone from India*." During a conversation one summer at his home, S told me that he had given a low pass to a Jamaican Hindu Indian student for his exam essay, without having even read it. When I said that his decision was arbitrarily unfair and unjust, he replied: "How can an Indian whose family had migrated to Jamaica be intelligent?" He was unaware of the Caribbean Nobel Prize winners in Literature, included V. S. Naipaul. He did not have any hesitation to make such a demeaning statement to me despite his knowing my diaspora roots. When I asked him what he would do if that Hindu student protested, as was his right, S… retorted: "In that case I would make life hell for him!"

surprised to discover that the anger which Allah reveals in the second Surah *The Cow*, gets extended across the entire stretch of the Holy Text. In the **Surah III**, *The Family of 'Imran,* Allah forbids the Believers from befriending the Kaffirs: Let not the believers take disbelievers for their friends in preference to believers. Whoso doth hath no connection with Allah unless (it be) that ye but guard yourselves against them, taking (as it were) security. Allah biddeth you beware (only) of Himself. Unto Allah is the journeying (**28***)*.

This verse unambiguously enjoins upon the Believer to abstain from establishing bonds of friendship with non-Believers. With thousands of madrassas requiring their alumni to learn by heart the entire text of the Quran, one can imagine the extent of the horror of hating and dissembling being cultivated as a way of living. Even in India, the A. B. Vajpayee government decided to sponsor, at the expense of the state, the running of madrassas in order to assuage the hostility of the Muslims towards mostly the Brahmanists. It is a surrealistic aberration for the majority population to pay taxes for the maintenance of madrassas engaged in the dissemination of hatred of the Brahmanist majority. That, under the dispensation of the secular 1950 Constitution, the nation would defray the costs of training thousands of individuals from the minority Islamic community to hate the Kaffir majority constitutes a perversion of secular liberalism in a functioning democracy. Worse: the concomitant disconcerting impassivity of the Indian Muslim silently confirms the unfounded, needless abomination of the Other as an Unbeliever as a sacred duty enjoined by Allah, beside whom there is, and there can ever be, no other God.

> Allah says: "Lo! ye are those who love them though they love you not, and ye believe in all the Scripture. When they fall in with you they say: We believe; but when they go apart they bite their finger tips at you for rage. Say: Perish in your rage! Lo! Allah is Aware of what is hidden in your breasts (**119***)*.

Allah is unforgiving and dispenses physical hurts on the non-believers. "That He may cut off a part of those who disbelieve, or overwhelm them so that they retire, frustrated." (**127**).

> Allah is thorough in the destruction of the Kaffirs. "And that Allah may prove those who believe and may blight the disbelievers." (**141**)

In a categorical rejection of the Nicene Creed and the Triune Divinity of the Christians, with the affirmation of His uniqueness, Allah fills the hearts of the Others with terror: "We shall cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve because they ascribe unto Allah partners, for which no warrant has been revealed. Their habitation is the Fire, and hapless the above of the wrong-doers." (**151**).

This verse (**3.151**) further stresses the absolute unity of Allah with

the denial of the validity of belief in all the deities pertaining to other peoples and cultures. India has not yet produced a single Muslim to propound, with irrefutable reasoning, that *plurality of religious beliefs in the same geographic space does breed tolerance and creative friendliness*. Invariably History is replete with monotheistic beliefs generating ceaseless lethal conflicts. Pluri-religious societies are invariably quiet. All the Oriental civilizations have maintained alive and vibrant the harmonious coexistence of their religious pluralities.

The disenchantment of the world as the cause of the ecological crisis. In Surah IV, *Women,* Allah enjoins battle against the disciples of Satan: Those who believe do battle for the cause of Allah; and those who disbelieve do battle for the cause of idols. So fight the minions of the devil. Lo! The devil's strategy is ever weak (**76**).

This particular revelation came to Muhammad about a thousand years after Gautama Buddha preached his first sermon on the Four Noble Truths and thereby set in motion the beginning of a most peaceful spiritual dispensation. History took a huge step backward when Allah resolves to send the Revelation which subsequently wages an obliterating war against the peaceful Dharma of the Buddhists which had been, during eighteen centuries, co-existing with the equally peaceful community of Jainas. Up to that time, that is, in the VI-VII century the Christians had been adopting a peaceful way of life. Jacques le Goff, the acknowledged authority in the history of Medieval Christianity, argues that the Christians developed their militancy as a reaction to the violence of Islam. Muhammad lived and grew up in an environment dominated by the Jews and the Christians. The reference to idols in this verse may recall the remnants of Arab belief, or information of other communities indulging in idol worship without engaging in violent conflicts with the Christian and Jewish communities. The followers of the Prophet, as well as the believers of the present time, consider idol worship as an abomination and as a rejection of the revelation. As a political chief and military leader Muhammad called, through the appropriate revelation, for the liquidation of the worshippers of the several idols. The curse, the great curse, which has, unfortunately, not yet roused the moral concern of all religious, philosophical, political and socio-economic celebrities, in order for them to wake up to the coincidence of the ecological crisis having emerged primarily in the West characterized by the total absence of any form of idol worship, throughout the entire spectrum of its Judeo-Christian theologies and their indifference to the disenchantment of the world created by Jehovah.

All those who, after Condorcet's *Outlines of an Historical View of the*

Progress of the Human Mind, made it their duty to welcome the advent of the religion of endless Progress inspired by unfailing Reason, failed to notice the colossal moral and spiritual regression of the violent upsurge of the Islamic religiosity *centuries after the blossoming of the humane* spirituality of the Upaniṣads complemented with Buddhism and Jainism. That Christianity got forcibly veered into a course of violence from the relative peacefulness of its first six centuries was a consequence of the sudden rise of the Islamic Believers' assaults on the well-installed Christian kingdoms in the eastern reaches of the Roman Empire. The Crusades came later with the first expedition to Jerusalem in 1096-99, that is, 464 years after the death of Muhammad. Islamic conquests had already swept across the entire range of North Africa and up to the Pyrenees, on the border of France.

The non-acknowledgement of the merit of idol worship. It has been a fateful misfortune that, during the past five centuries, in particular, the previous three centuries of the paramountcy of the Industrial Revolution, Western hegemony would have deliberately disparaged and, by the enforcement of mass conversions, scuttled the traditions where idols were celebrated with pious devotions. Above all, the military and forceful subjugation of the weak Oriental peoples facilitated the spreading of the view of the Biblical cosmogony having validity over all the cultures which fell within the ambit of colonized inferiority.

As it is still practiced in India, the original inhabitants of both North and South America entertained a poetic, reverent view of a tree, a hill, a lake, presided over with their respective spirits. They evolved forms of collective dances as prayers, which the European conquerors deemed it right to demean as barbaric practices. The natives were damned as being primitive and uncivilized for worshipping Nature as a spiritual presence. It was, and still is, a universalist poetic veneration of Nature, exposing the dry, desiccated spirit of the Judeo-Christian's claim of cultural superiority. The peoples of India saw reasons of religiosity in a large number of places across the entire landscape of the sub-continent: they transformed and hallowed their territory into a network of *tīrthas* (pilgrimage spots). But they were demeaned by Christians and Muslims for the treatment of the disenchanted Biblical space with sacred veneration. Little did they know that, hyped as religious and cultural superiority, their military triumph and the abusive technological mastery of the Earth would later be cursed as the cause of the ecologic degradation of the whole planet.

The sublime examples of spirituality without idol worship: the

cases of Buddhism and Jainism. The negation of a Supreme Being, or of God, of any God, is not inevitably, in all cases, be a spiritually barren form of Atheism. In *The Brothers Karamazov,* Dostoïevsky misses the point, due to his not being acquainted with Buddhist and the Jaina Dharmas, in arguing that one would feel free to do anything contrary to Goodness, if one were not to believe in God. In India the Muslims and the Christians who have assumed boundless self-righteousness in their criticism of Hindu worship of idols, have conveniently chosen to ignore the spirituality of, in particular, Buddhism which was inaugurated by Gautama Buddha emphatically rejecting the usefulness of rituals and of the belief in God and in the Soul, as mental forms of attachment which impede the progress towards the attainment of the state of Arhat in *nirvāṇa*! It must have been the absence of gods in Buddhism which attracted the cultures of the entire continent of Asia and their elites as well as the simple, but believing folks. In India the cultural beauty consisted of the people accommodating the practical deference to natural objects – a stone, a tree, an animal – in imitation of the Brahmanists who did not dispense with their fidelity to profess reverence to the idols standing for their respective *iṣṭa devatā* (favorite deity). Gautama even rejected the use of the belief in a transcendent Divinity.

As a mental object the idea of God would still constitute an impediment to the practice of renunciation and of non-attachment to any kind of sensuous impression of the mind or of the imagination. Gautama Buddha initiated a spiritual revolution in its rejection of all previous meaningfulness of the aids of icons and idols, by building a spirituality relying entirely on the psychic resources of the Individual seeker of self-perfection as the Arhat (the Worthy). Buddhism flourished without constraint of any sort, till, after a glorious existence lasting eighteen centuries, it got destroyed by the Muslim iconoclasts in the XIII century! The utter shame of the genocidal suppression of Buddhism in India consists of Islam *replacing* it with nothing original in the matter of culture. It is a barren, virtue-less replacement, identical with the barren replacement by Islam of the cultures of the Balkans, of Indonesia, of Afghanistan, of Gandhara, of Central Asia, of Den Huang in North-West China. These replacements, on this monumental scale, has not been sufficiently evaluated by Historians in the West, and more so by their Indian brotherhood. It is a subject which awaits due introspection and the commitment, on the part of Brahmanist intellectual and moral elites, to the repair of the colossal wrecking of the Indian Buddhism. Perpetrated with little expenditure of material wealth and manpower, the genocidal elimination of Indian Buddhism by Muslim iconoclasts, is a

cultural disaster specific to the Indian civilization. It proved to be more rigorous and final in its consequences than the dilapidation of Abassid Baghdad by the army of Mongol Hulagu.

The case of the effectiveness of Muslim iconoclastic intolerance as sacred duty. As evidence of their faith and their submission to the truths of the Revelation, the Muslims believed, and acted conjointly with Allah's *Taqdīr*, in the greater effectiveness of their iconoclasm obliterating a different way of life by means of the sword and by fire, impelled by the atavistic remembrance of the flatness of the Arabian desert. Yet it bewilders the mind to realize that the extraordinary destruction of Indian Buddhism, carried out with so little expense of Islamic pelf and blood, but for the infinite glory of Allah's abomination of whatever pertains to the Kaffir, would not have stirred the imagination of Hindu writers and intellectuals for the past seven centuries. It is a case of the effectiveness of Islamic intolerance that it can blot out of the surface of the earth a noble way of life like the Indian Buddhism and even the memory of a religious culture which had been alive during eighteen centuries adorned with superlative public art masterpieces. The indifference to the fate of Indian Buddhism and the absence of its memory has been sudden and thorough, to the extent that the remembrance of this magnificent, original spiritual product brought forth by Gautama, the universalist *vānaprastha* genius, vanished completely from public memory. In regard to this enormous genocide, the deafening stillness of the Brahmanist collective sensitivity defies all forms of understanding. Indeed the absence of the Indian Buddhism and the tragic mode of its disappearance does not provoke the slightest murmur of nostalgia or sorrow, even in the inevitable contemplation of the mute testimonies of Beauty in the art of Sanchi, for example.

It is extremely painful to grasp the magnitude of the loss of the Indian Buddhism and of the shameful surprise that the genocide of the Bauddha Dharma in India must be remembered, as`` an inversion of the catastrophe, that is, as the triumph of Brahmanism having absorbed the original Buddhism after eighteen centuries of its fruitful existence! Nowhere else in the world where Islam has replaced, with nothing, the cultures which it has rubbed off across an immense swath of the world – the Christian cultures of the Balkans, of North Africa, of the Middle East, of Byzantium, of Zoroastrian Persia, and even of the Arabs themselves during the six centuries of Ottoman oppression – has its success been so complete as to have the guilt of the genocide of the local religion or spirituality been assumed by a local community as its intellectual triumph. It is only in India that the Brahmanist community,

moved by an inexplicable reason – which deserves to be investigated – deemed it rationally responsible or opportune to assume the metaphysical supremacy, together with the concordant ignominious glory, for having snuffed out the sublime legacy bequeathed by the noblest *vānaprastha* who ever lived to enhance the preeminent spirituality for the welfare of Bhāratavarśa and of all Humanity.

In truth, it has been a mind staggering of their own victimization that the Brahmanists inflicted upon themselves by losing *the* ultimate spirituality, that is, Buddhism, arrayed with the promise of universal salvation. In the context of this examination due recognition is owed to the humane dynamism of Brahmanism which did, without any disturbance or turmoil, manifest its tolerant magnanimity in favoring the emergence, from its substance, the Dharma of Gautama Buddha, in the V century before the Common Era. Once more it displayed its resilience and its vitality, with appropriate reason and efficacy, in the XVI century, in the necessary rise of Sikhism. Again, in the XX century Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of Truth and of Peace, as the victor who drove into the ground the dragon of imperial evil. Mahatma Gandhi offers the unique example of standing in the middle of the XX century as the *triumphant practitioner of Truth and Peace* in opposition to a Christian Power, armed with an atomic arsenal, at the center of the entire Christendom. Yet, sadly, too sadly, a few centuries earlier Brahmanism proved to be so frail as to lose its Buddhism in the mire of a nondescript cultural replacement.

The universalism of the Brahmanist *Weltanschauung.* Historically the entire range of the Vedic influence, stretched into the Upaniṣads, the Epics, the Purāṇās, has one common decisive thread: their universalism. It is this universalism which Buddhism conveyed to the other Asian civilizations which readily, enthusiastically integrated it with their own independent, specific cultures. Professor T. R. V. Murti used, in this connection, to say, as one of his characteristic cryptic intellectual nuggets: "*Buddhism is Hinduism packaged for export*!" In truth, the Law of Karma and the Yoga ethos and practice, signified by the variations of the "*citta vṛtti nirodha",* (cessation of the thought process) are common to all the three indigenous Dharmas.

The recurrence of superior culture being impoverished by an inferior one. Thereafter, on a vast scale, all humanity witnessed the paradoxical absurdity, with cosmic proportions, of *inferior* religious ideologies displacing and driving into the ground what was a *superior* vision of the world. It is the Book of Genesis, of the Bible, which

postulated and fixed for all time the low act of Yahweh creating a barren, disenchanted world, with Adam as the Lord of all that was created. This disenchantment, worsened by the predominance of Christian power, was magnified by the Lutheran vision of the absolute dichotomy separating the world from God in Heaven.[11] Adam's lordship gained vigor with the supremacy of dogmatic rationalism pioneering the science and the philosophies which lent themselves to the search for the mastery of Nature. Slavery and colonialism established the hegemony of this materialism on a universal scale, with the active support of the Church.[12] The triumph of the Industrial Revolution, for which the capital was gathered by the means of the expenditure of Indian blood and sweat and many genocidal famines, introduced the new Anthropocene Age of consumption and of the concurrent atrophy of Nature. It is an age which consecrates the *inferior* view of the world as *disenchanted*, as the domain of *History*, triumphing over the *superior* vision of the world as *enchanted*, as the manifestation of *Poetry.* So long as the West and the Believers in the revealed religions remain trapped within the deadened sensitivity of living in a *disenchanted* planet, *there will not be a resolution of the ecological conundrum*. The ecological crisis is the direct, organic consequence of the Western, Judeo-Christian way of life, which has its origin, at the very "*beginning"* of the Biblical World

---

[11] The dichotomy of the World–Here and Heaven-Above, whether the believer lives in the Northern Hemisphere or at the tip of Patagonia, is an indelible trait of all religions. The exception of the vision of all that exists is the ONE, beside which there is No-thing, as embracing the fundamental cosmology of the Indian. It is *the* reason of the Western mind being, most of the time, if not always, unable to understand the ethos of the Brahmanist civilisation.

[12] Doug Cuthand, in *The Edmonton Journal,* of Saturday, April 2, 2022; p. A 10. *"*The domination of non-Christian lands and peoples was approved by the Papal Bull of 1493 when Pope Alexander VI authorized Portugal and Spain to conquer the Americas and convert, colonize and enslave the Indigenous people. The papal bull extended to other European nations and gave them free range to conquer Indigenous peoples from Africa to be traded to the "new world". The Doctrine of Discovery is a late medieval view of the world, but it remains in place today. The vestiges of colonialism are still with us – the so-called Third World is composed largely of former colonies that are struggling to regain their sovereignty. The Fourth World consists of the Indigenous nations within the European diaspora. Nations like Canada, Australia built on Indigenous land and the original people are subject to internal colonialism…".

created by Jehovah, the source and initiator of all, indeed *all* religious intolerances and their calamitous consequences.

The Brahmanist hope. But the hope for the instauration of a compassionate world order stays in the possession of the native Dharmas of India and of the Buddhisms of the Asian States if they be allowed to project their moral universalism and the elevating possibilities of universal salvation as politics for the world as a unified humane family (*vasudhaiva kutumbakam*). For the lasting establishment of a world peace as the foundation of universal contentment, the Dharmas of the Brahmanist and of the Buddhist would provide the determining category for a Realpolitik infused with the *Satyam* (Truth) and *Ahiṁsā* (absolute non-violence), according to their meaning exalted by the *Mahābhārata*. The challenge calling for the reconstruction of Humanity, purified of the legacy of Jehovah's assortment of intolerances, would need to be fortified, in its mode of operation, by imitations of Mahatma Gandhi manifesting these two moral absolutes in his contribution to the apotheosis of the Western civilization as the World Wars of the XX century.

The terrifying prospect of the world as a unitive Dar-ul-Islam. By regurgitating Yahweh's disenchantment of the world and, consequently, denouncing idol worship as an abomination, Allah commands his believers to maintain their zeal for the domination of a world totally devoid of idol worship. Today his injunction to the Believers to wage war against the seven billions of Unbelieving Kaffirs would, if enacted, intensify the pessimistic conviction of there being no exit from the ecological misfortune. Even if the mirage of the fulfillment of Allah's wish to transform the whole world into a culturally barren *Dar-ul-Islam* be hopefully just that, a mirage. For a mirage above the desert sands of Arabia is still a mirage. It never morphs into a Samarkand.

The unimportance of death to the Kaffir. Neither in the whole range of Christian Theology, despite the long history of violent conflicts and internecine wars within Christendom, nor in any of the Oriental philosophies or religious teachings, can one come across a direct pronouncement of the Supreme Being unambiguously urging upon the believer to kill the Other. But this is what Allah does when he asseverates, in **Surah IV, Women**: They long that ye disbelieve even as they disbelieve, that they may be upon a level (with them). So choose not friends from them till they forsake their homes in the way of Allah; if they turn back (to enmity), then take them and kill them wherever ye find them, and choose no friend nor helper from among them….Ye will find others who desire that they should have security from you, and security from their own folk. So often as they are returned to

hostility they are plunged therein. If they keep not aloof from you, no offer you peace, nor hold their hands, then take them and kill them wherever ye find them. Against such we have given you clear warrant (**89, 91**).

A believer, who receives such a lucid divine injunction, would not be deterred, by the law of a non-Muslim State, from killing with a guiltless conscience whomever he happens to see as a disbeliever who is immediately assumed to be hostile to the Prophet, or to his Faith, or to the Book. Islamic jurisprudence bestows upon the Believer living in a Kaffir host country, the right and the duty to fight on the side of the Muslim country against which his host country is at war.

The success of irascible, vindictive Allah is a regression from the reality of sweet Jesus. Allah lays bare His unforgiving harshness, in contrast with the compassion of Jesus. That Allah would promulgate such a ferocious treatment, with an unqualified support and encouragement of its enactment as a moral enterprise undertaken by the believer, was, in the VII century, a decisive regression in comparison with the moral codes of the other contemporary cultures. As if this ruthless intolerance is not unduly stern enough, Allah pronounces a more inhumane indignity upon the offending disbelievers in the revelation **33 of Surah V.** ***The Table Spread***: The only reward of those who make war upon Allah and the messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified. Or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land. Such will be their degradation in the world, and in the Hereafter theirs will be an awful doom.

Further, in the same **Surah V,** the reasonable Disbeliever would certainly sense the irony in the following revelation of Allah's kindness with these words: Save those who repent before you overpower them. For know that Allah is Forgiving, Merciful (**34**).

But Allah returns to His advocacy of uncompromising barbarism in: As for the thief, both male and female, cut off their hands. It is the reward of their own deeds: an exemplary punishment from Allah. Allah is Mighty, Wise (**38**).

We do not need to refer to the Laws of War, and to the Geneva Conventions, in relation to the humane treatment of prisoners of war, in order to judge, with a feeling of humaneness signifying a moral progress in relation to the enemy in the warfare of the XX century and after. It suffices to remember that Muhammad was in daily contact with Jews and Christians for him to be fully aware of the immense magnanimity of Jesus asking his Father to forgive those who had inflicted the cruellest forms of torment and torture on his body before the ultimate inhumanity of his being crucified. In regard to the example of sublime compassion of Jesus, unique in world history, what a moral regression was it with Allah's commandment to display a definitive barbarism in the exercise

of judicial Might and Wisdom in the punishment for theft with the permanent crippling of the offender with the loss of a limb, all the more so, when the offender happened to be a woman!

In **verse 45** of the same **Surah V**, Allah emphasizes his compulsive cruelty, borrowed from the Old Testament: And we prescribed for them – that is, the disbelievers mentioned in the precedent verse – therein: The life for the life, and the eye for the eye, the nose for the nose, the ear for the ear, the tooth for the tooth, and for wounds retaliation. But whoso forgoeth it (in the way of charity) it shall be expiation for him. Whoso judgeth not by that which Allah hath revealed such are wrong-doers.

Such a verse, such a legal prescription, is being, most unfortunately, spread rationally, by the instruments of the madrassas sponsored by Muslim governments of elected democracies: with its augmented mercilessness in regard to the original Jewish version of the *lex talionis* it activates a backward push to history. In the hundreds of madrassas across the world of Islam, the lesson is taught with the salient emphasis, approved by Islamic scholarship, on the negation of the ideology or religion of Progress which was celebrated, in conjunction with the philosophy underscoring the French Revolution of 1789, with, among other beneficent principles, the proclamation of the ideology or religion of progress as a beneficent contribution of the primacy of Reason.

The large scale reiteration of the barbaric practical fidelity to the Sharia law, which draws its authority and its justification from these terror-laden **Quranic verses : V. 33**, **38, 45** are a regular feature of the Islamic criminal law operating in those majority Muslim states governed by fundamentalist constitutions. Even in the pseudo-democracies like Pakistan and Bangladesh, the educated Middle Class maintains the usual silence over the barbarousness of these cruel Sharia penal laws. Indeed, it is most deplorable that the Indian Muslims too choose to dwell silent on the prevalence, in some majority Islamic countries keeping alive the Sharia dispensation of the enhanced severity of the *lex talionis.* They do not call for the abrogation of this penal law which inflicts the cruelty of the permanent crippling of men and women for the relatively minor crime of theft. Nor do they even reflect on the dehumanizing incongruity that, in the liberal democratic Republic of India, their identity requires the maintenance of madrassas where generations of Muslims are taught Allah's prescription of the law of talion.

The hostility of Allah against the Disbeliever is spread across the Quran. Allah does not relent in His hatred of the Disbeliever. He may be all compassionate towards the Believers but His affection does not extend to the Humanity which thrives beyond the perimeter of the Islamic space. In **Surah VI, *Cattle***, Allah declares: And forsake those who

take their religion for a pastime and a jest, and whom the life of the world beguileth. Remind (mankind) hereby lest a soul be destroyed by what it earneth, it hath beside Allah no friend nor intercessor, and though it offer every compensation it will not be accepted from it. Those are they who perish by their own deserts. For them is drink of boiling water and a painful doom, because they disbelieved (**70**).

Allah allows no room for the free existence of the Atheist or for any individual who uses his knowing faculties to give himself a free, independent opinion different from the meaning of an orthodox interpretation of the revelations. The fear of some Imam's fatwa does as a rule prohibit the freedom of personal scriptural interpretation and the social conduct corresponding to it. The wide scope facilitating the rationale of a fatwa has its justification in the **Surah VI**: Who is guilty of more wrong than he who forgeth a lie against Allah, or saith: I am inspired, when he is not inspired in aught; and who saith: I will reveal the like of that which Allah hath revealed? If thou couldst see, when the wrong-doers reach the pangs of death and the angels stretch their hands out, saying: Deliver up your souls. This day ye are awarded doom of degradation for that ye spake concerning Allah other than the truth, and scorned His portents (**93**).

The negative temper of **verse 93** offends by its rigor and its extreme intolerance. It contemns the free, independent interpretation or any meaningful deviation from orthodox dictation of the revelation. It supplies the reason for the non-recognition of another revelation and accordingly it repudiates the Ahmadiyas and their claim to a different Islamic orthodoxy. Considering that the Ahmadiyas had enthusiastically supported the Muslim League and joined the clamor for the Partition, they ultimately found themselves, in the 1970s, demoted to a status more abhorrent than that of Hindu 'disbelievers'. **Verse 93** justifies the amendment of the Pakistani constitution which denies the legitimacy of the Ahmadiyas to consider themselves genuine Muslims. The law even grants, as a demeaning insult, the Ahmadiyas the "privilege" of consuming alcohol, on a par with the non-Muslim citizens! By constitutional fiat the Ahmadiyas got suddenly cast into the caste of abominated Kaffirs! This verse further spells *the doom of degradation*, which can be both physical and psychological, as the punishment for the proclamation of a truth different from what Allah has revealed.

The Muslim contempt for Mahatma Gandhi. It is with the authority of such a revelation that the Muslim could view Mahatma Gandhi's *satyagraha* as deserving his contemptuous violence. It is incomprehensible that such revelations, as well as the consequences of the application of their meanings in the politics of Islam, remained hidden or ignored by the Mahatma and his Hindu collaborators. In fact it is misleading to think or to speak of the "politics of Islam", for the plain truth is, since the days of the Prophet himself, that Islam has been

nothing but totalitarian Politics. Besides the Roman soldiers too regularly had their religious ceremonies, without their religiosity replacing their renown as victorious soldiers. It must have been the acquaintance with the co-existence of a certain religiosity and the fame of Rome as a political power, which would have influenced Muhammad in his developing the new political religion of Islam in the VII century, on the easternmost confines of the Roman Empire. The obligation to pray in a mosque does not conceal, if not actually fortify, the fact of Islam as Politics. There is no direct or indirect evidence of any relevant discussion having ever taken place among the Muslim and Hindu leaders during the history of the Congress Party, even when the Indian society was caught in the whirlwind of the Dajjal's Dance of death in the frenzy of Partition. Why did the magnates and the second-hand writers of the Indian news industry, the academics, the artists, the philosophers, not ask the leaders of both the Muslim and Hindu communities the relevant questions for an explanation of Dajjal hurling his troops to wreak apocalyptic violence? Why did the Congress Party Muslims maintain their impassivity and their silence during all those months of their witnessing their Dajjal at work in the ravages inflicting India?[13]

Those who kill innocent men, women and children are innocent when they do so in the name of Allah. Certainly Allah has allies in the angels who are favorable to the believers. In **verse 12 of Surah VIII, *The Spoils of War***, He says: When thy Lord inspired the angels (saying): I am with you. So make those who believe stand firm, I will throw fear into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Then smite the necks and smite of them each finger.

For the Arab smiting the neck meant beheading.

The verse **17** is revealing: Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them. And thou (Muhammad) threwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that He might test the believers by a fair test from Him. Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower.

The non-Muslim cannot argue with the Muslim who acts according to this verse and accordingly believes he is innocent and he goes to Heaven to enjoy eternal, infinite delights. It is the verse which offers *carte blanche* to the committed terrorist who kills defenseless men,

---

[13] Islamic tradition refers to a diabolical individual called Dajjal, the 'Impostor', ' the Liar', as a sign announcing the end of time. Of Syriac origin, this name does not appear in the Quran. But the Sunni tradition identifies him with "beast"(*dabba*), which is mentioned in the **Quran: 27. 82**: "And when the Word is fulfilled concerning them, We shall bring forth a beast of the earth to speak to them because mankind hath not faith in Our revelations." Re*. Dictionnaire du Coran*, p. 270.

women, children with the fullest assurance of his innocence and of the certainty of eternal delights in heaven, if he happens to be killed. Assured of innocence the killer can indulge in the ecstasy of bestowing death to those who earn Allah's abomination.

The **Quranic 8.17** is a significant verse: it displays and authorizes the psychology of the terrorist and his uninhibited willingness to kill innocent and defenseless individuals assumed to be enemies. As a divine authorization, it is a contradiction of the killer who thus uses his life and his education in a liberal, secular democratic country to suppress, unprovoked or unthreatened, the lives of others as a sacred task. It is this Quranic verse which unambiguously postulates Allah as the guarantor of the innocence of the terrorist who kills while piously trumpeting the formula: "*Allahu akbar*"! Throughout the preparation of the act of terror and during its perpetration, the murderer is fully conscious of the belief that this particular revelation abrogates the laws and all the contingent moral obligations pertaining to his host society. He further believes the self-sacrificing act thereby earns him the immediate reward of unlimited sexual delights in Allah's paradise. The senselessness of the terrorist act does often baffle the understanding of Everyman in those countries which endure the eruptions of unprovoked murderous acts. Terrorist violence shocks even Muslim societies when the scenes of the wreckage and of the anguish and tearful suffering of the victimized relatives fill the screen of the television reporting the event. But the killer acts soberly with the conviction of his performing an obligatory duty as the proxy of Allah. He sincerely believes that he is not only innocent, but he is particularly happy and grateful for the immediate enjoyment of a reward conferred directly by Allah Himself for dutifully obeying His command. The terrorist thus catapults himself into the immediacy of his association with Allah in an exalted state of being transubstantiated into a denizen in Paradise. His act of terror extinguishes the Time stretching from the present moment of his act to the Day of Resurrection! He is absolved of the ordeal of appearing before Allah apportioning rewards and punishments on the Last Day.

An example of the lethal poison at the heart of Islam and as the venom in the Islamist's heart. The Quran **8.17** verse overwhelms the non-Muslim's mind with its representation of an ultimate decadence and moral debasement in the lust for killing attributed to the will of Allah, as the only God, and to the Believer assured of the supreme privilege of his murderous innocence. As a regressive statement it gives the lie to the Quran's claim that it is the seal of prophecy, that there cannot be any higher or more soul elevating motivation, that Muhammad is superior to

the compassionate and sweet Jesus, that the ethos of the Islamic revelation represents a peerless superiority in comparison with the Christian dispensation ennobled by the Beatitudes of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, let alone the virtue of *ahiṁsā* at the heart of Indian civilization. The spiritual chasm which separates in particular the Indian Muslim from his Kaffir neighbor can be further assessed by the latter's adhesion to a verse like the **Quran's 8.17** in a land where for centuries the Jainas have been teaching and publishing the uncompromising avoidance of the slightest harm to *all living beings*, however small and insignificant. Further the loyalty to Allah claiming to be the effective killer in the guise of the terrorist or Islamist activist epitomizes the Indian Muslim's insensitivity to the consummate graciousness of the Buddhist's reverence for life and of the *Mahābhārata's* proclamation of *ahiṁsā* as the ultimate moral ideal.

The abomination of Quran 8. 17. One can imagine the horror of the terrorist's act by imagining how it is preceded by a studied process of preparation, of cold calculation, of training, of concentrating all the senses towards the assumed sacredness and moral purity of killing innocent lives. The indoctrination brings forth the transformation of the consciousness in its *elevation* to a sustained, joyfully enlivening sentiment of a sacrificial enthusiasm. The believer dear to Allah lives, with a *reason* set in accordance to a code which starkly differentiates itself from the laws and mores of the country where he chooses to strike. Whatever may be the Believer's claim to the virtue of killing as Allah's proxy, there can be no hesitation, in the name of common sense morality, to assume that the action justified by **Quran 8.17** is an abomination, a denial of humanity, an affront to life regarded as a priceless gift graced with the Ultimate Reality being its in-dweller (*antaryāmī*). Above all, how can anyone claim, with a straight face, the macabre conviction that he owns the infinite grace of having innocence in killing non-Muslims? The magnitude of the evilness exalting this particular revelation compels, most unfortunately, the obligation to perceive even the gentlest Muslim to bear the potent authority of acting in accord with Allah's *mercy* and *knowing* in the ultimate depravity borne by **Q, 8. 17.**

The absolution of the murderous Muslim killer as the proxy of Allah. That is why it is disconcerting that at least this particular revelation of the Quran **(8,17)** is not known to the general public, in the West, and particularly in India, especially among the writers in the leading dailies and consequently among the educated class of India. Despite the centuries marked by violent iconoclastic devastations lustily indulged in, the indigenous Indians were taken aback by the murderous

mayhem which accompanied the Partition of the sub-continent in 1947. Despite the monumental catastrophe which so brutally ravaged India as a result of the partition, the Europeans, blinded by their ethnocentrism, chose to retreat into their closed-minded insensitivity towards the misfortune of a former colonized people. Not even the British elites and the people at large could summon any moral energy to evince any revulsion over their ultimate decadence evident in the cowardly retreat from the empire they were abandoning to the Dajjal's Dance of Death and to the Mayhem rousing the demonic fires of communal hatred. The Quranic Verse **8. 17 -** which confers innocence upon the prospective "martyr" or the obedient, faithfully submitting Believer - confirms the psychology of Muhammad as a ruthless Conqueror who is not disturbed by any scruple of Humanity in advancing the cause of Islam by the raw means of violent action for the mastery of the world. It was a characteristic feature of the Prophet's personality which Montesquieu accurately divined in the XVIII century, but which lay beyond the vision and the understanding of all the native Indians during a thousand years of co-habitation with Islam and its expression as iconoclasm and hatred. That collective insensitivity could even absorb the effacement of the major component of the civilization which Buddhism had been during seventeen centuries!

The difficulty of the Kaffir to be reconciled to Allah's injunctions to murder. However strange it may appear, it does indeed challenge the imagination to grasp that it can take a long time for the liberal mind to adapt and to be reconciled to the inhumane reality of the logic to commit mass murder, with a conscience molded by the imperative to kill cold-bloodedly as faithful service to the Almighty. Just as the Believer can silently observe the terror flashing in the eyes of the animal which senses that its life is being unnaturally cut short, as he slowly slits its throat and watches the blood gushing out while he murmurs a dedication to Allah, so does the 'mujahid' terrorist transfer the Hallal act, of watching life ebbing out of the sacrificial animal, to the unknown human being he chooses as the victim for the justification of his wish to be a martyr. Belatedly this ignorance of the self-sanctifying terrorist or suicide-bomber happens, in the XXI century, to finally stare in the face of the elites and of the ordinary citizens, in the West European secular, liberal democracies.

The direct involvement of God in war in Islam and in the revealed religions. It is common knowledge that, throughout the Judeo-Christian history of Europe, victories have been won by the victors claiming to have had God on their side. Emperor Constantine I imagined

he had seen a cloud formation resembling the body of Jesus and believed that was a sign of his victory against his enemy, the Emperor Maxentius. When the temperature suddenly dropped and the Volga river froze, and the tanks could cross over, Heinrich Himmler, who was visiting the German front, in 1943, during the Russian campaign, in the World War II, exclaimed: "Gott mit uns!" ('God is with us!'). The ideologues of the West European imperial powers self-righteously claimed that the Greed and the Famishing, the Exploitation and the Impoverishing, the Domination and the Humiliation, which spurred their enterprises, were the real benefits of European civilization conferred upon the 'benighted' conquered peoples who, as a result, ought thereby to be submissively grateful. But in none of these cases - and there have been many others practiced elsewhere by other races - does one find a potent, unambiguous scriptural command issued by God, as does Allah, as the more vehement avatar of Jehovah, who assures the Believer of being His proxy in murdering, with a conscience unencumbered with guilt. After the battle at Badr, Muhammad transmitted a revelation saying that the victory was won not by the heroism of the men, the first Muslims, but by the direct intervention of Allah. And so it will always be, with the benediction of the Revelation in **Quran 8.17.**

When in reality Muslim terrorists kill also Jews and Christians, in spite of Muhammad recognizing the latter as followers of the tradition based on the Book, Allah's command spelled out in **Quran 8.17** forces unbelief by the brazenness of its declaration of war against the entire Humanity of non-Muslims. It is a stupendous statement the like of which has not been thought of in any other known scripture or philosophy in world history. The haunting question which **Quran 8.17** forces itself upon the mind is: How could such a verse as **8.17** and its many cognate companions have sailed through the past fourteen centuries without any of the luminaries, without anyone, in the history of Islamic scholarship feeling the need to offer an adverse opinion on these injunctions to murder? What kind of obtuseness, what kind of permanent unflinching insensitivity, does the Quran breed in the mind of the Believers that till today no one has mustered the strength and the courage to question the Allah-given licence to kill – innocently! - with unmitigated jihadic fervor?

The ease of the Muslim's conscience in killing the Unbeliever. The monstrosity of suicide-bombings and of terrorist acts against innocent men, women, children receives its inspiration and its justification in this verse: "And when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever ye find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them and prepare for them each ambush. But if they repent and establish worship and pay the poor due,

then leave their way free. Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful (**Surah IX, 5).**

This ferocious injunction of murderous treatment of the "Idol-worshippers" - the word which in India is freely attributed, with condemnatory disparagement, by image-breaking Muslims, to the Brahmanists – has been carried out during the centuries of iconoclastic fervor. It has resulted in the disappearance of countless temples, of all the well-established, centuries old centres of learning, of the burning of libraries, together with the imposition of *Dhimma*, of *jaziya*. On all these depredations the Indian Muslims observe a judicious silence, while claiming, with infinite self-righteousness, a cynical reversal of their own history, as *their experience of victimhood*.

Against Christians and Jews Allah urges the faithful, not to use persuasion, with the intention to convert them, or to bring them to the "true" religion, but to adopt a violent intolerance towards them. Allah commands the Believers in **Quran 9.29**: 'Fight against such of those who have been given the Scripture as believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, and forbid not that which Allah hath forbidden by his messenger, and follow not the Religion of Truth, until they pay the tribute readily, being brought low.

Such a revelation suggests that the faithful severed all bonds with those Christians and Jews who would not have been strict fundamentalists, or who did not measure up to what the Prophet deemed to be the correct, visible expression of faithfulness to the textual expressions of their sacred scriptures. The reference to the Day of Resurrection confirms our view that Islam is a religion which deprives the faithful Believer of an Ontological dimension in his submission to the revealed rules and in his life spent by following the Straight Path. That thereby he is not disturbed is due to the conviction of living delightfully in Paradise, which is physically an enhanced continuation of living in the disenchanted world of his birth.

No miracles in the oriental religions. It is indeed a strain on the imagination of a Disbeliever to concur with the Jew, with the Christian, and especially with the Muslim, that the Day of Resurrection is as historical as the crucifixion of Jesus or as the Partition of India. One of the significant differences between the Dharmas and the revealed religions consists of the importance which the latter give to miracles as historical events. Indeed there are miraculous events galore in the stories told in the *Purāṇas*. But the simplest-minded *Bhakta* (devotee) knows that they are fictions meant to illustrate usually a moral value related to an individual particular moment or content in his existence. In a fair comparison, the abundant amount of science fiction and of the computerized wizardry of cinematographic other worlds bestow upon

their readers and spectators little enhancement of moral or aesthetic modes of living.

The question of the Indian Muslim's identity. The Quran **9.33** says: He it is Who has sent His Messenger with the guidance and the Religion of Truth, that He may cause it to prevail over all religions, however much the idolaters may be averse.

With this revelation as a norm and guidance, during more than a millennium the Indian Muslims have, despite the ceaseless conflicts, co-existed with Jews and Christians, with Buddhists, Jainas and Brahmanists. All through that period they have steadfastly claimed fidelity to this "divine" pronouncement of the unsurpassable Truth revealed by Allah to Muhammad the Messenger. In the imagination of the Muslims, Indians constitute a motley group of inferior people driven by untruths and errors and hence are significantly inferior. That is why, in association with Muslims, the native Indians cannot exist otherwise, than in submission to the Quranic command. It is this religious assumption which lies at the heart of the ethnic cleansing carried out by the educated middle class in Pakistan and in Bangladesh. However, concurrently, it is no wonder that, till today, the Indian Muslims have not produced a single intellectual to declare, or even to speculate, that the claim made in **Quran 9.33** is a tawdry idea compared to the sublime universal brotherhood which lies at the heart of Jesus's emphasizing the Kingdom of God being the true essence of Man. And before Jesus the Brahmanist had long been familiar with the perennial truths of *aham brahmo'smi* and *tat twam asi* and the supremely authentically universalist pronouncement *ātman brahman aikyam.*

The finality of human existence in the Dharmas. Still less is this particular Quranic Revelation able to rival the immanent essence of the Supreme Being as the in-dweller (*antaryāmī*) according to the tenets of Brahmanism. Still less does it measure up with the mystical perfection as the finality of Man in the *Nirvāṇa* of Buddhism or in the *Kaivalya* of Jainism. The Indian Muslim's existence *as-such* repudiates Patañjali's *nirvikalpa samādhi* as Man's ontological self-fulfillment, as the ultimate experience which distinguishes each of the three indigenous Dharmas, as well as the different Buddhisms which have enriched the cultures of North and South-East Asia. As a meta-linguistic personal experience, the *nirvikalpa samādhi* is the *only* authentic universalist experience as the perfection of Humanity. By its essence existentially realized without any qualification by word or image, by sound or by color, the *nirvikalpa samādhi* is the transcendental knowing which transcends all theologies, all philosophies, all languages, all forms, all particularities of History and of Geography. It represents the essence of the universal salvation,

by virtue of its meta-linguistic experience in the human body, on earth, as a private personal existential bliss.

It is the *summum bonum* of Humanity, above which there can be no other form of rival existential experience of self-perfection. Only the human condition expresses it as reaching the ultimate, timeless shore, after crossing the ocean of transmigration. There is no Day of Resurrection. Even if it were a reality, it would be just a gigantic jamboree celebrating on a more gigantic arena presided over, in specific spheres, by Jehovah, Jesus and Allah,

The best expression conveying the attainment of the mystical perfection is sculpted in the middle face of Śiva in the Elephanta Cave and in the smile of Gautama Buddha in the sculptures of all the Buddhisms. Enlightenment is illustrated best by silence, with a faint smile, the smile of the sublime self-realization. The smile illustrates the iconography of the Buddha in a variety of specific subtle expressiveness in the different Buddhisms of Asia.[14]

The vanity of the obliteration of the Indian Buddhism. The genocide of the Indian Buddhism by the Believers did not entail the death of the Buddha's smile! With Buddhism flourishing, fortunately, in most of the Asian countries, the genocide of the Indian Buddhism was a tragic, monumental malfeasance which did not obliterate the Idea of the luminous *Madhyama Pratipada,* (The Middle Way) a Himalayan summit of World Philosophy. The genocide of the Indian Buddhism by the Muslims is none the less an incommensurate loss to the Indian civilization. But it has not in any way diminished the worth and nobility of a most civilizing spiritual doctrine fortunately alive in the world. The genocidal triumph of Islam in India did not diminish the worth and vitality of the Bauddha Dharma. It is an indelible blot on the history of Islam, even if the Believers interpret the enormity of a diminution as a homage to Jehovah-Allah's aversion to the eminence of mystical spirituality. As a fragment of the nation, the Indian Muslims would have been a lot *more* than what they are today, in an immensely enhanced environment in which they had settled, without the Dajjal will to diminish it as *their* assurance of a seat in Paradise as an alluring mirage.

The identity of the Indian Muslim in adhesion to an exclusive, intolerant faith and the spiritual emptiness of the world according

---

[14] The Guimet Museum in Paris, France, exhibits a fair collection of marvelous Buddha heads adorned with exquisite smiles, signifying the ineffable joy of *nirvāṇa*.

to the three Revelations. The only impetus which can explain the Indian Muslim's petrified intellect having been rendered adverse to the contemplation of the hierarchy of moral and spiritual finalities available around him, is the fear of the possible loss of his identity. Along the Straight Path which Allah prescribes and indicates to the faithful believers, there is, beside the beauty of the calligraphy of the Quranic words, no fine art, no free significant work of literature or body of correlative independent speculative thought, as lasting foundations of the pride in Islamic culture, which non-Muslims could have adopted for their enrichment. In particular Islamic revelation does not have any structure of philosophical thought as is available, for instance, in the learning of the Chinese Confucian elite and in the learned refinements of the Indian sages and mystics. As a lofty tribute to the human enterprise it is philosophy which imparts serenity to the thinking elites at the summit of the social hierarchy, in India and in China. In His revelations in the three Old Testament centered religions - Judaism, Christianity and Islam - Jehovah or Allah does not bestow upon mankind any philosophical or metaphysical insight. It is the influence of the philosophical preeminent class which provides the reason and the substance of the enduring steadfastness of these two great Oriental civilizations, unlike the Christians and the Muslims who are unable to end the crumbling of their religious security and of the stability of their faith and even of their materialistic contentment. Hence they search in their mobility for a compensation to their ontological emptiness. The emptiness is locked within the belief in the Final Day, or the Day of the Resurrection, events which will happen at dates in the Greek Calends. However the Christians, particularly those pertaining to the Roman Catholic denomination, the certitude of a spiritual revival of the concrete experience of the mystical Kingdom remains as the saving alternative, for the welfare of all Humanity. Till then the Christian's sentiment of personal self-fulfillment in the realization of the Kingdom shall preserve the hope, if not the certainty, of believing in the eternity of individual and of collective living as revelations of the One. It is the negation of the One by the Book of Genesis which has brought the world to this apparently hopelessness as the characteristic feature of the XXI century. It began with the triumph of the banishment of Ontological certitude from the world, at the first moment of Creation, according to the Old Testament. The banishment of the Absolute Reality into the beyond 'above' left the Believers deprived of their Fullness, which they have vainly been seeking to end by roaming over all latitudes and longitudes in search of the peace of self-fulfillment.

The mobility of the people of the revealed religions. That is why

the Muslims and the Christians drove themselves to cross their frontiers in search of material satisfactions to compensate for the acedia of living according to fixed external codes and rules. They believed that they were blessed with having been given the prospect of living according to the best of all possible ideals conferred by the revelations, with the supernormal addition of their having a physically alive Divinity coming down to earth for their ultimate good. Yet, with the acceptance of the fact of the Straight Path bestowed upon them by God, the immediate Muslims of Muhammad rushed to fill their vast existential emptiness with the material spoils of conquest, with the domination of the weak and the destruction of their ways of life as the confirmation of the truth and beneficence of their religion. The ultimate, unlimited violence became the unquestioned acme of religious righteousness and the surrogate for fanatical faith and the enslaving of the defeated peoples as evidence and proof of their new-fangled spirituality. The cheap, infinite store of violence of a race untutored by the rigours of philosophical thought gave to the early Muslims the feeling of their religious supremacy, of its being the only Truth, as the evidence of their religiosity. Likewise the British interpreted their conquest of the weaker nations, including the Indian Muslim power, with the boast of their religiosity and their civilization having equality with the ascendancy of their military knowledge and the superiority of their military weaponry. The unexpected, but improvised, product of the revelations, has been the genocidal misfortunes of the cultures which happened to lie in the straight paths of the perpetually moving Believers seeking finalities in the intolerance of their victims.

The absence of the Quran in the Gandhian politics. One has only to recall that, while he borrowed ideas and ideals from foreign authors and sources such as Tolstoi, Ruskin, Thoreau, Mill, the Gospel, Mahatma Gandhi did not find a single word in the Quran to add to the language of his political campaign against the oppression of the British rule. He did not receive a single idea from even Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, the learned scholar specializing in Islamic studies, and President more than once of the Congress Party. The Gandhian political language, stretched in more than ninety-five hard cover volumes, does not bear witness to any borrowing from the Islamic scripture. Independence was won by the exertion of those who wielded the power of the will guided by the indigenous Dharmas. Pakistani apology for "independence" was won with British conniving prompted by their strategic concern for the preservation of the Middle Eastern Oil in conjunction with the Muslim's iconoclastic intolerance of the Brahmanist Kaffir. Churchill, with his enormous imperialist fanaticism, conceived Pakistan as a remaining

portion of the Indian Empire, as a bulwark protecting the Middle Eastern Oil. That is why Great Britain, with Mountbatten executing the plot conceived in London, gave India only two weeks to realize the Partition,[15] with open support to the violent *modus operandi* of the partition. Churchill's fight for the Christian cause meant also his leading the Raj to support the Dajjal violence directed against the pacifist Hind majority, with the help and connivance of the British in charge of the police and the army.

The influence of the Quran and of the Hadiths in the degradation of indigenous Indian civilization. Moreover, in a global view of History, the unimpeded violences of the Believers of the three revealed religions have been tested, on the stage of the Indian territory, by their failure to break the continuity and the vibrant vitality of the Dharmas in conjunction with the spiritual comfort of the hundreds of millions of their followers. It is a failure of the Muslim imagination that it has not been able to reconcile itself with the triumph of the soul of the Triple Dharmas evident in the rebirth of the forces of Satya and *Ahiṁsā* in the struggle for Independence from the might of the British Empire. French historians do sometimes recognize that Islam may have exerted some beneficial influence on the Medieval European civilization. In India, on the contrary, the influence of Islam can be measured as the congruity of Allah's revelations securing the identity of the Indian Muslims by the elimination of the achievements of the indigenous Kaffirs in Ethics, in Aesthetics and in Metaphysics. In the Indian sub-continent Islam brought religious intolerance, iconoclasm, diminution of native civilization and, in particular, the violent extinction of Indian Buddhism, without any iota of a replacement.

Even the angels are violent in the Islamic heaven. In imitation of associations of parallel political parties, the angels are always in league with the Believers. And together they obey Allah in their ill-treatment of the Kaffirs. To Muhammad Allah says: When thy Lord inspired the angels (saying:) I am with you. So make those who believe stand firm. I will throw fear into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Then smite the necks and smite of them each finger. (**Surah VIII, *Spoils of War;* 12**).

Verse 50 of the Surah VIII reveals the dark side of the angels: If thou couldst see how the angels receive those who disbelieve, smiting their faces and their backs and (saying): Taste the punishment of

[15] It tickles the imagination that in contrast Great Britain took five years to bring about the separation – with the funny name 'Brexit' - from the European Union, in 2021.

burning!

Indeed the Disbeliever does never have a chance in the cosmic view of Allah. The unfortunate Kaffir has nowhere to hide for his protection! The angels in folk literature are generally represented as gentle heavenly denizens. When they see their babies smile while being asleep in their cribs, mothers are wont to murmur with spontaneous glee that they are being amused and delighted by angels! But the angels who inhabit the heaven of Allah inflict the punishment of blows striking the backs and the faces of Disbelievers! The verse describing the behavior of the angels towards the Unbelievers anticipates the expression of giving a dog a bad name and thereby hanging him!

According to **Verse 67**, of the same **Surah VIII**, the Prophet must not make prisoners before he has prevailed: It is not for any Prophet to have captives until he hath made slaughter in the land. Ye desire the lure of this world and Allah desireth (for you) the Hereafter, and Allah is Mighty, Wise.

Owner of nine swords, Muhammad must have been happy with such a revelation. He did indeed use his swords to cut down the Jews and the Christians. In so doing, he self-righteously vindicated the Quranic allegation that the Jews and the Christians had forfeited the favor of Allah when they sinned by neglecting to abide faithfully by the rules and principles He had earlier revealed to them!

The Quranic damnation of the Kaffir. Mighty, Forgiving, Merciful Allah reveals that the Disbeliever is unclean. In **Surah IX, Repentance**, Allah speaks: O ye who believe! The idolaters only are unclean. So let them not come near the Inviolable Place of Worship after this their year. If ye hear poverty (from the loss of their merchandise) Allah shall preserve you of His bounty if He will. Lo! Allah is Knower, Wise (**28**).

Even during the time of the Prophet Muhammad the tensions between the earliest Muslim community and the Jews and the Christians were not friendly or harmonious, as is evident in the verses **34, 35**: O ye who believe! Lo! Many of the (Jewish) rabbis and the (Christian) monks devour the wealth of mankind wantonly and debar (men) from the way of Allah. Those who hoard up gold and silver and spend it not in the way of Allah, and unto them give tidings (O Muhammad) of a painful doom. On the day when it will (all) be heated in the fire of hell and their foreheads and their flanks and their backs will be branded therewith (and it will be said unto them): Here is that which ye hoarded for yourselves. Now taste of what ye used to hoard.

The Quran makes a stark distinction between the Muslim Believer and all others, the Disbelievers, the Kaffirs: the latter are the absolute opposite of the faithful, clean followers of Allah. The Holy Book paints the Believers in pure white. The Others are the darkest possible of all Blacks. Neither Allah, nor Muhammad, seems to be able to spot

exceptions of Rabbis and Monks who could have been good, virtuous, deserving of God's favor. But the damnation is apportioned to all Jews and Christians, and Muhammad administers the punishment which Allah decrees against them. *It is a verse like this one which, like those mentioned in the following chapter, remain beyond the purview of most opinion makers among the non-Muslim societies*.

The baneful role of Islam in the history of India astonishingly remains doggedly unperceived by even those historians who, with political fervor side-tracked by arbitrary subjectivities, publish opinions which flail Brahmanists objecting to Muslim fundamentalism as agents of communal disturbances. It is worse when this reversal gets openly published in major influential newspapers and magazines particularly in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America. The Brahmanist community does provide scope for a small community of Uncle Tom Hindus who, with the loud claiming of a rootless, superficial tolerance, do not hesitate to qualify serious criticisms of Muslim intolerance as Hindu intolerance, and thereby contribute to a certain denigration of India struggling to bring about the necessary reforms and reconstruction works after centuries of ravages by the two alien Hegemonies. With their blinkered vision, Uncle Tom Hindus fail to realize that their activities hostile to India are in reality expressions of their voluntary "*dhimmitude*", the attitude of kneeling to the revealed intolerance of a religiosity which has been absolutely soulless in its vocation to wage war against all the configurations of Kaffirdom. .

Migrant Islamic intensification of anti-semitism in Europe and Allah's relentless harshness against Disbelievers. To their dismay Europeans at the beginning of the XXI century experience shock and displeasure when they find themselves suddenly forced to confront the wave of a novel antisemitism rising in the wake of migrants from the Muslim countries of North Africa, the Middle East and of Asia. But the **Verse 34** of **Surah IX** already contained a whiff of the Prophet's contempt for the Jews. This undying hate-filled prejudice would be nowadays magnified by the Salafist indoctrination of the young registered in the thousands of madrassas in Muslim majoritarian countries. It is against the spirit of the secular 1950 Constitution that India would, as hostage to the obscurantism of the majority of the Indian Muslims, have felt the need to foster the establishment and the running of madrassas at the expense of the national treasury.

In **Surah XIII**, *the Thunder*, Allah assures the Prophet that the Disbelievers shall have shackles round their necks: And if thou wonderest,

then wondrous is their saying: When we are dust, are we then forsooth (to be raised) in a new creation? Such are they who disbelieve in their Lord; such have carcans on their necks, such are rightful owners of their Fire, they will abide therein (5). Allah invades their land and reduces them in all parts: See they not how We visit the land, reducing it of its outlying parts? (When) Allah doometh there is none that can postpone His doom, and He is swift at reckoning (**41**).

Throughout all the above quotes related to the Disbelievers, Allah reveals Himself as unforgiving, visiting the fullest doom upon them, for whatever difference they may exhibit in regard to the belief or the behavior of Allah's faithful follower. Mere difference from the prescriptions of Allah earns the Other a painful doom.

Like a conqueror who wreaks a harsh treatment on the defeated and rewards his allies, Allah destroys the guilty Disbelievers and installs the Believers in their place. Indeed Allah confirms such an attitude in **Surah XIV**, *Abraham.* He assures Muhammad: And those who disbelieved said unto their messengers: Verily we will drive you out from our land, unless ye return to our religion. Then their Lord inspired them, (saying): Verily We shall destroy the wrong-doers, And verily We shall make you dwell in the land after them. This is for him who feareth My Majesty and feareth My Warning (**13, 14**).

There is no exit for the Disbeliever, for Allah persists in relentlessly pursuing them. He says: And they sought help (from their Lord) and every forward potentate was brought to naught; Hell is before him, and he is made to drink festering water, which he sippeth but can hardly swallow, and death cometh unto him from every side, and before him is a harsh doom. (**XIV: 15-17**)

While the harsh doom is left undescribed, Allah may appear to be lenient in comparison with the descriptions of hellish punishments and torments in the literatures of other traditions. Still, in **Surah XIV**, Allah is not unaware of what the wicked do. He but giveth them a respite till a day when eyes will stare in terror. As they come hurrying on in fear, their heads upraised, their gaze returning not to them, and their hearts as air (**42-43**). And the fate of the guilty in chains will have their raiment of itch, and the Fire covering their faces (**49-50**).

It would seem that the Christian believers in charge of the administration of the Raj could have been inspired from the following Verse in their zeal to famish the Indian population one more time: Allah coineth a similitude: a township that dwelt secure and well content, its provision coming to it in abundance from every side, but it disbelieved in Allah's favors, so Allah made it experience the garb of death and fear because of what they used to do. (**Surah XVI**, the Bee, Verse **112**.)

When the mind is perplexed. Reading the above verses, which swell Allah's relishing His violent, unforgiving ill-treatment of the Disbelievers, recalls Voltaire's humane reflection: *"I recognize greatness in those men who excel in what is useful and agreeable; those who ravage the countrysides are mere heroes*!" The Divinity who exerts His omnipotence in allotting dooms even to the innocent, peaceful,

virtuous Disbeliever would, in the elevated vision of Voltaire, be, out of mercy, wanting even in mere heroism.

An open-minded Kaffir, or a Gandhian pacifist, does find it enormously difficult to even conceive as an abstraction the stupendous extent of hatred as an attribute of the absolute Allah who does command and receive submission to his pronouncements on the part of the believers during fourteen centuries. It baffles the imagination that such submission would be demonstrated by the piety of scholars, poets, legislators, scientists, mathematicians, nuclear physicists, physicians, artists. The bewilderment increases when, in the Indian sub-continent, hallowed with the plurality of the most humane spiritual persuasions, with universalist peacefulness and tolerance as their defining *Weltanschauung,* the Indian Muslim would not have developed the sensitivity to acknowledge such supreme benefactions published in stones all over the territory.

The astonishment increases to the measure that, after centuries of co-existence, the Muslim would so willingly refuse to cognize the abundance of the native spirituality. It is a spirituality endowed with compassion and respect for all forms of life, of life celebrated as the value which supersedes the worth of all the treasures of the Earth. The spirituality is there – in full view of all who care to see and acknowledge, in the written texts and in the lives of their exemplars. Yet it is the hatred instructed by the Quran which holds sway and preference in the mind of the Indian Muslim. It is this particularity of the Indian Muslim's psyche which still remains beyond the grasp of the indigenous common man. Disconcertingly it eludes the attention of the political elites, in reality of all religious and profane elites. The mind is perplexed when it contemplates that in fourteen centuries the Muslims have obdurately refused to own the reality of this hate-laden maleficence at the heart of Islam, and of the venom in the heart of the Believer in his submission to Allah's revelation.

There is no God but Allah as the reason for the believer's intolerance and hatred of the Kaffir. There must not be any other god, but Allah, according to **Surah XVII**, *The Children of Israel.* Muhammad warns against the worship of any Deity other than Allah: Set not up with Allah any other god (O man) lest thou sit down reproved, forsaken. (**22**).

Muslims do, with the most energetic submission, remain adamant in their belief in the One God, who is never represented in any iconic form. Despite the plethora of the evidence of the tragedies and misfortunes illustrated by countless graveyards of victims of wars of religions based

on the monotheistic faiths, it is still a cause of wonder that the concept of the unity of God in the revealed religions still holds its appeal. It is thanks to the spread of the military power and of the world domination by Europe that the causality, adopted by the Old Testament, in the Book of Genesis, has prevailed as the dogma of Yahweh being the sole maker of the world and commanding the belief in his sovereignty over Truth and Goodness. Consequently this notion of the perfect unity of the Biblical creator of all that exists has extended the credence to a singular supreme deity as the only truthful one among the populations which fell victim to the supremacy of the west European imperial powers acting with the authority of a Christian faith assumed to be the best of all possible faiths. This gratuitous moral assumption has been further hardened in the proclamation of the Islamic cosmology as a statement of consequent virtue and truth which calls for the violent suppression of those beliefs which are based on cosmologies pertaining to cultures unrelated to the contents of the Biblical view of the world. The Biblical concept of God is cultural; it is not universal. It is relevant to the three revelations: Jewish, Christian, Islamic. The other main civilizations have each its cosmology. The cosmology of the Brahmnist hosts a pantheon comprising a large number of celestial divinities, among whom the individual devotee chooses his favorite deity (*iṣṭa devatā*).

Hence it challenges common sense and learned understanding that the billions of men and women who believe in the truthfulness of the absolute unity of God do never feel the need to reflect on the causality of their Monotheistic belief in the justification of wars and conflicts, exclusions and enmities, and, invariably, of genocides. In regard to such a universal numbness of feeling, *must Humanity succumb to believe, as a perennial certitude, the Biblical representation of the Unity of God as the presider of War and of Genocide? Or must it dispense with it and, in its place, vindicate a world of men and women being each sanctified with the incarnation of the perennial, immanent Supreme Being?*

Such a reasoning does not occur among the different Christianities, of both the Roman Catholic and Protestant persuasions, despite their long close colonial associations with, and the witnessing of, peaceful Brahmanist and Buddhist pluri-religious cultures. It has not occurred even among the Indian Christians who have lived peacefully since the very beginning of Christian History in the midst of a population entertained by the three Dharmas. The Indian Christianity preserving its autonomous theological integrity without any moral and spiritual enhancement constitutes the characteristic invincibility of the closed-

mindedness of the revealed faith.

Likewise, despite the apocalyptic horror of the Judeocide wrought by Nazi Germany during the World War II, there has been no reflection within the international Rabbinate on the Old Testament as the source of all the religious intolerances which continue to plague mankind. I have received no answer from all the Jewish and Christian intellectuals, in France and in Canada, to whom I have asked for their explanation of *the concomitance of all the three revealed monotheisms with their respective genocides*. One does not find genocides in the histories of the Oriental and other non-revealed religions. Genocides are coterminous with the histories of the Jews, of the Christians, of the Muslims.[16]

The blessing of polytheism. In contrast, blessed is India that she has produced a Brahmanism endowed with the belief in a multitude of Gods and Goddesses, all aesthetically honored and represented by an iconographic profusion. Blessed is India that she gave to the world the sublime, pacifist Buddhism which has given expression to a great iconographic abundance, though doctrinally it upholds the belief in God and in rituals as a baneful form of clinging from which the seeker of Nirvāṇa ought to free himself. Blessed is India that she has bestowed a pacifist *modus vivendi* which embellishes and gladdens the lives of the countless millions of the Asian Peoples. With the tide of soullessness relentlessly flowing over all the Western Civilization it seems that the saving of Humanity will rest on the quiet pacifism of the Oriental forms of pacifist tenets gently winning the hearts and the minds of a universal joyfulness of which, for a long, long time, the smile of the Buddha has been a silent harbinger.

Likewise, with its emphasis on renunciation and reverence for all the forms of life, even of the life of the smallest worm or insect, Jainism too has inspired the production of a rich iconography. Blessed is India for giving to the world the *ne plus ultra* ethical precept of the Jaina ultimate doctrine of reverence for life. Indeed the Jaina would not be

---

[16] In an after dinner conversation, at my residence, with a learned English Jewish colleague, a specialist in International Law, in the Department of Political Science, of the Arts Faculty of my University, I happened to mention the genocidal man-made famines which regularly punctuated the history of the Raj. He argued that I could not use the word "genocide" in that context because the word had not been invented at that time. I replied: "Are You telling me that I cannot say that, during all the time before Isaac Newton, ripe apples did not fall due to the gravitational pull of the Earth?"

able to understand the meaning of the Muslim slitting the throat of a sheep or of a goat or of a cow in order to please Allah who consented to accept a sacrificial animal in exchange for His earlier asking, with demoniac arbitrariness, Abraham to sacrifice his son, as a test of his obedience! With the postulate of the innocence of the faith-full Islamist killer as the proxy of Allah, **Quran 8.17** enables the easy slide from the killing of the sacrificial animal, on the occasion of the Eid festival, in memory of Allah's deal with Abraham, to the victim of the Wahhabi Jihadi.

The externality of God in the revealed religions. The above **Verse 22 of Surah XVII** decisively marks Islam, together with Judaism and Christianity, as absolutely distinct from the Indian indigenous spiritual doctrines. The unitive, transcendental God of Islam, as an extension of the Biblical Yahweh, is the quintessence of the *external,* physical, Supreme Omnipotence, intimately connected, in a dualistic relationship, with the world and with the community of Believers. As a minor, unorthodox Biblical sect, Witnesses of Jehovah, consider the Old Testament God as a real, physical person who bears the name Yahweh, as any ordinary man is known by his name. They adhere to this belief without any reference, for the confirmation of their belief, to Muhammad's claim that he did indeed see Allah as an anthropomorphic reality at the end of his nocturnal flight, the *miraj*. In a decisive contrast to this belief in a celestial God conceived or seen as an able-bodied Supreme Personality, the Brahmanist establishes his faith in the favored deity (*iṣṭa devatā*) as a Myth which conveys the reality of the ineffable Brahman as the ontological reality of the devotee, signified by the Upaniṣad pronouncing the *aham brahamo'smi* (I am Brahman) experience.

As the object of devotion, the Biblical God remains *external* to Man and the pronouncements which He proclaims consist of values, norms, precepts, which form an array of calls to which the Believer has to respond by conforming to them. In the Indian indigenous forms of spirituality the immanent Supreme Deity lies *within* the depths of the individual's consciousness. The individual's homogeneity with the divine essence becomes alive as a mystical break-through resulting from the striving for self-fulfillment in contemplative solitude. It requires a living with the sacrifice of sensuous attachments and delights, in the concentration of all the energies and powers of the mind and of the heart in favor of the ultimate bliss allied to supreme knowing, and to being (*saccidānanda*). In a mode of living which holds the promise of transcendental bliss, the notion, or the image, or the sign, or the word of

God, is only an indicator which points to the ontological experience of the oneness with the *tat* (that): the ultimate ontological self-enlightenment is economically expressed as the knowing of the that-ness (*tattva-jñāna*).

This self-fulfillment remains unchanged amidst the crowd in the market-place. For example, Gautama, after his awakening at the age of thirty-six years, lived his blissful life as the Awakened One (Buddha), during the forty-five years of his crisscrossing the Indian territory, begging for his food, preaching, teaching. All his words and deeds were expressions of his nirvanized state. Paramahamsa Shri Ramakrishna describes the ordinary individual like milk mingled with water: the milk just dissipates itself in the bulk of the water. But if the individual goes through the right, meditative and contemplative discipline, he becomes like butter which, churned out of milk, floats on the surface of the water. So does the perfect Yogi move about in the crowd without losing or compromising the perfected state in which he has labored to dwell.

But in one simple, straightforward statement, the difference between the Quran and the indigenous Indian Dharma-based ways of living, consists of all the 6235 Quranic verses being *external* normative entities to which the Believer is called upon to conform. In contradistinction the Indian spiritual prescriptions postulate the Supreme Reality or the Summum Bonum of self-perfection dwelling at all time *within* the individual self. The Quranic injunction, like the Ten Commandments imparted to Moses by Yahweh, calls for the *affirmation* of putting in practice Allah's prescription which comes down from "above", from Heaven. And it demands unreserved submission to this fact as belief.

The rationale of intolerance. With the comfort of being assured of having no responsibility in developing a personal effort to live according to one's own choice and preference, in the determination of what is good and what is wrong, the Believer just submits and endorses the revealed laws as his own personal necessity. He derives happiness in the lightness of not being beholden to whatever imperatives may emerge from his own mind. Everything in his life owes its origin and its content to the Sovereignty and the Measure of Allah. It is a happiness steeled with the illusion of his abiding by a divine, not a human, call. The submission provides the substance of fanaticism as the effortless, natural way to be social. It does not foster the possibility of a dialogue with a concerned Disbeliever.

That is how and why the submitting Believer's obedience generates self-righteousness and intolerance. On the other hand, the Dharmas

invite the commitment to an *effort* for the realization of either *mokṣa,* or *nirvāṇa,* or *kaivalya* as the experience of the individual's essence. The striving for this attainment calls for a commitment to the exercise of detachment and of renunciation, which are indispensable to spiritual self-fulfillment. The Dharmas do not command; they suggest, they propose, and let the individual seek, in terms of his will, his own personal, private, physical and psychological efficiencies, to seek and manifest what *already* dwells in the depths of his psyche. The morality which undergirds the life of the *sādhaka* (striver) does, in its totality, proceed from the substance of his personality: it is uniquely personal, wrapped within the independent seeker's psyche. That is why his morality is genuine, authentic, for it proceeds from within himself, without the consent or agreement with an external authority to vouchsafe for its worth. The quality which distinguishes the authenticity of the moral act reposes on *its being done without any desire or expectation of a reward.* Only in the space of the native Dharma is desireless action (*niṣkāma karma*) celebrated as the only superlatively right action! And the desireless action can be, and indeed is, performed without any god being a witness. It owes its fullness to its Humanity. The moral individual is guided, either as a householder or as a renouncer, by the prudence of acting to his understanding of what the Law of Karma entails. The native Indian proceeds like a sculptor who chisels off the extraneous fragments of the marble or stone block to unveil the perfect image which, already present, had remained till the very end invisible. The *atman-brahman* identity, the *nirvanized sva-bhāva,* as well as the *kaivalya* experience, are not products, they are not caused, they were all the time co-existent with the virtuous act, as well as the act of sinfulness, or of the conscious or unconscious error. The homogeneity of the individual person's essence with the essence of the One is eternal: it was extant in the previous birth and will continue as such in the life after the death of the present body. The search for and the attainment of the self-enlightenment is in reality the experiential discovery of what has always been in existence. The spiritual endeavor has resulted in the spontaneous, uncaused pure contemplation of what is now experienced as an unqualified ontological bliss, which defies codification by any word or sign construed by thought or by the imagination!

The rationale of tolerance. The mystical, ontological, experience according to either of the three Dharmas is based on the ethics of conditionality: the Truth, as a personal experience, comes *out of the interior* of the individual: it is private, singular, original, unique, and consequently *genuinely authentic, as a self-motivated seeking for the*

ultimate good, independently of the surrounding community. The adhesion to a Dharma is not a submission. None of the finalities proclaimed by the Dharmas is a product, an act of conformity with a large community walking on some straight path. A Truth is a Truth when it comes unimpeded from *within* the soul of the Individual, not *as an act of conformity with an Umma orthodoxy.* In the reality of the Brahmanist orthodoxy, for example, there is never a moment when either the sinner or the saint lives without Īśvara being a living presence 'within' him as the in-dweller (*antaryāmī*): it behooves the ladder to unveil this divine essence by his self-striving (*sādhanā)*.

The cardinal difference between the finalities of Islam and of the Dharmas. In simple terms, according to the Brahmanist Dharma, for example, both the Disbeliever, whom the Quran abominates, and the Believer dear to Allah, are co-essential manifestations of the One Supreme Reality. Ultimately the sinner as well as the saint attain, in their due time, the salvation of self-fulfillment. This fundamental postulate of the Indian Dharmas lies at the antipode of the Quranic proclamation of paradisiac delights of the flesh as the reward for walking on the revealed Straight Path.[17] The significant difference lies in the fact that in the indigenous Indian dispensations the individual makes the voluntary effort to externalize the hidden Self (*ātman*), without any expectation of a reward, without even the desire of heavenly delights which are in reality, as a desired futurity, a heavy psychic obstacle to the attainment of an ontological freedom. The spiritualities of Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism do offer a wide spectrum of opportunities and of ways leading to the exteriorizing of the transcendental essence of the Self, or of the Mystic Reality which is ever present as the eternal now. It is the pure experience of self-enlightenment, sought without any material or other kind of reward, but as a plenitude of im-mediate knowing of the Absolute Reality, which constitutes the authentic spirituality as an end in itself, without any desire to continue living without any further purpose in a material Paradise. As there is nothing outside or beyond Humanity, the absolute saving knowledge resides in the human condition. There is no other place for the existence of spiritual perfection than the human body. Paradisiac delight is a mere seduction which

[17] The Revelation of the Straight Path is as real as a sky flower, or as the hair on the turtle's shell, or as the horn of the hare. No one ever walked along a Straight Path either in the Arabian Desert or anywhere else. The Kaṭha Upaniṣad is more realistic in stating that morality consists of walking on a razor's edge!

ceases to be in the experience of *mokṣa,* or of *nirvāṇa*, or of *kaivalya.*

Despite the absence of a central religious bureaucracy, similar to the ecclesiastical organization of the Church which regulates the content of the individual's faith, the Muslims have manifested varieties of cultural forms across their vast dispersation. In doing so they have maintained a large measure of a *common* direction to their *collective* belief. The inalterable authority of the contents of the fundamental Scripture and of the Sharia has secured the rigidity of the collective submission to the revelations of Allah. During the past fourteen centuries the divine pronouncements have been obeyed with submissive fidelity, compounded with the fear of punishment for any deviation from the Straight Path indicated in the first Surah of the Quran. With the Indian *Dharmas* the concrete expression of the required mimesis of the established representations of the perfected ways of speaking, of sitting, of walking, pertain to the responsibility of the individual in agreement with his individual, responsible understanding of the allures of Goodness, of Truth and of Beauty and of the obligations to society.[18]

The absence of renunciation and of mystical intimations in the life of Muhammad. Muhammad is the only founder of a major religion in whose life one does not find the slightest indication of a mystical inclination. Nor was there any dominant mystical feature in the lives of the first four Califs, of whom the first three got murdered. The Messenger was primarily a successful political and military leader. Hence when the Sufi movement arose about six centuries after Muhammad with the discovery of the Muslim Man co-sharing the essence of the Divine Being as Allah, it was considered as a heresy. In Pakistan, for example, Sufis expressing themselves in public, through the medium of music and songs, do get killed by self-congratulating, conservative Sunni believers. In North Africa and in the Middle East, Sufis practice their faith in hiding, in secret, fearful of the extreme harshness and intolerance of the orthodox believers belonging to the majority Sunni order. Besides certain Sufis did not shrink from encouraging the practice of *jihad* as the most important duty of the Believer.

The difference between obedience in Islam and consent in the

---

18. The reader may read Kṛṣṇa's reply, in the last 18 verses of the Ch. 2 of the Bhagavad Gītā to Arjuna asking in verse 54, how does the perfected, wise man sits, walks, speaks.

indigenous Dharmas. The above Verse 22 quoted from Surah XVII [19] constitutes a decisive denial of the spirituality of Brahmanism, of Buddhism, of Jainism. It is a denial which historically emerges early in the VII century during the latter half of the life of Muhammad (570-632). Each of these Indian mystical ways of living has its specific characterization of human existence culminating in a self-perfection attained as the conclusion of a voluntary, *individual* initiative. The Dharmas do have their doctrines, their scriptures, their traditions, their symbolisms to which the individual in the pertinent community subscribes, without being coerced by an authoritarian bureaucracy. But the search for the ultimate enlightenment depends on the voluntary effort of the individual seeker. Authentic morality proceeds from the initiative of the individual, without the compulsion of conformity to an external authority. The moral civilization of India derives from the native dharmas which validate their followers freely choosing their individual mode of living from within their own understanding, without any obligation to an external jurisdiction. In Islam, on the contrary, the Believer acts in submission to rules and principles dictated to him by Allah residing in Heaven and thence exerting his Sovereignty over everything and everybody.

Quran 17.2 [20] further denies the humane vision of the Taoist mysticism. Besides, Christian dogmatic orthodoxy rejects any accommodation to the mystical experience advocated by Meister Eckhart in his exposition of the Kingdom of God which Jesus proclaims and teaches as the spiritual essence of every individual. Jesus at that time was preaching to the Jews who were hoping – as they still do – for the coming of the Messiah who would establish the perfect Kingdom. But the people around Jesus could not grasp the mystical meaning of the new message telling them that the Kingdom already dwelt in each of them. *The legalistic mentality of the Jews could not, and they did not, grasp the fact of Jesus asking them to forego all belief in the futurity of the Kingdom which, transfigured as the representation of the mystical reality, already existed in each of them.*

The substantive difference between the Quranic revelation and the

---

19. **Quran, XVII, 22**: "Set not up with Allah any other god, (O man) lest thou sit down reproved, forsaken."

20. "We gave unto Moses the Scripture, and We appointed it a guidance for the Children of Israel, saying: Choose no guardian beside Me."

Indian mystical discourse consists of the Believer responding to Allah's commands with submission to the Fear of His use of a concurrent Violence as His measure (*Taqdīr*) for any deviation from the Straight Path. In the daily routine the conjunction of Fear and the threat of Violence acts as a practical adjunct to the political and religious authority of the Imam. Thus does the ethos of the Quran require an instant, *vertical,* unquestioning *obedience* on the part of the Believer who submits to Allah's injunctions. On the contrary, the ethos of the Indian Dharmas informs a *horizontal* perspective of self-striving depending on the *conditionality* of the seeker's disposition, *if* he opts to labor for his self-fulfillment, within his own specific mental space and mental time. No one curses him, or prescribes his going to hell, if he independently chooses to Be or to Have what is alien or indifferent to self-perfectibility, as long as it is not an anti-social activity which generates fear, hatred and suffering to anyone, at any time, or anywhere.

The relevance of the beard and of the niqab. There is always a coincidence of the explosion of violence against non-Muslims with the outbreak of young Muslims exhibiting their beards and thus distinguishing themselves from their elders. The aggressive expressions of the male Muslim are generally accompanied by the political statement of young women donning the niqab, and sloughing off the dress styles of the multi-ethnic or pluri-religious communities. The association of external forms of a rigid, exclusive orthodox Islam, together with its violence against Muslim moderation and Kaffir idolatry, does lend credence to the concomitancy of its close-mindedness. Concurrently this lightness of believing, with submission to the revelation as the traditional expression of religious obligation, does not imply or signify any concern or desirability for fostering inter-communal amity. On the contrary, such an internalized personal closed-mindedness generates alienation and apprehension in the host societies where Muslims migrate in numbers large enough to secure their culturally exclusive identity in opposition to the well-established social order of their host society. It is a significant irony that the conflicts thus generated occur in the midst of the secular cultures of Western Europe, which the migrants find attractive far away from the vast empty spaces of the wealthy Islamic theocracies. While the West Europeans do not hesitate to express bitterness and discomfiture in the face of the abusive exclusiveness of the Muslim minorities in their midst, they do not question the absurdity of the vast spaces of the wealthy Arab nations not welcoming the poorer migrating co-Believers. Nor do the latter raise a voice against the absence of hospitality in their favor on the part of the wealthy co-

Believing theocracies, where *hallal*, *burqa* and *niqab* would be naturally welcome. It is significant and revealing that their wealth of Oil guards the racial purity of the wealthy Arab States which do deny citizenship to impoverished, racially different Believers. Despite the omnipotence of its military power, the West, led by America, prudently observes a well studied silence in relation to this enormous international anomaly.

The historical irony of culturally inferior barbarians defeating superior civilizations. It is not only Rome which suffered the disgrace of being invaded and getting racked by the Goth vandals descending from the Northern reaches of Europe. Likewise the present predicament of the Western European democracies manifests the recurrence of the inferior Islamic migrant way of life damaging, and even threatening to obliterate, the secular, liberal and refined host cultures. Simultaneously India offers the monumental example of the British mercantile mentality prevailing against the mystical, moral civilization of India. Further, on a far broader geographical scale, History records the catastrophic loss to humanity due to the Islamic violence obliterating the many Buddhist cultures and their sophisticated aesthetic and spiritual way of life. On a smaller scale, but cogently illustrative of the triumph of barbarism, Canada offers the fact of the small Anglo community, equipped with economic dominance, in association with the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical ascendancy, prevailing during three centuries to lord itself over the majority Francophone population of Quebec, in Canada. History is replete with the low and the inferior muscling in and dominating the accomplished victims. John Ruskin derides the early British colonizers who boasted of their racial and cultural superiority by referring to the Natives of Canada as "savages". Ruskin reminds the reader that in reality the latter had for a long time already produced a tradition of genuinely perfected art, while the British conquerors could only boast of the colored squares of the Scottish kilt. But the latter won, with the help of the musket. The supremely moral civilization of India presents the unparalleled example of having been diminished by two successive, alien hegemonies characterized by the inferior dispensations of Islam and of British mercantilism. It teases the mind of the historian forced today to contemplate Europe experiencing a variation of the Indian syndrome: it is being "inferiorised" by the militant minority of a violent form of Islam and, simultaneously, by the military ascendancy of the United States dictating the conformity to its international policy, for the benefit of its military-industrial complex, the evil influence of which was wisely denounced by President Eisenhower.

Returning to the angry verses related to the Kaffir. Surah XVII,

The Children of Israel, says: And when harm toucheth you upon the sea, all unto whom you cry (for succour) fail save Him (alone), but when He bringeth you safe to land, ye turn away, for man was ever thankless. Feel ye then secure that He will not cause a slope of the land to engulf you, or send a sandstorm upon you, and then you will find that ye have no protector? (**67-68**).

This verse attributes ingratitude as a generic moral inadequacy of Man. In fact the Quran has a far higher number of references to Allah than to Man. Even in the very few relevant verses Man is represented with deficiencies numbering more than his merits. The *Mahābhārata* pronounces 'ingratitude' as one of the four sins for which there can be no atonement. The other sins are: *the killing of the Guru, the killing of a woman, the killing of a foetus*. Whereas all men and women are destined ultimately to end their respective cycle of rebirths in a self-enlightening identity with the Supreme Being, the epic lets the fate of the Ungrateful dangling in an unfinished series of rebirths. The significance of the harsh view of ingratitude in the ethical view of the *Mahābhārata* must be seen in the context of the morality of *giving* as a grace which does not require or expect any requital. Yet, despite the freedom from indebtedness by means of a repayment or a return favor the recipient of a gift is not expected to harbor any ingratitude. It is to this subtle walking on the razor's edge of receiving a favor without the compulsion or duty of a like response to the giver which the Dharma emphasizes as beneficence being a complete act which contains its end in itself, without the obligation of a following acquittal. In this particular regard, there is nothing in the Islamic notion of giving or of charity which comes up to an equal measure of the Brahmanist ethos. The Dharma according to the *Mahābhārata* does not attribute a divine punisher of the thankless receiver of benefaction. The good doer does not expect any reward. It is the absence of the expectation of the reward for the good action which consecrates the authenticity of the virtue of giving as an absolute transcendent act. It is Ontology in practice. In Islam, however, the economy of the act of goodness, or of giving, is essentially different for Allah offers due reward for the good deeds of the Believer. The consequent expectation of the divine recognition and reward of the Believer's goodness does not have the ontological finality of the act of goodness according to the ethos of the native Dharma. Hence in its vision of life the *Mahābhārata* does not bring in an unforgiving Cosmic Judge to prescribe dire punishment for the thankless receiver of goodness. The ungrateful is left to his own human resource presided over by the Law of Karma.

But Allah's unrelenting anger with the Disbelievers does not end. His cruelty does not soften. Even the giver described in the preceding

paragraph does not escape the stern decision of Allah who thus instructs the Messenger: "Say: (It is) the truth from the Lord of you (all), Then whosoever will, let him believe, and whosoever will, let him disbelieve. Lo! We have prepared for Disbelievers Fire. Its tent encloseth them. If they ask for showers, they will be showered with water like the molten lead which burneth the faces. Calamitous the drink and ill the sting- place. (**Surah XVIII, The Cave, 29**).

This is how Allah deals with wrong-doers: And this their crying ceased not till We made them as reaped corn, extinct. (**Surah XXI, The Prophets, 15).**

The indifference of the Islamic intelligentsia to the choleric affirmations of Allah. Allah's cruelty extending to Disbelievers and the extreme severity which he metes out to the wrong-doer defies the absolutist proclamation that the revelation shared with Muhammad is the seal of prophecy. It claims arbitrarily the dogmatic proposition that there cannot ever be a more humane Revelation in the future. After fourteen centuries Muslims still believe that the Quran is the eternally perfect reinterpretation of the pronouncements of the Old Testament dispensation. It even claims superiority to the pronouncements of the sweet Jesus, especially of the Jesus of the religion of the first three centuries during which it remained unsullied by Machiavellian politics following the reduction of the message of Jesus to the measure of its subservience as the ideology of the state by Emperor Constantine in 323. It is a cosmic, perverse irony that the mysterious hand, which regulates the destinies of Man and of nations, would nevertheless allow more than a billion Muslim men and women, today, to believe that, as a Revelation, Islam is an improvement over the Beatitudes enunciated by Jesus. That, by moving backward, History would play such a trick upon Mankind, justifies the wisdom of the ancient Ācāryas and Kavis. Of their own, the latter had the infinite wisdom to stake the Individual's personalization, of the essence of the best of all possible realizable ways of living, by the exertion of the mimesis of the virtues of the Mythic heroes and deities, instead of the physical submission to mere, external rules and principles which, enunciated by an able-bodied Yahweh or Allah, do not entertain the prospect of self-perfectibility as the mystical finality of human earthly existence.

The persistence of the choleric verses of the Quran. It has taken fourteen centuries for the abundant choleric verses of the Quran to be finally noticed by a small number of Arab intellectuals living in Western Europe, particularly in France. Without disowning the loyalty to their Islamic faith they do, actually on that account, express the desire to enhance and revitalize it by stripping the Holy Book of its undesirable contents. In so doing they do not flinch from boldly addressing themselves to the large number of the Quran's negative pronouncements

against Non-Muslims and their cultures. It numbs the mind today that such unequivocal criticisms would have escaped the attention of past Muslim luminaries for nearly fourteen centuries. Not even during the golden age of the Abbassid dynasty when Baghdad became the glorious hub of intellectual brilliance in the sciences, in the production of literary works and of architectural masterpieces, in lavish material prosperity, when Iraq was the unsurpassed center of cultural supremacy, during the VII-IX centuries, does one find the slightest questioning of the numerous injunctions of hatred, cruelty, harshness visited upon non-Believers. It was a time when Maimonides praised the aesthetic sophistication of the Arabic language to the extent that he hailed it as the best medium in which he could express his thought. Even then, in the midst of that splendor, no intellectual was moved to question the severity of the condemnation of the Other, the dire doom inflicted upon him by an unforgiving Allah, inured to a remorseless intolerance.

During the centuries of the golden age of the Abbasid Dynasty with its spectacularly blazing Day side, the astounding presence of the indifference - manifested by the scholarly elites, the artistes, the poets - invites the mind to conjecture that the approval of the Night side of the Quran conformed to the Night feature of their individual aesthetic refinement. In more recent times Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) in Nazi Germany provided philosophical grace to the stern policies and laws promoted by the State led by Hitler, who had the support of learned theologians belonging to both the Catholic and the Protestant faiths. Winston Churchill (1874-1965) honored and revered by the British people and by the Western historians generally, did personally, with a good conscience hardening his extreme hatred of the Hindus,[21] engineer the genocide, euphemistically called *The Bengal Famine*, during the war years of 1943-44.[22]

All those, who throughout almost two thousand years kept alive the undercurrent of anti-semitism which generated countless pogroms against the Jews, do enable the mind today to comprehend the silence and the indifference of the sophisticated intelligentsia of Islam to shrug

---

21. Churchill had this delicious description of 330 million majority Indians: "The Hindus are a bestial people believing in a bestial religion". At a time when his hated enemy was Mahatma Gandhi.

22. Vide Madhushree Mukerjee's Churchill's Secret War, Perseus Group Book, New York, 2010; 282 pp + Notes and Index

off Allah's malevolence towards the Other as irrelevant to their intellectual safety and sentimental tranquility. But communication technology did in 2002 broadcast across all latitudes and longitudes the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas as an act of religious purification of the Theocratic Afghanistan ruled by the Taliban Government led by Mullah Omar. In the Chapter referring to Abdelwahab Meddeb's *Malady of Islam* one comes across his regretfully lamenting the disappearance of the Bamiyan Buddhas as a sickness in the history of Islam. Meddeb does not disown his faith in Islam, but he does stress that it needs to be purged of its repugnant monstrosities, especially those to which it indulged in the land where its votaries chose to settle.

The compelling ill fate of the Disbeliever. For a certainty Disbelievers do not have a chance. They cannot dodge the wrath of Allah. In addition the Believers are commanded to wage war against the seven billion Infidels living beyond the borders of the world of Islam. The difference between the Believers and the Disbelievers cannot be more stark than what these Verses describe as ordeals for the latter: These twain (the Believers and the Disbelievers) are two opponents who contend concerning their Lord. But as for those who disbelieve, garments of fire will be cut out for them; boiling fluid will be poured down on their heads. Whereby that which is in their bellies, and their skins too, will be melted; And for them are hooked rods of iron. Wherever, in their anguish, they would go forth from thence they are driven back therein and (it is said unto them): Taste the doom of burning.(**Surah XXII, The Pilgrimage,19-22**).

By the hypnotic spell which the word 'doom' generates by its repetition, a Disbeliever may succumb and yield to even loving it and be pleased when a hostile verse comes up with the announcement of Allah's inevitable doom. The English sound '*doom*' may even suggest a preference to be an Unbeliever just to be assured of a doom, with the sound of the word serving as a meditative mantra!

Believers are commanded to use harsh treatment with the adulterer and the adulteress, according to this revelation: The adulterer and the adulteress, scourge ye each one of them (with) a hundred stripes. And let not pity for the twain withhold you from the obedience to Allah, if ye believe in Allah and the Last Day. And let a party of believers witness their punishment. The adulterer shall not marry save an adulteress or an idolatress, and the adulteress none shall marry save an adulterer or an idolater. All that is forbidden unto believers (**Surah XXIV, Light. 2-4**).

The distinction between the Believer and the Disbeliever here is based on the moral purity of the former. The Quran does never attribute any worth to a morally pure Disbeliever. According to the Quran ignorance of, or indifference to, the revelation overrides whatever merit or virtue may be the lot of the Disbeliever. The inevitable fate awaits the Unbeliever: the doom inflicted by Allah! This verse has its corresponding formula in traditional Christian Orthodoxy: "There is no

salvation outside the Church!" The orthodox Christian would accordingly pray to keep the pious Muslim too outside the pale of Heaven, even if he were an alumnus well trained in a madrassa and being able to recite the Quran by heart and eager to be a martyr in fighting against the Dar-ul-Harb. The inanity of the relativism among the beliefs in revealed dogmas happens to be one of the constituent vanities of Humanity.

The Kaffir as the object of divine hatred. The evidence that the Kaffir, or Disbeliever, is loathed by Allah and by the believer unambiguously stands out in **Surah XL**, *The Believer:* Those who wrangle concerning the revelations of Allah without any warrant that hath come unto them, it is greatly hateful in the sight of Allah and in the sight of those who believe. Thus doth Allah print on every arrogant, disdainful heart (35).

The ignorance of such a Verse is widespread among the Kaffirs of India, even among the rest of Humanity. It becomes a tedious exercise to argue with Hindu Kaffirs, in particular, that they ought to be duly cognizant with the fundamental injunctions related to their being the objects of abomination by both Allah and his more than a billion followers. There can be no amount of *bhai-bhaiistic* self-delusions to protect the Kaffir from the overt or secret contempt which the Believer is ordered to manifest towards him. It is at all times prudent for the Kaffir to store in his mind a little doubt, an iota of mistrust in his heart, against the professed undiluted friendship or cordiality in the Believer's transactions with him. However strong can the bond of a Muslim's friendship be, it does not abrogate the fact that the friendship is essentially at odds with Allah's prescription and with His revelation communicated to the Apostle. The Quran based jurisprudence would view the Muslim's betrayal of his friendship with a Kaffir as the actualization of the Muslim's faith deserving a reward conferred by Allah. But woe to the Believer for any falsehood committed in dealing with a co-Believer! There is no evidence, in the history of Indian Islam, that a Hindu's Muslim friend has ever confessed his disagreement with, or disavowal of, the revealed verses enjoining enmity with Kaffirs. Nor has any Muslim friend of a Hindu ever expressed any overt or private disagreement with the orthodox advocacy of contempt and enmity with the Kaffir, in all circumstances. In particular there is no evidence of any discussion on Allah's condemnation of friendship with non-Muslims among the intellectual Muslim leaders, like Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, Zakir Hussain, M. C. Chagla, Humayun Kabir et al. Nor has any discussion ever arose, about Muslims endorsing Allah's hatred of Hindus, among the Congress Party Muslim leaders talking with Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal or Motilal Nehru, Valabhbhai Patel and

other Hindu leaders of that generation. Why was there no concern or anguish evinced, by both Muslim and Hindu leaders of the Congress Party, about the tsunami of animosity of the vast majority of the Indian Muslims towards all Hindus and Sikhs during the first half of the XX century?

If a Hindu believes that a Muslim sincerely is a friend of his, in all circumstances, it may be because of the particular Muslim being independently faithful to his private sentiment of friendship and loyalty, as pertaining to his natural disposition, to his common sense assurance of knowing what is right and what is wrong. But, at the same time, he would be a true friend of the Hindu Kaffir *in contravention* of Allah's injunction to the faithful submitter. During the free-for-all chaos brought about by the implementation of the Partition, when Hindus and Sikhs protected Muslims against the Hindu and Sikh murderers, they were acting according to the principles and rules of Dharma pervading their daily life. When Muslims protected Hindus and Sikhs against the murderous vindictiveness of Muslim killers, they were acting in complete non-observance of Allah's injunctions to the Believer in regard to the Kaffir. Of the diametrically opposed roles of the Muslim, in these two extreme situations during the Partition, the categorical difference was substantively real, though it got subsumed by the tenuous, accidental humaneness pervading the mutually felt sentiment of pathetic solidarity on both sides of the mayhem wall.

Only the Quranic truth is Truth in a dualistic world defined by the Biblical religiosity. The Quran does not allow the contemplation of the possibility of the Disbeliever having moral merit, as well as being virtuous and capable of discerning truth from falsehood. The concomitance of Truth with Belief is indivisible, especially when the Quran claims *its* Truth to be the *only* valid one, compared to which all other Truths are errors and falsehoods leading to deviant living and consequently deserving to be annihilated. The Disbelief cannot be otherwise than evil. This is a pertinent revelation in **Surah XLVII**, *Muhammad*, **1-3**: Those who disbelieve and turn (men) from the way of Allah, He rendereth their actions vain. And those who believe and do good works and believe in that which is revealed unto Muhammad – and it is the truth from their Lord – he riddeth them of their ill-deeds and improveth their state. This is because those who disbelieve follow falsehood and because those who believe follow the truth from their Lord, Thus Allah coineth their similitudes for mankind.

The Disbeliever's ignorance of such divine injunctions feeds the prejudice which often breaks through in the international language of the ruling elites of the Judeo-Christian democracies of the West in relation to India. This prejudice stems from the Judeo-Christian Man's

inability to comprehend the specific characteristic of Indian culture *being the only one to be the manifestation of the integral cosmology of the One, beside which Nothing exists*. The intellectual inability of the Western Judeo-Christian Man to internalize the concept of the whole world as ONE is due to his living and believing in a dualistic cosmology pervading all his intellectual and metaphysical dispositions. The chasm between the Brahmanist's Monistic view of the ONE and the Judeo-Christian and Islamic Dualistic vision of the external world explains the constant hostility towards the Indian government's activism in redressing the deviations imposed, during the past centuries, by the alien hegemonies of both Islam and Christianity.

Furthermore, in India itself, there is scant evidence of internal debates between Muslim and Brahmanist writers, historians, sociologists, on the vital, fundamental distinction between the non-dualistic cultures of the three indigenous Dharmas and the respective ways of living which they inspire and motivate, in relation to the rigid dualisms of the Christian and Islamic faiths. *It is this banal, but crucial and historically significant, distinction which qualifies the monumental, eternal divide between the two main communities. That it has not impressed itself upon the consciousness of the Indian population, is difficult to comprehend*. On both sides of the divide, the socio-political parties, together with the secular and the religious elites, involved in the administration and welfare of the Indian polity, think and act like blinkered strollers on the beach seriously believing that the sea does not exist. Nor do the Muslim and the Christian grasp the infinite difference between their understanding of the contemptible Pagan and the latter's holy perception of the Believer too being co-essential with the Essence of the One. Evidently a monumental chasm separates the limited World-view of the Believer in Revelation and the instantaneous perception of the Brahmanist viewing the One as the Fullness present in all that is, more vitally, in all living beings, including the Believers. Indeed the Believer owns his due plenitude in the *Weltanschauung* of the Brahmanist who, drawing from his naturally inseparable tolerance, bears the burden of his Hater who, lured by the banality of Resurrection and the mirage of flesh-based delights, believes these to be events occurring in the Greek calends.

The revealed injunction for the radical hatred of the Disbeliever.

The revelation which follows immediately (**47.4**) further clarifies the contempt in which the Disbeliever must be held: Now we meet in battle those who disbelieve, then there is smiting of the necks until, when you have routed them, then making fast of bounds; and afterward either grace or ransom till the war lay down its burdens. That (is the ordinance). And if Allah (without you) but (thus it is ordained)

that He may try some of you by means of others. And those who are slain in the way of Allah, he rendereth not their actions vain.

On the Believer Allah bestows the privilege of scourging the Disbeliever for the fault of disbelieving, for there can be no doubt that disbelief in the revelations of Allah is devoid of any redeeming attribute. On the contrary, the Disbeliever, as such, just by being a Disbeliever, incurs the sin or the demerit of committing and being evil. However much he can be virtuous and saintly, the Disbeliever earns the wrath of Allah for being *different.* Such a sweeping condemnation of the totality of more than seven billion non-Muslims must have been borrowed from the Christian dogma that "outside the Church there is no salvation'. In the environment of the liberal ideologies which today characterize the greater part of Christendom, there is still a surviving streak of fundamentalists who buttress their learning and their faith with the conviction that salvation can be assured only by the manner of their response to the call of God. Islam blocks all possible exceptions to its fundamentalism with the proclamation that even the innocent ignorance of the laws of Allah does not assure safety against His wrath and the certainty of being doomed.

The failure of the Kaffir Indian to internalize the Muslim's contempt of his culture. It is then no wonder that in India, in particular, as a vast sub-continent swept by an array of beliefs and disbeliefs, the military triumph of the Muslims would have upheld the assumption of the prevalence of the religious superiority of "their" truth over the Dharmas of the indigenous population. It is a superiority proclaimed with fanatical elation, which animates the pride and self-esteem of the Indian Muslim, even if the Islamic collective memory of superiority be without any correspondence with historical and philosophical substantiality. One then needs not wonder that the Indian Muslims would view the lowest among them to be peerless for being the believer in the revelation of Allah, the only real God. The entire Indian Kaffir humanity is an abomination on account of the belief in fake divinities, in aberrant doctrines and teachings, all fostering falsehoods. In reality, the belief in Islam as the *ne plus ultra* of revelations and, still more so, in relation to all other religiosities, especially the Indian Dharmas, never leaves the mind of the Muslim in all the amiable superficialities which, in social discourse, perpetuate the illusion of civic equality being co-substantial with moral equivalence. It is a paradox that the Brahmanist who is familiar with the Vedānta notion of 'Māyā' would be unable to discern his own inability to 'see' the Muslim *snake* in the Bhai-Bhai *rope* of friendliness. And this reverse Māyā has persisted in the minds and the hearts of Brahmanists for the last one thousand years. There can indeed

be no greater astonishment than the fact of the Brahmanists not having yet asked the Muslims what - in view of all the spoliations and ravages inflicted on Indian civilization by their iconoclasm – do they think of their Quran damning the Kaffir as deserving of Allah's abomination.

The persistence of Hindus not internalizing the Muslim's hatred. The *immediacy* of the transmutation of *religious* belief into an adverse *mindset* as the substance of Muslim hatred of the Hindu-Buddhist-Jaina autochthonous Indian has till the present day not been internalized by the elites of the Kaffir sub-continent. That the Indian Muslim does, in his 'normal' disposition in everyday social intercourse, not overtly express this contemptuousness either orally or in deeds, must not be interpreted as its not constituting a potent component of his consciousness. His silent, unruffled equanimity in relation to the Kashmiri separatists' congeniality with Pakistani Wahhabism, stems from the mentality which has its roots in the verses of the Quran. It has become fashionable, among journalists, politicians, scholars, to write or think or speak of Pakistani terrorism. The habitual use of a tangential language conceals, or avoids confronting, the transcendental reality of the terrorist's sacred duty. For the esoteric reality consists of Allah acting through the Pakistanis as his proxies. It is Allah's terrorism. He states it clearly in **Quran 8.17**: "Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them. And thou (Muhammad) threwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that He might test the believers by a fair test from Him! Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower."

The logic and the reasoning of this Quranic verse fail if it be interpreted by an Atheist who does not, and cannot, conceive of a real, able-bodied God living somewhere in the outer vastness and exerting either the power of controlling and directing a Believer in the destruction of a temple or burning a library, or determining the smallest desire of a sightless worm crawling in a hole. But the Believer has the burden to justify the validity of Allah, as the sole true God, acting in the world of the living with unqualified ferocity directed to the hated Kaffir, however innocent or virtuous the latter can be.

The confirmation of the Muslim as Allah's proxy in the violence against the Kaffir. When the right perspective is restored, it becomes easy to grasp the fact that at no time has any Pakistani expressed the slightest objection, or disapproval, or condemnation, of terrorism as a natural mode of Islamic behavior. Nor is there any *sama bhāva* in the silent equanimity of the Indian Muslim in relation to "Pakistani" terrorism. The self-glorification of Jinnah who boasted of holding a revolver, against the *Ahiṁsā* of Mahatma Gandhi, confirms the moral equanimity of the Muslims being conscious of having done Allah's work

in the implementation of the Partition and of the past iconoclasms, with Dajjal's intolerant ferocity. By looking at the past through the prisms of such verses as **Quran 8. 17** (reproduced above), hindsight places the *historical* Muslim events in the right *moral* context of their murderous execution by Allah Himself. The Germans are still struggling with the guilt of the Judeocide. During her visit to India, in 1997, Queen Elizabeth II apologized to India in memory of the massacre at the Jalianwala Bagh, on 10 April 1919. In India no Muslim has as yet said: "Sorry!" in recalling all the iconoclasms and their intolerances as homages to Allah.

Even then the Brahmanist Kaffirs keep trumpeting *sarva dharma sama bhāva,* blissfully ignoring the fact that Islam is more a murderous *nīti* than a *dharma* designed for self-enlightenment. And worse, it sanctions the attribute of the Believer's hatred of the Disbeliever with the divine approval bestowing upon it an unqualified justification.

> Indeed, in **Surah LVI**, *The Event,* **51-55**, one reads: Then lo! ye, the erring, the deniers, Ye verily will eat of a tree called Zaqqum, And will fill your bellies therewith; and thereon ye will drink of boiling water, drinking even as the camel drinketh, This will be their welcome on the Day of Judgement.

Towards the end of the Quran, Allah is triumphant and assures the Prophet that He has been in charge of the Fate appointed to the Kaffir. In **Surah LXXXVI**, *the Morning Star, Allah* joyfully assures the Prophet: Lo! This (Quran) is a conclusive word. It is no pleasantry. And I plot a plot (against thee, O Muhammad) And I plot a plot (against them). So give a respite to the disbelievers. Deal thou gently with them for a while (**15 – 17**).

Did the Mahatma know? During the first half of the XX century, and in particular, during the decade preceding 1947, the followers of the Muslim League led by M. A. Jinnah were in reality carrying out Allah's plot against the Kaffir. During that time the Mahatma would still keep turning his *charkhah* (spinning-wheel) and at the fifth o'clock of the afternoon would lead his small crowd of followers chanting with pathetic sincerity *Allah Īśvar tero nām*! With hindsight the Kaffir today needs to ask why would no one, not even Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, learned in Islamic lore, several times President of the Congress Party, would have told the Mahatma that the refrain of his prayer constitutes a blasphemy for the Muslim. In no masjid was the *allah īśvara tero nām* ever recited. Not even the Deoband School of Theology ever endorsed this refrain, although it stood for a nationalism in favor of the struggle for the Independence of the country. Even today diaspora groups of Brahmanists in Canada do sing *allah īśvara tero nām* when they gather to commemorate the birthday of the Mahatma. They do so with the

sincerity which this refrain evokes, without the slightest awareness that for the Muslim it is a blasphemy.

With time eliminating the fog which hid, at that time, the surrealist pathos of Mahatma Gandhi's hallowed sincerity, what now stands out was the irony, as the response to his pious one-nation brotherhood, of the Muslims winningly shouting "Islam in danger!" to the accompaniment of brandishing torches, kerosene cans, machetes and swords. The womb which gave birth to that monstrosity is still fertile.

The dampening effect of the disconcertingly choleric Verses of the Quran. After reading the Gospels, the Upaniṣads, and subsequently the Quran, particularly the Verses like those quoted above, one cannot help being dismayed by the revelation that Allah - described as the only Supreme, Almighty, Unique, Unshared Divinity- could be so vehemently filled with such an unmitigated hatefulness towards the non-Believing Kaffir. It is all the more astonishing that the luminaries who have contributed their share to Islamic history would, as witnesses of the sophisticated civilizations and cultures with which they became acquainted, have passed away without being adversely impressed by the unforgiving violence of these bursts of arbitrary anger and vindictiveness. The two greatest names in the history of Islam, Avicenna and Firdausi, were not Arabs, but Aryans. Even they, as well as such distinguished, learned men as Averroës, Ibn Khaldun, and so many others, who were acquainted with the brilliance and soul-elevating Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian civilization of North Africa, of West Asia, have not left a single page of criticism of these Verses which visit absurdly unbending damnation and condign punishment for the offense of being born and living beyond the pale of the Islamic dispensation. That these revealed statements of unjustified negations and denials made no impression on the minds of these Islamic luminaries, does at the beginning of the XXI century smite the imagination with a prodigious astonishment. It does urge asking what could have been the Fear which would have inhibited their expression of outrage and of their willingness to 'humanize', if not to reject as aberrations, the choleric Verses. Why, during all the centuries of Islamic history dominated by the Caliphs, one finds no trace of any intellectual, poet or historian, philosopher or sociologist, jurist or administrator, who would have dared to challenge the sacred orthodoxy of the choleric Verses? The entire history of Islam does not evince a single example of an enlightened eminent personality having had the courage similar to that of those Confucianist ministers of absolute integrity who had to place their heads on the block when they held their own against their Emperors' deviant decisions and

corresponding acts.

The absence of persuasion in Islam and the Muslim's indifference to a sophisticated civilization. For the time being, as we proceed to other aspects of Islam, from the point of view of the Kaffir, the choleric Verses impress the mind with one characteristic attribute: the Quran, propounding submission as the obligation of an act of unyielding faith, does not favor the art of persuasion to convince the Non-Muslim of the excellence of the revelations. In the commercial environment in which Muhammad lived he would most likely have had to use some form of persuasion to sell his wares. But one does not find this mercantile trait, if he had it, projected into his communication of the revelations. Instead the Quran, which he transmits, prefers to hurl threats, blames, condemnations, with nary a possibility available to the Kaffir to escape from the doom which awaits him. The drastic refusal to offer the least touch of humaneness to the Other actually overlays the sufferance of his damnation, for being merely Other: Allah abides unmoved in His resentment of anyone electing for the Truth, Goodness, Beauty cherished by cultures flourishing in places beyond the sands of Arabia. Muhammad never listened to a musical recital, never attended a stage play, never saw a painting masterpiece, he never came across a sculpted figure. His story does not refer to any artist, or lay scholar, among his companions. He had no acquaintance with any sign or rumor of mystical experience. He did not have the personal culture to enable him to internalize the infinite nobility of Jesus's lasting four hours on the cross and of his transcendent compassion uttered, as a Sound uniquely spiritualizing the cosmic Space, as his plea to his Father for forgiveness of those who did not know what they had been doing to him. Such a monumental indifference to a transcendental virtue pervades the choleric verses which Allah, out of his Mercy, revealed to the Apostle! And how did the Apostle abide with the use of his swords and the thirty-three wars which he waged!

Muslim incomprehension in relation to the concept and the reality of the 'antaryāmī'. Even after more than a thousand years of co-existence, the Indian Muslim chooses to revel in his inability to entertain the thought of the Brahmanist's concept of the In-Dweller (*antaryāmī*), which is the extinction, the transcendence of both religion and politics. As the satanic murderous violence of the setting into motion of the Partition demonstrated, the Indian Muslim, despite his having lived throughout nearly twelve centuries in the sub-continent, could nevertheless resolutely retreat and immure himself within the unlit space of his exclusivism. It is a psychic state in which he does preserve his

obdurate insensitivity to the refined humanism, to the unqualified tolerance, and above all, to the exalting mystical finalities of earthly existence conveyed by the indigenous Dharmas. Though the invading Muslims had completely severed their links with their Mongol and other birth lands, and had established their permanence in India, yet the Indianized Muslims settled to grow, like mushrooms, in the wet, dim light of the sub-continental forest with the freedom and the lust to hate, with choleric passion, the quietude of the dense foliage and the shade of the giant trees.

The joyful satisfaction of holding on to a limited vision of the finality of human existence. With the confidence, born of the belief in the straightforward rules and principles conceived and bound by Allah to the Straight Path, the Muslim feels he does not have to think or how to develop the best possible independent way of life requiring effort and struggle for its preservation. The Straight Path is assured to him in the very first Surah of the Holy Book. The rules, the principles, the invocations and the calls, are all laid down in simple, eloquently persuasive terms which require no effort of the mind and of the imagination to comprehend. All that the believer is required to do is to submit to them and get along the Straight Path. It was not an accident that M.A. Jinnah did not deem it important to draw at least an outline of the constitution of the independent Islamic state, which he so adamantly insisted upon having for the Muslim community. It was sufficient for him that his Pakistan were Islamic, that is, a perfect Theocracy which would implement the laws revealed to Muhammad fourteen centuries earlier. Conceived by Allah, the Sharia leaves the believer free to accommodate himself to it. It is not a bundle of laws crafted as the result of man and women risking their lives, with heroism born of struggles against oppression and injustice, with liberties won with blood and sacrifice, and by enshrining laws which guarantee personal freedoms and peaceful living together in societies where mutual cooperation and sharing become a habit. The revelations dictated by Allah do not allow any qualification, except that they are inviolate, as absolute Truth. The Believer does not have to examine, to weigh the meaningful usefulness of the law, to plumb the depth of the beneficence of the revelation. He cannot see the merit or the virtue of a NonBeliever arguing or engaging in a debate about the indispensability of a revelation for leading a good life. The believer sees no merit in persuasion, or in doubt, or in the possibility that the Other *too* can be right, with difference which does not imply contrariness or enmity, or evil. The Believer prefers to kill, to annihilate the Other instead of using persuasion to convince that only He is right. Iconoclasm, not debate, is the *modus operandi* of the

Believer confronted with the superiority of the different Other.

The law which Allah forgot to write in the celestial book and the reason for the genocide of Indian Buddhism. The *habeas corpus* forced in 1315 upon King John by the aristocratic Lords is a defining law which has been incorporated into all the genuinely democratic constitutions. It did not exist in the Hindu law. It did not exist in the law of Hammurabi. The Greeks and the Persians did not have this law. The Spaniards did not see this law operating among themselves nor among the Incas and the Aztecs whom they chose to destroy. The meaning and the wisdom of the *habeas corpus* were beyond merciful Allah's concern for providing the apt perfect jurisprudence for living along the Straight Path. The *habeas corpus* is here mentioned with the specific purpose of emphasizing the beneficence of human made laws conforming to the time, the sociological circumstances, the education and the culture of the pertinent inhabitants. It is far better and considerably more humane, for example, to have adultery or theft regulated by civil laws, than by penal laws requiring death for adultery or the cutting off of a hand or a foot as a permanent crippling punishment for a theft.[23] Thereby the author of the Islamic jurisprudence closes his mind to any more humane legislation brought forth by human effort.

The closing of the Muslim mind due to the adherence to the Sharia. The transcendental dimension attributed to the Sharia has resulted in the closing of the Muslim mind with the lock of a hardened self-righteousness which does not brook of any criticism or improvement. The believer feels happy in his limitation and in the relief from any obligation to make an effort to think or imagine a better Law. The Native of the Amazonian wild is happy while he does not need to know anything about Shakespeare's *Hamlet* or Goethe's *Faustus* or Kālidāsa's *Abhijñāna Śākuntala*. The frog at the bottom of its well is quite content with its way of living and believing that the sky has the size of the circumference of the well: it resents the little bird singing of the vastness of the sea and of the immensity of the sky.

The radiant, uplifting spirituality of the Indian Buddhism is the only

---

23. It tickles the mind to imagine Muhammad viewing the large number of films with adultery as the central theme of their scripts, shot in Europe, in America, in India, in Japan, in China, for the entertainment of countless thousands of spectators. What would he have thought if he were to see the funny thieving feats of Douglas Fairbanks in the film *The Thief of Baghdad*?

genuine spirituality which, without the essential foundation of the fiction or of the reality of a divinity, was brought into being in the Brahmanist environment as a heroic, spiritual affirmation of the maturity of the Indian Humanity. It was beyond the comprehension of all the luminaries in Islam. The zero dimension of their inability to grasp what Buddhism could be, and was, demanded to be implemented with genocidal intolerance fervently carried out in the name of Allah. The womb of Islam bears the eternal seed of genocidal intolerance. The testimony of the Umma being riven with mortiferous conflicts, induces the sober thought that the possible world as *Dar ul Islam* will be a planet of fire and smoke. There may have been a religious and political reason for the utter destruction of the Indian Buddhism by the action of fundamentalist Sultans and their obedient generals enthusiastically carrying out the elimination of the Bauddha Dharma. It consists of their recognition that Buddhism, a genuine ethical and humane spirituality endowed with the existential finality of *nirvāṇa* and of the attainment of the *arhat* perfection, *was a downright refutation of all that Islam and its laws and rules stands for*. In reality Buddhism refutes all the three religiosities which assume that the cosmology of the Book of Genesis of the Bible is meant to be valid for *all* Humanity, with its never ending plurality of cultures, each based on its own specific cosmology. The theologians of the Greco-Roman and the Judeo-Christian religions fail to acknowledge the simple fact that their religions are *Space*-based, while the Oriental, and particularly the Indian, civilizations are *Time*-based. Buddhism postulating Becoming as the foundational reality marks its singularity in contrast with all other religions having Being as their specific centrality. Buddhism represents a mighty laughter at Islam boasting of Allah being physically seen by a camel driver riding a horse in a nocturnal flight up to Heaven. And Muslims cannot yield to the truth that the space 'above' is an infinite pitch-black emptiness. The Buddhist laughs at the claim that the resurrected corpse of Jesus ascended through the pitch-black darkness to Heaven. He laughs also at the claim of a camel driver riding a horse flying through the pitch-black darkness during one night to confirm the physical existence of an able-bodied anthropomorphic Allah standing in a garden! In the consideration of the fundamentals of Islam, Buddhism presents a full-fledged contrariness with the exposition of its spectacular fundamentals being not only different, but metaphysically antipodal in contrast with all that Islam proclaims to be essential for walking along the Straight Path. The *Madhyama Pratipad* of Gautama presented a mighty *modus vivendi* which towered above Islam as an infinitely nonpareil metaphysical magnificence. But Gautama, the proponent of *nirvāṇa* as Universal Salvation who claimed himself to be

a mere physician, was no match to Muhammad who could wield, at any time, one of his nine swords, for bringing the whole world under the aegis of Allah! The reason and the logic of Islam required the obliteration of the Middle Way of Gautama.

By having laughed the Buddhist sealed his death sentence. Yet the death of Indian Buddhism still does not explain the irony of the Ottoman Islam colonizing the Arab Islam during six centuries!

These two strictly different *Weltanschauungs* must not be interpreted as a pair of opposites, as one claiming superiority over the other. Each has had its specific cultural expression, its distinctive history, and its own explicit finality. The fate of the Indian Buddhism proves most dramatically the infinite difference which separates the Revealed religions and their corresponding cultures characterized by intolerance and violence from the sublime monistic Dharmas, with tolerance and pacifism as their perennial defining attributes.

The connection of Sharia with fundamentalism. Yet it is this belief in the transcendence of the Sharia which lies at the root of Islamic fundamentalism and its cognate violence. Within the space of the sub-continent, the Indian Muslim community will, till well beyond the Last Day, remain distinct, exclusive, self-accomplished, happy to bear its closed-heartedness, as a protection, just as the snail bears its cockled shell, as the ostentation of its identity.

The ontological void in Islam. Whatever be the reason of this ontological void in the history of Islam, Humanity today has to contend with the socio-political predicament of the cultural plateau as the present state of the world. Hitherto the West, and to a large extent the rest of the world forced to follow in tow, the stagnation is the product of the blind, effusive faith in the ideology or the religion of Progress as an endless boon assured by the use of Reason. Sponsored by the Enlightenment as the major conquest of the advent of the supremacy of Individualism buttressed by Reason, the Idea of Progress, hailed as a permanently growing benefaction, has recently, all of a sudden, proved to be a mirage. It is now regarded as a downright regression which verily had lain hidden in the thicket of technological innovations. During the XX century the seductive gadgetries have, with a life of their own, offered the melancholy spectacle of the consumer culture as a decadent environment which dulls all intimations of enlightened freedom from the allurements of comfort in a Lethe world bereft of ontological opportunities. The predominance of the invention of Jehovah, together with what He has subsequently hitherto stood for, has dulled Humanity

into losing the soulful response to the seductiveness of authentic living freed from the gravity of Having as the supreme commandment. There will never be a state of the world where peace and joy will flourish as a matter of fact so long as the ideologies of violence, with their roots in the idea of Jehovah, shall prevail. The possible future of Humanity freed from threats of the dominance of materialistic powers lies with the alteration of international realpolitik by the pacifist powers of the Dharmas of India and of Asia conjoined for the establishment of a mode of universal living without the prosperity of militaro-industrial complexes, as the ubiquitous block to the will for universal quietude.

The conjunction of the rise of Salafist violence with the death of the Idea of Progress. The resulting moral emptiness on the world scale has offered the opportunity for the blatant emergence of the inhumanity inaugurated by Salafist devotion to Death and to the murder of innocents as the Believer's faithful submission to the injunctions of Allah. It is an unquestionable denial of any praiseworthy celebration of Divine Call when cowardly, murderous acts are committed by the proxies of Allah with the belief in the obscene rewards of eternal sexual delights in Paradise. When the landscape gets obscured in the fog of Islamic fundamentalism, the salvation of India shall dwell in an economic and military strength adequate to preserve Truth and to maintain alive the Gandhian *ahiṁsā* as its specific policy: it shall be a worthy imitation of the Emperor Aśoka who, in his late years, committed his empire to the spread of the peace of Buddhism. To ensure the success of his Buddhist enterprise, he kept intact his powerful army as the protection of the vigilance for assuring social order and for the endless recognition of the work achieved by the Noblest representative of the unexcelled, infinitely admirable *vānaprastha* culture.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Search for Roots

The recurring defeat of high cultures by less civilized armed invaders. The sublime feature of India attaining Independence on 15 August 1947 must, with due recognition of the realities of the non-violent movement which preceded it, be acknowledged as the unique example of a nation throwing off the leaden weight of the two alien Islamic and British dominations. Unique in the history of revolutions and of the struggles of societies and peoples for their liberation from oppression and injustice, the Independence must be viewed from the vantage point of an eagle's sweep of a history spanning more than a thousand years. For a sober appreciation of the momentous event of the Indian Independence cannot be pressed into the narrowness of a worm's view of the previous two centuries, during which the British exerted their dominion. The Independence was achieved by the affirmation of the fundamental conjunction of the practice of a strict adhesion to Truth (*satyagraha*) and of an unblemished galvanization of the moral supremacy of Non-Violence (*ahiṁsā*). Be it acknowledged, as historic justice, that whatever participation the Muslim Kaum shared in the struggle for the Independence, it was nevertheless, by the will of the majority of the Muslim community, more importantly qualified by the coincidence of the extreme inhumanity of the *modus operandi* of the Partition and the creation of the two present Theocratic Islamic countries. It was the ancient spirit animating the indigenous Dharmas which achieved, by *satyagraha and ahiṁsā,* for the first time in world history, a political Independence from the most violent of all imperialist powers, without it costing the life of a single British man. It was hitherto the sole vindication of Jean Jacques Rousseau's idealism expressed in the thought that no political ideal is worth the death of a single man. Extolling the power of Truth and Non-Violence, as the exclusive powers of resistance and triumph in the struggle for Independence, needs not be used as material for a contrary sentiment towards the Muslim community.

On the contrary, it behooves the latter to concur with the reality of the consequences of the politics of the pre-1947 Indian Muslims. It is the event the ideology of which will remain riveted to their collective memory, at least so long as the Minar-e-Pakistan in Lahore shall be, for the measure (*Taqdīr*) of the three Muslim communities spread across what was once the sub-Continent! [1]

The short triumph of British mercantile Machiavellianism. The earlier period of alien oppressiveness bears the imprint of the obedience to the will of Allah commanding the Believers' hate-filled treatment of Disbelievers or Kaffirs. The British ethos of looting, taxing, famishing was performed as loyal service to the King (or Queen) endowed with the particular defining title of Defender of the Faith.[2] These predatory duties were judiciously wrapped in the self-righteous ideologues' praising Great Britain for bearing the burden of conferring upon the benighted Indians the beneficences and the blessings of the best of all European cultures. But, of all the colonized peoples who have had to live out their share of the debilitating subservience to the supremacy of a conqueror, the India of the indigenous Dharmas of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism, endured the unique fate of subjugation by the two successive less civilized invaders.[3] History is replete with examples of barbarian hordes vanquishing, for a short period, sophisticated cultures which had maintained themselves across long spans of time. Such an occurrence happened as the fate of the Roman Empire when it came under the attack of the Germanic hordes and the Slavs from the Eurasian Steppe, of the Saracens from the

---

[1] The Pakistani, the Indian, the Bangladeshi.

[2] Vide the chapter on India in Caroline Elkins' *The Legacy of Violence: A History of the British Empire.*

[3] In relation to Great Britain we are certainly aware of that *day* part of British culture represented by William Shakespeare, John Milton, John Ruskin, John Stuart Mill, and so many of similar merit. We are referring to the *night* side of the British civilization characterized by its rapacity, its heartlessness, its indifference to the sufferings of the Indian people, and to the apotheosis of all that in the Luciferan explosion of the Partition of the subcontinent.

Arabian peninsula, and of Berbers from the Atlas and the Sahara.[4] The vast territory of the Indian sub-continent had experienced three to four centuries of tranquility before the first Muslim invaders came in with their lust for conquest and with the zeal to write an Islamic historical episode with the sword. When Muslim power waned and became effete, a company of merchants arrived at the other end of the sub-continent. Animated at first with the lust for profit the latter soon found it easy to prey on a prosperous civilization with little military skill and still less means to counter the heavy greed of the merchants mutating into musket-wielding adventurers. Professor T. R. V. Murti, in one of his many cryptic synthetic cogitations, said: "*We opened out doors for them to exercise their trades and their mercantile interests, and they stole the country!"*

The irony of native Indian 'weakness' winning. As a mercantile elite the new breed of conquerors extracted the fullest advantage of using a *reason* pregnant with Machiavellian wile, as a weapon, more potent than gunpowder, against which the "natives" proved to be utterly defenseless. In particular the largely Brahmanist society, which confronted the Machiavellian naturalness of the mercantile-military cunning of the British, did not have the specific advantage, particularly the use of deceptive rationality, to assure itself of a correct interpretation of the intentions and actions of the wily British merchants suddenly metamorphosing themselves into greedy predators. Indeed, the long duration of the military weakness of the Indian natives was due, above all, to the absence of the art of duplicity in the ethics of the three Dharmas. Paradoxically weakened by the absence of this intellectual deformity, the native Indian armies were at a disadvantage when they had to face the *Taqiyya* of the Muslim invaders and, subsequently, the *rational duplicity* of British mercantilism.

Forging the instrument of Truth as a political power. It was a revenge of fortune that the "weakness" of rectitude lying in the collective consciousness of the native Indians - most particularly,

---

[4] Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History, Oxford University Press, 1963; p. 13

in the minds and the hearts of the silent proletarian masses - could be forged by Mahatma Gandhi as the weapon of Truth. In the XX century, for the first time in History, it was directed against the British power and its duplicitous rationality. Nevertheless the easily acquired dominion over the sub-continent could be effected with the combination of brute force aided by the stern use of a military-mercantile reason in alliance with perfidy. British economic success proved to be one more example of the phenomenon of the armed might of Barbarians overwhelming the history of a splendid civilization. No event in the history of India illustrates more convincingly the defeat of a sophisticated, well embellished moral culture collapsing under pressure by an inferior power than the ending of the Moghul Empire by a small British army largely composed of mercenary Indian infantry men. Not even the stars could prompt the astrologers to even dream or speculate that, arriving from beyond the seas and two continents, a company of merchants would undertake to plunder, with unchecked ease, the wealth which, with their labor, the people of the sub-continent had accumulated.

The dark period of British imperial rule. But the British did more: with consummate cunning they prevailed in colonizing the minds of the natives into believing that Christian predatory passion was, in those times, the gift of the best of all possible European cultures generously conferred and implemented for their unasked benefit. It actually proved to be an enforced *tamas* consisting of looting and taxing, of disparaging and famishing. Of all empire builders the British proved to be the most proficient famine promoters. Moreover the Brits had the luck that their man-made genocidal famines, which occurred regularly after every four or five years of their rule, left no testimony of mass graves, or of cemeteries, or of any kind of memorials. In the apt apotheosis of their barbaric rule trumpeted as their civilizing mission, the British gave the Indians only a few weeks in order to set into motion the catastrophic splitting of the sub-continent into three sections.[5]

[5] Lord Mountbatten, the Vice-Roy, announced on 3 June 1947 the partition to take effect on 14 August 1947. The short notice led to an apocalyptic violence among Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims. He chose the date to coincide with the date of the surrender of Japan, when Mountbatten was in charge of the Allied Forces on the Pacific Front. The British took

Supervised and executed by an insensate bureaucracy, the Partition explosion caused the death of a million men, women and children, tens of thousands of women being raped, and fifteen million refugees moving in both directions across the religious divide. The calamity of the partitioning of the Indian sub-continent showed to the whole world, and for all time, that pomp and splendor can be the camouflage for bestial lust and barbaric soullessness.[6] It is quite an informative contrast that the British themselves took about five years to bring about the Brexit separation from the European Union in 2017- 21.[7]

The myth of capitalism as progress. During nearly two centuries India provided the stage for the savage capitalistic exploitation of the riches, of the wealth of the land and of owning the fruit of the labour of the Indian masses. It was a large scale draining of the wealth of the country, unchallenged by any external constraint or by any moral disquiet within the collective consciousness of the British race, animated by the lust and the rapacity of glory and profit. The appropriation of the prosperity of the sub-continent was carried out with infinite self-righteousness.

Outside India, and for about two centuries, the savage capitalism thus practiced has been praised for its having extended the benefits of increased wealth and comfort to a vast number of men and women. The optimistic view of globally extended consumerism as a universal blessing may now, with hindsight, force the recognition that the preeminence of the British in the expansion of capitalism was possible due to the availability of a bottomless abundance of Indian labor providing the substance and the assurance of its vigor. Simultaneously it is none the less true that the apologists of capitalism and of its influence as economic well-being and moral progress, do rarely speak or write about the price

---

5 years to effect the Brexit from the European Union.

[6] We are fully aware of the beneficence of the cultural additions to Indian culture contributed by the British rule. However, for the purpose of the theme of this work, we respond to the obligation to refer to the *tamas* components of both the Islamic and the Christian influences, which politicians and intellectuals have been a little too shy to include in their estimates of the post-Partition state of the Nation.

[7] Relevant to this argument are Shashi Tharoor's *What the British Did to India* & Wm Dalrymple's *The Anarchy*.

the Indians paid in sweat and blood in order for the wealth to spread among large swaths of the upper classes of the Great Britain and incidentally of the other European populations. The savage capitalism practiced by the British gave the lie to Saint Paul's argument that "*he who works, eats and he who does not work, does not eat*". The historic fact consists of the British fattening themselves, while the Indian worked. And they found it convenient and 'moral' for their poorer classes and their own home subjects to emigrate to the white British Dominions. For the British and under their rule, the Indians worked and worked to the extent that, at Independence, the average longevity of the Indian was twenty-six years! [8]

The results of the savage capitalism of the British. Furthermore the Indian horrors following in the wake of the development of British cannibalistic capitalism which, executed on a colossal scale in India, financed the success of the Industrial Revolution, do hardly appear in the published works of ethnocentric economists in the West. Dadabhai Naoroji's *Unchristian Rule of India* scarcely had any influence on the minds of the British authorities, historians and economists, immured in their ethnocentrism. Since the XVIII century, the vindicators of capitalism have been exalting the optimistic delusion of Progress resulting from the uses of Reason. But, bewildered by the barbaric aberrations of the XX century, they have, by now, been forced to acknowledge the extent to which the ideology or the religion of Progress, hitherto deemed to being an inevitable, ceaseless improvement, has been in reality an illusion, the production of a mirage which T. S. Eliot has rightly qualified as the 'Wasteland'.

It is pertinent to stress that the real superlative goodness which came out of the British Raj has been, and still is, the quiet, humane, gracious offer of the native Indians' friendship towards the former famine originators, without the least incrimination or resentment, or the claim of a single penny as a token compensation for all the wealth they took by a force, which was marshalled in order to

---

[8] In Kerala today the average longevity is 74 years, equal to that of the U.S.A. re, *Causeur No. 105, October 2022;p. 16*

batten themselves and to swell their pride of domination. It was Gandhian humanity which helped the Brits to leave like gentlemen after they had duly supervised and conducted the apocalyptic mayhem of Partition as the apotheosis of their having carried their share of what Rudyard Kipling, with self-righteous irony, hailed as the White Man's burden.

The theme of this essay. Within the context of the history of India, no one among the alien Islamic and British communities need take any offence in the acclamation of the uplifting hopefulness borne by India in the present predicament of the troubled state of the world. All the valid arguments, or expositions of ideas and events deemed pertinent to the theme of this essay, are expressed in good faith for the enhancement of a universal inter-cultural understanding. The selection of historical facts and the related comments will be undertaken with the intention of calling for a creative cooperation, with the aid of an amicable dialogue, in the hope of bringing about a peaceful inspiriting of that particular humaneness which India holds as the promise for a serene, beneficent future for all men and women.

Any criticism of the debilitating impact, with which the British Christians and the Muslims have marked the history and the culture of the Indians nurtured in their indigenous traditions, is formulated with the desire to acquaint the reader with the images the outsiders have projected in the minds of their victims. Inevitably it will perforce incline towards the native Indians having had to bear the crippling brunt of the foreign invaders. The British acted like depredating outsiders, in asserting the correspondence with their claim to owning the fullest development of European civilization.[9] They lorded their outsider status with self-righteous contempt by using the excellences of their laws, their institutions, their literature, their educational system, their arts. With instilling these in their civil and military rules in order to hold down the conquered peoples with the pride of pomp and circumstance. The

---

[9] Vide the quote of the British ideologue praising Britain to be the best component of European Civilisation in Marc Ferro's *Global History of Colonialisms.*

Muslims came to ravish the sub-continent and lured by what they saw they chose to settle and dominate by means of brute force. With the claim to their religious superiority as the argument to justify their brutish power, they used their raw power to deny and deplete the native inhabitants of their cultural achievements. Even with the background of the very few centuries of the splendor of the Abbasid Dynasty and of the glittering fame of Bagdad, Indian Islam resolutely abstained from manifesting such human exploits as their own heritage accomplishments which they could have later vied with *their* conquerors in the estimation of the glitter of British superiority.

The Muslim invaders brought no culture to India. The Muslims brought no art or science to India. They brought the Quran, the Hadiths, and carried out all the physical and moral religious desecrations determined by the raw totalitarian ideology revealed by the medium of the Arabic language to a middle-aged camel driver. After a thousand years of their hegemony the Indian Muslims have resolutely maintained their outsider status. It culminated with the murderous vehemence of the Partition. The resultant hate-filled separation, eternalized as Pakistan and Bangladesh, got enhanced, in independent India, with the 1950 Constitution granting to the Muslim minority the provisional privilege of retaining the civil jurisprudence of the Sharia till such time when they would, on their own, freely ask to join the common civil code. During the seventy-six years, following the Independence, the Indian Muslims have doggedly abstained from defining the substance of the word "provisional" in relation to the absurdity of the Sharia as an appendage to the 1950 Constitution.

The obligation to remember without reciprocity of Islamic hatred of the Other. Consequently the reference to the Indian Muslims as *outsiders*, *as the expression of their will and of their identity*, needs not be viewed as a prejudice or as an indication of hostility. The followers of the native Dharmas are not, and must not be, Kaffirs *intent on reciprocating the hostility with which the Believers are enjoined to treat them, according to the injunctions revealed by Allah.* The fulfillment of the task of reconstructing the native civilization compels the preservation of the fundamental moral and spiritual merits of the legacy bequeathed by the learned

Ṛṣis, Poets and Sages, particularly the tolerance which has its roots in the metaphysical pronouncements of the fundamental *dhārmika* scriptures. It does simultaneously behoove the Indian Mussalman to consider and dispationately weigh the legitimacy of the Hindus striving to retrieve what they lost under Islamic hegemony. He would have to search in his heart for the reason and the will to tolerate this work of native reconstruction, for there is no scope for such a sentiment, advocated in the Quran. In reality there is no space for the graciousness of any assistance to the Hindu Kaffir, in the economy of Allah's *Taqdīr.*

The return to the roots is the urgent task of the indigenous citizenry now trapped in a new variation of dhimmitude. The prime question of the present generation of Indians refers to the question of roots, mainly in relation to the Brahmanist majority community.[10] The 1950 Constitution is not the civilization of India nor is it tantamount to the augustness of her spirituality. Nor does the Republic of India signify its being the totality of the India with its history going back several millenia. The constitutional laws exist as an agreed structure of dispositions for the peaceful safeguard of the composite people living together with each citizen enjoying the freedom of conscience, the freedom of practicing one's private belief, the freedom of social association. The Republic consists of the totality of its people living with free acceptance of the established laws iwhich assure the free execution of the Individual's private choices of his mode of existence.

The 1950 Constitution: the instrument designed for guarding the reality of the Indian civilization. But the notion of India as a nation representing a specific civilization refers to the reality of a History which goes back ten thousand years in the past. It is still alive in the recollection of its ancient cultural substance being relevant, in the XXI century, to the benefices which elevate and embellish present enterprises in the cultural continuity marked by

---

[10] The use of the word Brahmanist derives from the Upaniṣadic *mahāvākya "sarvam idam khalu brahman"* in preference to Hinduism. "Hindu" is replaced by 'Brahmanist'. The word for the Brāhmaṇa caste is0020 written, with the visible diacritical signs.

the collective preservation of the inheritance of moral and spiritual perfections. It cannot be otherwise, for the spiritual practices of the Dharmas are relevant essentially to the *mental* space of the native Indian, in a diametrical contrast with the other religiosities which prescribe their pertinent spiritual exercises in astronomical, or calendar, time. The Constitution, as the guarantor of the integrity of the Republic and its assorted institutions, further protects the heritage from transient aberrations passing for progress. More meaningfully the Constitution facilitates the blending of the fundamental traditional universalist virtues with the reconstruction of the cultural integrity which has been damaged by the intolerances of the two alien hegemonies. To the nation, the Constitution owes the onus to further the rehabilitation of the authenticity of the *sanātana* essentiality of India, while preserving and asserting its authority to preserve order and tranquility in the prevalent on-going inter-communal polity.

In short, the dynamic adaptability of the Constitution to the needs of the Republic will be always expected to favor the will of authentic India to regain peacefully her store of moral and aesthetic accomplishments, in a climate of communal quietude. Since the Muslim community already possesses its religious and, consequently, its cultural perfection as laid down in the Quranic Revelation, it is quite legitimate and righteous for the native cultures to claim imperatively to retrieve what they have lost during the centuries of violence and depredation inflicted by the two alien hegemonies. Additionally, any acrimony on the part of the Muslim Kaum in regard to the rehabilitation of the native Dhārmika India may be met with the representation that the alien invaders came to India to benefit, more than in any other country which fell under the harsh rule of Islam, from a well-ordered, fully developed and refined civilization which vastly contributed to their subsequent elevation.[11] The case then for the frank, open recovery of what

[11] The striking example of the Muslim Kaum internalizing to the fullest extent the love and the integration of Hindu Classical Music is a significant indicator of the civilizing process of the native culture on the rough Muslim hordes. In no other Muslim majority country is there a traditional music as beautiful and sublime as the classical rāgas. Nor is

India has lost need not be carried out with fear and with apology to the iconoclasts. On the contrary, if the Muslim Kaum is capable, with the favor of a collective recognition of their past savagery in the wrecking of the indigenous civilization, they would honorably share and contribute to the enterprise of reconstruction. But they will not do it, for it would imply a condemnation of the revealed injunctions which called for the destruction of the Kaffir way of living. The Quran contains no revealed verses enjoining upon the Believer to evince commiseration, or compassion, or any compensation, for any damage, or injury, or suffering inflicted upon the Kaffir.

On the contrary the sentiment, still active in the collective will of the Umma, proceeds from the Revelation, that the prime duty of the Believer consists of waging war for the realization of the *Dar-ul-Islam.* And that war includes the entire spectrum of divine prescriptions of irreducible enmity towards all that pertains to the Kaffir.

The Muslim's aversion to acknowledge the wrecking of the Indian civilization. Further, any recognition, however slight, by the Muslim, of the abundance of iconoclasms perpetrated against the art works and the educational institutions of the native Indians, would further be viewed by him as a condemnation of what Allah prescribes the Believer to do to the Kaffir. It would amount to a repudiation of the Sovereignty (*Rububīyat*) and the Measure (*Taqdīr*) of Allah. Indeed any Muslim participating in the Indian striving to extricate his culture from under the leaden sheet of foreign impositions would be viewed by Islamic orthodoxy as blaspheme. Nevertheless the maintenance of communal harmony would be indispensable for the realization of the re-possession of the integrity of Indian civilization. The task calls for an urgent execution, for there is indeed the essential need for the uplift of all Humanity which is now under the threat of a gross materialism saddled with the nearly total transformation of the planet into an

---

the art of the Qawwali, as an imitation of the Hindu *bhajans.* available in a Muslim country away from India.

armed camp subsequent to the end of the Second World War. The present generation deserves to be reminded that on 6 August 1945, the American chaplain of the GI regiment blessed the Big Boy before the plane piously flew the atomic bomb so named over Hiroshima. Three days later a brother of Big Boy flew over Nagasaki. The pilot of the plane carrying Big Boy afterwards took vows as a Trappist monk, out of remorse for the catastrophe which he had unleashed upon the defenseless civilian population of Hiroshima. He might have spent the rest of his life brooding over the meaning of a Christian's view of "duty" in the middle of the XX century. But in the context of the present argument related to India, no Believer ever felt the slightest remorse, let alone the desire for an absolution, for the lusty uses of swords wielded with pious submission to Allah's injunctions to abominate the Kaffir devotees of the Dharmas as the obligation to bring forth the whole world as the *Dar-ul-Islam*.

The reconstruction of the Dhārmika cultures. The task of the reconstruction of the nation, with the necessity of a reanimation of the moral certitudes which have remained buried by the alien hegemonic intolerances, constitutes the obligation to restore the soul of Indian civilization to its rightful integrity with its unequalled universalism. For it is only India which could and did nurture the plurality of mutually amicable three Dharmas which are, each in its respective exposition, splendidly universalist. For the finalities of human existence of *mokṣa, nirvāṇa, kaivalya* are perfected states of individual being which transcend the particularities of race, of time, of color, of gender, of history and of geography, and of all actual and possible languages and products of the imagination. The 'universality' of the word '*catholic'* in the rubric of the Roman Catholic Church is merely *cultural*, limited to the Christian community and to its expression mainly in the European languages. Worse: it is linked to the concept of Jehovah, the Only God, the source of all the violent forms of intolerance and of genocide which characterize the histories of the revealed religions. Christian Orthodoxies still maintain the dogma that no salvation is possible or available outside the Church (Ecclesia).

The spiritual inadequacy of the English language. Hence

the beneficence which, realized in the Kali Yuga, lies in the certitude of India regaining the lost nobility of her authentic naturalness. The present and the future follower of the Dharma cannot be fully himself unless he becomes the inheritor of the past in continuous integration with the present. In particular the revival of the admiration due to the past lore would be a practical mode of superseding the submission to the English language which, in spite of its exalted worth, does not serve as the right vehicle for the exploration of the psychic depths within each indigenous living being.[12] The convincing evidence of English not succeeding to plunge roots of spirituality in the collective psyche of the nation recalls the brief popularity of the Theosophy as a manifestation of a mystical appeal which flattered the national pride in the foreign recognition of the merits of the traditional Dharmas. But the Theosophists deserve to be gratefully remembered for their cultural contributions, by means of their using English as the medium of communication. They used it for the spreading of the its moral and mystical contents of Theosophy in the revival, for example, in India, of the *Bhārata Nātyam*, In Sri Lanka Buddhism was on the verge of a total eclipse, resulting from the activity of the foreign Christian missionaries. It was rescued from annihilation by the extraordinary generosity and intellectual integrity of the Theosophists which brought the tidal wave of cultural genocide exerted by foreign missionary financed by convenient Western

---

[12] At this moment in the flow of the Kali Yuga, it is relevant to observe that the Caribbean Islands have produced four Nobel Prize winners in Literature: Saint John Perse, Sir Arthur Lewis, Derek Walcott, Sir V.S. Naipaul. No Indian writer in English has won a Nobel Prize, except Rabindranath Tagore, in 1913, for mainly his own English version of his Bengali original *Gitānjali.* A lateral deficiency corresponding to this absence of Nobel prize winners in literature is the absence of worthy novels being adapted to the Indian cinema. Few, if any, of the novels consecrated by the Sahitya Academy find their interpretations or adaptions in films. It is tempting to believe that the dampening of the Indian spirit, for elevation to the Himalayan heights of sterling fiction writing, is due to the use of English as the foreign mode of expression cramping the Indian soul. Indian English maintains the Indian mind on a mid-level estimation. Paradoxically the use of English impedes the realization of Macaulay's vision of India being populated by educated brown English men and women!

imperialists.

The short life spans of English-based spiritual doctrines. Yet Theosophy, as a religious movement, failed to grow into a vast spreading, new Dharma banyan tree on the Indian soil. It was popular among a certain English speaking upper crust which itself got absorbed within a century into the mainstream of mainly Hinduism. Unfortunately Theosophy had no appeal to the masses of the impoverished country. It did not plunge roots among the still deeply religious proletarian stratum of Indian society. Moreover the intellectualist temper of Theosophy proved to be beyond the reach of the majority of the pluri-linguistic Indian society.

The other example of an eminent meteor, which flashed brilliantly in the Indian firmament with an English medium, has been Aurobindo's impressive mass of philosophical writing with an originality which remain stocked and frozen among a small number of followers, without being emotionally grounded in an appropriate and lasting popular fervor. It is unfortunate that a certain veneer of a mercenary inclination still survives in the national sensibility, in particular, in the southern Dravidian communities, hostile to the use of the Aryan media of Hindi and Sanskrit, in a consolidation of the politics of lower caste resentment against the Brāhmaṇa tradition. The level of social maturity is high enough in post-1947 India to bear stating the evident truth that Dalit resentment can never be the right stuff as the material needed for national reconstruction or as a virile component of the regained cultural wholeness. It behooves the Dalit community to seek practical ways leading to a genuine, lasting transcendental *modus vivendi* more elevated than the constant complaining for their past deprivations. The favor of an egalitarian owning of right to all the freedoms guaranteed by the 1950 Constituition and the availability of University level education, constitute the instruments for Dalit elevation from their feeling of insufficiency to the status of cultural creators on a level with, if not higher than, the past Ṛṣis and Ācāryas of yore. A whole new world of creative social excellence awaits the Dalits' lifework of original adornments of the remaining portion of the Kali Yuga!

The importance of the concept of the ONE as the

foundation of Indian civilization. And all this for a simple reason: the individual, faithful to either of the three Dharmas, has adhered, since the earliest beginning, to the concept of all that exists is the ONE, beside which no-thing exists. This dominant, unique cosmological vision pervades, as a banal matter of fact, without any intrusion by a supreme divinity being, however remotely, actively involved in the contents of the impermanence of Time passing. This simple *Weltanschauung*, which can be the vision of an innocent babe, does encompass the individual human being as a co-participant of the ONE. Hence the ancient sage, most likely, a visionary mystic meditating in a forest ashram happened to discover the co-essentiality of his existence with the Essence of the One. And he experienced the joy of transmitting his wisdom in such pithy sentences as *ātman brahman aikyam* (the self and brahman are one) and *sarvam idam khalu brahman* (all this indeed is brahman). This is not a knowledge infused into the sage from a supreme external source: it springs from the ONE manifested as his *ātman* (soul), which, according to the *Bhagavad Gītā,* is eternal. Indeed in the Chapter 2.12, of the *Gītā,* Śrī Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna: *Never was there a time when I was not, nor thou, nor these lords of men, nor will there ever be a time hereafter when we all shall cease to be.* Only in the vision of all that IS, of all that exists, the ONE, Fullness or Plenitude, is *essentially* homogeneous, of the belief and the fact that what inhabits the body has always been. In such a cosmological view, Man is co-eternal with the ONE and he is not told, nor does he feel he has to, be the master of what he sees in front of him.

The Biblical source of the ecological crisis. It has become a widespread idea at the beginning of the century for the West to be concerned with the ecological crisis having its major cause in the Biblical pronouncement of Adam having the privilege and the right to use the Planet for his satisfaction. The cosmic relationship, consecrated by the will of Jehovah, has ultimately brought forth the impoverishment of the Earth. It does now weigh on the mind of Believers that the cosmology of the three Revelations was faulty in its design at the very first throb of the Biblical Creation. It does now reveal the irony of Nature laughing at the success of the celestial joke of awarding supremacy to the debilitating effects

of the world created according to the Jehovah's plan. The still predominant Judeo-Christian fraction of the world has unfortunately no means, no philosophical category to grasp the cosmic tragedy of the more sophisticated, beautiful, spiritual vision of the Eternal One having been defeated, diminished, scorned, as the genesis and the material of an inferior civilization. Worse, the West still expects the people of the ONE to rally to its mortiferous civilization and learn from the death-dealing cosmology generated by Jehovah. It all began when Jehovah, as the Only God, came down in the Sinai Desert and colluded with Moses to establish the ethos of the dualistic religiosities which entrusted upon Adam the task of molding the world according to his blank, uncultured mind which needed to be indoctrinated with the ten commandments as the totality of the requirements for a full, moral mode of living. Sobriety and concern for the environment embolden the view that the future of the welfare of the world and of humanity may result if the ideas borne by the cultures of India and of the Orient were to inject their enhancing graces and elevations into the death-dealing *realpolitik* of the Jehovah inspired cultures.

The art of explaining the ONE. The metaphor which the forest-dwelling Indian sage could have used to explain the determining homogeneity of the soul with the ONE is the *sameness* of the wave heaving from and sinking into the Ocean. In religious terms the equation gets expressed by the essence of what is signified as the favourite divinity (*iṣṭa devatā*) being always present as the *antaryāmī* (in-dweller) as *sameness* with the devotee's personal essence.[13] The *sameness* does not desert the condemned man waiting behind bars for his execution. It is as vitally real as *sameness* in the Saint. That was the "Kingdom" which Jesus pathetically announced to his listeners and the latter would not grasp, by being seduced with the idea of a real, material Kingdom to be established by the Messiah who still keeps the Believers waiting for his arrival!

Sameness as the relationship of the ONE and the Turiya.

---

[13] It is germane to the celebration of the importance of the ONE to assert its similarity with Lao Tzu's Tao which we interpret as the equivalent of Brahman.

That is, in a straightforward manner, the individual lives every moment as the host of the essence of the transcendent, all-pervasive ONE. Consequently the futurity of the individual devotee is not directed by the attractiveness of the loving Father according to the Christian Triune God or as Allah, as the fearsome Only God, the hate-filled Jehovah of the Bible, all living out there in distant space, imagined with His quiddity reflected in the materiality of Heaven.

The Indian devotee strives and searches for the ultimate experience by recoiling within himself in the arduous pursuit after the really ever present One as *Brahman*, which hitherto had been hidden and overlaid by dualistic, dispersive knowledge. It is a lot more than the *anamnesis* dear to Socrates, the remembrance of a knowing which had lain hidden or forgotten, in the depth of consciousness. In the philosophical anthropology of the Indian civilization, the searching of the devotee leads to the realization of the Fourth state underlying the three states of wakefulness, of dreaming, of sleep. The existence of the Fourth State, Caturthī or the "Turiya", of the *Māṇḍukya Upaniṣad* experienced as its unveiling within the body as the transcendental bliss of the untainted, blissful thought of the truth of Being (*saccidānanda*). It is the experiential, unmediated by any sense organ, realization of the presence of the ONE disclosed in unqualified contemplation as the fulgent luminosity of one's own self (*ātman*).

The Aupniṣad glorification of mystical knowing. Experiencing the *ātman brahman aikyam* is the absolute self-fulfillment. Relatively, the transfer, according to the revealed religions, of the resurrected body on the Day of Resurrection, in the material territory of Heaven, there to experience unending joyfulness, represents the end of living as a never ending decadent grossness of sensual pleasure. The descriptions of Heaven in the revealed scriptures do not mention intellectual and contemplative rejoicings in Heaven; they emphasize carnal delights. But there can be nothing higher than the *saccidānanda* experience which is the result of steadfast, heroic, patient struggle against the forces of Ignorance preceding the attainment of Absolute knowledge, as the ultimate

glorification of Humanity homogeneous with the One.

The obligatory reconstruction of the Dhārmika cultures. The rehabilitation of the past will inevitably rival the perfection proclaimed by the Islamic scriptures which, revealed by Allah Himself as eternally perfect and, in relation to which, with the risk of incurring a death sentence, no submitting Muslim Believer is permitted to modify a single letter of the revealed verses. The closing of the mind by the Quran will remain the responsibility of the Indian Muslims who are expected to own their responsibility and their communal specificity. Certainly they should not have, for reasons of communal quietness, any objective reason to impede the recovery of the authenticity and completeness of the cultures animated by the native Dharmas.

The unique case of the reconstruction of the original Indian civilisation as a necessity in a pluri-cultural democracy. In short, the reconstruction of the Dharmas would be undertaken under the protection of the Constitution and with the maintenance of the republican configuration of the nation. It shall have to proceed without being held as a hostage by the Muslims who already possess their communal integrity conforming to *its* perfection *already* secured by their submission to the ideal, eternally valid Quranic dispensation. Meanwhile the *already extant* perfection of Islam bears no symmetry with the damaged indigenous cultures which call for the recuperation of their integrity. Conscious of the *perfection* of the revealed religion as laid down in the verses of the Holy Book, the Muslims are expected only to abstain from objecting and instead to evince amity in reality to encourage, the Devotees of the Dharmas to undertake the duty of recovering their pasts which, within the perspective and the vision of the ONE, dwell eternally concomitant with the present and the future. India has no tryst with any destiny. India simply IS. The Plenitude of Brahman as an existential reality is Now, without any relation to any futurity, which nurtures the vanity of a possible *Dar-ul-Islam.*

The historic naturalness of Brahmanism as its categorical imperative in the task of reconstruction. A nation does not exist only in terms of its laws, its institutions, its territory. The Republic is effectively characterized by the acknowledgement of its

customs, of the norms and the values, which seal the sentiments of a unitive civic belonging and of a well-ordered creative civil social life. Above all this network of agreed belief, there exists the freedom for the individual and the collective explorations of the arts, of philosophical speculations, of the expansion of the higher knowledges and of the inventions of the means adapted to the production of wealth for the common good. Most distinctively a nation arrives to its fullness by the freedom and the recognition of the allurement of, and of the searching for, the Ontological fulfillment of the individual mode of living as the revered universal norm for all sentient beings. Traditionally the Indian Mind holds that there can be nothing more priceless than Life and the individual must feel grateful to be endowed with life as a gift, which then calls for its due recognition, by spending all living as the acquittal of a debt, with service to all that lives in one's space, in alleviating the suffering of others and in contributing to their obtaining the mystical self-perfection. For it is only the mystical fulfilment of earthly existence which vouchsafes the arriving at Ontological fullness of a people rising above the decency of a civilized dominion safeguarded by collective agreement to freely approved rules and principles.

The respect due to the naturalness of Brahmanist majority. The Indian specificity cannot, by any means, abolish the historical fact of the Brahmanist majority being and living where it has been for several millennia before the arrival of the first Muslims for trade. The fateful change occurred later when the first hordes came rushing in for conquering and ravaging with their *modus operandi* for the spread of Islam and for the transformation of the world into a *Dar-ul-Islam.* The resolve of the Brahmanists to recover the security of owning their identity in the attachment to their continuing history cannot, and must not, be interpreted, gratuitously, as being a hostility or an impediment to the welfare of the Believer community. On the contrary, any effort by the indigenous Brahmanists to recover the fullness of their natural way to Be, ought to be a complement to the further growth and enrichment of the Believers themselves without their forgoing the relevance and meaningfulness of their cultural specificity.

The purpose of the essay requires that, wherever relevant, the

term 'Kaffir' shall replace 'Brahmanist' with the rider that the reader understands the 'Kaffir' word to be associated with the Quran qualifying it drastically as signifying Evil, as an abomination, as unworthy of existence., as an impurity to be eliminated. The Believer is enjoined by Al Lah to abominate the Kaffir who is revealed to be a far lesser human being than even the worst submitter. The Kaffir, as such, justifies, according to the Revelation, his elimination, as a categorical act of manifesting his faithfulness in believing. For being outside the pale of the Revelation, the Kaffir has no right to life, for such is the desire or decree of Allah who expects the Believer to wage war till the accomplishment of the *Dar-ul-Islam*.

The task involved in the searching for the authenticity of Brahmanist identity, in the prevailing pluri-religious ambiance of India, is to be undertaken without being burdened by the catastrophic failure of what was once, that is, before the hordes rushed into the sub-continent, fondly assumed to be an amicable multiculturalism. It was the brief period of the residence of mostly merchant Muslims. The subsequent historical reality of India has been such that the old co-existence of the Muslims and the indigenous Kaffirs has forced the latter to re-examine the reason and the necessity of recovering the integrity of their culture from the ravages wrought by the two-tiered Islamo-Christian hegemony. It is pertinent to observe that the Christian threat to the identity of the Brahmanist Kaffir refers particularly to the bruising and impoverishing impact of the British Anglican power. The role and the influence of the original Indian Christianity is dealt with in a subsequent section of this essay.

The decadence implied in the innovation and in the acceptance of the Muslim Vote Bank. As ``things stand, since the first day of Independence, the institutionalization of Vote Banks, as an unasked boon conferred upon the pseudo-minority of Believers, has been detrimental to the well-being of both communities. As a reaction to the satanic mode of the realization of the Partition, the Vote Bank ideology, as implemented by the Congress Party, prevailed in blocking the development of the Brahmanists who, as a collective hostage, found themselves, immediately after Partition, to be unable to secure their rehabilitation from the

wreckage wrought by the two successive alien hegemonies. By its weight the Vote Bank restrained the electoral fortune of the majority community having to forego their reconstruction by having to yield to the institutionalization of placating the remaining Muslims. It did so, mainly by the overt pro-Muslim slant adopted by the leadership of the preponderant Congress Party. The absence, or the refusal, on the part of the Vote Bank clientele, to offer even a token reciprocity for the gracious liberalism which the Congress Party had evinced, despite having been victimized by the Muslim League's murderous prosecution of the Partition, proved to be the cause of the slide of the Congress towards the quicksand of near irrelevance.

The Vote Bank as an instrument of paralysis in the obligation to repair the broken native traditional well-being. It is indeed odd to realize, with hindsight, that no sociological study was carried out to investigate the thinking or feeling of the Vote Bank Muslims benefiting from the comfort provided by the Congress Party. It was implicitly assumed that the numerical advantage of the Muslim vote would provide the Congress an insurmountable electoral advantage every five years. This voter arithmetic worked for nearly half a century during which it nurtured the lethal enigma of the frequent *jihads* bureaucratically disguised as communal riots. Furthermore with the proliferation of Vote Banks among other parties, the Indian Muslims chose to maintain an obdurate silence over the Two-Kaum Pakistani Believers waging three wars and decades of terrorism against their host country. Besides the Minar-e-Pakistan will always remind the Vote Banks of India of the neurosis of their political incompleteness concurrent with the assumed perfection of their revealed status.

The obstinate denial of Islam as a permanent violent intolerance. But with the Congress having opted for a squinting perception of the Partition volcano, its leaders were checkmated by their own idealism and pacifism. Driven by their moral integrity and their appeasing propensity, they were bound to lose, due to their suddenly having to face the *jihadism* of the Muslims against the nobility of the dream of a communal concord. Despite the evidence to the contrary, the Congress Party Hindus chose to ignore the fact that, in their majority, the remaining Muslims had, in

faithfulness to the politics enjoined by their scriptures, fervently expressed their endorsement of the Idea of an independent Pakistan, without their having made a solemn commitment to a loyalty to the One-Nation doctrine. Nor did the majority of the Hindus showed any desire for a demonstration of an enthusiastic cooperation, by the remaining Muslim masses, to the common undertaking of the reconstruction of India freed from the common British oppressor. Despite their intelligence and the sophisticated wisdom of the Hindu leaders of the Congress, they did nevertheless ignore, or chose to ignore, the reality staring them in the face, that the Vote Bank community had actually followed a policy concordant with British imperialism, and had lent their support to the Partition ideology. The Hindu leaders assumed, with folly passing for wisdom, that the Vote Bank participation was actually a conversion to a homogeneity with the Congress vanity of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva*! The Vote Bank Mussalmans sustained the *mirage* of their sympathetic voting as *their naturally taqiyya inspired* continuation of Partition during more than five decades.

The short history of the Vote Bank *mirage*. Hence the Vote Bank got crafted on the untested premise that, by remaining, the majority of the pro-Pakistan Muslims had overnight converted to the One-Nation doctrine. It was a political decision which flew in the face of the Muslims' exclusiveness being secured by the Sharia conceded by the Constitution as a *provisional* arrangement. In truth it was one more demonstration of Hindu tolerance and of the expectation of Muslim gratitude and recognition of the sincerity of Hindu friendship. This historically unparalleled concession was offered with the expectation that Hindu tolerance would consolidate the solidarity of the Remainers as free citizens in a free secular India. That is, the Vote Bank Indian Muslim would be a citizen as a *Muslim Indian*. The unexpected outcome has been, on the ground, such that, after more than seven decades, the remaining Muslims have not yet, as expected, defined the meaning of the word '*provisional'* in regard to the maintenance of the Sharia civil code. Nor have the Remainers ceased to hold on to their exclusiveness by insisting on their identity as *Indian Muslims*' instead of their being "*Muslim Indians*", on a par with the indigenous

Harbi Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina citizens.

The aberration of the minority status of the Remainers. In August 1947, it must have been traumatic for the majority of the Vote Bank Believers who, after having earlier supported the Muslim League's demand for Partition, suddenly found themselves in the predicament of having to face the gloom of feeling trapped within the space of their old homeland. When the fires of the Partition died down, they suddenly felt the dire absurdity of having to confront the forced condition of staying as aliens in their ancestral surroundings. It must have been galling for them to feel helplessly trapped in the peculiar geography of their locations and thereby forced, against their desire, to stay in Kaffir India.[14]

In India a minority has the arithmetic qualification with such adjectives as: Parsi, Adivasi, Santhal, Buddhist, Jaina, Dalit, and many more. Yet, despite so many convulsions inflicted upon the Indian body politic by the Muslim Kaum since Independence, no one among the leadership of, for the most part, the Brahmanist political class, seem to have adequately gauged the magnitude of the incongruity evinced by the Muslim community owning, even in its remaining predicament, a demography larger than that of Pakistan, or of Bangladesh.[15] It is even larger than the population of every country in Europe, where each is distinguished by its distinctive, sophisticated cultural history. It is even larger than the Japanese population who maintain a vigorous, vibrant civilization which goes back uninterrupted to the third millennium before the Christian era. More: the usage of this particular claim to being a *minority* has ennobled the Vote Bank to prevail in maintaining its Islamic exclusiveness as a preserve, even with the near eclipse of the Congress Party to which their sociological privileges had contributed. Paradoxically, the collective sentiment, of being the actors in the fulfillment of the prescriptions of Allah, does not

---

[14] The film *Garam Hawa*, with the script written by Kaifi Azmi, brings out the compelling logic of the remaining Muslims seeking an opportunistic protection in association with the Congress Party.

[15] Up to 1971, there was a Pakistan with a West Wing and an East Wing. It was then the only state composed of two "wings" separated by about a thousand kilometres of an alien territory.

provide to the Indian Muslims the collective dignity and self-reliance for standing tall as a contribution to the multi-religious polity in ways amicably different from the demonic enthusiasm of the *modus operandi* of Partition.

The missed opportunity of the reorganization of the educational system. After Independence the country needed the reconstruction of the educational system in order to foster a homogeneous civic cultural spirit protected by the law assuring the freedoms of conscience, of religious practice and of association. India ought to have imitated revolutionary France which set up a free public school system supplied with a curriculum designed to foster personal republican virtues befitting an enlightened democratic secular state. The Nehru Government failed to come up with a similar educational reform including a national school curriculum contingent upon the rehabilitation of a civilization damaged by foreign domination and transformed into a nation of obliging mercenaries. This reform has not been undertaken, with the result that the Indian Muslim community, arrogating to itself, with unlimited presumptuousness, the status of a minority, continues to contend that it has the right to its identity in the maintenance of its irreducible communal personality. As a result, with its segments scattered in several provinces, the Vote Bank, benefitting from the freedom of its believing, functions as a fragment of the transnational Umma. During the last more than seven decades the habit fostered by the democratic practice of voting has made it possible for Muslim exclusiveness to exert its constraining influence to exploit the political humaneness of mostly the Brahmanists who, thus beguiled, silently subverted their own traditional tolerance into the novelty of a voluntary *dhimma*. With this monumental self-abasement have the Hindus complied, out of the fear of being characterized as communal, right wing fascists. Nowhere else, but in the post-independent India, has there occurred a similar loss of opportunity for the reconstruction of a damaged civilization by a people debasing its own freedom, won after an immense sacrifice, by voluntarily kneeling and avoiding the obligation to recover its cultural plenitude. *At no time in world History has there been a similar example of a great civilization surrendering the promise and the necessity of its reconstruction as the result of choosing to be*

the hostage of the exclusivism of an intolerant, violent, culturally inferior minority! By sticking to its role and to the influence of its acting as an impediment to the reconstruction of the indigenous civilization the Indian Muslim community indulges, under the guise of cooperation with the established electoral politics, in a subtle continuation of the demand for Partition!

The deleterious influence of the Muslim Vote Bank. In brief: Vote Banking in reality unveils the moral vacuity of the entire Indian Muslim community who, bereft of its pre-Partition *jihadi*c vanity, cunningly abases itself to the status of a backward minority. They effortlessly used the security and the comfort of acceding to the Congress Party as a gravitational force pulling down and frustrating India's tryst with her destiny, as Nehru had eloquently, but vacuously, envisioned it. After having generated two independent theocracies, the remaining Muslims, by ensconcing themselves snugly with the Nehru Congress Party, continued to prevail as a minority, with the endowment of the Sharia as the symbol and substance of their identity. They have reason to be amused with the apparently invulnerable wiliness of using their "minority" as the justification to maintain their inflexible exclusivist policy of closed-mindedness as revealed wisdom. Yet, a short while earlier the same millions of the "minority" could, impelled by Jinnah's Direct Action, morph into being Dajjal's proxies to burn, to kill, to rape, driven by contempt for the Kaffir ideology of brotherly co-existence and for the millions animated by the ethics of *Satyagraha* and *Ahiṁsā*.

The womb which gave birth to Partition is still fertile. Despite all the monstrosity of the sudden regression suffered by India when she got overwhelmed by one more Islamic manifestation of barbarity in Partition, the Vote Bank Muslims could still, against all odds, maneuver to turn upside down the unexpected absurdity of the fateful, unexpected physical obligation for them to remain. They did so by re-activating their fallacious victimhood as backwardness and their minority status, in the full face of their huge numbers. Their well cultivated silence and neutrality, in relation to the adverse treatments of the Hindu and Sikh minorities by their majority Brethren in Pakistan and in Bangladesh, do sufficiently indicate the hidden potentiality of a renewed effort to realize the

Dar-ul-Islam.[16]

Using the wile concomitant with the ethos of Islam, they instrumented their two-tiered inferiority as a political force claiming, as a matter of fact, rights to concessions from the availing constitutional provisions for the uplift of the traditionally deprived communities. Heartened with the madrassas feeding their exclusivism as political advantage, the Muslims have managed to steer their artificial victimhood as the indebtedness owed to them by the majority Hindu Kaffirs. By such a political ruse they do forcibly use their political constraint to constrain their Hindu victims to live as their *dhimmis* while they themselves could masquerade in the full possession of their exclusivist identity. It bewilders the mind to contemplate the display of such a voluntary self-demeaning by the Hindu community, despite the long history of Islamic abusive persistence of hard contempt for all that pertains to the humanism of the Hindu-Buddhist-Jaina comprehensive culture.

The unasked question. Hence, in Independent India, the Muslim pseudo-minority delights in flaunting its history as an integral component of the Umma, not as an adventitious component of the history of the indigenous civilization going back several millenia. In India it views its history as starting with the arrival of the first invading horde. In faithful submission to the exclusivist prescriptions of the Quran, they cannot, and they do not, have any affinity nor do they display any intellectual appreciation of the Indian civilization prior to the invasion of the first horde equipped with the sword which they used to write their chapter on the tapestry registering the events of the previous millennia. The psychological tension which this historical difference will maintain throughout the future of the nation will depend on the responsibility of the Muslim community to recognize its historical asymmetry in relation to the reality of the more ponderable heritage of

[16] In 2021 the violent reaction of groups of Indian Muslims against the enactment of the CAA (Citizenship Amendment Act) Law was an indication of Indian Muslims feeling no commiseration for the Hindu & Sikh victims of Islamic hatred in the two Theocracies.

the Hindu-Buddhist-Jaina majority.

The Indian Muslim citizen has the constitutional right to think or feel, as it already does, with the freedom dispensed by the Constitution, which he does exert. But the socio-political stress arises from the Muslim interpreting, as a prejudice to his welfare, the Kaffir communities engaging in the rehabilitation of their civilization from the ravages wrought by Islamic iconoclastic fidelity to the injunctions and commandments of the Quran and by the exploitation and impoverishment of the people by the unchristian rule of Great Britain. The clash would occur between the Believer's submission to the static, unchanging Islamic revelation and the responsibly free, principled interpretations and practices enabled by the indigenous Dharmas.

Consequently, resulting from the inevitable cultural divergence, the psychological tension within particularly the Muslim community will not cease so long as the two communities shall dwell on the two distinct historical times riding simultaneously in the same geographical space. This temporal particularity does not apply to the British period because the Administrators of the Raj did not settle in India. As an extension of the history of Great Britain, the history of British India ends with the conclusion of the colonial rule. Within the Indian space the Muslim community, as a portion of the Umma - to which it maintains solidarity and as the assurance of its identity - finds itself, as a community, up against the wall of a unified Kaffir power evincing a vibrant energy for the recuperation of its lost authenticity. Nowhere else is there a Muslim community with a comparable demography doomed to co-exist with a culture which is the object of Allah's abomination. In such a predicament the pious Believer, locked within his submission to an unalterable ideology, will always feel the neurosis due to the feeling of being individually and collectively incomplete. The socio-political effect will necessarily be borne by the Muslim himself in his devotion to the divine call, without any reference to Kaffirs having no reason to legislate on the imperatives of monotheistic beliefs.

The necessity of the Indian Muslims to let the reparation of Indian culture proceed. The 1950 Constitution does

intellectually and effectively allow the Indian Muslims to recognize Indian history beginning with the time of the first invaders. But, as outsiders, they have no right or justification, moral or intellectual, to exert any supervision, or consent, or approval, of the form and substance of the repair work calling to be undertaken, after all the spoliations they have wreaked during the centuries of their hegemony. Moreover the shorter history of the Muslim's India conveniently disregards the fact that the majority of Indian Muslims owes its number to the conversion of mostly Hindus and Buddhists who were forcibly thrust into an Islam several centuries after the Apostle's death in 632 A.D. The conundrum of who belongs to which of the two histories gets further shrouded with ambiguity when certain historians in Pakistan claim the history of their country having begun with the Harappan civilization!

Nevertheless the Muslim minority represents the incongruity of a backwardness professed as the substance of their political force, with the addition of the right to owning economic privileges. No question was raised in the media, or asked by academic sociologists and historians and, during the decades following Independence, by no one in the Parliament, on why a community which did cast its majority in the support of the creation of two Muslim countries out of the ancient sub-continent, would be the same community suddenly defining itself as a weak minority claiming economic and political favours as compensation for its backwardness and its poverty. For the demand for Partition was based strictly on the exclusive constitution of Islam and on the declared will by the Muslim Middle Class not to co-exist with the Hindu Majority. The question of social justice or of economic uplift of the Muslim proletariat did not arise.

The repetition of the minority "inferiorizing" a majority. Thereby the Remainers repeat the well-known historical successes, as outlined above, of culturally inferior societies invading and stultifying well established advanced communities. Unsuspected at the time of Independence, the Brahmanist community now finds itself squeezed, on one side, by the hatred of the Pakistani Muslims sponsoring acts of terrorism on the Indian territory and, on the other side, by the Remaining minority frustrating the repairs which the indigenous folk would like to carry out to undo

the ravages of the two alien Islamic and British hegemonies! In particular, Brahmanists tend to delude themselves with assuming the facile, conventional, manifestations of cooperation and comradeship, without being dutifully concerned with the *silence* of the Muslim neighbour or collaborator. The *other* linguistic medium adopted by the Muslim consists of his quiet contemplation of the Pakistani folklore of terror against Indians, of his silence on Kashmiri separatism and on the failures of diplomatic agreements, of the Pakistani campaigns against India in international fora. No Hindu ever asks the pseudo-liberal Muslim companion what he thinks of the Quranic verses which enjoin hostility and hatred of the Kaffir and, if he is truly friendly, why does he not publicly repudiate those hate-filled injunctions of Allah against all Disbelievers.

The imperative of questioning the silence of the moderate Muslim. Against the politics of Jinnah, why did Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad and the other Muslim stalwarts of the Congress Party never refer to Jallal-ud-Din Rumi and Ibn Arabi who so openly expressed unreserved recognition of all religions, in support of the Mahatma's proposition of *sarva dharma sama bhāva?* The subject of the Indian Muslim's *silence* on these important moments of the history of Islam still waits to be written. For the reason for plumbing the depth of the Muslim's silence importantly relates to Islam being homogeneous with the violence of Islamism, or the volcano of Dajjal's Dance of Death, dwelling hidden in the quietness of the Believer who pretends to abide by the illusion of the *bhai-bhai* superficiality as a convenient deception. The test of Muslim moderation, of Muslim friendship, of Muslim faith in professing the Kaffir to be *equal*, *lies in an open, publicly proclaimed unreserved critique and abrogation of Allah's abomination of the Hindu, of the Buddhist, of the Jaina.*

The inanity of the reason for Vote Banks. Yet, despite all the bending backward to please the Believers and all the stooping to ingratiate themselves with the Vote Bank, the Brahmanists find themselves compelled to acknowledge the fact that Vote Bank concession did not ward off the regressive outbursts of the communal riots which paradoxically punctuated the rule of the Congress Party for more than fifty years. Indeed the riots were violent

refutations of the four-word universalist dictum of *sarva dharma sama bhāva* which was launched with the noble sentiment of inter-faith solidarity. With their recourse to the riots – the word which masked the fact of the reality of sporadic *jihad* - the Muslims co-gently enounced the rejection of the worth of the *sarva dharma sama bhāva* statement. Their claim to be right and their sporadic mini *jihad* to be justified, reflected, on the rebound, the vanity of a self-deluded section of the Hindu-Brahmanist elite who, due to being baffled by the violence, nevertheless remained unconcerned with the inadequacy of their acquaintance with Islamic theological prescriptions. The unfortunate, but baneful, ignorance of Islamic thought and history, of the particularly different Islamic psychology, was mindlessly maintained by the Kaffir Elites, in all the political parties. Yielding to electoral compulsions, they still refuse to acknowledge openly the reality of Islam as quintessentially an intolerantly violent, Political ideology cloaked with a devotion to an absolute, supreme Deity, borrowed from the Old Testament and assumed to be the genuine authentic one. India has paid a heavy price resulting from the Hindu elites' obstinate reiteration of *namāz* religiosity as constituting the totality of Islam. It never did. It still does not. It is in reality a violent totalitarianism wrapped in the Believer's submission to the five obligatory religious duties made attractive with the instant innocence of killing the Other, in the performance of Submission, as Allah's proxy. The revelation as **Quran, 8. 17** confers innocence to the killer of the Kaffir, for the sin of merely being Kaffir, irrrespective of the latter being eminently virtuous, by any standard. In this regard, by not submitting to any of the Revelations the Kaffir is proclaimed to be destined to hell. In truth, a Brahmanist like Mahatma Gandhi would, according to Islam and to Christian Orthodoxy, have already gone to Hell. But the Believers to the Only God forget, or ignore, or are taught to ignore, that the Brahmanist does not go anywhere, for he is always co-essential with the perennial Plenitude. So do the Muslim and the Christian despite their seeking solace in the resurrection of the body.

The rebirth of Dhimma in free India. It is incumbent upon the Muslims to believe that there can be no common denominator between any religious or spiritual doctrine crafted by Man and the

divinely revealed Quran. Any public asseveration of the endorsement of the "*sama bhāva*" by a Muslim willing to ingratiate himself sincerely with the general population, or for the sake of convenience, or out of electoral obligations, he does nevertheless know in his heart that he cannot concede, to the divinely written Quranic verses, equivalence with any man-made doctrine however exalted it can be. The history of the Indian Muslims profusely provides evidence of their having faithfully preserved the undented integrity of their religiosity. The vigorous maintenance of their faith free from any contamination with Judeo-Christian secular culture happens to be overtly displayed, since the mid nineteen-fifties in particularly Western Europe. As a result all the existing cultures obtaining in Western Europe have been stoutly denounced by fundamentalist Imams as expressions of decadence which a triumphant Islam will in due course stamp out and replace by a Sharia based way of living. The denunciation of the Judeo-Christian faiths as decadent does not take into account the Quranic recognition of their approval as dispensations revealed earlier by the same Deity. In India the Muslim's abomination of the Hindu as a benighted idol-worshipper is the easy spontaneous mode of his proclaiming the religious superiority of Islam.

The lure of *dhimmitude* in the Brahmanist society. But in India it is largely due to the ignorance of the fundamentals of Islam as a totalitarian Political Force that Brahmanists, bewildered by the blind belief, fostered by the Constitution, of all religions being essentially alike, fall silently into the trap of a variation of the *Dhimma* of an earlier epoch. The new version of the *Dhimmitude* is effectively brought about, by means of the Muslims' use of the constitutional provisions, with a cunning convenient for the affirmation of their distinctiveness. The use of the 1950 Constitution by the Muslims to the advantage of their exclusivist distinctiveness seems to be a repetition of the historical occurrence of the fate of a superior civilization being overcome by an inferior assailant. The classic example of the degradation suffered by a distinguished civilization by barbaric forces occurred to the Roman Empire by the invasion of the Germans and the Slavs, to the Franks by the Visigoths, to the East Europeans by the Samartians,

the Huns, the Mongols,[17] to the Québécois by the English mercantile minority, to the Buddhist cultures of Central Asia by the Muslim hordes, to the Indonesian and Afghan and Central Asian Buddhisms by an inferior Islamic dispensation. In all of these examples it was the physically and materially robust Barbarian winning over the more civilized cultures unable to save themselves due to the absence of an adequate military protection.

The impact of the Sharia on the culture of the Kaffirs. In the Indian context, by the cunning use of a convenient silence, the Believers projected a semblance of conformity by the pretense of being a well-disposed amicable Vote Bank which artlessly practices the politics of pietistic hypocrisy which superficially flattered the vacuous bhai-bhaiism of particularly the Congress Party Hindu clientele. However with the passage of time, it became evident that, in their heart, the Vote Banks held their loyalty to the exclusive privilege of being endowed with the sole Truth proclaimed by The God in the revealed verses. Their holding on to the Sharia rests on the conviction that the Indian Muslims own a set of laws, rules, principles which have greater ontological significance than do the provisions of the Constitution. In such a multi-ethnic, multi-religious polity, out of fear of being censured or denounced for intolerance, or for Hindutva nationalist domination of the pseudo Muslim minority, the Brahmanist Kaffirs doom themselves to straying away from the imperative of the reconstruction of their ravaged civilization by the chimerical assumption that the reality of India began with the proclamation of the 1950 Constitution. Thereby, by some kind of an esoteric good behavior, which in effect has the substance of a self-imposed cultural paralysis, they surrender their obligation to reach out to their roots and to the essence of their specific cultural authenticity. Faced with the unavailability of Muslim collaboration in their search for the lost cultural legitimacy, the Brahmanists accordingly constrain themselves to yield, for the sake of social harmony, to their being "inferiorized" and to live like Dhimmis in a mode conforming to the

---

[17] Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History*, (abridgement by D. C. Somervell), Oxford U Press, 1963; p. 13

socio-political realities of the twenty-first century.

In a free, independent Bhāratavarśa which, for the first time in twelve centuries, comes into its own, the indigenous Kaffir majority finds itself constrained to be defensive and apologetic in its searching to recover its untrammeled independence and the originality of its civilizational authenticity. It is indeed unfortunate, if not immensely deplorable, that this self-constrictive attitude of the Brahmanists would be flaunted as necessary *bhai-bhaiism,* to which there exists no Muslim reciprocity. The real, the consequential disheartening loss does not affect and diminish the cultural and moral substance of the present Indian civilization. But, more importantly, due to its unavailability, the Indian universalist message does thereby get frustrated from contributing its beneficence to Humanity, in the era of violence and of the world transformed into an armed camp more than into a village of brotherly solidarity.

What did Islam give to the Balkans? In Europe the fundamentalist Imams do not hesitate to trumpet, with brazen self-righteousness and with insensitivity to their own spiritual deficiency, their will to replace European culture with the inferior Islamic dispensation. The prospect of a possible catastrophic '*inferiorisation*' of the sophisticated Greco-Roman Judeo-Christian European civilization can be guessed by a survey of the history of the Balkans. During nearly half a millennium Ottoman Islam gave next to nothing in the matter of culture to the Balkan populations, following the devastation of the Byzantine Christianity. Likewise Ottoman Islam gave nothing substantial, during no less than six centuries, to even their colonized Islamic Arab populations. Even when the time came for the latter to exert and free themselves from Ottoman domination, they needed the heroic dedication to the cause of Arab freedom, of the foreigner Lawrence of Arabia, to lead the campaign for their liberation.

The repetition of culturally deficient communities overwhelming culturally advanced societies. However, in India, the Law of Karma has its specific mysterious ways to bring about

certain corrections of her share of the evils perpetrated by the former imperialist powers of Western Europe. The populations of these former imperial powers - Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Spain, Italy, Portugal - suddenly, after the devastation of Europe in the World War II, found themselves to be in need of workers to help maintain the rhythm of profit established by the savage capitalism of the previous three centuries. Beginning with the 1950s, the first generation of the guest workers were supposed to return to their base countries after the conclusion of their residence according to their contract. However as the workers stayed on and subsequently requested and obtained the right to bring in their families, the Europeans found themselves, as from the 1970s, internally besieged by an active Muslim minority claiming identity with their original culture, in open defiance of the expectations of those who had placed their hopes in the benefits of a multiculturalist policy designed to merge the migrant communities with the host societies. The host societies failed to foresee the foreign minorities in their midst could, by the use of the existing laws, maintain their autonomous triumphing identity at the expense of the host cultures. Nobody in Europe could grasp the possibility of foreign working classes being capable of upsetting the well-established liberal cultures by new breed of cultural wreckers wielding the weapons of the very laws and principles of the European civilization. The Muslim minorities in Europe prove to be more effective in disarranging Western civilization more effectively than the Goths descending upon Rome.

Western Europe under the threat of losing its civilization to an Islamic minority. In brief, the new state of Europe has become such that the Islamic minority does pose a material threat of obliterating the European civilization, by means of its aggressive success in maintaining its autonomous identity with the claim of owning a superior God-given *modus vivendi*. It is the extension,

on a vast scale, of the irony of a culturally feeble minority displacing or eliminating, by means of violence, a more culturally advanced majority culture. In a startling difference distinguishing the fate of Europe in the XXI century, compared to the past examples of cultures being suppressed by the invasion of physically strong, but spiritually inferior barbarians, the present *inferiorizing* rot works by means of the demographic power exerted in electoral politics, by the abuse of the secular, civil laws in order to undermine the socio-political structures which sustain, after centuries of sacrifice and heroic ardour, the quiet, elevated modes of living peacefully and creatively which, hitherto, bore the semblance of being capable of lasting for ever. Till the 1950s no one thought that the mighty, sophisticated European Civilization *also* has, like so many in earlier times, to face the certitude of its waning and its time to exit. For civilizations too, like individuals, do face the stern Law of Karma which is administered by the Mysterious Hand of the Universal Spirit.

The cases of the *inferiorizations* of Quebec and of India. A vivid example of such a historical irony illustrates the fate of the majority Francophone population of the province of Quebec in Canada getting 'inferiorized' by the smaller, but politically dominant English community. A larger and more dramatic illustration is furnished with the impressive triumph of a Muslim minority exerting, over a span of centuries, a barbaric iconoclasm against the sophisticated culture of India. It staggers the mind that even if one were to consider the myth as historical Truth, that is, the belief that the Islamic scripture is materially the work of Allah, the absolutely unique, physically real anthropomorphic God, there can be no questioning of the Muslim's intransigence in implacably maintaining the superiority of Islam, especially in its Indian expression, over the cultures informed by the values prescribed by the founders of Brahmanism, of Buddhism, of Jainism. The subsequent chapters will bring forth the falsity of this assumption in a

reasoned comparison of Islam with the native spiritual traditions.

The ancient values of India are relevant to the present and to the future. Despite the facilities which enable the whole world to be instantly informed of any event in any remote corner of the globe, the Europeans, enclosed within the confines of their ethnocentrism, remain loath to learn from the Indian example where the Brahmanist majority, with its hierarchy, happens to be the only civilization to have survived a Muslim hegemony lasting nearly a thousand years. Molded by the precepts of the Dharmas, the Indian society has survived with a vibrancy and energy drawn from the essence of its ancient, but still alive, moral spirit driving the continuity of its tradition. Mahatma Gandhi did not invent *Satya* and *Ahiṁsā*. These are the two primary values which thread through the entire range of the *Mahābhārata*. They are the pillars of the Dharma of the Land of the Bhāratas. The Mahatma had only the unparalleled genius to give to these two virtues a body - His! Thereby Mahatma Gandhi provided the example of the embodiment of these two Transcendental Values lived and borne effortlessly with a simplicity, as an event occurring after several millennia. The Mahatma's *performance* of *Satyagraha* (holding to Truth) and *Ahiṁsā* (traditionally, the absence of harming by thought, speech, action; popularly, but inadequately translated as non-violence) throughout his life stands on a par with Gautama as the Buddha proclaiming the novelty of the "Turning of the Wheel of Dharma" (*dharma-cakra-pravartana*). More: Mahatma Gandhi demonstrated how the ancient values could prove to be relevant in the present, in a manner which endows the future with the legacy of its congruity. Truth and *Ahiṁsā* need to be kept alive, both in the internal administration and in the international policies of India, as the assurance of the preservation of her soul, for the welfare

of all Humanity.[18] And, in regard to the preservation of their identity, it shall behoove the Islamic Believers to limit their retarding exclusiveness to its staying within their collective religious space, without adversely affecting the freedom of the devotees of the Dharmas to establish the Ontological elevation of the mystical finality of human existence as the centrality of the native Indian civilization. The essential difference between the Dharmas and Islam consists of the Dharmas enunciating their respective ontological promise in the perfections of *mokṣa, nirvāṇa, kaivalya,* with the variety of ways of their realization on Earth, in the human body, within the humanity of the individual being. In an infinitely cogent difference, the revealed religions deny to the individual believer an ontological fulfillment on Earth, with their celebration of his ultimate destination being his appearance for Judgement on the Day of Resurrection, which will be set somewhere beyond the Earth, in a setting devoid of Humanity.

Gratitude is due to the cultural wealth of the Judeo-Christian civilization. However mankind is grateful for the infinite glories which have embellished the last millenium of Christian History in Literature, in the Fine Arts, in Philosophy, in Theology, in Laws, in the Sciences and in the life-saving products of Sciences and Industries. The gratitude is due to all this munificence of civilized accomplishments resulting from the myth of the ascent to Heaven of Jesus resurrected from his tomb on the third day after his crucifixion. Force compels the comparison with Islam having produced much less as the result of the myth of the

[18] . It was immensely revealing that, in the entire Christendom, no praise or recognition, has ever been acknowledged for the merit of Mahatma Gandhi's Truth having been directed against the might of a Christian Power. Nor was anyone in Christendom moved by the eternal irony consisting of the fact that the Mahatma's used the sublime ethos of the Gospel according to Saint Mathew against a Christian Power. The indifference to the Mahatma's moral policy failed to win even the recognition of, above all, the Indian Christians who chose to support the alien Christian imperialist domination of the country where they had never experienced any hardship during all the centuries before the arrival of the British.

nocturnal flight of Muhammad to a point in Heaven where, at the distance of an arrow's throw, he witnessed the anthropomorphic presence of Allah. And these miracles, or fictions, do, to a large extent, gratuitously enable justification in Believers indulging in poetic license, more than in historical truth, in regard to the Constitution proclaiming, as irrefragable veracity, the equality of all the religions obtaining in India. The equality of all religions reflects the socio-political configuration of the Western Judeo-Christian democracies with their religiosities deriving from a common source: Jehovah.

The constitutional error in the proclamation of the equality of the religions obtaining in India. Installing the equality of religions in India, by borrowing it lock stock and barrel from the Constitutions of the Western Christian democracies, the 1950 Indian Constitution erred in pronouncing the equality of the *man-made* Dharmas with the *revealed* Indian Christianity and Islam. Furthermore the Indian Islam, in particular, is buttressed with the grant of the Sharia, which concretely characterizes the inequality of Islam in relation to the other Indian religiosities. Nevertheless that the freedoms of belief, of conscience, of speech, and especially the law of *habeas corpus,* have till now been functioning with keeping and protecting the praiseworthy conduct of the Indian Republic, with its entire complex assortment of castes, customs, languages, cultures and religions, *is due, to a great extent, to the participation of the majority* Brahmanists, Buddhists, Jainas, who think, behave, and act, according to their respective *individual* initiatives, *determined by the Law of Karma and by the natural habit of thinking and acting determined by unchecked personal responsibility.*

All the modalities of Karma (action) described by the Dharmas, are expressed by individual initiatives and with complete personal responsibility in each, without anything, however slight, which would intimate similarity with Allah's *Taqdīr (Measure). In Islam, Allah's measure of the disposition and ability of every living being, including the tiniest, and of the desired corresponding mode of action.*

Accordingly the finality of the Islamic form of human

existence does not have an ontological dimension in the enjoyment of sensuous pleasures as the reward of virtuous living. The finality of human existence, according to each of the Dharmas, is celebrated by the ontological experience of *mokṣa, nirvāṇa, kaivalya.* Compared to each of these finalities, the highest pleasures and delights of the Islamic Heaven are mere material rewards which, as such, nullify the worth of the best of moral action inspired by the Revelation. For a moral action to be genuinely acknowledged as such, it must be carried out, originally and fully, from within the individual's own personality and not as a response to an external source, however exalted it may be; it must be performed without any regard for any material benefit, or reward, without any celestial or godly confirmation. The desireless action (*niṣkāma karma*) eulogized by the Dharmas is just that: the right moral mode of living, without any expectation of a reward.

An inferior Islam confronts the sophisticated European civilisation. European industrialists, still driven by greed and profit, now find themselves, like victims of the revenge of History, shackled with a permanent, alien Islamic minority drawn from the southern fringe of the Mediterranean sea that stretches from Morocco to Syria, and lately from also the former French sub-saharan Muslim colonies. Beside their labour these migrants contribute next to nothing to the enhancement of European culture, in the matter of the Arts, of Philosophy, of the Sciences, of the Intellectual graces, of the wisdom contributing to the elevation of thought and of feelings. Europeans do gratefully acknowledge the contributions which the Arab civilisation has made to the culture of the Medieval Christian civilisation. In return Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian Europe has rendered substantial additions to the well-being of the Arab civilisation, contributions which enable the latter to clash with pride with the Western powers.

The absence of the Muslim's critical examination of his moral and cultural shortcomings. However, in the present century, instead of adding, of embellishing, of improving, the Muslim

minority communities, ensconced in Western Europe, opt for manifesting their violence, their demeaning arrogance in their assaults on the institutions and values which, earned with sacrifice and suffering for centuries, deservingly distinguish and embellish a refined cultural environment. The educated fringe among the Muslim migrant population feels no compunction that all they insist on contributing as their cultural motifs consists of *hallal* and of *burqa*! The French Muslim intellectual Abdennour Bidur dejectedly exclaims that the entire world Umma does not offer a single exceptional man or woman who has earned universal admiration. His regretful observation offers a measure of the inferiority of Islam in comparison with the great civilizations alive today across all the continents. Indeed it may be observed that Indian Muslims have not given to India an intellectual of universalist commitment and of outlook as was Rabindranath Tagore or a Poet like Kalidāsa or Tulasīdāsa, or intellectuals like those who established the different centres of High Learning, such as was the Nalanda Centre of Buddhist Studies, with its three impressive libraries of manuscripts. The ultimate degenerate mimicry of socio-religious preeminence, as a historical accomplishment, has been illustrated by the Muslims claiming pride and glory in the devastation of the centres of learning of the Hindus, the Buddhists and the Jainas.

The political weakness of the small Arab Muslim intellectual elite. Nevertheless the Muslim minorities in Europe incline to spread the leaden weight of their Sharia and its precepts which were devised in the VIII century by an Angel speaking to a member of a mercantile Arab society. Their action in promoting the laws and rules of Islam recall the brutish rawness which their co-believers brought to the full-fledged civilisation of the Indian subcontinent. Yet, blinded by their ethnocentrisms, the Europeans do not evince due awareness of the Muslims' indifference to their

culture and of the possibility of the repetition, in their midst, of the extinction of the Judeo-Christian civilization of Byzantium. This may be a sweeping statement which a dispassionate observer would be drawn to dismiss in taking stock of the many intellectual Muslims, of both genders, who, living and writing in Europe, do not hesitate to raise their voices against the dense obscurantism of fundamentalist Islamism. The arguments marshalled in favour of their militancy command respect in recognition of their loyalty to what they joyously affirm to be positively attractive features in the spirituality and history of Islam. Their minority efforts and heroic endeavours do not however dispel the pessimism and the apprehension of the majority of the host Europeans. The significant difference, between Europe facing the Islamic threat and the earlier experience of the Indigenous Indians, brings forth the weakness of Europe with its *egalitarian* way of life, while the majority Brahmanist population of India survived the *egalitarian* Muslim intolerant dominance thanks to its *hierarchical* social structure. This particular saving feature of the still continuing Indian civilization is unfortunately not consciously and duly praised by, in particular, the Hindu-Brahmanist community. It is an immense shame that the Hindu-Brahmanist majority would not openly recognize the strength of their hierarchic society, out of the debilitating fear or hesitation related to the combinations and permutations of electoral calculations necessitated by democratic imperatives.

The truth of the Islamic ravaging of Indian civilisation. In India, any affirmation or effort, on the part of the Brahmanists, to redeem their authentic cultural personality, which has been impaired by an Islamic iconoclasm carried out with implacable energy during centuries, is immediately qualified, in certain sections of mostly the English language press, as an upsurge of intolerance, as a fascist plot, or as the right wing demeanor of the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangha, motivated by a philosophical disposition malignantly interpreted as Hindu chauvinism. The published

animadversions levelled by the critics and the opponents against the RSS institution, have a simple explanation; they all have a monovalent dimension, without having genuinely thoughtful and credible reasons to justify their validity. It is relevant to the second decade of the twenty-first century that the spade be called by its name. In particular Truth needs to be told with the same courage and faithfulness as exhibited by Mahatma Gandhi who used to marshal the force of a veridical directness in his engagement with the administrators of the British Empire and prevailed in undoing it. Nor did he hesitate to use Truth and Ahiṁsā against some Hindu "minorities" who strayed from the line chalked by him for the right conduct of his movement. He opposed the violence of the anarchists, while acknowledging their patriotism and their hostility to the British oppression. Consistent with his pacifist policy the Mahatma refused to intervene on behalf of even Bhagat Singh, who had been tried, together with his companion, for the murder of a British officer.[19] Truth and Ahiṁsā dwell in levels well above and beyond the contingencies of political passing shows. In the present predicament of the Indian State and of the need of the Hindu Kaffirs to undo the iconoclastic ravages of their civilization, it is not intolerant to argue in favour of their task of reconstruction and of its necessity both for the betterment of the Indian people and of all humanity. For the sake of communal amity, it would be desirable that the task, undertaken for the reparation of the damages, inflicted throughout centuries upon the enfeebled majority, be implemented without the Muslim 'minority' exerting any non-consent veto, based on fleeting, unreasonable

[19] Martin Luther King Jr. adopted the political ethics of Mahatma Gandhi. Opposed to the war in Vietnam, he also opposed the Blacks killing Whites, in retaliation of Whites killing Blacks. His opposition to the violence of the Blacks led to his being abandoned by a large section of his following among the young in the Afro-American community.

compulsions of rights and privileges.

The historical obligation to refer to the ravaging of Indian civilization by the Muslims. The fact of the Muslims having debilitated the Indian civilisation ought to be told, must indeed be told, without fear and without any desire to offend the sensitivities of the Indian Muslims and the relevant vote banks. The peaceful future of the country requires an anti-bigoted, purposeful appraisal of the past in order not to lose the future. Till now it has been a characteristic feature of Indian society that the history of India be constantly told in a manner consistent with the scruple of not offending the Muslims, even after the trisection of the country accompanied with the hot wind blowing an apocalyptic zeal to kill, burn, rape, destroy, terrorize. But Truth is not the exclusive preserve of the Brahmanist, or of the Buddhist, or of the Jaina. It was never the sole privilege of Mahatma Gandhi. A different Truth pertains to the Muslim, for Allah repeatedly pronounces his revelations to be the only Truth. It therefore behooves the Brahmanist, as well as the Muslim, to honour Truth, preferably understood to be of the Brahmanist variety. The ruins which litter the Indian soil tell the truthful story of Islamic iconoclasm, which constitutes the major part of the pride and the glory of Indian Islamic memory. It is a corollary of the truth proclaimed by the Holy Book. The broken stones and bricks, the disfigurement of countless statues decorating the walls of temples, the ruins of Hampi and of Vijayanagar, of Nalanda, mutely tell the Islamic truth of the ravages which were wrought upon the native Indians, their ways of living, their art works, their monuments, their learning institutions.

The urgency of the reconstruction of the Dharma-based indigenous culture. Bringing forth this normally unspoken constituent of Indian history does not call the Believing community to account for a rehabilitation of the damage perpetrated on Kaffir cultures, which it reckons as glory and as fulfillment of its *raison*

d'être. Nevertheless, conscious of the invader's zeal exerted in the abridgement of their original civilisation as the stuff of his pride, the indigenous communities owe it to themselves to give vigour and substance to the *continuity* of their heritage for the purpose of a humanity endowing a world of goodness and of beauty still unborn. It is simply the indigenous communities' search for the recovery of what, in their history, has been driven out of the collective consciousness.

But today there seems to be no prospect of the cessation of the ill-will between the two communities. It consists of the Muslim "minority" being unaware and unwilling to recognize the Hindu-Buddhist-Jaina Indian remembering the pride and the disgrace, the ecstasy and the sorrow, which stimulate the memory of a span stretching from the earliest Harappan day down to the present. To say it with renewed pride and confidence does not amount to rancor activating the remembrance of past barbarisms executed as manifestations of Islamic piety. It is an affirmation of the continuity of the native traditions which, as such, obeys its own sub-terrestrial volition, like the *Satya* and *Ahiṁsā* of the *Mahābhārata* emerging, after centuries, in and as the body of Mahatma Gandhi, to the surprise of all Humanity. The interpretation of the native Indian's sorrows of the past, resulting from iconoclasms carried out as sacred Islamic duties, urges the mind of the Kaffir to revive, in the search for his identity as cultural wholeness, the splendor which had been driven underground by the brute forces acting as the proxies of Allah (**Quran 8.17**).

The relativism of Truth in the histories of the Indigenous Dharmas and of Indian Islam. Indeed the Muslims themselves ought to be faithful to their own history in the sub-continent and own the *truths* of whatever merits of *their* rule accrued to the cultures with which they collided by invading the land and settling down in it after severing all the bonds with their previous

homelands. It further behooves the Muslims to acknowledge, not as memories of only their past glory, but honestly, also the wounds they consciously inflicted on the native people and on the civilization which the latter had fashioned after many centuries of patient work and devotion. Telling the truth of the history of India need not diminish whatever relevance the *bhai-bhaiism* devised for social harmony may have as an expression of Brahmanist humanity.

India had all the appurtenances of a wonderful civilisation. The first element of the Truth consists of the incontrovertible fact that before the first Muslim set foot on the Bhārata Land, the Indians had everything. They had Architecture, Town Planning, Social Laws, Philosophies, Languages, Literatures boasting of sublime Poetry, Dramatic Plays, Scientific Treatises, Medicine, Music, the Fine Arts including Painting and Sculpture, Centres of High Learning, a unique Plurality of Spiritualities as Dharmas prescribing individual self-fulfillment as the defining finality of all living beings, with a plurality of Mysticisms as the essence of the native civilization, and all this within a sub-continental ambience of peaceful, tolerant and prosperous humanity. In addition the peaceful, elevatingly influence of Indian lore on the cultures collectively qualified as the Greater India testify to the magnificence of the original Indian culture disseminated by the action of learned scholars and monks and by the activity of merchants who must have been otherwise humane in comparison with the harsh British capitalists practicing their form of cannibalism as famine-generating exploitation.

The Muslims brought in Iconoclasm, Religious Intolerance, the *Dhimma* and the emasculation of the learned classes, the unjust infliction of the *Jaziya* tax as an expression of their dominance based on military might and as a means of forced conversion of the native population. They brought iconoclasm and the

demolition of thousands of Temples, the destruction of the Centres of High Learning, in particular the catastrophic destruction of Indian Buddhism characterized by the razing of the Nalanda Centre of Buddhist Studies, the burning of its Library, and the massacre of the hundreds of defenceless resident monks. The murderous violence of the Partition was one more spectacular demonstration of this Islamic hegemony and its feats of destruction which Indian Muslims still recall, with pride, as their glorious legacy. The Indian Muslims still view the barbaric diminution of Indian civilization as their success and as the substance of their cultural identity, to which they desire to return with total separation from the Kaffirs, in a recovery of their distinctive religious purity and as a contribution to the realization of the world as the *Dar-ul-Islam* commanded by Allah.

A shameful irony. Furthermore it is abundantly ironical that, with the cataclysmic demonstration of their murderous effort to separate from Harbi Kaffirdom, the Indian Muslims would still claim their privilege to hold their constitutional rights. It is a shameful irony that they would prevail as hostage acting as an impediment to the followers of the native Dharmas striving for their own authenticity by exiting from the long duration of the eclipse of the two alien hegemonies. The exertion of the native Indians strikes the imagination as a literal enactment of the Upaniṣadic prayer : *tamaso mā jyotir gamaya, asato mā sad gamaya, mṛtyor mā amṛtam gamaya* (*from darkness lead me to light, from non-Being led me to Being, from Death lead me to Non-Death*). Despite the Taj Mahal, Muslim iconoclastic hegemony was, in the eyes of the ancient cultured Man of the pre-Islamic civilization, Darkness (*tamas)*, non-Reality (*asat*), Death (*mṛtyu*).

The relative benefit of the influence of the British rule. In contrast the British came as the liberators of mainly the majority Brahmanists from the oppressiveness of an effete, decadent

Muslim power. True: they looted, they taxed, they brutalized, they "inferiorized", they famished. But, while the Muslims had destroyed a lot with next to nothing as replacement, the British gave to India: a system of Public Education at all three levels including the University modelled on Oxford and Cambridge, Roads and Railways, a Postal Service, the Hospital, Medical Science, the Law enhanced with the *habeas corpus*, the English language adorned with a Magnificent Literature. They revived Sanskrit Learning, they established the Archaeological Society and dug out Mohenjodaro and unveiled the Origins of the Indian Civilization, which now a certain Pakistani historicism claims as the beginning of the Pure State.

The high price of British beneficence. But despite their establishing their hegemony the British nevertheless generated the space for a certain Kaffir elite, particularly in Bengal, where Brāhmaṇas came out into the open and militated for the social reforms which they felt free to propose and carry out without any impediment. What had remained latent, as the merits and virtues repressed by Muslim intolerance, suddenly sprouted forth and asserted themselves. Warren Hastings had to use an enormous persuasion to bring out the Bengali Pandits, with the honorarium of one rupee a day, to help Charles Wilkins in the translation of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, the English version being the first translation into a European language. Exemplars like Ishvar Chandra Vidyasagar, Keshav Chandra Sen, the Tagores, the Arya Samaj, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Rukmini Arundale at Adyar and her revival of Bhārata Nātyam, are still revered by a grateful Kaffirdom for their immense contributions to the revival and rebuilding of Kaffir civilization and culture. Their reforming and educational contributions became realizable under the protection of the British who simultaneously found it easy, with a conscience laden with greed, to plunder an almost defenceless sub-continent, by the ironfisted use

of the whip. [20]

The affirmation of post-Independent Kaffir humanity. After Independence, the Nehru Government gracefully evinced the humanism of the native Hindu culture in leading India to join the British Commonwealth without any recrimination, without asking a single cent of reparation for all that the Raj had looted out of the country during two centuries. It is pertinent to stress that, with the additional courtesy of asking Lord Mountbatten to remain as the Governor-General during the first year of the new Independent country, the Indians showed to the whole world that freedom from colonial rule was not followed by any resentment. The British did not leave their empire with gentlemanly elegance. They left without offering the slightest sign of all their past brutishness, with a collective sense of propriety assured by the Indian leaders evincing the magnanimity which, as the signature of the legacy of the nobility of the Dharmas, the iconoclasm of the Muslim and the depredation of the Christian could not stamp out.

The soulless unresponsiveness of the former exploiters. Today the preeminent dignity of the indigenous magnanimity needs to be emphasized, specially in the face of the evidence of the morality of the Indian attitude having scarcely made any dent in the deadened psychology underlying the Judeo-Christian European elites. British Historians, still unreconciled to the loss of the Empire, do not hesitate to recall and assert what they still dream as the perennial benefaction of the White Man's Burden consisting of the soul-bruising of his conquered humanities. On the contrary, in the international Realpolitik dominated by the Cold War against Russo-Chinese Communism, the Western powers, including Great Britain, have persisted in the adoption of their foreign

---

[20] The whip aspect of the British rule is abundantly described in Caroline Elkins, *The Legacy of Violence: A History of the British Empire.*

policies contrary to the economic and political interests of India. To bring out the specific merit of India abstaining from any kind of resentment against the British for their famine-riddled genocidal rule, it is worth recalling that the anti-colonialist literature published in the aftermath of the World War II is French, as a product of leftist Black African intellectuals, hailing mainly from the former French colonies. India has not produced an equivalent anti-colonialist literature. The India led by Nehru chose the way of friendship by effusively joining the Commonwealth. And Nehru did pay a courtesy visit to the old anti-Hindu warrior, Winston Churchill, known for his perception of the Hindus "*as a bestial people believing in a bestial religion*". During his brief meeting, Nehru, faithful to the innate nobility of his character, did not say a single word about Churchill's committing his own crimes against Humanity, during 1943-44, in the genocide euphemistically described by Imperial British propaganda as the "Bengal Famine". For, coincidentally, the euphemism of the Bengal Famine was Churchill's self-congratulating gift of a genocide to India at the same time as the ovens of Auschwitz were belching out smoke.[21]

In a dramatic contrast to this legacy of friendship and concord which India manifested towards her former rulers, the Indian Muslims chose to reverse their own history of devastation by claiming, with fanatical cynicism, a victimhood as vindication of their

[21] The Bengal Famine, the euphemism engineered single-handedly by Churchill, was the cheapest ever genocide: it required no barbed wire, no guards, no dogs, no miradors, no Zygon gas, no oven, no bureaucracy, no burial ground. Several millions of men, women, children slowly died of hunger. Churchill later commented it was nothing for the Indians are used to breed like rabbits. Later Mahatma Gandhi asked: "Why is Churchill not being tried for crimes against Humanity?" Emmanuel Shinwell, the only Jew in Churchill's War Cabinet, and a witness of and a participant in Churchill's decisions, never said a word about the "Bengal Famine" till he died at the age of 101. Vide" Madhushree Mukerjee, *Churchill's Secret War.*

sustaining the Revelation-centric hatred of the Kaffir profusely illustrated by the heartless convulsion of the Partition.

The inversion of Indian History by the majority of Indian Muslims. Unchallenged, astonishingly enough, by Brahmanist elites, the Muslim League brazenly inverted the iconoclastic history of the Indian Muslims by the vociferous chanting of Islam being in danger and in the groundless assumption of Hindu oppression in a free India. The signature communal politics of the Muslim League, as an endorsement of the Quran instructed obloquy of the Hindu Kaffirs, was implemented subsequently by Pakistan initiating three wars and decades of terrorism. Today the Indian Muslims find themselves confronted by the Brahmanist majority remembering its past, not with communalist fervor, but with the desire to recover all the cultural wealth that it has lost under the withering influence of the alien powers. Contingent to the buoyant legacy bequeathed by the ancient sages, the desire to renew with the past urges reviving, for the good of all Humanity, the enduring universalism characteristic of Indian culture with its characteristic magnanimity defined with the will to contribute to the world being elevated as a *vasudhaiva kutumbakam* (the world as a family).

The indigenous Indian is not responsible for the mobility of the Muslim. Indian Muslims refuse to acknowledge the undreamed effect of their having stayed and developed a *modus vivendi* in the midst of the favorable Harbi Indian sub-continent, and the consequent continuity of living undisturbed. Simultaneously they chose to be grossly disturbing with their zeal for iconoclasm and intolerant violence, in an overwhelming similitude of the adverse treatment inflicted on the Jews and on the Gothic Christians by the intolerant zealots of Omeyyad Islam in al-Andalus. Yet they are irked when they are qualified as an alien community mainly because they refuse to acknowledge the damage to the

indigenous culture caused by their closed-minded zealotry and their iconoclasm. Additionally the Indian Muslims refuse to own as their heritage, or even to express any solidarity with, the long history of India before the advent of Muhammad. They cannot indeed contemplate the very prospect of mingling the pre-Islamic Indian civilization with the Revelation communicated to the Messenger by the Angel Gabriel on behalf of Allah.

It is moot in the present essay to juxtapose the weakness of the Hindu-Buddhist-Jaina humane inhabitants of the sub-continent with the strong upsurge of Christian power which, in the XVII century, did bring to an emphatic end the seven centuries long rule of the Islam of al-Andalus.

The Muslim obstruction to the regeneration of the indigenous culture. Moreover the Indian Muslims lack the sagacity and the intellectual integrity which could prompt them to refute - on the basis of the memory of their own ill-treatment of the indigenous civilization - the constant denunciation, presented as enlightened objectivity, by self-flagellating far-leftist Hindu historians, of the Brahmanists' endeavor to reconstruct their culture. That this be so owes its explanation to the Indian Muslim basing his identity on the feeling of his distinctiveness from every aspect of the habitus of the Brahmanist. Despite the enormity of this Muslim reluctance confronting them, Hindu politicians and historians shy away from acknowledging the simple fact of the Muslim Kaum's historical, causal association with the state of the damaged Indian civilization. The natural, moral impulse for the restoration of the damaged Indian civilization gets further distorted when it is interpreted by Communist historians as Hindu fanaticism, or as a misguided nationalism assisted by hostility to the Muslim "minority". It is unfortunate, essentially for the Muslim submitters to the revealed verses, that they would see their Quranic hatred of the Hindu Kaffir being independently vitalized, in unison with the

reprobation levelled by Marxist historians driven by hailing, as academic wisdom, their submission to Marxist dogmatism.

The incompleteness of the Indian civilization. The validity of a peaceful native Indian reconstruction happens to be rarely, if ever, mentioned. *Above all the present state of the Indian civilization will remain incomplete so long as the once glorious Indian Buddhism be not restored to its original splendor.* Such a reconstruction deserves to be carried out by the educational system, in particular, by the university level academic community, aided by the resources of the Central Government and by the activity of Buddhist Monasteries.

The elimination of this cultural abyss has nothing to do with the Muslim "minority". *Nor must the Indian Muslims feel demonized if any effort be made to bring back the rebirth of Indian Buddhism which suffered catastrophic destruction in the XIII century by an anti-intellectual minority successfully devastating a superior majority culture adorned with the sublime Madhyama Pratipad (Middle Way) of Gautama Buddha.* [22] Leftist historians avoid mentioning, beside other events of like magnitude, the catastrophic disaster which befell Nalanda, for example. Such omissions, undoubtedly deliberate, bring out the pompous self-righteousness of those pronouncements with which Communist historians claim infallibility. They are to a large extent aided by the widely spread slogan of the *bhai-bhaiist sarva dharma sama bhāva* which, in the reality of the communal history of India, is a monumental falsehood! Even if it be not a falsehood, it still retains

---

u[22] . All the Brahmanists, including Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan and K. M. Panikkar, who opine that Buddhism disappeared as the result of being absorbed by Vedānta do in truth, consciously or moved by the *bhai-bhaiism* of the politics of their time, support the success of the Islamic intolerance in the destruction of Indian Buddhism. For there was no Vedānta in Indonesia, in Afghanistan, in Central Asia, in Gandhara, in North-West China, where creative Buddhisms once flourished, but got obliterated and replaced by violent Islam, the mere apology of cultural sophistication. The Guimet Museum, in Paris, offers exhibits which recall the splendor of Central Buddhism which disappeared after an existence of more than a thousand years.

its socio-political sterility in Muslim indifference to it.

The working collaboration of the majority with the minority. It does indeed serve the humanity of the whole Indian society when Brahmanists tolerantly accommodate themselves with their Muslim co-citizens not acknowledging the past of India up to the arrival of the first Islamic Horde. At the same time the Muslims need to concede that their Brahmanist neighbors evince neither enmity, nor estrangement, in their striving to search for their identity in that very Past. Still laden with the meaningfulness of a transcendental appeal, the past infuses itself fully in the contemporary lives of preeminent exemplars of legendary spiritualities. For it is the subtle fact pertinent to the Brahmanist civilization that, throughout the history of India, spiritual giants do never fail to appear, at appropriate times, as singular preeminent prodigies who infuse into their followers the appeal rousing them to strive for the acquisition of the ultimate self-perfectibility cognate with the mystical knowing described in the ancient writings.

The Muslim's indifference to the knowledges of the Dharmas. From that pre-Islamic past the Indian Muslim sees fit not to take any inspiration. As a matter of banal fact, during the past fourteen centuries, the Muslim has sought pride in his lack of curiosity in any of the cultures with which he has come into contact.[23] He believes that the Revealed verses of his Faith contain all that Man needs to know in order to lead the perfect life, for which the laws and rules prescribed by the Only God are the only ones which conform to the Straight Path enunciated in the very first Sura of the Quran.[24] Self-satisfied he will continue to do so till the Day of

---

[23] Certainly the Arabs borrowed from the Greeks mathematics, certain scientific ideas and practices, but none of their religious and philosophical ideas.

[24] This claim was roundly rejected by the 1956 Constitution of Pakistan which, founded as an original theocracy, converted itself to an imitation of the Westminster type of Democracy which, saddled with electoral representation, paradoxically

Judgement. Consequently he has no vantage point from which he can contemplate and assess the worth of the matter of fact simplicity of the Brahmanist's willful desire to return to *his* past. As such the Brahmanist's search for his authenticity acquires the force of a reasoned nostalgia fed by the recognition of the vitality of the relevance of the ancient lore to what completes his present spiritual wanting. Concurrently it is almost parallel with the Believer's faith in the Quranic verses as the perfect, eternal *raison d'être* of his identity. The Muslim views as *jahiliya*, the pre-Islamic past, which includes all that is bereft of all religious worth in the past determined by the native Dharmas and consequently, of all their present contents. Confiding in the security of walking along the Straight Path, ascribed by the Revelation, the Muslim manifests no curiosity in that Brahmanist past which offered ways leading to the land of Light (*jyoti*), of Being (*sat*), of Immortality (*amṛtam*).

The denial of impermanence by the Quran. Hence, relieved of the burden of getting acquainted with such a past, and of the fear of sharing in its substance, the Muslim finds comfort in the lightness of his immediate faith in the Eternal Quran and in its corresponding tradition. He believes that the divine Quran supersedes all the books related to the Dharmas and to all other religiosities and philosophies. Gratuitously enthused by the assurance of a religious superiority and with his faith secured with the belief in a perfect dispensation, he ought not to find it difficult to co-exist in the space where thrive the followers of the three Dharmas. Yet it is an enormous paradox that, despite the knowledge of the Quran being perfect for all time, the Muslim has always, since the first day when Muhammad started the new religion, been restless, mobile, devoid of the quiet self-confidence like the sentiment of complete self-satisfaction of the Taoist Sage who feels no wish to go to the next village from where he can hear a dog barking. But almost immediately as the first Muslims acquired the sufficient demographic mass, they set about ranging across the entire scantly

---

classifies minorities as second or third class citizens, in a qualitative difference from what a genuine democracy stands for.

populated northern stretch of the African continent and forcing, by the use of the sword, the conquered inhabitants to adhere to Islam. The quick spread of Islam from Arabia to the Pyrenees was conjointly a conversion by the use of brute force in a total inversion of the procedure of the converting of the different Asian cultures to Buddhism by the persuasive action of compassionate, renouncing Monks equipped with the Sūtras and the technique and the know-how of contemplation conveyed by a well-established method of teaching. Spiritual pedagogy was the instrument used in the spread of Buddhism. Wherever Islam installed itself, it did it thoroughly by filling the entire space owned by the previous culture. The similar conquest of an Islamic space by a like military action in the retaliation of a complete elimination of an Islamic civilization happened by the reconquest of Spain by the action of the Roman Catholics freeing Spain from the Omeyyad Islam of more than seven centuries. Kṣatriya India did not have the social structure and the particular quality of kingly power to protect and preserve the vast, scantily inhabited sub-continent from the hegemony of a far inferior community of Believers who had learned to steel the words of The Only God with the steel of swords and then rushed into the scantily inhabited Indian sub-continent to deplete it by means of a submission to a religion which has as its essential purpose the prosecution of war to islamize the whole world. That such a goal would be an unimaginable catastrophe for all Humanity can be gauged by the violent state of the countries inhabited by Muslim majorities. Furthermore that the Muslim would be so completely incapable to take stock of the cultural richness of the other major civilizations compel the certitude of his mind being occluded by the superstition of having received an unquestionable divine revelation which conferred upon him the illusion of being the best of all Humanity.

The sacredness of intolerant violence specific to Islam. But such a mode of living would be a betrayal of the revealed injunctions to hate the Others, to be hostile to them, to wage war against their community or their people. With regard to the different

Other, the Quran offers neither a proposition of indifference to his faith nor a persuasion to adopt the superior revelation. Instead the Quran enjoins the obliteration of the Other, by violence, by physical liquidation, as a unique aspect of the Islamic revelation and of the manner to express its superlative exceptionality. It is true that political Christianity too has manifested violent suppressions of the beliefs and the cultures of Others. But the commandments to adopt a lethal conduct against the Other does not pertain to the body of theological writings. Islam advocates violence and hatred in the Believer's relationship to the Other as a dynamic duty commanded by The God exerting in it His Sovereignty (*Rububīyat)* and his *Taqdīr (*Measure*).*

But, despite the sustained acquaintance with much of the whole world generated by the media and by television information, it has become easy to acknowledge the virtues and merits of the non-Islamic cultures. Indeed the raw violences, which Islamic piety ceaselessly generates in the name of Allah, actually fill one with pity that the Indian Muslim, in particular, does seemingly dwell incapable of a beneficent curiosity in the ontological appeals of the Upaniṣads, of the Middle Way of Gautama Buddha, of the Noble Ethics of Vardhamān Mahāvira.

The eternal chasm between the Earth-bound Dharmas and the Heavenly Revelations will remain. However a long time will pass during which the Brahmanist Kaffirs will endure, with patience and resignation, as hostages to the imperative of a communal harmony, to the existential irony of the Dhimma revival, however softly. The Muslim will sooner or later have to adjust to the fact of socio-political improvement allowing the Brahmanist to search for and regain the cultural plenitude which Muslim hegemony strove, and almost succeeded, to stifle within the will of the realization of the World Death as *Dar-ul-Islam.* While leftist historicism constantly harps on the reconstruction of Indian civilization and culture as a calamity threatening the Muslim well-being, the fact stands out that the two different, divergent

references to the Past will remain forever at odds with each other.

For the Muslim the past lies in the eternally valid Quran and in the jurisprudence of the Sharia, in a *vertical* relationship with Allah in Heaven; he believes that the Brahmanist will move inexorably *backward* on the long *horizontal* line on the ground leading to a distant moment on Earth, the Last Day of Resurrection. But the Brahmanist knows that he is secure in the possession of his Ontological essence being a reality in his *eternal present,* in the *Now* moment which holds the promise and the certainty of the infinitude of his mystical self-fulfillment in the Plenitude which has always been and shall always Be. As such the *Now* has no dogmatic relationship with any of the books of the three Dharmas. The *Now* holds the promise and the adequacy for the identity of the native Indian. The Eternal *Now* is ancient (*purāṇa*), it is a metapsychic realization beyond all languages, beyond all forms of the imagination, beyond all books or dispensations. There was no time when the *Now* Real was not ad there will be no time when the *Now* shall cease to Be. Even the Sufis flinch from declaring that the *summum bonum* of their sublime love of God transcends the words of the Revelation. The Muslim, Sufi or plain Believer, denies to himself the appropriation of the meaning of Patañjali's definition of Yoga as the cessation of the thought process (*citta vṛtti nirodha*), for the Straight Path does not reach out to the destination infinitely beyond the Day of Resurrection, which is *Now.* Better still when the *Now supersedes* the obligation of submitting to the Final Day. Eternity is not a post-mortem event. It is present, homogeneous with the present *Now* moment. The present moment is the egg out of which, either by the action of the beak or of the claw the Eternal chick as *Now* hatches out! Such is the benevolence of the Dharmas with their unerring promise of the lightning flash of mystical awakening!

The rootless intellectual fakery of the Communist or Marxist way. The mysterious working of Time persuades the

acknowledgement of the thought that the Brahmanist and the Muslim views of human ultimate destiny which, like the rails enabling the Indian train to run, are parallel without ever meeting. The Brahmanist takes pride in a history which stretches back to Mohenjodaro and millenia beyond. For the Indian Muslim history began in the VII century AD and views as *jāhilya* (a dark age, a period of ignorance) what the Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina Indians do in truth value as the formative time when a fully developed mystical civilization came into being, without any exertion of Force, and justifying the pronouncement that there has never been a time when the Soul was not and there will never be a time when it shall not Be.

The sub-continent does in reality offer the prospect of two Indias: the India based on Force dear to the Indian Muslim and the India which essentially has remained mystical, as a unique civilization built without Quietude as its defining characteristic. The Indian Muslim seeks his identity with Force represented by Mahmud Ghaznavi, Aurangzeb, Nadir Shah, Mir Jafar, M. A. Jinnah, all of whom claimed justification in the Force urged and celebrated by Allah's revealed verses calling for the reduction of the world into the fabric of the *Dar-ul-Islam.* The Brahmanist pitches his identity in the substance of the Vedic humaneness and in its variations as Buddhism, Jainism, Gandhiism. These two identities, the Muslim and the native Indian, are diametrically exclusive of each other. They will stay as such beyond the Day of Resurrection, or beyond the Pralaya of the Kali Yuga.

Marxism as an alien mode of thought with no roots in the authentic idea of India. As an offshoot of the Judeo-Christian theology and thought, Marxism has no antecedent speculation rooted in any of the intellectual manifestations of the three Dharmas. All the communist leaders draw their leftist assumptions from the translations of Marxist books. In practice many Indian

Marxists do not hesitate to take part in the traditional festivals, with the ready argument that participating in festive events does not contradict their political loyalty. In contrast, conversion to Christianity does require the convert suddenly to turn away from any kind of participation in events and festive occasions pertaining to the previous religious culture. In India the Christian convert does not take part even in the celebration of such a secular festival as Holi. It has not been a mere coincidence that communism made itself felt in West Bengal, which is the part of India with the longest contact with the British and their Protestant faith, and in Kerala where the Indian Christianity had plunged roots in the very first century of the Christian era. A causal connection realized the conjunction of Marxism thriving in these two areas already acquainted with a long association with Christianity, either by the original missionary work carried out since the very birth of the Christian faith in Kerala, or by the traders and subsequent conquerors of the East India Company in Bengal. With such origins the Communists of India have throughout their history dwelled beyond the pale of the three Dharmas, although the ideological elite of Indian Communism was largely composed of well-educated Brahmins. Additionally they earned the animus of the population on account of their supporting the Muslim League's demand for Partition and of the method of its being set into motion. At the behest of Stalinist Russia, which was an ally in the war against Nazi Germany during the World War II, the Communist Party of India opted to act in favor of the British rule, against the Independence movement of the Congress Party led by Mahatma Gandhi. On that score the Indian communist does not have a *locus standi* for an identity in like measure of the identity of the Brahmanist in India or of the Muslim in Pakistan or Bangladesh.

The onus on the Indian Muslim. If the imperatives of parliamentary politics require a close, lasting peaceful collaboration between the two principal communities, the burden shall, of a

genuine reason, fall on the shoulder of the Indian Muslim. The limitations of the scope of this essay do not oblige enlarging on the entire history of native Indian thought. Suffice it to postulate that one of India's historical embellishments consists of the fact that the native Indian certainly belongs to one of the two most celebrated metaphysical races, the other being the German. Even the German has felt the obligation to yield to the authority of Revelation with Kant basing his ethical pronouncements on a Lutheran interpretation of the Beatitudes of the Gospel. But the Indian metaphysician has relied solely on his particular Reason, a component of the philosophical anthropology expounded by the Sāṅkhya Darśana, as the necessary substance appropriate for the production of the unsurpassed summits of speculation in the Vedānta and in the Mādhyamika and Yogācāra versions of Mahāyāna Buddhism.[25]

The case of Muhammad Iqbal. These speculations lend themselves to the certainties of the Brahmanist never confining himself within a closed set of beliefs, for he has the fullest freedom to guide himself rightly with relevance to circumstances and to socio-political requirements. Muhammad Iqbal, as the paragon of the Indian Muslims, best advertises the total absence of curiosity in regard to the magnificence of the elevated metaphysical accomplishments of the race in the midst of whom he had won lasting respect and adulation. Iqbal earned a doctoral degree in Philosophy in a German university and was familiar with the metaphysics of Immanuel Kant. Yet in his *Reconstruction of Religious Thought of Islam,* while he does indeed refer to several American university teachers of philosophy, with names which scarcely anyone remembers, Iqbal does not have a single word about the supremely

---

[25] In reference to their respective majestic defining concepts of : *māyā* (the indescribable), *śūnyatā* (emptiness, void), *vijñapti-mātratā* (pure consciousness) .

elevating thoughts of the native Indian metaphysicians. He was blissfully unaware of the influence of Indian metaphysics on Arthur Schopenhauer, G. W. F. Hegel, Friedrich Nietzsche. With such a categorical indifference to the fundamentals of the indigenous civilization, Iqbal exemplifies, within the compass of Muslim exclusiveness, the unbridgeable chasm which separates the two Indias and the mentalities of the two peoples. The abyss between the two religious communities will stay indefinitely because: (i) the Believer cannot of his own, for the reasons of comparative estimations, submit the eternally valid truths of the divine revelations of the Holy Book to a questioning in relation to the human provisional thoughts of philosophers; (ii) the Believer cannot come down to the level of the NonBeliever as the necessary requirement for any profitable construction of social harmony, when the mission of the Submitter is either to convert, by force, the Other or to physically liquidate him, but never to establish an intellectual platform suitable for cordial common social sharing; (iii) there has never been, nor will there ever be, a dialogue between Islamic theological scholars and native Indian Philosophical scholars on the explicit assumption of the equality of the hermeneutics of the two religious articulations. Hence the intellectual, and consequently, the social and moral chasm between the Believers and the Kaffirs will remain, as such, till beyond the Day of Resurrection, as a banal matter of fact!

The short-sightedness of Iqbal. Moreover Iqbal's example brings out the fact that, if ever the urgency would arise of the two communities coming together within the economy of a permanent communal quietude, the onus of a relevant rational effort will necessarily have to emerge on the side of the Believer in the Quran. That will have to be so because, as an eternally perfectly valid text, the Quran does not brook any modification or adjustment to changing socially related circumstances. Each side of the religious divide will need to demonstrate the specific configuration of its

identity: that is, each community would have its own history of India, together with its religious foundations, its particular personal and collective psychology, its expectation of the future corresponding to its specific finality. It is no accident, but it is supremely logical, that Muhammad Iqbal (1877-1938) be honored as the founding ideologue of Pakistan. Hindus still show superficial fondness with some of his poems celebrating his enthusiasm for Hindustan. They do so without being acquainted with his *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* which is conceived and set in an abstract space devoid of the histories of the Hindus, of the Buddhists, of the Jainas. Iqbal postulates the need for the reconstruction of Islam without a single word on the devastation which his co-Believers have wrought on the native civilization, an aspect of his work which has not elicited any comment on the part of the Hindus. Nor does Iqbal elicit the faintest thought or feeling for the indigenous civilization having been so barbarously mutilated by the followers of his own faith and by the savage exploitation exerted with limitless brutality by the British conqueror.[26]

The intellectual limitations of Iqbal and of Mawlānā AZAd. It is significantly revealing that both Muhammad Iqbal and Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad in their seminal works on the fundamentals of Islam demonstrate the intellectual wanting of their closed-minded-ness to a right awareness of the native civilization in the midst of which they were born and spent all their lives. They give substance to the native Indian's obligation of adopting a judicious prudence in always holding to the constant mindfulness of the silence over which the friendly, moderate, liberal Muslim floats the effusiveness of friendship and

---

[26] Hindus are fond of expressing the superficial admiration for Iqbal's by referring to his poem containing the words "… *hindustan sab se acchā,* with sentimental ignorance of Iqbal's son having chosen to live in Pakistan, and thereby giving the right interpretation of his father's real meaning of what territory was the best of all lands.

collaboration. Much of the history of Indian Islam has erupted with volcanic fury, as iconoclasms, as riots, as perennial suspicion, the reason and violence of which is stored in the silence of the private religious source of the Muslim's social intercourse. That is why, of the anti-Kaffir verses in the Quran, there exists no record of any genuine, relevant discussion between the Hindu leaders of the Congress party with their learned Muslim collaborators. It was a stupendous example of the ignorance, or of the lack of awareness, of the strategic importance of Muslim silence. Indeed, the history of the fourteen centuries of Islam have passed by without any Muslim having ever been prompted to examine the mortiferous verses which install the venom of hatred in the heart of every single Believer without the least qualm of conscience. Silence is the salient dimension of the Muslim psyche which, nurtured with the knowledge of the latent will to bring forth the realization of the *Dar ul-Islam*, deserves to be ever present in the consciousness of the native Indian, as a category of well-informed precaution. Above all, it devolves upon the moral responsibility of the Hindu to assure himself of a correct appraisal of the fact that intolerance and violence are not mere external predicates to the essence and purpose of the Revealed verses. They are, in reality, supremely homogeneous with the very essence of the Revelation. Violence constitutes the substance of Islam starting from the moment of Muhammad's first pronouncement of the words conveyed to him by Angel Gabriel. It was actually a merciless enhancement of the violence searing the pages hailing the brutish wars described in the books of the Old Testament, wars waged with absolute violence, as spontaneous habits of the everyday life of the main Biblical characters. In the wars of the Biblical time and place there were no prisoners taken by the victors. Losers got physically wiped out.

Historical fidelity and Islamophobia. The contemplation of the stone ruins littering the Indian soil and testifying to the history of iconoclastic savagery, together with the simultaneous obligation to recognize the beneficence of social concord, would require the Indian Muslim to gracefully own the negative image which he projects into the mind of the Brahmanist. History having been what

it has been, especially in India with Muslim invasion and recurrent violence, the burden rests on the Indian Muslim to internalize the meaning and the spirit of the ugly iconoclast image which he has self-righteously, as Allah's proxy, fostered as hegemony over the Kaffir Brahmanist's sacred homeland. The consequent preoccupation for a Truth-laden mutual understanding would be necessary for the advent of a homogeneous citizenship undisturbed by religious conflicts. It must not, on any reasonable ground, be interpreted as "Islamophobia." This spontaneous battle cry of the Mussalman reacting to the least reasonable criticism of his uncivil conduct is the characteristic ploy used by the Muslim who self-righteously opposes his deadened moral fibers to the sufferings of the Kaffir populations, victims of the Believer's submission to the injunctions of The God.

Paradoxically, it was the lethal enthusiasm of the Jinnah-led Muslim majority which urged the political fraud of "Islamophobia". Under the guise of the slogan "Islam in danger", it actually was, in the context of Indian history, a topsy-turvy demonization of the traditional indigenous tolerance. Worse, it was coupled with the inversion of iconoclastic barbarism into the cunning perversion of a Muslim upside-down, reversed victimhood. Ever since Partition, the majority of the Muslims who had had recourse to the Partition mayhem - which was a naturally characteristic mode of being Islamic - found themselves in the predicament of having to burrow themselves into the Vote bank of the Congress Party, where they conveniently devised the cunning of nurturing and preserving their freedom to silence.

Silence as a contrary adjunct of Indian Muslim solidarity. Following Partition the Muslims who remained opted for joining the Congress Party with the assurance of being welcome in view of their recognition of its liberal, non-sectarian policy. None of them sought admission to the Hindu Maha Sabha party, for

instance, where they could not find an intellectual or moral space for their comfort. But what paradoxically qualified the maintenance of their identity within the Congress Party has been their silence about the preservation of their real religious sentiment. No one questioned their silence on the relentless ethnic cleansing practiced by the same middle class which had advocated and practiced the raw violence as the means to bring about Partition. Nor did the educated moderates among the Vote Bank express any criticism or condemnation of the purification of Pakistan of its non-Muslim minorities. Nor did it seem odd that the Indian Muslims would steadfastly maintain a studied silence over the acts of terror repeatedly affecting India in which they had staked their tranquility. More: their silence over the separatism of the Kashmiri Muslims was a way of approving their hostility to the Hindus, though the former resented the Indian Muslims not openly expressing their support of the Two Nation ideology.

No one has questioned the silence of the Indian Muslims over the Quranic verses advocating unrelenting hatred of the Kaffir. Nor do they overtly offer an opinion on the contradiction of Muslims seeking refuge in India from Bangladesh. As vote bank clients the Indian Muslims silently, but passionately, held on to their endorsement of iconoclasm as a sacred duty throughout the decades of the Babri 'question' without any compunction in insisting on the preservation of a symbol of Islamic iconoclasm, in a free Indian Republic endowed with a secular, liberal, egalitarian constitution.

The Muslim usage of the *Taqiyya.* As the apanage of *Taqiyya,* silence is the language of ambiguity which the Indian Muslims use with sophisticated subtlety hidden in the semblance of ordinariness. It is an instrument which the Muslim uses to safeguard his exclusivism. It serves as the private sub-conscious preservation of Allah's eternal abomination of the Kaffir and of the duty to wage war against India as a part of the *Dar-ul-Harb*.

The silence of the Indian Muslim is the closet where he stores the will to perform the duty of *Jihad* at the convenient time. The question is: why is the concurrent prudence not availing in the mind of the Brahmanist? Even the closest collaborator with a majority Hindu Party remains silent over the Quranic verses hostile to the Kaffir, over which he is never asked for his unambiguous opinion, openly stated. Either due to the Brahmanist's courtesy and politeness, or due to the moderate Muslim's prudence in holding out in reserve the legitimacy of having recourse to *jihad*, while the silence prevails and generates the illusion of a permanent quietude.

During the 1940s, it was the few silent nationalist Muslims who were the trees which the Hindu leaders of the Congress Party mistook for the forest of the Muslim majority. Bound by their pacifism and their professed large-heartedness the Hindu leaders proved to be unaware of their innocently entertaining, in those circumstances, an immense misperception of the Muslim middle class galvanizing the low untutored mass by openly beating the drum with the deafening din damning the detested Hindus as a danger to Islam.

The novelty of the present dhimma. As a matter of fact, the variation of the *Dhimma* to which the Brahmanists voluntarily yielded in offering to the Muslims the gratification of the Vote Banks, is worse than the original one enforced by the Islamic hegemons. In the earlier times the Muslims openly, as an expression of their right flowing from their might, imposed a *Dhimma* with the native subjects being compelled to pay a tax for their protection. The *present* variation of the original Muslim practice is that, *as a minority not seated at the summit of the power structure as it once did*, the Believers can still prevail by implementing the cunning of benefiting from a judicious interpretation of the Constitutional guarantee of the civic freedoms. It is worth recalling that the Sharia was granted to the Muslim Minority in the 1937 British India Act and it was at Independence only ten years old. The 1950 Constitution stipulates that the award of the Sharia to the Muslim community would be *provisional until the Muslims*

themselves ask to join the common civil code. That 'provisional' time has lasted to this day and there is no intimation of the Muslim community ready to forego the privilege of holding on to the Sharia. As a consequence, in the wake of their allegiance to the Sharia, the Muslims do more or less quietly get along, while assuming the role of keeping as hostage the imperative of maintaining communal peace. Thereby the Brahmanist majority all along inflicts upon itself the refined version of a *Dhimma* adjusted to what Nehru described as ''India's tryst with destiny!'' This is one feature of the Indian nation where the leaderships of all the political parties willingly or by habit, *allow the institutionalization of fear at the heart of national politics.*

The task of the adherents to the indigenous Dharmas is to claim spiritual authenticity as their birthright. All Indians, who have succeeded in remaining faithful to the ancient traditions and to the Dharmas which preside over their ways of life, do naturally take for granted the fact that their history began long before 15 August 1947. It began several millennia before the first Muslim horde advanced into the sub-continent. They have learned to reconcile themselves to the Muslims not recognizing the history of India before the moment of their first invasion. Consequently the work of reconstruction, carried out under the protection of the 1950 Constitution, need not be qualified with such negatively charged expressions as nationalism, right wing postures, intolerant maneuvers, threat to democracy. In all matters related to the permanent state of conflict between the Indian Muslims and the majority Kaffir community the basic convenient argument will reflect the unchanging nature of the Islamic closed-mindedness based on the Quran and its totalitarian ideology. The potentiality of recurring conflict due to reasons prescribed by the divinely perfect Quran will be the responsibility of the Indian Muslim Kaum, in fidelity to its belonging to the Umma, more than to the Indian subcontinent and to the submission to a Quranic revelation which cannot be altered.

The natural tolerance of India of the Dharmas. The India of the Vedas and of the Mystical Upaniṣads, of Gautama Buddha

and his *Madhyama Pratipad* ('The Middle Way'), of Mahāvīra and his Noble Ethic of reverence for all forms of Life, does not have to prove its tolerance. Abundantly expressed in the indigenous plurality of spiritualities, in their legacies, in such monuments as the cave temples of Ajanta, tolerance has been chiseled into stone and has been collectively lived as effortlessly as breathing. Pre-Islamic tolerance was as natural as the gravitational pull. Indian Christians have never had to complain against any form of duress or conflict since the very beginning of their history in the first century. Not a single drop of Jewish blood fell on Indian soil. It did fall in November 2008 at the hands of the terrorists whom Pakistan sent for that purpose, by men impelled by a Revelation inspired by the contents of the Old Testament and the Gospel. But the traditional tolerance, for the benefit of mankind, shall have to remain as an obligation of India in both its national and international policies.

The compelling wonder of pre-Islamic tolerant India. It is one of the antithetic wonders of the world that, in a span of more than two thousand years of co-existence, the religiously alien minorities - the Jewish, the Christian, the Islamic - would have so ardently, so arduously, closed their minds and hearts to the adoption of tolerance as a supreme religious merit. With obdurate obstinacy they have maintained the narrowness of their respective world vision despite their knowledge of the histories of their faiths having been blemished with conflicts, wars, massacres, genocides. It defies common sense that all these bloody products of intolerance would not generate any reflection by the best and the brightest of their respective societies. In more recent times after the Second World War, the mind fails to come to terms, for example, with the indifference of the Rabbinate not reflecting, in the face of the Holocaust, on the Old Testament proclaiming Jehovah as the Only God, having been the source of *all* the forms of religious intolerance! Nor are Theologians prompted to reflect on seventeen

centuries of Caesar transforming into so much violence the initial teachings of the sweet Jesus who, for the first time in Biblical lore, proclaimed the virtue of forgiving the offense suffered from the enemy, in an outright negation of the law of talion.

The indifference to genocides evinced by Believers in the Revelations. The universal indifference to the repetition of genocides persists, as the centrality of belief in societies persuaded by revelations, in providing the indigenous Indians with a stoic indifference to the reprobation of offenses committed against mostly Muslims accused of cow crimes among the culturally backward rural folks. Sensational newspaper reports of crimes concern the responsible authorities of the Law and Order establishment. They do a disservice to the merits of the Indian Republic by blowing up such incidents as actions which demean the well-established tradition of tolerance and of devotedness to peaceful co-existence. In the Rājya led by Rāma the commoners did not spare Him their censure of his beloved Sītā's conduct. Though the rule of Rāma's Kingdom and society was perfect, with zero tolerance of the slightest murmur of incivility, yet, as a figure of thought, it never has had any representation anywhere in history.

The need for an unerring understanding of Islamic superiority. Indeed throughout more than a thousand years the Muslims have exerted a hateful, sterile superiority over the native Indian peoples. It was the misfortune of India to be struck by invaders who, believing they held the nonpareil Truth revealed in the Quran, set themselves freely upon the Indians with the guiltless exertion of their violence enjoined by the verses written by Allah. With Allah commanding his followers to act as His proxies (**Quran 8.17**) the Muslims had a free hand in their treatment of their Indian victims. With their divinely inspired violence, the invaders experienced no compunction in *inferiorizing* the native inhabitants devoted to the Humanisms of the Dharmas. In such conditions of divinely sanctioned military actions, the *dhimmis* did not even have any reason to exalt the virtue of *sama bhāva.* Up to

15 August 1947 India offered to the world the spectacle, on the scale of a sub-continent, *of an inferior set of beliefs which, pronounced by Allah in revelations transmitted to the Prophet, prevailed in crippling a civilization which had been founded on the sublime loftiness of mystical self-perfection as the finality of human existence*.

With India having been reduced to the status of a European power's colony, it was natural for the ethnocentric Europeans not to be concerned with the fate of the majority Indian population being subordinated and culturally diminished by the Islamic power. Muslim power was easily understood with admiration based on the British religious sensitivity owing its substance to the same Biblical source. Europe stood with impassive detachment with scarcely a murmur of horror during the Islamic Dajjal's rampage for Partition in 1946-47. Since the 1970s, with the growing influence of their exclusivism and their violence, the Muslim minorities are enacting a variation of their passion for *inferiorisation,* the reason and substance of which have their roots in the Islamic scriptures. The reality which confronts the secular, liberal democracies of Western Europe is the inevitable experience of its *pakistanization* by a Muslim minority which does not want to assimilate or integrate the culture of the host societies and thereby foster a multi-cultural, beneficent way of living together. But, with undisguised brashness, the Islamic minority vigorously imposes itself by creating the space within Europe for the establishment of an autonomous Islamic civilization, with its pertinent, exclusive laws and mores.

The unfortunate loss of Kṣatriya influence across the subcontinent. What is unique in the Indian case was the enfeeblement, if not the loss, of the *Kṣatriya spirit of protection* as the bulwark for the safeguard of the territory and of the sophisticated native Indian civilization which had been in existence for several millennia before the first Muslim raid. It needs to be said, with due emphasis, that the Muslims arriving in India put an end to the period of about four centuries of peace and tranquility across the subcontinent. Yet, despite the resulting weakening of their obsolete

military art and knowledge, the Kṣatriyas did prove their mettle with unqualified bravery and self-abnegation in the defence of their kingdoms. As in all military triumphs, throughout history, the victories always went to the side endowed with a superior armament and military hardware. With their heritage of war and with the lust for conquest behind them, the Muslim invaders moved into a vast, scantly populated stretch of land defended by brave warriors equipped with outmoded military equipment. It was easy to move in, to roam freely, to pillage, to loot. Mahmud of Ghazni could make seventeen raids, he could reach as far as Vārāṇasī and return unmolested, at the speed of bullock carts and elephants laden with treasures, without losing any item of his immense plunder. Today the empty spaces have shrunk. In reality all the continents are today devoid of empty spaces across which armies could roam at will and conquer.

Few historians, or writers of all sorts, have noticed that Mahatma Gandhi wielded the 'weapons' of *Satyagraha* and *Ahiṁsā* to win the independence of India against the rule of Britannia at a moment when the latter was already equipped with an atomic arsenal. Yet, the Muslims, resting with the security of the vote banks since immediately after the satanic action of Partition, can still at leisure, with peaceful, cunning use of the Constitutional provisions, revive their materialistic endeavor to constrain Brahmanist Kaffirs to the status of a voluntary *Dhimma*.

The necessity of an in-depth dialogue for mutual understanding. One of the psychological endowments of the Indian Muslim manifests itself in his inability to commiserate with the suffering of his victim. He shares this trait with the British colonialist who, with a stiff upper lip, can starve the Indian to death by his engineering a famine and still feel remorseless. In the midst of famines, the British maintained the 50% tax on the produce of the starving proletarian population. General Reginald Dyer did not

express any remorse over the massacre which he ordered at the Jalianwalla Bagh on 10 April 1919, five months less one day after the 11 November 1918 Armistice which ended the World War I. He actually regretted that, due to the narrow gate, he could not bring in the truck equipped with a machine gun to kill and wound more individuals in a peaceful, defenceless crowd trapped in a closed space. And he claimed that his feat of ordering a massacre was his teaching the Indians a moral lesson! On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Independence, Queen Elizabeth II, during her visit to India, publicly apologized for the massacre at Jalianwalla Bagh. No one in the Muslim community has ever said a word of regret, let alone of sorrow, for all the ravages wreaked upon the native civilization by the sword and the hammer of Islamic zealots enjoined to wage war against the sub-continental *Dar-ul-Harb.*

A word of praise in favour of the historic justice in relation to Ayodhya. The Indian Muslim goes a step further: he gets offended whenever he is reminded of one of his offences. The demolition of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya illustrates this trait of the collective psychology of the Indian Muslims. Since 1925, when India was still under British rule, the tension between the two communities had been brewing about the construction of a Mandir (temple) at the ancient location on which the Babri Muslims had built a mosque, as their co-Believers have done in other places, throughout the time of their domination. The discussions had been going on for decades until, in a fit of anger, or of an impatience resulting from the feeling of being victimized unceasingly since the original act of iconoclasm which, as sacred Islamic duty, consisted of the Mosque having been built on the premises where stood the Hindu temple. It was certainly the first time, in more than a millennium, that Hindus consciously demolished a mosque, especially in Independent India, ruled by its liberal, secular

Constitution, which, for the first time, guarantees equal rights to Hindus and Muslims. The demolition of the Babri Mosque, the architecturally insignificant five-century-old symbol of Muslim affirmation of intolerance of a Kaffir temple in a city revered since time immemorial, triggered a rash of anger across India and in Pakistan, resulting in violent communal clashes which took many lives. In the midst of the murderous reaction of the Muslims to the demolition of the Babri Mosque, the Muslims forgot, or pretended to be unaware, that during their hegemony the Hindus were classified as *Dhimmis* and had experienced the demolition of thousands of temples and *all* the Centres of High Learning and of Wisdoms, for reason of their being different from the contents of the Quran. To the slightest criticism of his voluntary submission to the laws of the Quran, the Muslim spontaneously reacts with the sensitivity of the squinting eyes of a cockled snail.

The unfeeling self-righteousness of the Muslim. Yet, apparently, it did not occur to the Muslims that they have destroyed thousands of Hindu, Buddhist, Jaina temples throughout the time of their hegemony, before the arrival of the East India Company. They maintain an artful ambivalence in the matter of their having to confront their past ravages of the indigenous civilization of India. They resent being reminded of their committing a genocide while claiming it as the substance of the pride in their hegemonic domination.

That is why it was scarcely surprising that the Muslim elite would be loath to reflect on why the Hindus would have committed that particular act of breaching their traditional tolerance, after losing patience towards the end of a long period of trying to regain peacefully, by means of dialogue and mutual arrangement, the ancestral tradition of venerating Ayodhya as an ancient holy city. After Independence in 1947, in India as a free republic, governed by a liberal secular Constitution, the least that the Muslim Kaum

could have done, in past-Partition India, was an acknowledgement of the incongruity of their persistence to preserve a symbol of their intolerance which impelled the earlier iconoclastic hegemony. The Indian Muslims did not protest when, after 1947, India removed the vestiges of the supremacy of the British who had ruled over both the Muslim and the Indigenous Indian populations.

Muslim closed-mindedness in relation to their iconoclastic intolerance. Nevertheless the Muslim community frowned on any attempt made by the majority Brahmanist community to express resentment towards any evidence of *their* intolerance which, practiced as piety and as fidelity to the Quranic injunctions, gets manifested as abomination of the cultures of the Hindu Kaffirs. They evinced to the whole nation the concomitance of intolerance with the practice of the Islamic faith. Moreover the Hindus were led or forced to feel that it was too much to expect from the Muslim community having a right consciousness of the absurdity of the Babri Mosque representing the assumed superiority of Islamic political religiosity over Hindu spirituality. Enforced by the use of brute power, and not by the means of persuasion, this superiority does not exist, and never did, in regard to the Brahmanist denial of superiority in any spirituality elevated by being trumpeted in the language written with a sword. Consequently the adamant refusal by the Muslim Kaum to open moral space to accommodate the legitimate wish of the Ayodhyan Hindus has proved, for all time, to be a lamentable display of the hatred enjoined by God in His revelations.

The Babri mosque as the symbol of Islamic intolerance. It meant nothing to the Muslims that they were living under a jurisprudence which had adorned the country by its being one of the best four or five liberal, democratic constitutions in the post World War II world. Above all, it bewilders the mind of the traditionally tolerant Hindu when he is faced with the obstinacy of the Muslim refusing to, at least, consider, if not to historically acknowledge, the indecency of the continued symbolic usage of Islamic intolerance. The traditional maleficent Islamic attitude towards Kaffir institutions and religious monuments, was characteristically represented by the Babri Mosque having been built on the very

premises of a former Hindu temple, in a traditionally religious city venerated during the many centuries before the Muslim invasion. No Muslim voice was raised to offer the slightest regret for the past devastations practiced against Hindu, Buddhist, Jaina institutions and monuments.

In the entire sweep of Indian History it would have been a simple, easy show of graceful amicability with the gesture of allowing the reconstruction of the temple as a token redemption for all their devastations of the indigenous cultures. They let go the one in a millennium opportunity to show that Islam could, for the first time, in fourteen centuries, demonstrate to the world a whiff of freedom from the stern call of Allah for the elimination of anything which does not conform to His command for the realization of the world as the pure *Dar-ul-Islam* in conformity with His *Taqdīr* supervised by his *Rubūbiyat* (Sovereignty). But the Indian Muslim Kaum resolved to remain faithful to their submission to the remembrance of their iconoclastic glory as the security of their communal identity, within the Umma. Illustrated during the decades of the turmoil leading to the destruction of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya, the unwillingness of the Indian Muslims to make any concession to the indigenous Indians of the three Dharmas seeking an iota of historic justice, bears similitude with the Afghan Taliban government obliterating the thirteen centuries old Bamiyan Buddhas in 2002, viewed as abominations offensive to the purity of the Islamic theocracy.

The belated recognition of the immorality of academic participation in British imperialism. During the last weeks of the year 2019, the leading newspapers in Great Britain have been reporting the decision of the Oxford University authorities to initiate research into the responsibility of the academics involving themselves in the imperialism implemented to the detriment of India and the other colonies. The reference to India, in particular, has importance for the monumental irony that a magnificent, fully blossomed and matured as a sophisticated, universalist civilization would have been conquered and humbled into degradation as a colony by a small power skilled in the use of the master's whip.

Still buoyed by the memory of the glory of their imperial power maintained with raw violence, the British have, thanks to the magnanimity of the soul of India, continued to hold on to the illusion of imperial gloss with the mirage of potency as the Head of the Commonwealth, without King George VI and Queen Elizabeth II expressing a single word of contrition for all the genocidal sufferings which were deemed necessary to uphold imperial prestige as obedient service to the Defender of the Faith. In a marked moral contrast it is heartening to contemplate the genuine compassion on the part of the post-World War II German leaders who manifested their sorrow and regret for the Judeocide committed by the Nazis.[27] Chancellor Schmidt even went to Israel and knelt at the *Yad Vashem* memorial built to commemorate the victims of the mass killing of the Jews during the war. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Indian Independence, Queen Elizabeth II apologized to the Indians for the crime committed at Jalianwalla Bagh on 13 April 1919, that is, five months and two days after the Armistice signed on 11 November 1918, by the belligerent powers in the First World War. She must have thought that the Bengal Famine was not "worth" the English word "sorry"! For the Bengal Famine was the typically British euphemism for genocide of several millions of men, women, children dying slowing of hunger at the same time, in 1943-44, when the ovens at Auschwitz and Treblinka were belching smoke.

In the same vein, with equal absolute heartlessness, no Muslim has ever said: "Sorry" for the ravages of Dhimmitude, of Jaziya, of forced conversions, of the destruction of thousands of temples, of centres of high learning, of particularly the destruction of Indian Buddhism and of the Centre of Buddhist Studies at Nalanda and the burning of its library of manuscripts, as well as the massacre

---

[27] Susan Neiman's *Learning from the Germans* is an American Jewish author's recognition of the Germans expressing regret and atonement for the crime of Judeocide. Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, New York, 2019; 384 pp.+ Notes & Index

of the thousands of defenseless resident monks.

The hard-heartedness of the self-righteous Indian Muslim. On the contrary the Muslims, especially those of the Muslim League, supported by 75% of their co-Believers, found it convenient, with infinite self-righteousness, to reverse their history: cunningly they claimed *victimhood as their misfortune* and, consequently, they opted for not living as a minority, endowed with equal rights and privileges as they would have been in a free India peopled with a majority of Kaffirs. They succeeded by rousing the fanaticism of their followers with the slogan of "Islam is in danger", without any material or historical evidence to sustain the argument that they would be ill-treated by the majority Brahmanists in a free India.

The historic failure of the Brahmanists. What baffles comprehension in relation to this monstrous absurdity of a reversal of history stems from the elites of the Brahmanist political class manifesting neither the strength, nor the need, to refute this maleficent distortion of their own history. It does all the more astonish that none among the Muslim historians themselves has ever expressed the slightest scruple to correct this monumental misrepresentation of the history of their community. Their studied silence solidifies the falsehood of Muslim victimhood as a communal reality. Despite the long history of iconoclastic intolerance, despite the evidence of the horrors of Partition, the Muslim 'minority' continues to accredit its baseless victimhood as a means to extract, from the freedoms granted by the Constitution, meaning and justification for its exclusiveness which, cloaked as a minority, shackles the feet of the Brahmanist with the handicap of a soft extension of Partition. With the contents of the Quran being eternally valid and with the impossibility of any dialogue with the Muslim, the Brahmanists need to adopt a corresponding precaution, with quiet, unwavering steadfastness and with compassionate resolve to view

unmoved the eternal hatred of the Kaffir Other as the essence of Islamic piety.

The unfortunate history of Brahmanist indifference to the scriptures of the Muslims as the foundation of their hegemony. Despite the long history of sufferance administered with self-assured rectitude, in obedience to the dictates proffered by Allah, as the Seal of Divinity, and transmitted to the Prophet, the Seal of Prophecy, it is remarkable that few, if any, among Brahmanist intellectuals, academics, political leaders, sociologists, writers, media owners, have deemed it an imperative duty to study the Islamic scriptures in order to understand the ideas, the ideals, the individual and collective psychological characteristics, the will to change the course of History, the ethics and the intent of the Islamic forces which have unceasingly arrayed themselves against everything which the native Indians, faithful to the three Dharmas, hold as humane absolutes for a civilized way of life. This ignorance, on the part of the Brahmanists, surprises by the magnitude of its irresponsibility. It does so indeed, when one contemplates the antagonism against the Kaffir enjoined by a large number of Quranic verses. Such a disheartening insensitivity shocks and surprises for being an inverse image of the fact that, throughout the last fourteen centuries, none of the luminaries who have illustrated the history of Islam - Averroes, Ibn Sina, Firdausi, Ibn Khaldun, Al Ghazzali and so many others - seems to have been in any way concerned, or surprised, or disturbed by the extreme violence levelled by Allah against all those who do not subscribe to His Revelation. Either out of their ignorance, or of their endorsement of the prescribed Straight Path proclaimed in the first Surah, or of their agreement and conniving with Allah's obsessive abomination of the Kaffir however meritorious and virtuous the latter can be, their perduring silence nevertheless astounds the imagination in the presence of a world presided over by the institution of the United Nations. From among the fifty-seven Islamic nations

represented at the United Nations, which claim to represent the ideology of a universal egalitarianism, not a single voice has been raised so far in favor of at least a questioning of the relevance and the merit of the Islamic divine Law distinguishing the good Believers from the evil Disbelievers and of the divine postulate that the Kaffir is, in comparison with the Believer, a lesser human being, undeserving of the Believer's friendship or tolerance, for all time.

The strange avoidance of criticism of Allah's abomination of the Kaffir. It further confounds the imagination that, during the decades which preceded the Partition, the leaders of the Independence movement - Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru, Patel, Rajendra Prasad, K. M. Munshi, Rajagopalachari, Sarojini Naidu, to name a few, all of them highly educated and well read - would not have raised this significant component of the Muslim faith with, for example, Abdul Kalām Azad, who was a specialist in Islamic lore and jurisprudence.

How indeed could the leading lights among the Brahmanist leadership of the first half of the XX century, including even Tagore, not have been motivated to seek for an explanation of the collective psychology of the Muslim literati in the full view of the swelling tsunami of Muslim rejection of co-existence with the Brahmanist community, led for the most part by the generous, pacifist leadership of the Congress Party? And why did Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, learned in Islamic Studies, not refute the Muslim League leaders' policy of non-cooperation and, if he did exert himself, why did he fail to have his "better, peaceful, more humane" view prevail? But they all, the Brahmanists and the weightless minority of the Muslims, in their joint sincere commitment to the Independence Movement, provided no guidance, no understanding of the Ideas, of the Imperatives, stemming from the Revelation as the categorical deontology impelling an Islamic

rejection of the One-Nation doctrine. When one surveys the abundance of the published Gandhiana literature, the several books written by Nehru, the wealth of Tagore's literary production, one does not find a single page in which the question of ''why?'' would such a Muslim hatred emerge against their prestige, against the deserved adulation they had already won, not only from admiring fellow countrymen, but by intellectual elites in the rest of the world. Furthermore, it teases the mind that, even after Independence, even after the barbaric Partition apotheosis of the Muslim tradition of iconoclasm, there has been no subsequent interest among the Brahmanist educated society to seek for at least a minimal, but trustworthy, understanding of Muslim hostility. Y

The willful avoidance to see the evidence of Islamic hatred in full day light. Yet that hostility was there, written in black and white, in the Quran, as it still is, in the clearest prose, but unread and absent from inter-communal discourse. Indeed it bewilders the mind that despite the evidence - written in black on white, in the pages of the Holy Book, in the fourteen centuries of the violence of Islam, of its exclusivism, of its intolerance of any co-existence with a “different” culture branded as Kaffir, of the orgies of devastations of indigenous cultures, of the gigantic explosion of the Partition with its brutish execution of its anti-Hindu hatred – the Hindu still remains incapable to internalize the Muslim’s inexorable hatred of him, as a person, and of all that he stands for. The Arabic word “kuffr”, suggestive of what is most execrable, and its version as ‘Kaffir’ conveys the superlative intensity of the extent to which the Believer views the Other, in particular the Idol-Worshipper. The intensity of the hatred of the Other, in the context of the History of India, is characteristically demonstrated by the genocide of the large non-Idol-worshipping Buddhist community!

Understanding the Muslim psychology as the leitmotiv of this work. Most of the time Hindus write or speak about bits and pieces of the history of the Indian Islam. There is no dearth of biographies of distinguished Muslims, especially those who have actively cooperated in the different political parties and have won the affection of grateful Hindus. Yet there is not much evidence of

Hindus having been willing to explore the fundamentals of Islam: its psychology, its personalism, its substantial politics, the history of its intolerance, its advocacy of *jihad* and war as the obligatory activity for the attainment of the *Dar-ul-Islam*, its jurisprudence, the reasonableness or otherwise of its claim to be the best of all religions. Few in the Departments of History in the more than eleven hundred universities have committed themselves to delve into the archives, files, documents written in Persian and Arabic in order to accede to the facts pertaining to the history of the Indian Islam. The present representative of such research in Indian Islam happens to be a foreigner who has decided to settle, together with his family, in India.[28]

The importance to understand Indian Islam. The present study represents an attempt to understand the Islamic mind, particularly in regard to the fateful inevitability of the Indian Muslim's existence in Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina Kaffirdom. India presents the unique predicament which Fate has stipulated for the Indian Muslim community, being forced to co-exist with a majority of non-Muslims, ruled by laws not revealed by any supreme deity, but are products of human endeavor. Most Kashmiri Muslim separatists have – apparently – no shared concern with the Muslims in the rest of the country; few among the latter, if any, ask themselves, in return, why do the Kashmiri Muslims not entertain a sentiment of solidarity with them under the aegis of the Sharia. The Kashmiri separatist Muslims comfortably entertain the ambiguity of hostility towards the Indian Harbi Republic, while they do never express the desire to seek their fulfillment by migrating to Pakistan, in imitation of the minorities in Pakistan who seek refuge in India, for whom the enactment of the CAA (Citizenship Amendment Act) Law was popularly deemed humanely necessary out of compassion for all non-Muslims seeking refuge in India away from Pakistan and Bangladesh. The hostility which Indian Muslims manifested against the CAA law revealed the extent of

[28] Having made India home for himself and his family, William Dalrymple writes, fortunately, with credible faithfulness about Medieval India by an extensive use of documents written in Persian. His work and his example could stimulate imitations by native Historians for an increasingly better understanding of Islamic Indian History.

their incapability to grasp the humanity evinced by the Indian Government in favor of the victims of their co-Believers' persisting intolerance after Partition. Their objection to the CAA law disclosed the closed-mindedness of all the strata of the Muslim Kaum: the crowds protesting in the streets against Indian compassion, in favor of the victims of Muslim intolerance in the two Theocracies, were supported by the silence of the intellectuals and of the educated without their making any effort to instruct their co-believers to have the right understanding of the logic justifying the reasonability of the CAA legislation. It was a characteristic example of the irrationality pervading the collective psychology of the Muslim community shamelessly erupting as mobs spewing hateful slogans.

The hasty propensity of the Muslim mind to react to the slightest contrary opinion. The collective impetuous irrationality of the Muslim community results from the contents of the revelations and from the habit of thinking which they foster. It is not a quark of the race. Kashmiri Muslims are the descendants of former converted Hindus, as are the bulk of the Indian Muslims. In truth, Kashmiri Muslim separatism is a continuation of the basic hostility which the Quran so emphatically enjoins in relation to the Other. And their hostility to India is more intense due to their being converts and descendants of converts. There is actually more amicable relations between the Arab nations and India than between the Indian Muslims and the India in which they have been living during the past many centuries.The hatred is instilled in the collective imagination since the earliest childhood, by the family, later by the congregation, with the further indoctrination by the belief being assumed to be shared by the entire Umma. It becomes a totalitarian mass psychology which, while dimming the personal responsibility of the individual, does nevertheless harden his belief by its transmogrification into the fanatical claim of owning an imperative truth.

The petulant irascibility of the Muslim. In reality the impetuous mobility of the mind makes it easy for the Muslim to move easily into a violent mood at the slightest disturbance caused most often by the usually misconstruing of the thought or intention of the Other. It is the mercurial temperament of the Believer which

facilitates the expression of his touchiness at the slightest sensation of being criticized or opposed. It is a profoundly inbuilt atavism in the collective mind of the Islamic society that it can instantly gather a marching movement of protesting crowds shouting righteousness in the name of The God. That is why, even in Europe, where there is no Harbi space, both the Jew and the Christian do not today benefit from any protection, in spite of the Holy Book asseverating, that they too are dear to Allah for He had magnanimously offered them cognate revelations.

The specific characteristic Muslim's mobility in conjunction with his confinement. In the new post-Partition age, the Kashmiri Muslim displays a cultural outlook determined by a mentality riven by two contradictory impulses: *mobility* and *confinemen*t. From the moment of its birth and of the first tremor as the new Faith broke out as a new Force in Arabia on the fringe of the frontier of the Greco-Roman empire, Islam hurled itself across the sparsely peopled North African territory until it reached Spain on the West. Within a few decades it was further able to cut across a vast landscape beyond the Indus to the East. All along, the new faith triumphantly collided with, and rolled over, a variety of well perfected cultures in relation to which it remained confined within the bounds sealed for all time by Allah. This double feature of *mobility* and *confinement* is prodigiously evident in the conflicts generated by the Muslim migrants in democratic, secular Europe during the last decades, especially since the 1970s.

The compulsive mobility of the peoples motivated by the dualistic Revelations. It is no accident, or whim of Fate, that throughout history the peoples whirled by the revealed religions have manifested *the collective trait of mobility.*[29] The contradiction consists of the absence of reflection on this significant cultural dimension of the dualistic faiths in a transcendental God out-there in Heaven. If the Christian, for instance, really believed that God had come to him as the Word made Flesh, why would he have felt

---

[29] In *Bilan de l'Histoire*, written shortly after the end of the World War II, René Grousset refers to the mobility of the Germans who, within a century, twice rushed out of their frontiers to attach their neighbors on the West and on the East.

the need to seek unexplored spaces, to generate territorial expansions, to wreak violence and death on other peoples for the sake of satisfying material wants? If the Muslim had received the laws, the rules, the principles as the viaticum for the life journey along the Straight Path, why would the Believers have felt the need to rush out of Arabia and ride across the whole stretch of Christian land up to the Pyrenees? In comparison, why did the Oriental spiritual traditions, the Indian and the Chinese, in particular, did not leave their "homes" in search of material satisfactions beyond their borders, all the more when they had full possession of the man-power, the material and technological means and the wealth, besides the arts, for easy colonizations?

The absence in the West of a critical examination and awareness of cultural mobility. Somehow such a monumental historical difference, between the cultures inspired by the Bible and the Oriental ways of life determined by their mostly contemplative mystical doctrines, seemingly do not attract the attention of the learned class in the West. Western historians do not deem it worthy of their curiosity to explore this evident difference, while they do not fail to praise the superiority of the Western civilization measured by its historical ascendancy hinged to military superiority and to a way of blending amoral duplicity with politics. Often historians of the empires labor to justify the earlier ideologues of the imperialist dominations the authors of which boasted of extending the benefactions of the Christian civilization to the inferior African and Oriental cultures which fell prey to their politics of rapacity and profit. It was a self-gratifying attitude classically summed up with Rudyard Kipling's popular three words shibboleth of the "White Man's Burden"!

In reality there exist few, in any, indisputable studies published by Western historians providing an honest, objective evaluation of the colonial sources of the funding of the Industrial Revolution, led by Great Britain in its dehumanizing practice of the famishing of the prosperous and peaceful Indian civilization. It was a mighty, colossal sinfulness exalted as imperial grandeur and presided over by the Defender of the Faith. In India, the savage capitalism was indulged in with the blessings of the Protestant and the Catholic Churches animated more by inspiration drawn from Barabbas,

than by the sublime humanity of Jesus! And, unfelt by the British people themselves, it was an impoverished India which, on being freed from the burden of the British Dracula, evinced the elegance of collaborative friendship and of cooperation, in a monumental imitation of Jesus prescribing the turning of the other cheek after having been slapped on the other. No Theologian, in London or in Canterbury, noticed that Indian magnanimity which the priestly tribe is trained to celebrate as abstractions, but fail to acknowledge its historical evidence. India thus revealed that the sentiment which Jesus unveiled on the Cross had been a naturally effortless integral part of the magnanimity of the *sanātana dharma* bequeathed by the Vedic sages and such luminaries as the sages and the forest-dwelling mystical searchers who gave to Humanity their noblest representative, the Prince who found the Way to promote Universal salvation, as the experience of the personal, individual *Arhat* state attained as the culmination of contemplation. And it was in the midst of such a civilization that on the fateful day of the massacre at the Jalianwalal Bagh, General Reginald Dyer declared, with infinite Luciferan sanctimoniousness, his massacring a peaceful gathering to be a "moral lesson taught to the Indian people"!

The reason of the absence of mobility in the culture of the original Indian people. At no time did the early Indians, as well as the other major Oriental populations, feel the impulse to leave their homelands and travel to other lands in the quest of a satisfaction of some undefined yearning. Unquestioningly it is the paramount distinctiveness of the Revelations which would have fostered, among the Muslims and later the Christians, the collective passion impelling the personal and cultural obligation to leave their homelands and rush across vast open spaces in search of the satisfaction responding to the undefined feeling of a wanting.

The absence of mobility in the original Indian culture. At the same time, the early Indians, dwelling on the vast sub-continent, had nurtured a mentality of aversion to any settlement in a foreign territory. For a long time it was the fashion of Westerners and of Westernized Indians to feel superior to conservative upper caste Hindus on account of the latter's scruple of losing the

cleanliness pertaining to their *varṇa* (caste) by contact with other people living in a different country. Indeed for a long time, during the XX century, Westerners ridiculed this 'superstition' entertained by the upper caste Indian. It is known that Mahatma Gandhi's father had to resist the pressure of those who were against his sending his son to study Law in England.

There is no room or reason for mobility in Plenitude. Further, the Western educated man or woman still does not grasp Lao Tzu quietly observing that the wise man, that is, the Tao-ed Man, does not wish to go even to the nearest village whence he can hear a dog bark. Nor does the Christian reflect on his search for profit and glory beyond the seas as a contradiction of the belief that God had, out of His infinite Love, come down to redeem his Original Sin, at the cost of his martyrdom. It is indeed a cause for wonder that in two thousand years the Indian Christian, among all Humanity, would not have noticed that while his European co-believers were roaming the seas out of lust driven by the desire for profiting, for enslaving and for colonizing, his Hindu neighbor remained at home with the quiet confidence that the Supreme Being did not dwell out "There!" but in the "Here" of his psychic space. Most surprisingly, no one, among the Indian Christians themselves, seems to have noticed that, like the native Indians, the Indian Christianity never adopted the feature of mobility which does so abundantly characterize the history of West European Christianity. But, manifesting a significant difference, the Indian Muslims do most potently represent the vigorous mobility of the Believers, inaugurated almost immediately following the birth of Islam in Medina.

It is evident that the Heaven-centric Revelations do accord plenitude and fulfillment in a post-mortem benefaction in Paradise, "over there, above!" The Revelations debunk the importance and the value of life on the surface of a disenchanted world, the cosmic art work of Jehovah. It was a healthy sentiment which the

Christian experienced in his life, a sense of want which the revelation-doctrine did not, and could not, and still cannot, offer to the faithful adherent to the Faith. In a dramatic contrast the Brahmanist feels at home with his co-essentiality with the Essence of the Plenitude. Likewise, the Chinese feels at home in being coterminous with the Tao. The Japanese learns to see the sacred all around him, as a *kami.* The quality of Humanity as Fullness provides the stability necessary and desirability of "staying at home", of not thinking of going far to seek completion of the dissatisfaction which the hope for Paradise could not satisfy. Mobility is the direct consequence of the duality of Man-Here and God-There, of Physis and Meta-physis, of Incompleteness with Fulfillment-There. The cosmic evidence of Mobility could never stir the theological bureaucracy of the Church in Europe to examine the spiritual vacuum which fed the passion for the Christian Pilgrim to seek personal plenitude in places beyond the seas. When Meister Eckhart declared that the Father begets the Son in him, he was exposing the personal experience of the mystical fullness of a high experience. But such an existential conclusion of the professed belief was hostile to the standard dogma promulgated by the Church authorities who summoned Eckhart to the Inquisition. The treatment of the Gnostics as a heretics constitutes another chapter of the clerical bureaucracy's hostility to the search of self-fulfillment on Earth. The Church bears an immense responsibility in the success of its denial to the pilgrim for the personal striving for the self-fulfillment in the body, here, on the Earth, without proposing any real proposition or a reliable *modus vivendi* having its finality on Earth. The mind is bewildered that the Indian Christianity would have spent two thousand years and more without discerning the incompleteness of the Christian experience defined and guarded by the Church in Rome. With limitless rejoicing, the indigenous Dharmas based on the magnificence of the Vision of the One, the Plenitude, assures, with perfect justice and truth, the authenticity of the *sanātana* durability of the inexhaustible bliss assured by the certitude of self-perfectibility as the essence of Humanity in regard to which there is No-Thing-There!

The termination of mobility in the dualistic revelations. The twentieth century constitutes a watershed in world history

when the mobility of the European imperialisms came to an end. Wars of conquest have been replaced with guerilla warfare, with different intensities and purposes. In particular the Middle East persists in its turbulent tradition according to which the three dominant mobilities – the Jewish, the Christian, the Islamic – continue to clash among one another, in fervent faithfulness to the religious intolerances which have their common source in the Old Testament, in the Idea of Jehovah being the Only God, as the source of *all* the configurations of Intolerance.

The exception of the Oriental cultures, particularly of India and China. In a stark contrast which has escaped the attention of the entire spectrum of academic historians, India and China never colonized any people or territory, though, for centuries, they had the wealth, the manpower, the technology to do so, but did not. The only time, when Indians evinced any mobility to leave their borders to go and kill and be killed, happened in the two world wars as colonial mercenaries, legally compelled to be drawn into the conflicts. Hindus in particular claim legitimate pride that in ten thousand years, out of a natural cultural bent for moral *constraint,* they did not colonize, or exploit, or famish a foreign people for either profit or for glory. For the followers of the native Dharmas the only conquest that matters relates to the search for the cognition of the Ultimate Reality as self-perfection, in the immediate experience of sitting, of walking, of speaking.

The question of the Kashmiri Muslims. Against this background in which the characteristic of *mobility* is attributed to the followers of the revealed dispensations, the question of the Kashmiri Muslims becomes easy to grasp. Its *mobility* gets frustrated by the limitation of their not being able to express it beyond the perimeter of their province. In addition, this *physical constraint*, forced by geographical and historical circumstances, gets hardened by the *submission to the mental constraint* concomitant with the belief in the unchanging, eternally perfect revelation communicated to Muhammad and subsequently written as the contents of the Holy Book. Such a *constraint* is unique, it is specific to the Muslim's *Weltanschauung.* The Believer would lose his identity were he to exert the freedom of independent thought and seek a way of life away from the stultifying closed finality of the Quranic

text, concurrently with the integrity of faithfulness to his tradition.

The satisfaction with the *confinement* enables the recognition of the specific *reason* which justifies it. It recalls the satisfaction of the frog which is satisfied with the narrow space of the well and with the perception of the sky conforming to the area of the well's opening. The Migrant Muslim in France, for example, retains his myopia and does not see the vastness of the French cultural landscape. He feels the pressure of the desire for the comfort of his *confinement* which is vital for his identity and his will to *move and seek* a space for the adaptation of his independent civilization *within the vast territory of French culture.*

The particular case of the Islamic 'Kasmiariyat'. Hence the dichotomy within Indian Islam has come up with the Kashmiri Muslim claiming, apart from the rest of the Indian Muslim pseudo-minority, the distinctiveness of "Kashmiriyat", which is in reality a bloated myth of upper crust sacrosanct privilege. Nevertheless the future holds the possibility, if not the certainty, of a *mobility* propelled by economic forces emerging from the integration of the state with the rest of the country. *As a matter of hope*, such a prospect will lead to a sociological coalescence in which the desired peacefulness will find its center of gravity in an enlightened amicable *citizenship* rather than in the myth of a Quranic perfection eternally resistant to the demands of active brotherhood open to embracing the Kaffirs

The Kashmiri Muslims and the power of a minority "*inferiorizing*" a majority. If, in view of the above exposition of the dominant features of the Muslims as a cohesive community, the Kashmiri minority, were to insist on "*inferiorizing*" the Kaffir majority by violent means, it will find itself further confined to a political impotence which will degrade its collective 'Kasmiriyat' personality. As such it would limit itself as a prolongation of the Partition and thereby give persuasive proof that the violence of the Muslim League makes no difference to them, just as the *Ahiṁsā* of Mahatma Gandhi had no appeal to the near totality of the pre-Independence Indian Muslims. Most Muslims preferred the calamitous volcanic outburst of Partition to a peaceful co-existence for the building of a synthetic civilization the like of which has

never existed, nor will it ever be born. Those who stayed in India, by the force of geographic compulsions, still feel the warmth and the nostalgia of the hot wind which blew over them in the middle of the XX century. But today, with hindsight, it is convenient and sober to ask what are the cultural elements of an Indian Islamic *Enlightenment* which could creatively blend, in a lasting synthesis, with the soul-elevating features of the universalist Dharmas and their accompanying fine arts and wisdoms? In Europe migrant Islam does not produce a synthesis commensurate with the wonderful Gandhara civilization which homogeneously united the Greek with the Indian Buddhist cultures.

Muslims in Harbi India: unique in the world. The Muslims who have migrated to Europe find themselves in the environment of Christians, whom the Quran declares to be Believers, equally faithful to the tradition of the Book. In India the Muslim finds himself in a totally alien *Harbi* environment, where the people and the rulers are Kaffirs. The Muslims of Pakistan and of Bangladesh have the satisfaction and ease of mind due to their being ruled by Believers and they feel superior to the Muslims who stayed behind and got stuck within a fraction of the *Dar-ul-Harb*. It does not offend the mind or the heart of the Indian Muslim that the Brahmanists and Sikhs in Bangladesh or in Pakistan live as second-class citizens according to the Constitutions of these countries. Indian Muslim journalists writing in Pakistani newspapers, for example, do never hesitate to attribute negative characteristics to the politics of India. Intellectually they do not seem to notice the paradox of their strictures on what obtains in India, regarding the fair treatment of the Muslim community, in the contrast with their silence on the constitutional inequality which downgrades the civic status of the Kaffir in Pakistan and in Bangladesh.

The necessity of Brahmanist vigilance against falling into *Dhimmitude* due to Muslim cunning. Any observer of the Indian society knows that the multiplicity of beliefs, customs, preferences, has its specific historical causes characterized by the conjunction of a variety of races, beliefs, cultures. In view of a right understanding of what the future holds, it behooves the observer to grasp the importance of, in particular, the future role of the

Muslim community, its exclusiveness, its assumed or real demographic weakness, and how it defines itself in its relation to the Kaffir majority.

It is therefore important to understand the Muslim's mind, his sentiments and his actions, the psychology of contentment in his exclusiveness and in his zeal to maintain a certain vertical distance above the Kaffir. The knowledge of all these traits must be viewed as an opening into an in-depth acquaintance with the attractiveness of Islam to a vast multitude of intelligent men and women and of the latter's will to make all mankind a *Dar-ul-Islam*. The overriding obligation will be an effort to understand how a community, galvanized by an inferior ideology, could for a long time prevail upon a higher civilization and, by ravaging it, claim it as glory without feeling any compunction for the devastations wrought by its organic iconoclasm.

The Islamic *inferiorizing* of Europe. What happened on a large scale in India due to Islamic hegemony is at present being acted out against the national cultures of Western Europe where the *Dhimma* is being reborn not by means of military might, but, as in India since 1947, by the cunning of using the existing liberal, secular constitutions, against the host societies and their ways of life. Accordingly the culturally inferior minorities take advantage of the "Universality of the Inalienable Rights of Man and of the Citizen" decreed by the United Nations in 1945, for the institutionalization of *Hallal*, *Niqab*, and of even saying mass prayers in streets, in regions where there is no Masjid for the use of the local Muslim agglomeration. French elites now recognize that the ensuing social aberrations brought forth by an uncontrolled migration, urged by the political will of particularly leftist European intellectuals, has become detrimental to the host cultures of Europe. Concurrently *Dhimmitude* is back in India. It began with the "majoritarian community" bending backward to please the pseudo-minority institutionalized as Vote Bank, instead of undertaking the essential repairs of the damages incurred during the centuries of Islamic and British hegemonies. The venture of exploring the territory of Islamic thought and its prospects within the Indian Republic is meant and designed to serve as a warning to help the native majority of Indians for the recognition of the revival of

Dhimmitude which, disguised as Hindu generosity or tolerance, gnaws into the body of a great mystical culture, the only one which, without Force, has been nurtured in India for the welfare of all Humanity. The resulting awakening may be further useful if perchance the arguments and discussions initiated in these pages were to provide to the citizen of a Western democracy a certain awareness of the danger of falling into the *Dhimma* of the new age devised by Muslim cunning.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Quran: Part I

It has become evident by now that our work relates entirely to a right perception and understanding of Islam being a political force more than as a religion limited to the five fundamental obligations, beside the duty of Jihad.[1]The second chapter on the choleric verses provides the Quran's contrapositive view of the Kaffir with respect to the revealed truths which instill pride and devotion in the heart of the Believer. We also acknowledge the indebtedness which an educated elite in Judeo-Christian Europe recognizes in relation to the contributions which the Arab civilization has made to the blossoming of Medieval Christianity, though recent scholarship has convincingly argued, on the basis of new evidence, that the Arab contribution has been unduly exaggerated. The spread of Islam in the Mediterranean coincided with the early centuries of Christianity rising from the remainder of the Roman Empire in the last phase of its decline. Richard Wagner writes that the only original contribution which Christianity has brought to Europe has been Music. The Greeks had already produced all the components of high culture: architecture, social laws, political organization, philosophy, literature, fine arts. We are not concerned with the history of the contributions which Islam made to the Christian society emerging in the midst of the Greco-Roman Europe. We wish to emphasize that, when the first wave of Muslim invasion occurred in the Indian sub-continent, India had already established and developed a sophisticated material and moral civilization for more than several thousands of years. Indeed India had

---

1 The five obligatory exercises are: recitation of the *kalima*, that is, Allah is the sole God and Muhammad is his Prophet, prayer, charity for the poor tax, fasting during the month of Ramadan, pilgrimage at least once in a lifetime to the sacred Kaba in Mecca. While the Quran in 2.256 asserts there is no constraint in religion, and while j*ihad* is supposed to be an interior spiritual struggle, Islamic theologians do approve military action in order to preserve the security of the Islamic community. In the history of al-Andalus *jihad* was considered as the primary duty of the Muslim. As the modus operandi for the Partition of India, Jinnah's Direct Action was the euphemism for *jihad*.

architecture, social laws, urban planning, fully developed and sophisticated philosophies, a plurality of spiritual ways of life with their specific scriptures and accomplished iconographies, the fine arts, a literature distinguished by high learning and aesthetic magnificence, institutions of higher learning, industries generating the wealth and the prosperity which attracted so many invaders.

The installation of the permanent state of Islamic violence. In this splendid, well-ordered civilization the Muslims came not to add to what they found, but to reduce and wreck and to Islamize. In Europe Islam earned credit and praise as a result of the contributions which the Christian and Jewish scholars offered with their translations of the works of the Greek Philosophers from Arabic into Latin. They helped the Medieval Christians to discover the intellectual wealth of their Antiquity which led to the blossoming of the spectacular science of Theology which has been the mainstay of the Christian tradition down to the present time. In India Islam came upon a mature, fully developed, culturally pluralistic civilization, endowed with superlative moral, aesthetic and intellectual brilliance. In such a magnificent, luminous sub-continental culture, distinct from the Semitic revelations displayed in the Old Testament of the Bible, the Believers, motivated by the intolerant revelations of Allah, rushed in, during the VIII century, to install an iconoclastic ravaging which had its one more murderous Illustration with the havoc and mayhem of Partition in 1946-47, followed by three wars and decades of terrorist attacks.

The purpose of this essay. What follows shall explicate a Kaffir's perception of Islam within the perspective that, contrary to what it might have brought to the enrichment of European culture, in India it chose to destroy a lot without giving anything in return as replacement. We are sensitive to the achievements of Muslims in their empire stretched along the southern rim of the Mediterranean and in the original lands of the Arabs. We recognize the love and the pride which Arabs, in particular, manifest with regard to their literature, their jurisprudence, their arts and sciences. We start with the conviction, as the premise for this work, that the Indian sub-continent would have been a more humane, more beautiful, more peaceful, more beneficent part of the planet without the presence of Allah's believers. It is a definition of our approach based on, as objective as can be possible from a Kaffir dispassionate approach, the meaning which Islam has adduced to the history of the Indian sub-continent. The interested reader will find it easy, by browsing, according to taste and intention, among the easily available copious literature, in a number of

languages, on the Quran, in order to acquire a judicious understanding of the Holy Book. However, for the purpose of this essay it will be sufficient to refer to *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought of Islam* by Mohammad Iqbal and to *The Basic Concepts of the Quran*, by Syed Abdul Latif, which is a resume of the views advanced in the commentary of *Sūra al-Fātiha, the Opening Chapter of the Quran*, by Abdul Kalām Azad. The choice of these two works has been determined by two well-known representatives of Islam: Mohammad Iqbal, who lived and died in India, is universally regarded in the Islamic world as the ideologue of the creation of the separate state of Pakistan, and Abdul Kalām Azad who acquired prominence in the struggle for the independence of the sub-continent from British rule.

The relative insignificance of *the Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Among the Muslim intelligentsia of the first half of the XX century, Iqbal acquired some notoriety for his studying for a doctoral degree in Philosophy in a German University. It was on his return from Germany that he gave a series of lectures which were published as *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Reading this book can prove to be quite trying indeed for its dry-as-dust style which makes going through the whole of it quite an ordeal. It is a shallow piece of sterile prose. There is no evidence in his *Reconstruction* of any acquaintance with Arthur Schopenhauer who developed further the Kantian metaphysics in the light of his discovery of the Indian speculative thought. Iqbal makes it quite transparent that his knowledge of German Philosophy amounted to a symbolic acquaintance with Kant without his having the slightest curiosity to wade through the dense tradition which would have enabled him to be acquainted with Friedrich Nietzsche's denunciation of the entire range of Western Philosophy following his discovery of Buddhist thought in the work of Emile Burnouf and his acquaintance with Vedānta due to his contact with his classmate, the Sanskritist Paul Deussen. He would have been familiar with the *Upaniṣads* which Deussen had translated besides his excellent appraisal of the magnificent *Advaita Vedānta.* Iqbal's *The Reconstruction ā*ets weakened by the frequent references to secondary and tertiary level American academic philosophers who are scarcely remembered. It is lamentable that Iqbal makes no reference to the Islam of the two centuries when it reigned supreme during the Abbassid Dynasty in Baghdad, during the seventh to ninth centuries. Despite Iqbal's being known with genuine respect among a certain elite in Pakistan, it is Ala Maududi who has exerted a trenchant, fundamentalist influence on the theocratic *raison d'être* of the Pure

State. Consequently we shall explore the ideas of Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, proven and acclaimed scholar in Islamic Studies, eminent leader of the Congress Party, which he served as President on several occasions. His perception of the Quran, in the context of the history of Indian Islam has legitimacy and relevance for the purpose of this essay.

The symbolic significance of Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad as President of the Congress Party. Let it be said at the outset that, in the sum total of the action produced by the Indian leadership, with Mahatma Gandhi positioning himself as the spearhead of the Independence Movement, the Mawlānā at best remained throughout the dramatic 1930s and 1940s as a mere decorative symbol. With 85% of the Indian Muslims being won over to the idea of a separate state for the community, the Mawlānā, despite his deep understanding and knowledge of Islamic history and lore, proved to be just a light feather easily blown away by the popularity of Mohamed Ali Jinnah who, with his knowledge of British law, and his ignorance of Islamic thought and jurisprudence, could nevertheless win the allegiance of the majority of the Muslims. Within the Indian Muslim community, it was the thoroughly educated anglicized Middle Class which could win over the majority of the untutored lumpen Muslim proletariat. Mawlānā Kalām Azad and his like associates were actually dead weights, dressed and posturing as symbolic props of inter-communal cohesion, which proved to be ineffective against the attractiveness of the Two-Nation doctrine adopted by the Muslim League. In the face of the popularity of the future Pakistan to be a repetition of Medina, the first Islamic State, there is no evidence of the Mawlānā's opposing that campaign with the naked truth of Medina being, during the lifetime of Muhammad, an area of constant conflict and of murderous violence. In Medina Muhammad had to be buried in his own home by his family, for his companions could not agree upon a convenient, deserving burial place. And the social condition of the "ideal" city was marked by the fact of three of the first four caliphs being murdered.

The demand for Partition by the educated, anglicized Muslim Middle Class. On an immense scale, the raving enthusiasm for Partition was a dramatic manifestation of the conquest of the minds of the 85% by the Indian portion of the Umma by leaders who, steeped in a veneer of English culture, could overwhelm the efforts of traditional Islamic thinkers like those of the Deoband School of Islamic Theology and of scholarly literati like Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad. Somehow the Muslim masses evinced more responsiveness to the fanatical hatred

of the Hindus and of the Sikhs in awakened congruity with the Quranic injunctions of hostility to the non-believing Kaffir Other. It was sufficient to shout "Islam is in danger" to rouse the Muslim masses against the Hindu-Sikh humanity, in utter contempt of those Muslims, who opposed the Two-Nation Doctrine of the Muslim League with the impotence of a vain, pathetic search for an inexistent scriptural authority advocating an enlightened inter-communal brotherliness. As we proceed with the examination of the thoughts of Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad, we may be tempted to acknowledge their yielding to the contempt which Jinnah heaped upon him as unrepresentative of the Muslim community. Victim of Muslim League fanaticism, the Mawlānā was denounced as a sham, put forth by the Hindu leaders of the Congress Party, serving as a political ruse to frustrate the liberation of the minority from the inevitable oppression by Hindus in a free India. Indeed the learned Mawlānā and the Deoband Theologians could not, and did not, see that there was nothing in their Scriptures which lent itself to the ideology of the One-Nation, in spite of their own individual, humane but marginal, individual concerns for a possible, peaceful communal co-existence. Nor could they overrule the many revealed verses of the Quran which provided fodder to the hatred and the rage of the Believers feeding the fundamentalist convulsion of the Muslim League against the Gandhian pacifism of mainly the Congress Party.

Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad's restoration of the Qur'ān to its pristine purity. The Mawlānā reveals his decision to vindicate the purity and the excellence of the Quranic revelation by means of an interpretation which eliminates the occluding excrescences deriving from Greek thought and science. "The tragedy of the legacy bequeathed by the Qur'ān is that, no sooner had the first generation of believers passed away, even before the second century of the Hidjra was over, the influence of Greek thought introduced through translations of Greek works on philosophy and science began to invade the Muslim mind."[2] This led to the loss of the simplicity of the original approach to the Holy Book. It resulted in the commentaries written by scholars giving to the Quranic word a meaning which it was not meant to have. In his 3-volume *Tarjumān al-Quran* the Mawlānā states his duty to effect the needed corrections, with the intention of restoring the Holy Book to its initial Arabic sources, before it got mixed up with Ajami or non-Arab meanings.

[2] *Basic Concepts of the Quran*, henceforth indicated as BCQ, p. viii

The decision to return to the origin or to the purity of a doctrine has always been a recurrent commitment by idealistic reformers willing to set back a way of life along lines unsullied by a departure alien to original purposes. In *The Light of Truth* (*satyārtha prakāśa*) Swāmi Dayānanda quotes chapter and verse from the Vedas to buttress his resolve to restore to the Hindu society its pristine norms and its way of life, divested of the distorting accretions which have nearly smothered the authenticity of what it ought to be. In a similar fashion a lot of academic Biblical criticism was aimed at the restoration of the original, uncorrupted text in order to present the sacred scripture in its genuinely pure form in order to reset Christian practice as it was among the first generation of the faithful. Whatever may be the honourable impulse for the restoration of a religious tradition back to its origin, the imperative of the influence of changing social, economic, political circumstances will always force changes and adjustments exacted by the pressure of Time passing. The lesson, taught in a school primer, that Matter is inert, happens to be the primal Untruth taught in an introductory Physics prescribed for elementary education. The whole world whirls in a perpetual movement. There is nothing which is inert, static. Above all, a religious tradition can never remain stationary. The belief that a religion must not change, usually for the better, appeals to the fundamentalist, to the fanatic, to the Muslim user of violence and of intolerance as sincerity and faithfulness to a subjective assumption of the existence of a Supreme Being, in reference to which, an atheist would agree with Stendhal saying: "The only excuse of God is that he does not exist!" The path to *mokṣa* skirts around the allurements of Paradise and the fears of Hell. When eminent theologian, Pope Benedict XVI, says that Heaven does physically exist, though it has not yet been found, one can shrug off such a statement of faith with a benevolent smile of amused tolerance.

Mawlānā Azad's vision of the ideal Quran. Maulānā Abdul Kalām Azad recognizes that the Quran was not a planned execution. It was delivered piecemeal to the Messenger during a period of twenty-three years marked by changing circumstances. Initially the revelations were collected and implemented in a form which came to be considered as the standard interpretation. But the distortions arose from the bewildering interventions of interpreters who added new, alien meanings to the original text. In particular the Maulānā expresses his aversion to what he considers the 'pagan' dimension of the anthropomorphic accretions to the concept of Divinity and its

attributes. In particular the Mawlānā resents the influence of Neo Platonist esoteric mysticism encroaching upon what was exoteric or mundane in the Quran.[3] His purpose consists of re-presenting the authenticity of the original Holy Book and the simple directness of its language. He set himself to this task while being active in the politics of his generation while laboring to structure a specific method of interpretation with the distinction offered by the Quran between Dīn and Shar'a and Minhaj. The Dīn was given by the Prophets to every community. It is not clear what the Maulānā means by saying that every community was given a Dīn by a Prophet. For the expression "every community" would not include any of the three Dharmas of India, or of any religious or philosophical doctrine obtaining in other civilizations. The Orientals, in particular, got blessed since the beginning of time by the Biblical Prophets ignoring them and thereby allowing tolerance to prevail in their civilizations.

Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad's failure to project an Islam specific to the history and culture of the sub-continent. The monumental example of the fossilization of the Indian Christianity remained unperceived by the Maulānā throughout his exceptional career marked by the various religious agitations whirling the different communities into hurlies of raw violence. In the midst of a cultural milieu where they did not suffer from any humiliation or oppression, the Indian Christians could have broadened the horizon of their Faith with a mystical orthodoxy centered on the Holy Spirit. Instead they chose to remain within the cocoon of their quietness zealously maintained in an alienating imitation of all the external symbolisms of the Western form of Christianity. There is little knowledge available of the first four centuries of the Christianity of Jesus when it was still uncorrupted by politics before it got altered into a state ideology by Emperor Constantine in 323 A.D., even though the Emperor himself was not then a Christian. He was baptized shortly before his death in 337 at the age of forty-nine years. Yet the mind is bewildered by the fact that the Indian Christians have lived through two thousand years without evincing the slightest awareness of the fundamentals of Christian Orthodoxy having been borrowed from the Indian Dharmas. Indeed they never manifested any intellectual sign of grasping these borrowings and striving to establish on them the foundation of a theology based on the concept of the Holy Spirit.[4] The possibility of a

[3] BCQ, p. ix

[4] These are the similarities: confession invented by Gautama Buddha for

Theology of the Holy Spirit, calling for a corresponding mystical belief and practice, still stands as a challenge facing the Indian Christian community. A similar hypothetical development in Indian Islam with a specifically Indian theological pronouncement and practice could have been initiated by Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad. He claimed to be a committed partner of the Hindus in a common struggle for the independence of the Indian people, while staking all his intellectual energies in a reconstruction of the Quran, as if in answer to the call of Mohammad Iqbal, rather than building up a mystical Islam in tune with the mystical Dharmas, Such an Islam would have been specific to India, with a universality in harmony with an India ennobled by the citizen's fullness of living in a land of Light (*jyotis*), of Being (*sat*) and of Immortality (*amaṛtvam*).

The Islamic law according to the Mawlānā. Sharia is the Law, or the Code of conduct. Mawlānā Azad stresses that the Sharia has varied, as warranted by the exigencies of time and conditions of life prevailing among different sections of mankind. With hindsight one cannot resist attributing an immense hypocrisy in the Mawlānā arguing: "The Quranic recommendation is therefore not to wrangle over these variations, so long as they do not belie the basic ideology. What should primarily matter is the ideology, the Dīn, a firm belief in the Unity of God expressing itself in righteous action such as shall operate for the unity of man."[5]

With his advocacy of a return to the pristine purity of the Quran and its laws, the cynicism of the Mawlānā's hypocrisy gets brought into the full light of the liberation of Muslim Womanhood when, in 2019, the Loka Sabhā and the Rājya Sabhā, under the majority of elected Hindu representatives, enacted the law qualifying, as a criminal offense, the

---

the monks, the Sangha as the idea and model for the Ecclesia and later of the Umma, the Buddhist refuge in the Buddha, in the Dharma, in the Sangha = the refuge in the Holy Trinity; the belief of the immaculate conception of Gautama Buddha; renunciation as a pre-requisite of spirituality as the ideal adopted for the celibacy of the Catholic Priest; the Nicene Creed based on the *Tri-Kāya* doctrine of the *Dharma-Kāya, Nirmāna-Kāya, Sambhoga-Kāya;* the concept of the Word coming down to History and to Time in the world as Flesh (Jesus) is borrowed from the Indian *avaṭāra* of ViÃÏu; proselytizing was invented by A±oka in the 3rd century B.C.; the concept of the Kingdom repeatedly mentioned by Jesus corresponds to the concept of either *NirvāÏa or Mokãa;* the halo above the head of saints is a copy of the circular disk behind the image of Buddha either standing or sitting. These similarities all have one common denominator: the Hindu-Buddhist artefacts *historically precede* their inclusion or adoption in the Christian dispensation.

[5]BCQ, p. xi

Muslim husband's arbitrary use of the Triple *Talāk* to definitively divorce his wife, according to the Sharia jurisprudence. Nor does the Mawlānā recommend the maintaining of the penal law according to the Sharia.

Islam as a regression compared to the ethos of Christianity. Even then there is no indication in the Mawlānā's conservative view of the Qur'ān that Jesus preaching forgiveness of the enemy is infinitely superior to the *Lex Talionis* of the Sharia. The nobility of Jesus humanely preaching the forgiveness of the enemy, and his sublime pleading for turning the right cheek when the left is slapped, bear up the sufficiency to explode the Quranic claim to be an improved revelation, far superior to the previous Jewish and Christian dispensations. On the contrary the Qur'ān introduces into the world a woeful moral and cultural regression in comparison with the Christian ethos of Jesus of especially the first three centuries. If Muhammad argues that the Revelation made to him is preferable and eternally unsurpassable, in comparison to the previous Jewish and the Christian benefactions bestowed by Allah, one may still advance that the ideal of forgiving the enemy for his offence had been prevailing for more than five centuries when Angel Gabriel descended to recite Allah's words to him.

The argument for the superiority of the Christian faith remains valid even after Emperor Constantine subverted it to the State as its ideology, down to its presence as the quintessence of European civilization. According to the Sharia the offended victim is entitled to repay his offender with a reaction duly measured to the equal amount of the pain inflicted. In simpler terms, the offended is required to return the offense with a material equivalence according to a strict observance of the rule of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, an ear for an ear, a nose for a nose, a wound for a wound. Mawlānā Azad's praises this reciprocity of offense as a belief based on Justice, with its being preferable to forgiveness which, according to him, exposes society to immoral abuse. Forgiveness entails the conversion of the offender to his redemption, while the equal measure of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, leaves the two parties involved equally tainted by an unrepaid degeneracy. Far better than the Sharia view of criminal justice is the law taking its prescribed course in an enlightened, secular democratic society devising laws without any divine intercession.

Mawlānā Azad's concern: the restoration of the purity of the Quran. In his exaltation of the Quran revealed during the last twenty-three years

of the life of Muhammad (570-632), Mawlānā Azad offers the painful observation that the revealed ideology was meant for all mankind viewed as a uniform, single family. Unfortunately it got disfigured by vested interests and it gave rise to a variety of creedal dissensions between man and man.[6] As a result the belief in the Unity of God has produced rivers of blood. This abstract postulate of a uniform belief at the beginning of History - to which the Mawlānā judiciously avoids providing a date - belies the fact that the three distinct indigenous Dharmas of India had already exhibited a history of several centuries of peaceful co-existence. The postulate of a homogeneous world where peace prevailed under the jurisdiction of Allah as the sole Supreme Divinity can be charitably endorsed as a fable for the delectation of nursery kids. But the abundance of historical evidence confirms the reality that religious tolerance and peacefulness does creatively exhilarate the co-existence, in the same social space, of a plurality of beliefs and practices. India was never wracked with iconoclastic conflicts during the pre-Islamic time when Brahmanists, Buddhists, Jainas, Christians, Cārvākas, Ājīvikas, atheists, lived in cordial mutual respect and enrichment, with the delightfulness of living in harmony with one another's adopted choice of what was right and what was wrong.

The unfortunate absence of the Indian's acquaintance with French Humanism. It is unfortunate that the Maulana must have never heard of Voltaire (1694-1778) who wrote of tolerance in a society dominated by mutually contending religious fundamentalisms, each claiming to be the true representation of the faith in the same Deity. Indeed it is revealing that in India, no one among the Brahmanists, no one among the Muslims, no academic, no writer in any of the twenty-one recognized national languages, no thinker, has, in the contemplation of the loss of so much beauty, of so much learning, caused by the observance of iconoclastic obligation commanded with particular intensity by Allah's revealed injunctions, been sufficiently informed of the liberal, enlightened and thought provoking thought in the works of such Humanists as Montaigne and Voltaire. It bewilders the mind to recognize the fact that India has not bequeathed the legacy of a lament on the obliteration of the abundance of works of Beauty and of Learning in the wake of Muslim frenzy for destroying what was assumed to be different from the contents of what Allah has prescribed as the only Truth in His revelations. In India, as in all the countries

[6] BCQ, p. x, ll. 4-5

which suffered kindred misfortunes, the Islamic hegemony acted as the bed of Procrustes: be it a book, a temple, a monument, a school, a community, a living human being, or anything which did not fit the ideas or the norms defined by the revelation communicated to Muhammad, had to be rubbed off the face of the earth, where only Allah's mandate must prevail.

The religious insensitivity of Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad. Despite his declared solidarity with his Hindu companions engaged in the struggle for Indian Independence, Mawlānā Azad does not have a single empathic word for all the harm done to the indigenous culture by his co-followers. That particular feature of the Mawlānā's insensitivity extends to his scholarship and to his political engagement. No wonder then that in the totality of the language used by the Indian people against the evil of the British rule, the Mawlānā has contributed nothing, not a phrase culled from the Quran to raise against the alien domination. It must have been so, because the Muslims too had been the dominating power before the arrival of the merchants of the East India Company and they had effected all the ravaging in which they could indulge without any constraint. The Quran, in the hands of Mawlānā Azad, offered nary a single verse to urge a Muslim desire for "freedom" with the equivalence of Abdel Kader using his mystical poetry and the Quranic verses in his struggle for an independent Algeria against French imperialism. The Mawlānā only followed in the trail blazed by the Mahatma leading with the might of Truth and Ahiṁsā. In favour of Independence the Muslims like the Maulānā followed in the rearguard of the Congress Party. For the object of owning a territory to settle their fundamentalist ideology of Kaffir-hating and of materialist Islam, the Indian Muslim Middle Class opted to rage as the front line troopers serving in the vanguard of the British imperial power remaining obliquely in order to maintain their control of the Middle Eastern oil industry.

The reason for the Mawlānā's weak following among the Indian Believers. It was a pathetic aspect of the movement for the independence of the country that the majority of the Indian Muslims did not follow him, despite the eminence of his elevated knowledge of the Quranic faith. Mahatma Gandhi borrowed ideas from the Gospel, from John Ruskin, from Leo Tolstoy, and other Western Thinkers, in all his writings and speeches directed against the Raj, without his making any reference to the Qu’ran. Indeed he did not use a single verse from the Qur’an. The Mawlānā failed to see the paradox of his

knowledge not being shared by the majority of the Muslim educated Middle Class. All his vast knowledge of Islamic lore failed to curb his inability to detect why the Middle Class to which he belonged had opted to buttress the conviction that they were a different, exclusive *nation* or *kaum.* In continuity with the unbroken tradition of all previous luminaries in the history of Islam, he could not see that the *two-kaum* doctrine had its roots in the Qu'ran dividing mankind between the good Muslim and the evil Kaffir. Of all the educated Muslims, particularly during the important two decades previous to 1947, the Mawlānā had the personal distinction of being an authority on Islamic thought. Yet he could not succeed to make his vision prevail. Nor did the theologians of the Deoband School exert any influence to check the fundamentalist juggernaut moving defiantly to the murderous enactment of the Partition. Neither did the Deobandi theologians, nor did Mawlānā Azad, after Partition, leave an explanation and an analysis of their failures. It is germane to this essay to speculate that, in their heart, they would have been happy to see the birth of two new Islamic nations. They only provided a fig leaf to those who sought some symbolic meaning to their symbolic participation in a common search for freedom. For neither the Deobandi theologians, nor Mawlānā Azad and those upper crust Muslims who gravitated around the Nehru family, ever gave any indication of their realization that Islam harbours, as the core of its ideology, a narrow fundamentalism and a divine sanction for the believers, as the proxies of Allah, to hate and hurt the non-believers. At the present time the 35,000 madrassas of Pakistan and the thousands of madrassas in other majority Muslim countries are actively training a sizable portion of their population into believing that it is their duty to wage war against the seven billion men and women living in *Dar-ul-Harb* (World of War).

The absence of tolerance in the world view of Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad. It is regrettable that Mawlānā Azad would not have considered it important to confront the question of the importance of religious tolerance. When confronted on this matter, the Muslim most often readily protests by quoting the solitary Quranic saying in the verse 256 of the Second Sūra (*The Cow*) that there is no compulsion in religion. This singular verse is often quoted by Muslims in spontaneous attempts to ward off criticism of the fundamentalist totalitarianism of Islam. The pretense of Islam being a tolerant dispensation is affirmed with the ready effrontery which pretends to ignore the stark traditional opposition to the Muslim converting to

another religion by qualifying it as *apostasy*. Islamic apostasy, considered as a betrayal of the Umma, incurs a death sentence which can be carried out by any Believer. Nor has the verse **2.256** of the Quran ever had any weight to counterbalance the more vital, more frightening verses which convey Allah's abomination of the Kaffirs and of the "Doom" which He reserves for them. These hatred-commanding verses have been in existence during the past fourteen centuries and will last till the Final Day. Any Muslim straining himself to convince the Other that Islam is compassionate, tolerant would be equivalent to Tiger standing at a distance and trying to convince the Community of Lambs that he is a vegetarian. Indeed the Quranic verse **2.256** does actually serve as the stock argument to counter any evaluation or criticism of the use of brutish force coterminous with the history of Islam. It serves as the adamantine armor which the Muslim wears in order never to concede the extreme intolerance which pervades the entire history of his religion and never to apologize for the monumental ravages wrought in the destruction of those cultures over which it spread the leaden sheet of its hegemony. When in truth the Believer spontaneously quotes the verse **2.256**, he does accordingly express his inability to entertain the slightest thought of a humane persuasion for him to acknowledge the violent intolerance immanent in his submission to the injunctions of the Only God.

The rigorous ethnic cleansing of the minorities in Pakistan has made no dent even in the psychology of the remaining Indian Muslims. The disappearance of the Jewish minorities in the Muslim countries of the Middle East and of North Africa constitutes a huge, persuasive rebuttal of the solitary verse that Allah does not recommend compulsion in religion. That isolated verse of an accidental religious tolerance is a mere wrinkle when compared to the Himalayan range of iconoclastic destructions of the civilizations which got wiped out by Muslim hegemony.

That is why it can be so disconcerting that the obligation and the grace of tolerance did not motivate the Mawlānā to reflect upon the absence of any relevant inspiration that can be drawn from the Quran and the Hadiths. In reality, one is bound to sympathize with the Mawlānā and all of his like-minded theological brotherhood that, to expect them to produce an Islamic apology and endorsement of tolerance as a highly desired necessity for inter-social and inter-national concord, would be like trying to churn water to make butter. It is extraordinarily simple to state it: there is no suggestion for tolerance in any of the Islamic scriptures and in the tradition which they have fostered.

The meaning and the substance of the indigenous tolerance of the Dharmas. The heroic, exceptional indigenous tolerance is based on metaphysical pronouncements. Indigenous Indian tolerance must not be construed as a sentimental, feely-feely goody-goody indulgence of the lazy sentimentalism such as is contained in an inept *bhai bhaiism.* The tolerance of the Brahmanist is a virile, sturdy end product of the sentiment cultivated patiently throughout countless generations of contemplative thinking. It was at the end stage of its perfection that this tolerance has been expressed as the trans-cultural expression of metaphysical mysticism in the Upaniṣadic *mahāvākyas (*pronouncements) : *tat tvam asi, sarvam idam khalu brahman, aham brahmā'smi, ātman brahman aikyam.* The *Nirvāṇa of the* Buddhist and the *Kevalya* of the Jaina *are additional* mysticisms proclaiming the universality of the mystical finality of all sentient beings. Beyond the borders of India the similarities of the native mystical perfections appear as the Tao of Lao Tzu and the Kingdom of Heaven in the teaching of Jesus which Meister Eckhart echoes in his sermons as the break-through (*durchbruch*) of the Gottheit (*Godhead*), or as the Father begetting the Son in him.

In the midst of the Indian sub-continent the Christian and the Muslim chose to dwell unmoved within their respective unhatched egg of spiritual closed-mindedness signified by the dogma of the Day of Resurrection, the central act of faith common to the three revealed religions. Accordingly, in favour of the expectation of the Last Day of Judgement, the dualistic revelations proclaim, as the finality of human existence, the deprivation of a scriptural beak or claw to break open the individual egg-shell and marvel at the infinity of the blue sky of mystical self-perfectibility. No religion has produced as much ravagement and ruination of well-established and well-proven humane cultures as has Islam wrought upon the peoples which it brought under its withering hegemonies. With the credit of that record of destruction the Quran does, with historical legitimacy, though with monumental irony, claim Islam to be the best of all revelations, the best of all possible ways of living, the best supremely of all intolerances.

Despite the plurality of her literary traditions, India has not given birth to an advocate of religious tolerance like Voltaire. Nevertheless it is moot to speculate that, without its conjunction with Islam, India would have offered to the world today a more beautiful and joyful civilization. It is a subject of regret that India has not inspired even one citizen to write at least one page in emulation of the *Treatise on*

Tolerance of Voltaire (1694-1778).[7] That it has not, the evidence of so much iconoclastic intolerance and ravaging which has diminished her unique universalist civilization, may be explained, not without regret, by the immense capacity of the people to absorb pain and suffering in solitude. The collective power of absorbing pain derives sustenance in the cultivation of the spirit of renunciation as self-sacrifice. Indeed, throughout the entire range of Indian earlier history, the characteristic spirit of the people has been fostered by the imperative of self-abnegation prescribed by the three Dharmas as the requisite of spiritual pursuits. It is this self-abnegation which became evident at Independence in August 1947, when the country, with its majority Hindu community, did offer the courtesy, without the slightest remembrance of the sufferings endured during the British rule, to Lord Mountbatten to stay on as the Governor-General and as the Minister of Defense, for one year.

The cultivated power of self-abnegation, as a collective blessing, has saved the soul of the Bhārata Land of the Three Dharmas, as has been quietly manifested by the absence, after Independence, of any resentment towards the former imperialist power. The collective salvation came from the Humanity signified by *Satya* and *Ahiṁsā* assuring the dissolution of the Empire. The quiet provision of the Vote Bank to the Muslims who had been, only a while ago, been baying and howling for Partition, was another variation on the theme of collective self-abnegation, characteristic of the Brahmanist culture as the legacy of the Vedas, of the Epics, of the Purāṇas, and of the glorious sunlit Upaniṣads.

The divine anthropomorphism in Islam and Mawlānā Azad's misrepresentation of Hinduism. It astounds the mind to read: "In India, even till this day, the gods of destruction outnumber those of grace and of benevolence."[8] Such an adverse observation reads like a benighted statement of some blinkered evangelist missionary. To say the least, it is rather surprising that it should be written with such clarity as the Mawlānā's trustworthy perception of the Brahmanist mythology. It is a stunning statement the like of which bespeaks the petrified obduracy of the Muslim mind being unable, or unwilling, to

---

[7] Voltaire, *Traité sur la Tolérance*, pp. 563-650; in *Mélanges*, Pléiade, nrf Gallimard, 1961.

[88] BCQ, p. 5, #2, last 2 lines.

admit the distinctive nobility crowning the sterling humanity which undergirds the religiosity of both the ritualistic and the mystical aspects of Brahmanism, as well as of the other two indigenous Dharmas. The laughable conclusion attributing more devilry than saintliness to the Brahmanist pantheon ignores the very foundation of the Vedic-Brahmanist cosmology of the *One, beside which nothing else exists*. In such a cosmology the consequent belief, entertained by the learned pundit as well as by the untutored *pān*-vendor, tells of the Supreme Being as the all-Pervader, as the Dweller within the devotee. God, as the *iṣṭa devatā*, is the *antaryāmī* (in-dweller), is all Love (*prema*). There is no room for fear in the expectation but, on the contrary, there is a yearning and a striving for the experience of the soul with the One, expressed with the pronouncement *atman brahman aikyam.* The Quran does not advocate the individual soul's union with the Ultimate Reality, which explains Sunni Islam's uncompromising hostility to the Sufi whose search for the soul's union with God, who, in Brahmanism, is addressed as *tvam*, signifying closeness, intimacy, in a friendly and loving relationship. On the other hand, the Holy Book describes the inviolable duality of Man and Allah illustrated by the miracle of the Messenger's nocturnal flight of riding his horse Buraq to Paradise where, at the distance of an arrow's throw, he could discern the anthropomorphic physicality of the Almighty. This myth particularly emphasized the fact that the Apostle stood at a far distance from God who, during his brief visit, was for a moment the material object of his organ of vision. In other words, Muhammad saw God as a real anthropomorphic Being, thus providing an irrefutable proof of the existence of the materiality of the source of the Revelation. Even when it is predicated by the belief in the assumed real feat of the Prophet's nocturnal flight by riding the horse Buraq up to Paradise! Even when there is no Hadith reporting any Companion who would have been curious enough to ask the Messenger for his emotions while whizzing through the stratosphere to the garden where he saw Allah standing. There is no Hadith of a companion of the Prophet asking how did the horse Buraq fly and behave during the flight! How could such a miracle have left all the companions of Muhammad being unconcerned about the physical reality of such a miracle? Yet the theologies of the revealed religions have prevailed in each of them brutally suppressing the belief and the search for their corresponding mystical experiences in dire opposition to the oriental spiritual traditions which celebrate the mystical bliss as their desired respective centralities.

When 1.5 billion Muslims believe as literal truth the myth of the

nocturnal flight of the Prophet. Evidently the nocturnal flight of the Prophet, believed to be a genuine physical feat, asserts as a greater miracle, in this particularly unique example of cultural polemic, the Islamic superiority of the *Mirāj* over the corner stone of the structure of Christian Theology, that is, the three-day old corpse of Jesus ascending to Heaven and commemorated every year as the important festival of Easter. By riding Buraq, the horse, flying through the pitch-black space to the Garden of Allah, Muhammad accomplished a feat materially more convincing than the veracity proclaimed by the dogma of the Gospel's postulating, as a historical event, the Word becoming Flesh in Jesus Christ. Asseverating that he had literally witnessed the anthropomorphic reality of Allah, the Prophet established it as the objective, incontrovertible Truth which elevated Islam far above the other two revealed theologies. In the age of the banality of information about space travel not causing the slightest astonishment, that the immense fictions of the physical reality of the Word becoming Flesh, the ascent of the corpse of the crucified young Jesus, Muhammad's riding his horse flying through the pitch darkness of space to the garden of God, can still command the beliefs of Nobel Prize Winners, as well as the belief of a road-mender, compels admiration for the indifference of the Oriental religions to miracles. Instead they rely on myths as thought props for the guidance of the spiritual searching towards the desired self-fulfillment, concretely experienced by the individual, in his body, on the surface of the Earth. Mystical self-enlightenment refutes the poetic license, however much it may be so widely entertained, of the belief in the immortality of the body, with its resurrection from its grave to attend the Final Judgement.

God as the seducer in Brahmanism. The Brahmanist's affirmation of self-fulfillment as the end of earthly existence ultimately relies on the assumption of the concept of God as a lure, as a seducer indicating the goal which disappears once the striving has come to its end. It is like telling the *sādhaka:* the moon is on the tree top. He looks at the tree top and then has the immediate, right knowledge of the position of the moon. So is God, and all the literature, thought systems surrounding 'It' as the indicator accompanying the effort to reach the ultimate goal. Brahmanism is the only dispensation which provides the possibility and the certainty of the supremely joyful, mystical attainment with the aid of the concept of the *nirākāra* Absolute Reality (Being without a form). The ultimate benefaction of God can only be in His universal accessibility as the formless source and end of Bliss as *sac-cid-ānanda,* or as *nirvāṇa,* or as *kaivalya.* Or simply as the *nirvikalpa samādhi* of Pata–jali. In the spiritual universe of the

dualistic revealed religions, there is no equivalent of the Brahmanist's concept and reality of the Supreme Being as formless (*nirākāra*).

The mystic norm central to this essay. Nevertheless it is the history of Humanity, measured in terms of centuries of human conduct ordered by the contending theologies, which will, in this essay, constitute the norm for a genuinely sagacious evaluation of the civilizational effect determined by a religious discourse. Provisionally, these days, the state of the world being increasingly unified displays the emergence in Europe of the conscious constraint to bear the burden and the sorrow of the collective guilt of slavery and of the inhumanities of colonialisms. Concurrently all humanity can witness the horror of Islam which, claiming to be the best of all past and future revelations, confers innocence upon the proxies of Allah who, as suicide-bombers, motivated by the prospect of paradisiac delights, revel in homicidal acts against even innocent and defenseless Muslim men, women and children belonging to a divergent Islamic denomination.[9]

In vindication of its Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian heritage, the West produced a cosmic theatre of the most brutish violence and destruction, as the apotheosis marking the end of the XX century with two world wars, in addition to the euphemistically described Cold War at the expense of millions and millions of dead and crippled in the southern hemisphere. In a contrast which has not been acknowledged by the Judeo-Christian and Islamic believers, India of the pacifist Dharmas concurrently gave to the world the activism of Mahatma Gandhi with his use of Truth and Non-Violence as the mighty forces which dissolved the dominion of the most dehumanizing, materialistic power on earth. These consequent wars enkindled by forces animated by revealed beliefs, and measured by the number of hecatombs, on all sides, on all continents, may provide a measure of the superiority or inferiority of this or that religious pronouncement. Suffice it to stress at this stage of the essay that the Dharmas of India have not lent themselves to the creation of a hecatomb - yet. It is with the hope that this be so for all time, that this essay may contribute to their legacy lasting till the end of the Kali Yuga!

The difference between the use of myth in Islam and in Brahmanism. The Dome on the Rock, in Jerusalem, stands at the

---

[9] Vide **Quran 8. 17**: "Ye (Muslims) slew them not but Allah slew them. And thou (Muhammad) threwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that he might test the believers by a fair test from Him. Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower."

place whence the Prophet rose by riding his horse Buraq to Heaven where he had a glimpse of the anthropomorphic Allah. After Mecca and Medina, the Dome is the third most revered place in the history of Islam. Just as there is no irrefragable evidence of accredited witnesses of Jesus ascending to Heaven on the third day after his burial, there is no record of anyone having witnessed Muhammad's flight to Heaven to see and confirm the reality of the existence of Personal Allah. Nevertheless in the history of Islam Believers have steadfastly assumed that Muhammad's nocturnal miracle, the *Miraj*, authenticates the physical reality of the existence of Allah. But it is not unreasonable for the reader who owns the unqualified freedom of thought and of expression to speculate how can a mathematician, an engineer, a medical doctor, a nuclear physicist, indeed rationally believe that a human being, even if he were the Prophet, could ride a horse flying during one night to heaven where he saw God-Allah, and thence flew back before daybreak, without anyone witnessing such a feat by a human being. Such a miracle is as 'believable' as the Red Sea parting, as Cecil de Mille's film *Ten Commandments* shows it, to allow Moses and his followers to cross over to the eastern shore, or as the physical ascent to Heaven, against the gravitational pull, of the resurrected body of Jesus.

The Brahmanist adorns his faith with stories of superhuman feats performed by the different deities. Hanumān, for example, uproots a whole mountain together with its flora, and holding it on one of his palms, flies across the entire length of the territory from the base of the Himalayas down to Lanka. But it is only a fantastic delectable myth. No Brahmanist believes such a feat to be factual, historical, in its defiance of all natural laws and of all imaginable possibilities. The evidence of this fancy for the irrational as an aesthetic banality still inhabits the consciousness of the educated Brahmanist who does not question the verisimilitude of a Bollywood feature film showing the hero and the heroine beginning to sing in a flowery public garden and continues to lip-synch the words of their duet through a display of street scenes in several foreign countries. Westerners are baffled when they have to watch a song or a dance sequence split into a variety of locales and times. But in the three revealed religions, the believers, from the Nobel Prize winner to the garbage collector, unquestioningly accept the respective miracle as a *historical phenomenon agreeable to reason and to faith*. Even those who claim and fuss to be recognized as atheists do nevertheless abide by the social norms of the culture determined by the ethics pertaining to the very respective religion which they disown. Michel Onfray in *Décadence* vigorously rejects the

historicity of Jesus with a laborious argument based on the absence of historical evidence of his life.[10] Further he castigates those theists who persist in their faithfulness to the ethos based on the fundamental rules of Orthodoxy. He advocates an atheism based on the ethics of the early Greek philosophers, in particular of Epicurus (342-270).

The merit of polytheism in Brahmanism. It has been the great fortune of India that Brahmanist devotees believe in a plurality of divinities. The belief and the spontaneous, almost unreflecting, acceptance of the plurality of divinities has, throughout the history of the Indian spiritualities, nurtured the spirit of broad-mindedness and the avoidance of fundamentalism and its nefarious influences. The Hindu home almost invariably accommodates a small prayer room with images of a variety of deities, conforming to the 'taste' and preference of every member of the family. Brahmanism blesses the Indian territory with festivals honoring deities in the form of animals, of Gaṇeṣa with the elephant head, of Hanumān honored with musical musical events on the grounds of temples honoring him, besides Dūrgā riding a tiger. The Rāma Līlā, as a popular mystery play based on the recitation of the poetry of Tulasīdāsa, is unique in the world. Each of the main deities holds a weapon used in the relevant stories against evil-doers. Against this iconographic peculiarity the Mahāyāna Buddhist populates his celestial pantheon with the pride that none of the divinities bears a weapon. For someone living in India, and with close acquaintance with learned Brahmanists, Mawlānā Azad should have known that the cosmology of Brahmanism significantly stresses the simultaneous production of both good and evil at the beginning of Creation. The weapon worn by the principal deities is invariably used against evil-doing demons, and against humans generating immense suffering by the use and abuse of their immense power of domination. The *Bhagavad Gītā* epitomizes this theme in the soul gladdening couplet: '*Whenever there is a decline of righteousness and rise of unrighteousness, O Bhārata (Arjuna), then I send forth (create incarnate) Myself.*'[11] None of the three revelations has graced Humanity with the representation of the Supreme Being as the loving friend of the devotee, as Kṛṣṇa is for the Pāṇḍava brothers.

---

[10] Michel Onfray, *Décadence*, Flammarion, Paris, 2017; 656 pp.+ Index & Bibliography.

[11] S. Radhakrishnan, *Bhagavad Gītā*, Ch. 4, verse 7. Harper Collins, London, UK, 2015.

The intolerance of Allah and the scant reference to Man in the Qu'ran. On the contrary, Chapter Three of this essay demonstrates the constant anger of Allah. The believer transfers the divine anger to his own insensitivity with regard to the Infidel's suffering as the victim of his intolerance. It is not a coincidence that, wherever they settle in non-Muslim societies, the Muslim minorities generate conflict and invariably the social host's reaction of uneasiness. Throughout the history of Islam the faithful practitioners of the *Dīn* have maintained the tradition of translating, toward the non-Believing Other, the anger and the hostility conveyed by the choleric verses. Noteworthy it is that the divine obsession with inflicting dooms upon infidels, in a persistent catalogue of adverse treatments, strewn among 6235 verses, of which only three refer to Man. The majority of the verses of the Quran refer exclusively to Allah. Even the few verses which mention Man berate him for having a moral weakness, with a feeble disposition.

Mawlānā Azad emphatically declares that the Revelation was given by God to all humanity. But the original belief of the Unity of God got perverted by its unfortunately taking a perverted turn. He takes the Biblical story of the Genesis of the world as a valid and applicable to all mankind. He fails to grasp the fact that every culture has devised its own cosmology and the Yahweh of the Old Testament is not the " Only God" to which all Humanity, in all continents, at all times, must give assent. Even learned academics in a Western university would react with a stare of incomprehension when told that the God of the Judeo-Christian society is not a universal concept adopted by believers in other cultures, It is cultural. Non-Christian cultures have their own distinctive religious histories with each having its related cosmology. Learned Christians, for example, find it almost incomprehensible that learned Brahmanists do find it meaningful and agreeable to believe in a multiplicity of divinities pertaining to both genders.

Strikingly Mawlānā Azad fails to note the one characteristic feature of the Brahmanist notion of God as both *sākāra* (with form) and *nirākāra* (without form). Brahmanism is the only spiritual tradition which celebrates the Supreme Being as a formless reality. Śiva is the only representative of the Supreme Being as being both *sakala* (with form) and *niṣkala (*(without form). The Śiva-lingam represents his formless reality. It is in accord with the present argument to assert that today the Brahmanist temples get filled with pressing crowds eager to have a *darśana* of their favored deity. Westerners witness with disbelief the Hindu crowds gathering for the 'vision' of the image of the divinity of their choice with freedom, without any overt or hidden constraint by

fear or by communal pressure. However the concept of the formless Supreme Being bears no common trait with the Islamic tenet prohibiting the representation of Allah's physical body.

The unity of God and the unity of humanity. In defense of the work of Mawlānā Adul Kalām Azad, Syed Abdul Latif argues that it has been a pity that, confined only to their Urdu version, his Quranic studies remained largely unknown to the wider public using the English language. Had it been available in English, "a powerful stimulus might have been furnished to the thoughtful mind everywhere to revive the universal element in every religion, as recommended in the Quran, to function as a force for religious tolerance and world unity."[12]

It may be nice to write in 2006 that Muslims failed to have noticed the tolerance of the Mawlānā's *Al-Hilal*. After all the undivided sub-continent did have millions of Urdu speaking and writing men and women who could have learned tolerance from the Mawlānā. Tolerance had already been integrated with the Indian civilization during several millennia and practiced by the plurality of Dharmas and translated with beauty and permanence into stone all over the territory. And what kind of tolerance was the Mawlānā advocating when he could not internalize the Islamic reason and the belief which justified and led to the destruction of those monuments and institutions which had been earlier raised by the indigenous spirit dedicated to the transcendental gift of life?

If indeed the Mawlānā had written in Urdu a text for the dissemination of an original reflection on tolerance, as a universal message, he would have encountered the hostility of established Islamic orthodoxy rejecting his idea as a heresy, for, subsequent to the Hanbalite reaction, Islam stood firmly grounded in its unyielding intolerance. By claiming that his interpretation of the Quran would have generated the force for a world unity, the Mawlānā testifies to a resolute disregard of the Declaration of the Universal Rights of Man and of the Citizen proclaimed in 1945 by the United Nations. The Quran did not issue a single word of resistance to the domination of the Raj, let alone the emptiness of a belated claim that it could have promoted universal unity. By what gyration of reason and of logic would the Mawlānā envisage the belief in a tolerant world unity hinged on the Quran which

[12] BCQ, p. xii, # 2.

contains only three verses referring to Man and even this in regard to his moral inadequacy and weak character, without any description of what the Ideal Muslim must be? What would have been the reply of Allah if Arjuna had asked him how does the perfect Muslim sit, how does he walk, how does he speak?[13]

Mawlānā Azad's celebration of monotheism. Mawlānā Azad is no anthropologist who records the 'primitive' Man's belief in a supernatural Creator of all that exists. None of the prophets ever demonstrated any curiosity similar to what motivates the modern anthropologist objectively studying the characteristic structures of Kingship and of Divinity in 'Primitive' as well as in 'Advanced' sophisticated cultures. Most of the time the consensus leans towards the universal range of beliefs in Monotheisms, of which the Semitic prevailed with the preeminence of the Old Testament. Simone Weil courageously writes that of all the divinities available in the Mediterranean basin, Osiris is the god who is loving, benevolent, forgiving, peaceful.[14] Yet it is Jehovah who triumphs in being accepted as the most important divinity, despite his being irascible, jealous, vindictive, intolerant, unforgiving. More: Jehovah created a disenchanted world. And it is a disenchanted world which became the nursery for each revealed monotheism to cultivate its respective genocide.[15]

Mawlānā Azad laments that the initial vision of a singular almighty God underwent a regression which gave rise to the concept of polytheism.[16] More than in any other geographic space, it is India which offered the favorable setting for a myriad divinities worshipped by a large sophisticated people at peace with itself and with the world viewed as the One. Yet the Mawlānā could not see therein the well-established tolerance of Brahmanism, magnificently exhibited by the

---

[13] In comparison to the reply of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the last eighteen verses of *Bhagavad Gītā*, Ch. 2.

[14] Simone Weil, *Waiting for God*, Harper, 208 pp; 2009

[15] To those who argue that the word "genocide" does not apply to a mass death willfully carried out at a time before the Holocaust of the mid-twentieth century, the answer is that it is correct to say that, even before Isaac Newton, apples fell to the ground due to the force of gravity.

[16] BCQ, p. 1, # 2.

cave temples of Ajanta. In particular, the adjacent Buddhist and Jaina temples could have been incomprehensible to a Quranic Believer on account of their emphasizing, as a detrimental and unnecessary bond of attachment, the rejection of the belief in a transcendental God. Mawlānā Azad provides the characteristic lack of curiosity of the Muslim in trying to understand the Other and possibly learn and integrate into his own set of rules and principles a merit having acquired validity by centuries of believing and living accordingly. Polytheism fosters tolerance and joyful acceptance of a variegated society. The obdurate impermeability of the Muslim mind to the recognition of supremely superior modes of thought and feeling is fully evident in the stresses and conflicts which Islam generates in the midst of the sophisticated cultures of secular, liberal Western Europe since the 1960s. In truth the great illusion at the heart of Islam consists of the assumption that its rules and principles guard the moral unity of the Umma. Throughout its entire history, since the very first days of its initiation by the Prophet, the Muslims have been at war among themselves, during the past fourteen centuries. It is baffling that in the midst of the turmoil generated by the violent apotheosis of British rule, the Mawlānā would have been so unresponsive to the Islamic storm engulfing the sub-continent. Nor, if he were even for a while aware, did he question his fundamentalist confidence in a peaceful Islam which never existed. Islam was always war, and more war. It began as war, led by Muhammad, the Conqueror.

Islam and the Original Sin. As a scholar Mawlānā Azad takes the story of Adam as-is, without questioning why would God create Man as an ignorant slave and why must it be a sin for the slave to seek freedom by the means of acquiring Knowledge. On the contrary he quotes:

> **Quran 10.19**: Mankind were but one community; then they differed...*)*.
> And again Quran **2.213**: Mankind were one community, and Allah sent (unto them) Prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners, and revealed therewith the Scripture with the truth that it might judge between mankind concerning that wherein they differed.

Archaeological evidence in the Middle East and in China, for example, has been published, decades before Mawlānā Azad wrote this fiction of all mankind using only one language as the antecedent of Muhammad's Arabic. The Museum in Baghdad exhibits convincing, material proof of ancient languages used before the medium of the Book of Genesis. The bone tablets of the ancient Shang culture in China do testify to the reality of a language far different from the medium used by the first

emperor Huang Di. Besides there is no common link between the language spoken by Adam and the Sanskrit of the first Vedic sentence ever spoken or written. It does indeed baffle the mind that the Mawlānā would, in the first half of the XX century, assume as high learning, and thereby command national respect, such a gratuitous supposition that all Mankind used one common language which, with time, degenerated into breaking out into a myriad tongues! At the courts of the early Abbasids, during the golden era of Islam when Baghdad was the brightest centre of learning, of science, of literature, and of material goods, the capital was alive with a motley mixture of people speaking the languages of the previous places of their births. Besides, it is quite surprising that the Biblical Book of Genesis does not contain a single word in relation to the first appearance of the "Word" or of "Language" in Egypt, or in the Middle East, or in any other place.

The difference between Allah and the Christian concept of the Holy Trinity. With a casuistry rivalling that of a Jesuit, the Mawlānā, according to his disciple Syed Latif, argues that "the differences which have marked the course of religion, have mostly been in respect of the attributes of God, and not in respect of God."[17] The Quran actually does not offer a definitive philosophical anthropology corresponding to the religiosity which it prescribes, in comparison with the psycho-somatic structure of Man which, according to the Sāṅkhya doctrine, underlies the Yoga-sūtras of Patañjali. He takes the simple view of Man having a mind, or intellect, qualified by the senses, a view which tallies with the Greek view of Man composed of mind or reason and body. To this duality the Christian Orthodoxy adds, with the ceremony of the christening, the supernatural component of the Holy Spirit, which makes Man a Person. Artlessly Mawlānā Azad argues that a child entertains a fanciful view of the divine attributes. As the individual grows he transfers his own higher qualities to the divine person. Taking the cue apparently from Darwin's theory of evolution the Mawlānā stresses three strains in the process of visualizing the divine person: they progress from the stage of anthropomorphism and anthropophuism to transcendentalism. The anthropophuist strain consists of attributing human nature to God: it was a distinctive feature of the Greek religion, apparently as the result of a Persian influence. The Mawlānā opts for the progression from polytheism back to

[17] BCQ, p. 3, # 3.

monotheism, that is, from a vision of God of awe and terror to that of a God of Love. It needs to be emphasized that Christians see their Trinitarian Divinity having a loving relationship with the faithful follower. In a vivid contrast Allah maintains his Sovereignty (*Rubūbiyat*) while his Measure (*Taqdīr*) surveys and adjusts every thought and action of the believer who submits to His Revelations.

Such a reconstruction of the early stages of religion strikes the imagination for its being far-fetched and foolhardy. According to the learned Mawlānā the early primitive mind attributed destructiveness to God with the occurrence of earthquakes, volcanoes, thunder and lightning, raging storms, phenomena which struck terror in the heart of Man. He could not then see the Beauty of God amid the swirls of natural devastations. Hence in those early times Man associated terror and awe to God. Mawlānā Azad goes so far as to see more gods of destruction in the history of Brahmanism than deities of grace and love. Disconcertingly his fairy tale of the evolution of the religious sentiment down the ages can mercifully be qualified as unworthy of even an elementary school pupil. I remember the French language primer prescribed for study in the first year of my primary school in a small village: the first lesson was entitled: *Dieu* (God) and the first words were: *Dieu est bon.* (God is good). The second sentence read: *Il a crée le ciel et la terre* (He has created the heaven and the earth). There was never any suggestion, however remote, of terror and fear. The reference to awe, violence, destruction, to a world wracked with catastrophic disturbances occurring in the imagination of Mawlānā weakens whatever reverence one may be tempted to show for his learning. The temptation leads one to believe that indeed, with such shallow reconstruction of the pre-historic epoch, the Mawlānā could not, and indeed did not, exert any intellectual or moral authority when it was sorely needed in the turmoil preceding Partition, which was more virulent and dehumanizing than all the earthquakes and volcanoes and floods which made Man view God as a cosmic terrorist. Subsequently this essay will establish that there is really no Love in any verse of the Quran, while Christian Theology can rightly argue, and does, that the Trinitarian doctrine of the Nicene Creed gives prominence to the relationship of Love between God and Man. And in the Bhakti version of Brahmanism the concept of *prema*, ineffable love, is the supreme bond between the favored deity (*iṣṭa devatā)* and the devotee (*bhakta*). Not even the Sufi tradition has produced equivalents of poets singing the devotees love for Supreme Deity, such

as Caitanya, Sūrdāsa, Mirā Bāi, Tyāgarāja and so many others.

Mawlānā Azad's predilection for the transcendence of God in Islam. He asserts that before the Quran came into existence, "the highest that the human intellect could achieve was to think of God without any symbolic aid."[18] Yet, nearly a millennium before the birth of Muhammad, India had, with the God-less Buddhist and Jaina Dharmas, produced well developed spiritual traditions, enhanced with the noblest ethical teachings, as preludes to the searching for the self-perfecting mystical experience. Only in India could the extraordinarily bold God-less spirituality be taught as a complete, saintly mode of living as Gautama Buddha preached for the enlightenment of, not only native Indians, but of all Humanity, as demonstrated by the joyful acceptance of the Bauddha Dharma by the Oriental civilizations with each voluntarily admitting it to their already specific flourishing culture. Buddha's version of spirituality is a frontal refusal of any reliance on even the concept of God as a necessary psychological need or conceptual support for the sustenance of the patient, relentless striving for *nirvāṇa* as the liberation from Time, from its Impermanence, into the ontological transcendent experience of the eternal bliss present in the ever present moment. Suffering, according to Buddha, is homogeneous with Impermanence, that is, Becoming as the banality of life, concomitant with the whole world turning while moving along the ellipse round the Sun, but is *all time* pregnant with the eternal Awakening. And Gautama Buddha proclaimed the *sublime banality* of the moment being pregnant with the Immortality of *nirvāṇa*, the state of being an *Arhat* (worthy). That was the first proclamation of universal salvation. No wonder then that the Buddhist Middle Way (*Madhyama Pratipad*) constitutes the invincible critique of all spiritual traditions which celebrate the feebleness based on the opinion of a superhuman God-there living in the infinite dark space unlit by the Sun. Blessed be Gautama the Awakened who glorified the reality of the moment being the egg out of which, at the right moment, either by the action of the beak or of the claw, comes out the chick ...gaily! Gautama Buddha is the towering Indian who proclaimed Impermanence or Time as co-essential with the Timeless *Nirvāṇa*, and Humanity as the reality holding the Be-All and the End-All of Life! That is why it bewilders the mind to read that Mawlānā Azad evinces a pathetic misunderstanding of the Indian Dhārmika religiosity in arguing that "in respect of divine attributes, no concept anywhere could

[18] BCQ, p. 5, #3

invest God with any attributes other than the human".[19] Evidently he takes advantage of the fact that Indian Buddhism, destroyed by his earlier co-Believers, was not available in the XX century to confront him with the reality of an essentially Indian religion did promulgate a spirituality without the aspirant or follower feeling the need of a divine prop privileging the empty space - there! instead of Humanity as Fullness of the One which has always existed and there will be no time when it will not be in existence.

Mawlānā Azad's ignorance of the absolute values of the indigenous cultures. Furthermore, the Mawlānā fails to grasp that the Brahmanist faith actually inverts the relationship between God and Man, for the aspirant for spiritual self-enlightenment undertakes the mimesis of the Divine attributes in the individual's domestic and social existence. While the Supreme Being is said to be unborn, devoid of limitations, unchanging, eternal, He or It is co-essential with the devotee, in a finality which is the mystical destiny of Man. The Quran actually insists on the transcendental distinction of Allah, uncontaminated with anything materially connected with the Earth. The nocturnal flight of Muhammad to Paradise emphasizes the distance between Man and God, with Muhammad himself standing at a distance of an arrow's throw from Allah, whose face he could not see. It is still heresy in orthodox Islamic belief to assume - as the Sufis do, and are accordingly violently suppressed - the desirability of the individual Believer's unity with the Divine Being. The Mawlānā criticizes the Jewish similitude between God and Man while disowning the practice of image worship. Eager to impose the 'superiority' of Islam *uber alles*, he avers that, before the advent of the Quranic revelation, "man had not risen high enough to discard the veils of anthropomorphic similitudes and directly behold the splendor of divine attributes."[20] The Mawlānā thereby confesses his ignorance of the native Indian mystical spiritualities and, most particularly, the Brahmanist vision of the World as One inclusive of the homogeneity of the individual *ātman* with the One or *brahman*. It staggers the mind that Mawlānā Azad would write the words just quoted most certainly due to his never having been acquainted with the

---

[19] ibid

[20] BCQ, p. 6, #1. The words are by Syed Abdul Latif who adds this revealing note: 'In an illuminating lengthy discourse, Mawlānā Azad surveys the concepts of God in relation to attributes held by the leading religions of the world before the advent of Islam: pp. 135-165, *Tarjumān-al-Quran*, vol. 1, Lahore, 1947.

popular Brahmanist concept of the formless *Brahman* (*nirākāra*). Indeed it makes one wonder how and why he would never have come across, as an Islamic scholar, in consideration of his political activities, including the last years of his serving as the first Central Minister of Education of Independent India.

The absolute transcendence of the Biblical Only God: the source of all the religious intolerances and their corresponding genocides. The magnitude of the Mawlānā's enthusiasm to maintain the absolute transcendence of God-Allah, or Jehovah, is central to the view of the Jew and of the Christian: God is the only Pure reality, while everything related to Earth which, being disenchanted, is impure, imperfect, subject to the erosion of Time. It is this philosophical prejudice, central to the dualistic philosophy of Plato, which has been the curse of mankind: transcendental monotheism has produced countless religious wars, slaveries, colonialisms and genocides. Polytheistic India, China, Japan have each evinced its respective way of life where plurality of beliefs has been constructive, peaceful, aesthetically productive of corresponding forms and representations. In the midst of India, constantly ravaged by Islamic intolerance, the Mawlānā, together with Islamic elites in a span of fourteen centuries, could not, even in the company of a Hindu elite proclaiming the unhistorical two-nation theory of the Jinnah-led Muslim League and its murderous violence, elevate his mind above the connection between the belief in Allah out-there, beyond Humanity, and the savage reawakening of His monstrous iconoclasm which lustfully destroyed so much of Indian culture. Religion earns a good name when it refers to the exalted humanity of Brahmanism, of Buddhism, of Jainism, of Taoism, of Confucianism, of Shintoism. It earns the praise and the devotion of those who turn their eyes away from the hecatombs, the mass murders and the enslavements of countless millions of men, women, children, and a lot more of the same evil enthusiasms, all exerted in obedience to a superhuman, celestial Almighty. Buddha, Mahāvīra, and Jesus are the three singular personalities who provided each a humane way of life which does not need heaven to be complete and whole.

Unfortunately, in the history of the Judeo-Christian civilization it was Saint Paul who discarded the Humanity of Jesus as central to the faith and instead erected the cadaver, the "resurrected" body, three days after the crucifixion, as the God worthy of worship. It is this heresy which, as the official religion, is the only one to have instituted the horrors of the Inquisition. For its part in glorifying Allah, Islam has demeaned the moral and aesthetic worth of Humanity by the

obliteration of several Buddhisms and Christianities, and of Zoroastrianism.

The fateful flaw in the Maulana's comparison of religions. He frowns upon the Father-Son relationship associated with Jesus Christ as an anthropomorphic image which derogates from the august authority of the Transcendent God. Against this fundamental concept of the Divinity in the Christian Faith, the Mawlānā quotes from the Quran: "Say (O Muhammad, unto the idolaters): Disbelieve ye verily in Him Who created the earth in two Days, and ascribe ye unto Him rivals? He (and none else) is the Lord of the Worlds. (**41.9**). Vision comprehendeth Him not, but he comprehendeth (all) vision. He is the Subtle, the Aware.(**6. 103**). Say: He is Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. Say: He is Allah, the Great. Allah the eternally Besought of all. He begotteth not nor was begotten. And there is none comparable unto Him. (**112.1-4**)."

The Maulānā rejects two aspects of God: the Absolute with attributes and the Absolute divested of all attributes. According to him, the former leads to anthropomorphism, a view which paradoxically blocks the perception of Reality. Such a casuistic argument does not make sense in relation to Muhammad *mirāj* at the end of which he saw the able-bodied male Allah standing in the distant garden. The other view is represented by the Upaniṣads with their *neti, neti (*not this, not this). The latter, he argues, leads to an advanced view of transcendentalism, which ends in 'nullification and in the denial of the consolation of positive belief. It can never become an active or living faith. He concedes that a concession had to be brought forth with the concept of Īśvara (Lord) in order to avoid total nullity.

The paradox of Islam. Against these two alternatives, the Quran prescribes a line of its own. It states that there is nothing which can be compared to God. It postulates a transcendental vision of God while avoiding an anthropomorphic suggestion surrounding it. The Reality of God is so high that the human mind cannot rise up to It, though there is always the human urge to know it. The Quran avoids both the transcendentalism of the Brahmanist's *neti-neti* and the emphasis on the affirmation of the attributes which give rise to anthropomorphism. Brahmanists personify God with the indulgence in image worship. But the Quran personifies only the attributes of God, but not his Being. Hence there is no scope for any symbolic representation. The Unity of God has the positive aspect of being the only One. The negative view consists of none being like Him. In the pre-Quran age God was represented as having the uniqueness of his essence. The Quran stresses the uniqueness of His attributes and the consequent rejection

of image worship. Yet Muhammad had to fly to Heaven to see, with his eyes, the physical substance of Allah in the distance while He hid His face from even his Messenger! The uniqueness of Allah as a radically transcendental being lies in the belief of His spatial and temporal reality which compels the believer to submit to his revelations. Such is the monumental paradox of Islam: the submission to a word, to the sound, Allah.

Mawlānā Azad's fundamentalism. The Mawlānā issues a critique of the Christian belief in hero worship in a relation to Jesus being hailed by the faithful as the Son of the Father, and consequently as God. He further reproves the Buddhists for the worship of sacred objects related to Buddha and even of the image of the founder himself. Against such forms of adoration the Quran asserts that Allah alone is worthy of worship. A true believer in the Unity of God cannot turn to a different form of devotion, for only such a God, such as Allah, only, can answer the cry of Man and fulfill his prayers. To emphasize this aspect of the Unity of God, Mawlānā Azad, in the *Sūrat-ul-Fātiha* the prayer is: '*Thee* alone do we serve and from *Thee* alone do we seek aid', with particular emphasis on *Thee*. Mawlānā Azad ignores the usefulness and the effectiveness of meditation in an infinite variety of practical ways, which do not necessarily need the consciousness of an abstract figure residing in the depths of infinite space. Nor does he seem to take into consideration that every Muslim would have his or her own subjective thinking of Allah. He misses the banality of Allah as the object of thought is an *object* with the same empirical value as the object of any thought or perception. Allah as the object of dualistic thinking is reduced to being an object. Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad does not seem to be aware of Patañjali's noncept of *nirvikalpa samādhi,* and of his definition of Yoga as the cessation of the thought process (*citta vṛtti nirodha*). At the same time the Mawlānā illustrates to what extent a high Muslim intellectual would be so ignorant of the ways of thinking of the Non-Believers swarming around him. It is so unfortunate that there exists no record of any philosophical discussion between the Mawlānā and the Hindu intellectuals with whom he was collaborating in the Independence movement.

The historical influence of the Quranic exaltation of the pre-eminence of the Unity of God. Any ideology, be it religious or secular, must be appraised by its historical application and by the related consequence of its affecting the lives of men and women. Its particular importance must be weighed in its concrete historical

repercussions on civilization and on Humanity. Hindsight, aided with an eagle's view of the past spanning several centuries of the particular contents of the histories of the main world religions, makes it easy to come up with an honest, disinterested estimation of their respective theologies in relation to the ways in which they have fashioned the socio-political mores of their respective societies. The claim to one's religion being unique, absolute, a *nec plus ultra* of perfection and as such valid for all eternity exclusively pertains to the Believer in each of the three revealed dispensations which have their common source in the Old Testament. Fundamentally all three assume that all that IS, began with the Creation as described in the Book of Genesis of the Bible. The domination of the West, over all the five continents, during the past more than five centuries, has fostered the notion that the world began as the Bible describes it. The view, broadcast by the political and military preponderance of the West, has acquired, by the influence of conquering circumstances, the force of the material domination arrogantly qualified as the White Man's burden. The *globality* of the spread of the cosmology, according to the Book of Genesis of the Old Testament, got interpreted and taught, as a matter of fact, but erroneously, as a *universality*, aided by military force and by the spread of slavery and colonialisms, by all believers in the revealed religions. This gratuitous global reach of the belief in the Creation of the world out of the pre-existent Chaos, is central, in particular, in the mind of the Muslim who submits, as a rule, to the faithful endorsement of the Biblical story. As a result, the Muslim mind, in particular, is struck with disbelief when he is confronted with the evidence that every distinctively different civilization has evolved its own specific cosmology and its corresponding ethos.

Hence Mawlānā Azad uses a rationality founded on his particular scholarship and thereby endorses the Quranic asseveration of Allah being the sole superlatively perfect God, in comparison with the Supreme Being worshipped in other religions, particularly in the Indian Dharmas. In doing so he excludes the early Christian thinkers maintaining the primacy of their belief and the privilege of offering to Humanity the incomparable, supreme Truth of God incarnate in the historical Jesus of Nazareth. By postulating that God has come down from Heaven and assumed a human body, the Church felt confident that this historically objective fact has the authority of physical evidence to compel universal adhesion and its consequent following.

The amazing contrast between these claims of the absolute incomparable Truth, each in its literature and its institutions and

resultant culture, and the propositions of Indian Dharmas is infinitely stark: for in none of the three Dharmas - the Brahmanist, the Buddhist, the Jaina - has anyone claimed that the doctrine dear to him is the Absolute Truth, in regard to its literature, its practice, its symbolism, its prescription for the right spirituality. All the three Dharmas, with their foundation secured in the *citta vṛtti nirodha* of Patañjali, claim that the Absolute Reality, the Perfect Truth, is concretely *experienced in the personal history* of the individual, in the banality of his sitting, his walking, his speaking. The postulate of sole ownership of Truth - unsurpassable, irrefragable - in each of the revelations has persisted throughout their histories as oral-aural or as inspired-written documents having their authors and originators in *outer* space.

For the indigenous Dharmas of India all space is One, the 'there' and the 'here' are homogenous and have the same ontological status. Transcendence is not a 'there' *thing*, or event. For the Dharmas Transcendence is the experience of the ontological mystical going beyond all the dualities constructed by the intellect. Its authentic expression is *silence*. It is the experience of bliss (*ānanda*). All over India, and in all the countries where Buddhism has plunged roots, the *bliss* gets translated into the smile on the face of the image of the Buddha, and of each of the Mahādevas of Brahmanism. [21]

The criteria of measurement of the influences pertaining to the world religions. No amount of polemical disputation, no abundance of theological acrobatics, will ever enable reaching the conclusion, based on hermeneutic assessments, that this or that religion holds the sole incontrovertible, Absolute Truth. Nevertheless there are assuredly definitive grounds, moral and cultural norms, humane and civilized criteria, which justify a valid comparison which compels the recognition of a hierarchy distinguishing the world religions, with the evaluations of their historical products.

The purpose of this essay assumes Violence and Death as a fundamental criterion for the evaluation of a religion. Jean Jacques Rousseau argues - rightly, with an elevated humane concern - that no political ideology is worth the killing of a single man. To this precept may be added: no religious ideology too is worth the killing of a single man or woman or child. In the view of this norm, there cannot be an adequate comprehension of the wars between Catholics and

---

[21] The smile of the central face of the triple Śiva at the Elephanta Cave is the perfect illustration of the beneficent Deity.

Protestants, of the genocides wreaked by Christians, of both Catholic and Protestant dispensations, upon the Pre-Columbians from the Arctic zone to the southern tip of Patagonia, of the ravages of Muslims upon the indigenous Indians, of the obliteration of peaceful Buddhisms of Indonesia, of India, of Afghanistan, of Central Asia, of Den Huang in North-Western China; of the wiping out, by Muslim forces, of the Christian cultures of Byzantium, of North Africa and of Spain and of the Zoroastrianism of Persia.

All these violences, massacres, apocalyptic destructions, have occurred by Christians believing in, and bound by, an ideology of brotherhood and by the precept of loving-thy-neighbour-as-thyself; and by Muslim Believers who selectively bring forth the sole Quranic verse **2.256** saying that there is no constraint in religion, a statement which has been belied with countless wars and forced conversions during all the past fourteen centuries. In contrast Brahmanists never left the Indian territory to conquer, or colonize, or impoverish, or enslave, men and women and children living beyond the borders of their sub-continent, though they had the wealth, the technologies, the manpower to do so. In a nuclear age, where any small country can acquire the means to bring forth a sudden apocalyptic death, the world history of the catalogue of violences, urged and committed, has all come out of the wombs of Revelations. Against the broad background of world history characterized and illustrated by the main world religions, the Oriental Humanities can legitimately, with due reason, and without any inclination to gloat, justly claim to be preferable to the three dispensations still believed to have come down from Someone living somewhere in the infinite beyond.

True: distinguished by the excellence of their Humanity, the Greeks did not spare themselves the lethal luxury of burning one another's cities. So did the Romans who spread laws, social order, civic propriety, while building an empire which lasted a thousand years. The contribution of Roman Humanity to the culture of Europe has lasted to this day. It is so unfortunate that the West has not yet begun, despite the wealth of its store of learning and wisdom, to comprehend the spirit of, in particular, the beneficence of the mystical culture of India holding Peace as an organic cultural category, in a strict contrast with the Western civilization which holds Force, and the ideology of “Might is Right”, as its own cultural category.

Maulana Azad's celebration of the merit of the absence of image worship in Islam. Hegel argues that the Jews who migrated away from Pharaonic Egypt were like Shudras who had no art of their own.

Accordingly Moses decreed the commandment that image making or representing the human figure was sinful. As slaves in Egypt they built all the great Pharaonic public art of the Nile Valley. From a modern psychological viewpoint it was a stroke of genius on the part of Moses to free his followers from their sense of cultural inferiority by the belief that all representational art was contrary to the will of Jehovah, their benefactor and liberator. The representation of the figure of a living being would be an act of ingratitude towards God Almighty. That commandment, which the Mawlānā esteems as a significant component of the veneration of Allah, has been the cause and the justification of countless acts of iconoclasm against works of beauty and of sophisticated libraries filled with learned manuscript books, all over the Indian territory. It was indulged in again in the full presence of the world, and especially with the consent of all the fifty-seven nations with Islamic majority populations, with the destruction, in 2002, of the Bamiyan Buddhas which had been standing during thirteen centuries and were protected by the UNESCO as a World Heritage.

The Mawlānā sustains the Quranic view of the Unity of God as an exclusivā, preternatural essence towering above all known and possible divinities. He stresses the notion that Allah owes His autonomy to His attributes, not to his Being. His argument cries against the story of Muhammad's nocturnal flight concluding with his *seeing with his eyes* the physical reality of Allah, who, as such, supersedes the Trinitarian Deity of the Christians. By means of the miracle of this extraordinary feat the Prophet proclaimed the uniqueness of the superiority of the *material anthropomorphic* reality of Allah such as does not exist in the theologies of the Jews and of the Christians. Nevertheless the Quran gives the reason and the necessity for the absence of images to represent the absolute Unity of Allah, by referring to his Being, not to his attributes, which are normally projections upon Him of human attributes. Mawlānā Azad disparages all the religions familiar to him - the Indian Dharmas, the Roman Catholic version of the Christian faith, in particular - for their representations of the figures of the founders of the religions and of the Supreme Being, in their paintings and plastic arts. *Nor would the Mawlānā understand Mahatma Gandhi telling Romain Rolland, during a visit at the residence of the latter, in 1931, that since his childhood he had believed that God is Truth, and now he had come to realize that Truth is God.*

Despite living in the XX century world, unified by instant

telecommunications, in the presence of all the main religious communities, and of their respective histories and art forms, and additionally in his close personal contact with highly educated, learned Brahmanists, that the Mawlānā would not have had the least incentive to grasp that, not only words, but Beauty too, in all its different forms and expressions in the fine arts, is a Knowledge expressed in a language eminently capable of conveying the glory and transcendence of God. He could not even claim, as his, the thought of Hugo von Hofsmannsthal that reading a book is like saying a prayer! [22]

The Islamic decision that the absence of the image of Allah is the only way of conveying His transcendent Being does not leave the Believer indifferent to the indigenous Indian or the Christian seeking religious or spiritual self-enhancement in image worship. The Muslim, paradoxically enough, sees the particularity of image worship as a derogation of faith in the one True God which the Believer translates as moral and social superiority. A superiority which, as a proxy of Allah, the Believer exteriorizes by the crude violence of iconoclasm as an act of faith. In India the Muslim exerted his iconoclastic ferocities against the monuments of the Brahmanists, of the Buddhists, of the Jainas. He did not molest the buildings, images, paraphernalia of worship of the Jews and the Christians.

The use of force to manifest religious 'superiority'. The representatives of the revealed religions postulate the fundamental notion of the infusion, into the soul of the Believer, all that the latter needs to know and feel in order to live in view of personal salvation. The indigenous Dharmas provides to the individual the inducements to unfurl from within the depths of his consciousness the ontological reality of his self which partakes of the essence of Brahman. The striving (*sādhaka*) seeker removes what hides or covers the Brahman who breaks out as his mystical bliss. Brahman is not a product of the infusion bestowed by an external source. In the ONE as Brahman there is neither an external entity nor an internal entity. The Dharmas state what is Real and the statement implies that the Real is already "within" the aspirant. His searching ranges totally *within his psychic space*, which signifies an interiority which is homogeneous with the formless, eternal ONE, which has always existed and will never cease to exist. The presence of the ONE negates the well-established notion of the world having been created in the manner described in the Old

[22] Hugo von Hofsmannsthal (1974-1929) : Austrian poet, playwright and librettist.

Testament Book of the Genesis.

Religious superiority as religious Force. Religious superiority has, throughout History, manifested itself, particularly in the Judeo-Christian civilization, as a moral justification for the use of Force against the Other. It requires the sweep of several centuries of History for a civilization to have its praiseworthy attributes and its dolorous deficiencies rightly evaluated. Till half a century ago, the prestige of the British Empire was such that there was no dearth of paeans for the superiority of its civilization and for the benefits which its domination was assumed to visit as an unqualified benefaction upon the conquered nations. Today, since the past two or three decades, the heavy criticisms of the institution of slavery, of the perversities and depredations of colonialism, have come to the fore with the elimination of statues of renowned pioneers in the business of slavery, for example, as illustrations of anger and of denunciation of the hitherto hidden dark side of the trade in human beings. In short, the acclaimed superiority of the Christian dispensation, with its blessing, during centuries, of the slave trade, did promote a way of living characterized by its having a night side overlaid by its day side. But in the spirit of this essay all forms of Force are evil, based on the cultural category of Might being invariably Right, in its concordance with Truth. The British Empire provides a persuasive example of such a categorical evil which was in its heyday blessed by the Church as the glorification and proof of the purpose for which the Word became Flesh in History for the spiritual advancement of Mankind. The reality ultimately proves to be material for a sorry tale of extreme shabbiness: whatever goodness may be conceded as a "momentary" phase – measured as centuries on the scales of civilizational ages – is subsequently perceived in the fullness of its realization as a justifying agency for the sorrowful inhumanities inflicted upon the sufferers of imperial force.[23]

The uncouth self-righteousness at the heart of the iconoclastic rejection of idol-worship. Mawlānā Azad's sanctification of the absence of images, as an authentic expression of high religiosity, runs parallel with the Gospel's condemnation of the Jews as the authors of the crucifixion of Jesus. The pogroms directed against the Jews in the midst of Christian societies present a cognate picture of the intolerance of the Indian Muslim's iconoclasms against the visible representations

[23] Caroline Elkins, *Legacy of Violence: A History of the British Empire;* Knopf, 2022; 896 pp.

of the indigenous Dharmas as temples and centres of high learning. Furthermore the iconoclasms were often, if not always, accompanied with the unprovoked murderous suppression of the idol-worshippers. In Europe the enormous difference lies in the fact of the pogroms having been carried out against the *minority* Jewish communities. In India the iconoclastic furies were directed against the *majority* native Indians, who were reduced to the secondary status of Dhimmis. In both cases - the Islamic and the Christian in mainly his Protestant expression - the assumed excellence of the respective revealed religion was coterminous with the superiority of the military equipment and of the art of strategy forged in war before the Islamic hordes' invasion of the Indian territory. Very quickly the tables have been turned in relation to the former Christian powers: nobody today would even think of talking or writing about the superiority of the Gospel and of Christian Orthodoxies over the Indian Dharmas. However the Muslims still maintain the illusion of the Quranic Allah being exalted high up there, in the dark space appearing as a blue sheet by its being viewed from "down below",[24] far above the Īśvara immanent in all Humanity. However, for the Brahmanist, the all-pervasive Īśvara redeems, with the permanent plenitude of spirituality, the disenchanted Earth of the Book of Genesis. But with his mind being entrapped and fossilized by submission to the revealed prescriptions, the pious Muslim cannot even conceive, as an abstract thought, the worthiness of an image as a reminder of an elevated thought or of an exalting sentiment which raises his consciousness above the trials and tribulations of life into a sunny sphere of quietude and contentment. Existentially important is the fact that the idol represents the sign standing for the reality of Īśvara who, as an actor and, as a sentient being, performs the appointed role as the devotee's in-dweller (*antaryāyāmī*). The life around the devotee is an open space homogeneous with the One. Like a mathematical principle churning in the mind without the instrumentality of a sense organ, the idol spontaneously performs the role of making present the banality of the ONE as Brahman, as Īśvara living as the *bhakta* Other. For the Muslim the sacred duty of hating the Other transmutes his personal religiosity as an exhilarating violence synchronizing with abounding heavenly delight. The Believer's hostility to the adoration of the idol reflects the aridity of Islamic hateful apprehension of the seven billion Kaffirs in the present

[24] Is the " down " for the observer in the norther hemisphere the same when he visits a friend in Australia?

demography of Humanity.

There can be neither error nor sinfulness in image worship and in the search for the Ultimate knowing within the psyche. However much Mahatma Gandhi deserves praise for his sincere belief that God is God whether He be designated as Allah or as Īśvara, the plain fact is that these two words, Allah and Īśvara, represent concepts or realities which are culturally poles apart. Allah, for the Muslim, or the Father for the Christian, are each a transcendental mental object external to the humanity of the individual believer. For the *bhakta* too the concept of Īśvara is an external object of the mind, as is the concept of I, *the Ego as the object of thought*. The comparison does not refute the historical and cultural endowments which impel more than two and a half billion Judeo-Christian believers seek meaning for their daily life. Of the Jew and the Christian the revealed legalisms require conformity and faith as submission to revelation. But the native Dharmas posit images, personifications of celestial or earthly supreme beings as myths representing maximal merits and virtues which the devotee may or may not strive to imitate depending on his will. He strives with the energy required for a mimesis of the perfection of the acts of the particular deity. It is a *conditional* choice, depending on how and what he wants to Be. The spiritual action of the devotee is from the *interior* of his consciousness towards the world outside. His action is the reverse of the Muslim's or the Christian's who *adds* goodness, virtuousness, rightness, to his 'soul' by the conformity to values prescribed by an external authority. The native *bhakta* acts like the sculptor who chisels off the unwanted mass in order to let the perfect form *simply be*. Most importantly the *bhakti* relationship with the Ultimate Reality is, as a matter of fact, accompanied with the act of renunciation and with the possession of the rightly conforming knowledge.

He unveils the perfection which had always existed within him. He does not add. He *negates* the hiding mass. He *reveals* the Deity *immanent* in him. The *bhakta's sculpting* is the practice of abstinence, of avoiding superfluous wanting, of withdrawing from the instability of passing attachments, the abandonment of all hopes for rewards, of the resolute searching for the ineffable fulfillment waiting to come to the light of knowing from the depths of the psyche. The ultimate liberation from the shackles of desire and attachment consists of the meta-psychic realization of the ontological transcendence of all words of thought and of all the signs of the imagination.

The external legalism as the substance of the Revelations. The

Supreme Deity in the revealed religions is external to the Believer: Jehovah meets Moses and gives him the tablets engraved with the Ten Commandments; He sends Angel Gabriel to recite the contents of the Book He has written to the Apostle in Arabia. In Christianity it is the Word, the *Logos,* which comes down as the Son in Jesus Christ. In each Revelation God *descends* into the History of the world, in astronomical, calendar time. The virtues, the norms, the laws, the rules, the principles which the God in Heaven prescribe for the right proceeding on the Straight Path - all constitute an *external* legalism to which the faithful must conform and submit. In Brahmanism the *avatāra* of the Supreme Being occurs in the *psychic time* of the Bhakta and manifests Himself in the *psychic* space as the private history of the Bhakta, in his thought, in his speech, in his walking. The manifestation of the *iṣṭa devatā* is universal: it occurs as the *private individual history* of every individual within the differences and hierarchies extant in the social order.

In the world of the Dharmas, Gautama Buddha, during the moment of clarity moments before his death, gave the key to understand the ontological difference which defines the native Indian religiosities. The Buddha said: *'The Dharma which I have given you is only a guide. It is like a boat which you use to cross the river over to the other bank. When you reach the other bank you leave the boat and you continue while walking towards your destination. I have given you all that I could, without holding anything in my closed fist. But you must be lamps unto yourselves!*"

This recommendation to the follower to be a lamp unto himself epitomizes the essence of the indigenous Dharmas in their construction of the Indian civilization across several millennia. It emphasizes the Buddhist's inescapable searching, all the time, alone, with the use of his physical and psychic resources; relentlessly he abides by the independent, individual use of the resources of his Humanity in the resolute effort to draw from within it the fullness of being an *Arhat.*

Add to this the unique, the magnificent, discovery and affirmation of God as *nirākāra* (formless), unparalleled in the history of the world religions, as the reflection of the *nirvikalpa samādhi* (contemplation without any idea or concept thought or imagined) proclaimed by the very first Yoga-sūtra of Patañjali. The ultimate experience of the *nirākāra brahman,* for example, in Brahmanism, is trans-cultural, unlimited by the history and the geography of India. It is the foundation of the proverbial tolerance of the non-Islamic, non-Christian, non-Jewish, India. *And there can be no justification for any violence, or deprecation, or iconoclasm, in relation to the celebration*

of the experience of the hallowed emptiness. Lao Tzu says that no action whatsoever is needed - let alone iconoclasm - once one achieves the state of oneness with the Tao. In China neither the Confucianists, nor the Taoists, ever engaged in iconoclasm, which is characteristic of the history of the revealed religions. In India no Brahmanist, no Buddhist, no Jaina ever burned a book, or a library.[25] The ultimate Yoga experience of the *cessation of all the thought process* (citta vṛtti nirodha) is the statement of the ontological psychic perfection which transcends all theologies and philosophies, however exalted and prestigious they can be in their historical expressions. The *citta vṛtti nirodha* relativises all written and oral spiritual discourses, all signs and symbols, whatever may be the claim of each to own or represent the exclusive absolute Truth: it is the Ocean in which all rivers experience their end, in faithfulness to their origins. Had the Believers of revealed religions integrated, into their thought and belief systems, the reality of the cessation of the contemplating process as a universal mystical attainment, they would perhaps have been able to restrain themselves in the indulgence of genocides and other forms of ill-treatment of fellow human beings.

The merit of enchantment and of image worship. More than any other religion or form of worship, Brahmanism has remained alive, since the very early beginning, with the devotee knowing that the image as-such is not physically his *iṣṭa devatā*. It is a contingent, immediate reminder of the Divinity with whose *mythic* personality he entertains a *living* relationship and unveils the meaning of the icon in his experience as *his history* in his sitting, in his walking, in his speaking. The idol provides the occasion for a private worship, in the language or dialect of the worshipper, to the measure of his vitality and his sensitivity. That is why all the iconoclastic destructions were carried out by the Muslims without any diminution of the Hindu religion, on account of the simple fact that the Hindu can carry out his worshipping at his residence, with the aid of a picture, or of a polished stone representing Śiva as the *favoured divinity,* or by a silent moment of meditation. The Brahmanist act of worshipping is devoid of the

[25] Had the Indian Muslims shown, in a secular India under a liberal constitution, at least an iota of tolerance and of recognition that the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya was an expression of the oft-repeated iconoclasm against Hindu sacred places, the Hindus would not have lost patience after nearly a century of negociation before demolishing the mosque as a memory of iconoclasm. Even then the Muslims persisted in not acknowledging their iconoclastic heritage. Mawlānā Azad did not.

calisthenics of the Muslim *namāz.* The Muslim iconoclasts could never grasp the ineffable role a friendly or loving idol plays in the life of a devotee, just as they could never open up to the thought of the love which a cow can elicit in the mind of a Hindu. Such psychological infirmities interpreted as religious Islamic superiority restricts the understanding of the Believer who fills the vacant space of his consciousness with the ignorance of the Other. Submission to Allah's revelations implies the Believer's own philosophical limitation which he hardens with the hatred infused in his consciousness by His Sovereignty and His *Taqdīr*. The Believer compensates the limitation of his religious sensitivity by exerting the sacred zeal of hating whatever is non-Islamic with the further license of practicing violence connatural with the submission to his *dīn* (religion). With the faithful Muslim, a Kaffir Hindu has no resource which could enable him to strike a dialogue as the possibility of a cordial mutual understanding.

Mūrti pūjā is radically different from the worship which, designed for an Umma, is effective only when it is conducted in Arabic. In the context of the practice of the Islamic *dīn* the Arabic language *is in reality a concrete* idol in comparison to the *symbolic* meaning the image lending itself to a heart-felt, silent evocation of the Supreme Being. Though the Christian too belongs to a Sangha, or Umma, or Ecclesia, that is, to the Church, his worship of Jesus Christ constitutes a private dialogue, a private engagement specific to his spiritual need, in a relationship which does not breach the transcendence represented by the sacredness of the altar.

It is ironic that Muslims berate Brahmanists for their worship of idols, when the Believers consider the Holy Book as really coterminous with Allah, or the Kaba as more than a mere meteorite fragment, which attracts Believers to cross continents in order to fulfill one of the obligatory duties prescribed by the revelation. The real freedom from the need of an idol becomes a personal reality with the attainment, by self-effort, of the transcendence of thoughts in the contemplation as *nirvāṇa*, or *kaivalya*, or *saccidananda*, each of which is an ontological experience unqualified by words or by images conjured up by the imagination. It is a meta-linguistic experience. The words, in this context, are useful for the purpose of teaching and explicating. They do not explain the *supra-conscious states* as *objects* which have been physically lying out in space or in time, waiting to be collected.

Despite the countless visible prodigies of iconoclastic fallouts all over the sub-continent, Mawlānā Azad does not even 'see' that the foremost

homage to the Unity of God requires the negation of an image which has fostered the barbarism of iconoclasm, implemented by its fatalistic logic of ignorance passing as *faith and as pride in the possession of the very words audibly spoken by a physical God.* In reality, the triumph of Islam over the plurality of Buddhisms and over the plurality of Christianities has, due to its implacable brutish practice of iconoclasm, considerably reduced the beauty and peacefulness of Humanity. The two extreme poles between which spread the spaces of the major religions represented in India are (i) the Muslim's violent iconoclastic ignorance of the Other affirmed, with the aid of brute force, as a spiritual superiority based on the knowledge of the Revelation and (ii) the mystical finalities of the indigenous Dharmas.

Islam destroys and replaces a culture without contributing any original cultural element of its own. The barbarism perpetrated against Indian Kaffir society, as the translation of the submission to revealed injunctions, has had one contemptible feature: the mindless obliteration of native aesthetic artefacts without any comparable replacement in the barren emptiness which it generates. During nearly five centuries of their domination the Ottoman Muslims gave nearly nothing to the Balkans. Nor did they enhance the culture of the Arabs during the six centuries of holding them as colonized subalterns. In a thousand years Indian Muslims have not produced a single great book in which a non-Believer can find an iota of solace, or of happiness, or of any kind of elevating delectation. But they burnt libraries. They destroyed centres of high learning. Their demolishing pieties are urged by the intellectual indigence of the Believer animadverting on the Indian Kaffir who exalts the Supreme Being in a multiplicity of ways: with silent homage, with music and dance, with painting and sculpture, as well as with writing a sermon or a *sūtra* or orating with the art of eloquence. Wherever it imposed its hegemony, the Muslim's iconoclasm has been acted out as manifestation of collective atrocity carried out with remorseless fervor in the name of Allah, with the arrogance stemming from the sword in the service of a baneful ideology.[26]

[26] Muslims are wont spontaneously to refer to the Taj Mahal as a beautiful contribution to the Indian culture. With similitude to the exception of Cordoba in Spain, as beautiful monuments raised far from Arabia, in pluri-cultural places, the Taj Mahal is one of the Mausoleums which testify to the hegemony of Indian Islam. As a homage to a King's erotic passion for his wife, it could have been as worthy of eulogy as the unknown love of the King's stable man for his wife. It does not stir the soul as does the wonder

Islamic iconoclasm and the Constitution of 1950. Mawlānā Azad's celebration of the Unity of God and his sanctimonious praising of the Quran, as the best of all the religions available in the Indian sub-continent, belies the constitutional proclamation of the equality of all religions obtaining in the country. The Mawlānā is right, in fidelity to his orthodox belief, which jars with there being no evidence of his having experienced any disquiet due to his association with the independence movement based on the ideology of Satya and *Ahiṁsā* drawn from the *Mahābhārata* epic. His assumption that Islam has no equal must be taken as a gratuitous assumption, with the endorsement by the Believers. With his whole-hearted submission, the Mawlānā's insistence on a hermeneutic, which vehemently insists on the Unity of Allah, would have been a downright rejection of Mahatma Gandhi's singing at his regular afternoon prayer gathering that *"allah ishvar terā nām.* Unfortunately there is no available published evidence of any discussion which the two leaders would have had about the Mahatma's catholicity based on his belief in a generic God evoked by different Names. But it is further significant that there is no published speech of the Mawlānā using the Quranic verses providing expressions of the demand for independence. Nor does one find any evidence of any borrowing from the Quran in the prodigious writings of the Mahatma. Hindsight compels the bitter astonishment that Partition could be brought about by the tidal wave of Muslim hatred of the Hindu swelled by the power of the one-line slogan: *'Islam is in danger'*, and by the canard that, in a free India, the Muslims would be oppressed by the Hindu majority. No one among all the millions of the Indian Muslims, particularly those who approved of the antagonistic ideology of the Muslim League, could exhibit, however faintly, the equivalent of the physical and intellectual courage of Abdel Kader who wrote mystical poetry beside fighting on the front line in leading the rebel forces against the French imperialist power. But the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi's *Ahiṁsā* shall dwell for all time as the guiding ethos for the government of the Indian nation. This Gandhian addition to the tradition of the Dharma Śāstra shall stay as a humane norm informing all the forms of future political jurisdictions. It is a living blessing for India that the Mahatma remains as the reference for the normative appraisal of *all* socio-political initiatives.

---

stirred by contemplating the temple of Ellora, despite the evidence of its share of iconoclastic ravages.

The hierarchy of worshippers according to the Quran. In his estimation of the history of the Indian Dharmas, Mawlānā Azad adversely views the hierarchy of the native worshippers, according to whom the worship of God in his absoluteness is undertaken only by the elite.[27] He finds this social trait present among the Greeks too. In Greece the thinkers were certainly not unaware of the gods of Olympus having no reality about them. But "the Quran asserts that God alone is worthy of worship. If you turn to any other in devotion, you cease to be a believer in the Unity of God."[28] It staggers the mind that the Mawlānā would exclusively advocate that adoration or worshipping can be held to be valid only if it be directed to the Only God of the Revelation. Thereby, he signified that he was, while living in a sub-continent where Hindus, in particular, frowning upon the worship of the deity chosen (*iṣṭa*) from an abundant pantheon. He is blissfully unaware of the extensive plurality of deities worshipped by so many peoples, in so many places, for millennia before and during the XX century! Nor is he apparently aware of the conflicts and lethal consequences which monotheistic modes of worship have entailed in the histories of the populations faithful to the three religions revealed by the Only God of the Bible.

Refutation of Maulana Azad's restrictive monotheistic viewpoint. Mawlānā Azad correctly asserts that the indigenous Dharmas do recognize the reality of degrees of understanding in the worship of the favourite divinity (*iṣṭa devatā*) according to the capacity of the worshipper. The authors of the Vedānta, for example, do write simplified versions of the doctrine for the sake of the *manda buddhi* (low intelligence). In the *Bhagavad Gītā* Śrī Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna that anyone who worships Him even with the offering of a leaf is dear to Him. Worship of God in the Dharmas, in particular of the Brahmanist dispensation, the worship is not obligatory, as it is in the revealed religions. In the indigenous Dharmas worshipping is an individualistic practice. It rises as the expression of a yearning which varies according to the worshipper's personal disposition: the yearning may arise from Doubt, or from Ignorance, or from the desire to be freed from suffering, or from a curiosity provoked by study, or from the influence of a Sat Sangha like catching an 'infection' in contact with others. In none of the Dharmas is religiosity commanded by an external agency

[27] BCQ, p. 8-9.

[28] BCQ, p. 10.

or bureaucracy, or from a priest or rabbi, or mullah, or any external authority, be it even God. In the Dharmas the religious call affects the individual, not the collectivity. Even in a homogeneous community or society, the yearning for closeness to the Supreme Being arises from the heart of the individual. In the revealed faiths the worship is ordered for the totality of the believing community. The initial revelation came from 'above', from Allah communicating his words through the mediation of the Angel Gabriel. The Quran is not the outcome of Muhammad's yearning. The synagogue, the church, the mosque are designed for congregational worship. In a temple the space allows for a few standing worshippers voluntarily worshipping in front of the idol. The Indian Dharmas recognize the existence of the wide spectrum of worshippers endowed with an array of degrees of individual venerating the meaning and the characteristics of the deity being worshipped, in the perspective of a finality conforming to the worshipper's desire. In Islam the five standard religious duties which, initially proclaimed by the Prophet, are required by Allah according to the Quran. The obligation of the entire Islamic community worshipping with the aid of a set of calisthenics does not signify that the apprehension of the meaning of the prayer is, in reality, equally grasped by all the attendants. In all the acts of group violence which, in the communal riots, are initiated, most of the time, as extensions of the Friday noon prayer, the goons who lust in destroying, burning, killing belong mostly to the 'lower' class, though it is not infrequent for the college, or university educated middle class, to join in in answer to the call issued in the mosque by the leading Imam. The praying congregation can, and does, transmute itself into a live tsunami of blind fury roused for mass mayhem. In such cases the congregational prayer acquires homogeneity with a murderous political act. As such, in Islam, in particular, the praying gathering can suddenly morph into a deadly political eruption which in truth unveils the essence of the revealed *dīn*.[29]

In sum, for the Brahmanist, for example, it is neither easy, nor necessary, to invoke God as the author, or projector, of Māyā, in the

[29] When I joined the Banaras Hindu university in 1954 and witnessed for the first time the crowd of the students filling the main street linking the campus with the "down town", I was surprised by the small leading group shouting: "*Hara Hara*!" to which the crowd would respond in chorus with : "*Mahādeva*!" When I asked my class friends for the origin of that slogan, they explained that it was the reply to the *"Allahu Akbar*" of the Muslims.

same measure as to imagine Him as the Creator of all things known and unknown. But, for the Muslim, any possible or necessary cogitation of the nature of Allah signifies the simplicity of uttering the word as the sound of the divine Unity. His belief requires only the immediate submission to the sound 'Allah': it is an economy which dispenses with the hierarchy of the ways of worshipping corresponding to the degrees of understanding evinced by the native Indian devotees.

The infinite chasm which separates the Islamic Unity of God from the pluralistic Dharmas. Mawlānā Azad refers to Abu Bakr, shortly after the death of the Prophet, proclaiming: 'He who worshipped Muhammad, let him know that Muhammad is dead; and he who worshipped God, let him know that God lives always. He never dies.' He further comments that, previous to the Quran, distinction was made between the common people and the elite. The Quran brushed aside this distinction. "It presented for one and all only one single way of approach to God and afforded to them but a single view of divine attributes. It held before both, the philosopher or the gnostic, the unlettered shepherd or the rustic, but the only one and the same glow of Reality."[30]

There is no verifiable justification of the Mawlānā's claiming that everybody in a congregation performing the gestures of the n*amāz* is doing so with the same or equal understanding. Democratic equality does not exist in spirituality. At all times, in all cultures, high spirituality has been exhibited by a rightly acknowledged, select elite aristocracy commanding respect and admiration. The critical difference which distinguishes the devotee of the Dharmas from the Muslim believer consists of this: the devotee's essence and the essence of the Supreme Being are homogeneous: all devotees - and the Dharmas claim this privilege for *all* beings - have *sameness* or *homogeneousness* with God, coexisting with psychological and social differences. The private individual Bhakta thinks of the favourite deity or of the Supreme Being in different ways at different stages of his life and of his understanding. Likewise there is a specific, practical private and social difference between the devotee's relationship with his mother and the relationship with his wife, or with his sister, or with his daughter, or with his neighbour, while they all *are each* an expression of the *sam*e divine essence. Mystical sameness and social hierarchy simultaneously qualify the relation between the Ultimate Reality, either as *Sākāra* or *Nirākāra*, and all living beings. That is why, incidentally, it is worth stressing, the Mahatma never said, or wrote, a

[30] BCQ, pp. 11-12

single word of abuse, of anger, or of hatred, in relation to the person of the foreign administrator of the Raj. He had trained himself to view the Other, whoever or whatever the Other might be, as being essentially one with himself. His universalist compassion did pervade also his perception of the British official administrating the oppressive rule of the colonized population. Such a perspective was not, and would not have been, available to the Mawlānā. There was a qualitative, essential difference between the singer of *Allah Īśvar tera nām* and the Believer's exclusivist view of the absolute Unity of God, postulated and named originally as Yahweh in the Old Testament. Even if Al Lah be the only God and Īśvara be a fiction, the Mahatma singing was evincing a universalist, compassionate sentiment which the Mawlānā could not reciprocate at the cost of being denounced as an Apostate. Allah, as the only God, could not, and can never, be Ishvar. Above all, it would be a blasphemy in the understanding of the submitting Believer. No wonder then that, while riding the band-wagon of the Congress Party, Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad could exert barely a minimal, if any, influence upon the majority of his co-Believers loathing the Hindus in the name of Allah! By claiming himself to be the sole leader of all the Indian Muslims, Jinnah, ignorant of the history of Islam and of India, as well as of any other History, actually succeeded in demeaning the scholarly Maulana as an ineffective lackey in the service of the Congress Party.

Intolerance immanent in monotheistic belief. However the evidence of the same level of understanding the 'same glow of Reality' becomes manifest in the simple-mindedness of uttering: "He is Allah the One, Allah the eternally Besought of all!' (**Q. 112. 1-4**). It is this unreflective, economic simplicity which gets dressed up in the physical universality of violence, as the chanting cry of an army on the march. As a cryptic theological statement of an absolute truth it would have lent itself to serving as a war cry under the military leadership of Muhammad. It has persisted and will continue to persist till the Day of Judgement in the service of Islam in movement as Fundamentalist Islamism and of Fundamentalist Islamism at rest as Islam. Either the absolute exclusiveness of Allah or the absolute exclusiveness of Jehovah, both fortify the absolute disenchantment of the world as it is enunciated in the Bible and reasserted in the Quran. In *The Cunning of History*, Rabbi Richard Rubinstein displays the signal courage to argue that, prescribed by Protestant Christianity, the stark disenchantment of the world - which is intensified and made worse, more rigid, than the disenchantment of the Book of Genesis - was one of the three forces

which made the Holocaust possible.[31] For the cosmic disenchantment of the Earth renders it easy for the Christian Believer to project the fundamental, cosmic disenchantment upon the living Other and accordingly deprive him of the Humanity and the Sacredness of his life. With greater severity the disenchantment pronounced by the Quran happens to be more drastic and unbridled than what obtains in the Lutheran *Weltanschauung.* In addition to the disenchantment of the universe, the innocence which Allah in Quran (**8.17)** confers upon the killing Believer acting as His proxy, did spur the lust of the Muslim League Islamists in the Partition massacres. The validity of the verse **8.17** preserves its relevance among the community of Fundamental Islamism at rest within the Indian Republic.

Intolerant violence inherent to Revelation. To kill, out of divinely ordained hatred, with a feeling of innocence vouchsafed by Allah, explains the gratuitousness of the Muslim believing in his unquestioned superiority over any other kind of votary. It is true that, throughout history, collectivities claiming superiority have not restrained themselves from combining it with power to exert raw violence upon those who happened to be physically weak. Far superior cultures have been wiped out by such lethal associations of ungrounded religious or philosophical superiority allied to the use of raw power and to the easy availability of deadly lethal weapons. Endowed with material military strength, enthused by the love for war, Islamic armies could irremediably devastate the noble, genuinely peaceful, superior cultures of the Buddhists, of the Persians, of the Christians. In India, in the midst of the XX century, the minority consisting of the murderous proxies of Allah prevailed against a majority of Hindus and Sikhs trapped in the way of life suffused with the spirit of *ahiṁsā.* It was left to itself without the safekeeping and the protection of a worthy Kṣatriya power dedicated to the traditional duty of protecting the body politic.[32]

---

[31] The other two causes were: the amoral sophisticated rationality of the Nazi bureaucracy and the uses of the technologies of an industrial civilization.

[32] Traditionally the word '*kṣatriya*' combines the two roots '*kṣat*'(injury) and '**tra**' (protect); hence the classic statement : "*kshatāt duhkhāt trāyate*" (Protects from wounds and suffering). In the absence of the Kṣatriya protection, the Mahatma offered the new political ethos of submission to voluntary suffering as a moral force to subdue the ferocity of the enemy. It worked against the Raj and left a noble legacy as a further enrichment of the Dharma.

Mawlānā Azad's critique of Brahmanist tolerance. "The spirit of tolerance which has characterized Indian history, no doubt, deserves a meed of praise. But life is an expression of action and inter-action, and unless we draw a limit or line for every type of activity, canons of knowledge and morality will get disturbed, and we shall cease to possess any definite sense of moral values. Tolerance is a good thing, but strength of belief and opinion, and integrity of thought are also factors of life which we cannot ignore. "... Forgiveness is a good and beautiful idea. But this very forgiveness, once it over-steps its legitimate boundary, ceases to be forgiveness: it becomes timidity or cowardice. ..... Compromise is a necessity of life. Our life itself is one long compromise. But there should be a limit to it. .....You will certainly respect the beliefs of others, but you will insist on your right not to let your own belief weaken on that account."

The Mawlānā generously quotes from S. Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy* (Vol. I, p. 119) the passage saying that the Aryan religion, in its expansion, did not fight the lower religions and fight them out of existence. And the Mawlānā boldly comments that "the peculiarity of the Quran is that it refuses to enter into any compromises in the field of beliefs. In the unitary and transcendental concept of God, it is definite and inelastic. This rigidity however, does not prevent it from observing tolerance towards other beliefs. But it certainly refuses to enter into compromises with them."[33] That rigidity does not prevent the Quran from observing tolerance towards other beliefs must be attributed to the Mawlānā and his disciple Syed Latif as a droll kind of humor! A casual look at a world map showing the areas covered by Islam refutes any attribution of its tolerance and of the heartlessness of seeing it as a peaceful ideology. Wherever Islam has established its rule, it invariably reduces the previous culture to naught. Indeed the Quran explicitly forbids the Believer having any friendly relationship with a non-Believer: "let not the believers take disbelievers for their friends in preference to believers. Whoso doth that hath no connection with Allah unless (it be) that ye but guard yourselves against them, taking (as it were) security. Allah biddeth you beware (only) of Himself. Unto Allah is he Journeying. (**Q. 3. 28)**

Islam as a lethal regression from the ethics propounded by Jesus. The few reflections of the Mawlānā, as conveyed above, by his disciple Syed Abdul Latif, do provide a reliable perception of his opinions on tolerance, forgiveness, truth. Indeed one is stunned by the lightness with which Mawlānā Azad dismisses these virtues which had been cultivated and perfected by the followers of the Dharmas during several millennia, before they became the habit, the effortlessness of

[33] BCQ, pp. 14-15

virtuous conduct as a natural feature of the social environment. These virtues had been discovered, learned, taught and transmitted as paradigms of normal living-togetherness. However baffling it can be to any dispassionate observer's mind, the Mawlānā does not 'see' the tolerance in the midst of the plurality of the Dharmas which had expanded their influence without any prejudice to the Jews and the Christians during the time before the invasion of the first Muslim horde. It is depressing to read of his relativist downgrading of forgiveness without any appreciation of Jesus's sublime asking his Father to forgive his tormentors and crucifiers. It is indeed disturbing that, endowed with the high scholarship in Islamic studies, Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad's mind would be so impervious to the awe-inspiring refutation of any casuistic defense of the uncompromising Islamic law of talion by Jesus, in his crucified state, pleading with the Father to forgive the authors of his agonies. The obdurate coolness of the Mawlānā in the face of such a tremendous example of compassion provides the exact measure of the Islamic mind's incapacity to gauge the splendor of forgiveness and the prodigiousness of compassion. It teases the time to speculate that most probably, during the twelve years of his disappearance from the Jewish society, Jesus would have been acquainted with the Buddhist perfection (*pārāmitā*) of *karuṇā* (compassion), a virtue expressly qualifying the character of the Bodhisattva (the state of the Saint who needs one more birth to be an accomplished Buddha). Being "full" of saintliness, Jesus, being so perfected, with not the least of psychic space clouded with ill-feeling, pleaded for the forgiveness of his tormentors. *That* sublime state of absolute purity entered, for the first time, into the Jewish culture which the Rabbis and the religious elites, inheritors of Jehovah's harsh laws and prescriptions, could not understand. Even in the history of the succeeding Christianity there has been little application of the infinitely moral category of compassion manifested towards the victims of enslavements and colonialisms. These failures do not, however, negate the tremendous powerfulness of the forgiveness which, a new moral norm, Jesus introduces as a novelty in the history of the culture bequeathed by Jehovah and Moses. It is reasonably urgent, and culturally important, to belabor, with humility, the original Buddhist contribution of the noble concept of the virtue of *karuṇā* (compassion) as one of the Himalayan summits of the Bauddha Dharma. There is no compassion in the Idea of Jehovah as the Only God. The Ten Commandments of the Biblical Book of Genesis do not have any reference to compassion or forgiveness. The guards who supervised the crucifixion and would have heard his exclamation of

forgiveness, showed no sign of surprise or understanding of the sudden lightning bolt of a new virtue suddenly invading the history of the faith and the sensibility of the Jews. The politics and the history of Christendom and of its empires evince nary an iota of compassion in the exercise of its colonizing denominations. Worse, the imperial agents of violence were not even aware of their own self-corrupting activities in the function of their responsibilities as the authors of the violence and intolerance initially inspired by Jehovah and transmitted, throughout the British Empire, as service to the Defender of the Faith. After all the Word which was at the beginning bore no relation with Jehovah. It is disconcerting that any scholarly authority learned in God-Talk would so artlessly dismiss Jesus's unequalled magnanimity bequeathed to Humanity. No Muslim luminary could ever express the thought to match Soren Kierkegaard's statement that Humanity moved a big step forward with the advent of Jesus. On the contrary Muhammad used his swords against the Christians of Arabia. His revolution based on his proclamation of a revised, pure, version of the original Revelation, which had been offered by Jehovah to the Jews and subsequently to the Christians, was a major, catastrophic regression from the ethics propounded by Jesus. The Messenger introduced into History the lethal concomitance of individual and national purity with absolute political power.

The relative worth of the Biblical cosmology. If '*muslim'* means 'submission', then, without feeling any need for an appreciation of the virtues propounded by the indigenous Dharmas, to which he ascribes at best a relative importance, the Mawlānā does, with soulful adhesion to the narrowness of his vision, submit to the Quran saying:

> "As for those who strive for Us, We surely guide them to Our paths, and lo! Allah is with the good." (**29. 69**)."And in the earth are portents for those whose faith is sure, And (also) in yourselves. Can ye then not see?"(**51**. **20-21**).

Such assertions are rooted in the belief that, according to the Book of Genesis, the world has been created out of nothing or out of a Chaos, as a banal matter of fact implying the existence of Jehovah, the omnipotent Creator. Mawlānā Azad endorses this *Bhagavad Gītā (Chapter 2)* elevated view which pronounces with metaphysical boldness, that, different from the Biblical cosmology, that the world has always been in existence, that there was never a time when it did not exist, and there will never be a time when it will cease to exist. Further, that the individual who exists now, has always been in existence, and there will never be a time when he will not exist.

The Brahmanist cosmology which pronounces the Supreme Being as *anādi* (beginningless) involves the reality of the beginningless existence of the world. The corresponding belief in the cosmic cycle presupposes that there have been previous cosmic cycles and the on-going one in which all mankind is living is not the only one. After the conclusion of the fourth segment of the present cycle, a new cosmic cycle will arise.

The particularity of the Brahmanist cosmology. The Brahmanist cosmology accordingly postulates the world as the One, without the distinction between Nature (*physis*) and Supernature (*metaphysis*) made by the thinkers of the Eastern Mediterranean, that is, the Greeks and the early inhabitants of the Near East. The *physis* and *metaphysis* of the Greeks constitutes the dualistic foundation of the three Revelations. The assumption of, and the belief in, the Supernatural category determines the centrality of each of the three dualistic, revealed religions. Above all, the ethos based on the cosmology of the *One* generates a total humane vision of the world, in contrast with the difference between Believers and Non-Believers. Brahmanism rests on the crucial belief that Man is *in* the world, *with* the world, *of* the world. The homogeneity is constituted of permutations and combinations of the three *guṇas: sattva, rajas, tamas*, which, in an infinite variation of combinations, constitute the totality of the material and immaterial substance of the One.

Buddhist indifference to cosmology. Buddhism goes a step further: it does not elucidate the importance and the relevance of a cosmology in regard to the mystical search for the extinction of all suffering inherent in Time. Gautama if the only founder of a spirituality which, with magnificent assurance, replaces the Euclidean space with Mental Space, and the astronomical, calendar time with Mental Time, within which all the striving for the attainment of Nirvāṇa is carried out, independently of a belief or a necessity of a cosmology. By means of this astute transfer of personal moral responsibility to the personal space and time, Buddhism liberates Man from any preceding philosophical and religious baggage borne by the local tradition. That it has spread and maintained itself all over Asia, for the well-being of countless millions of men and women, testifies to the perfect sagacity of Gautama Buddha who, at the age of thirty-five, with the sole equipment and authority of his personal awakening, set into motion a metaphysical-religious Middle Way (*madhyama pratipad*) as the means of universal salvation. In no other nation, in no other culture, in no other civilization, has a young man given to Mankind, a nobler

vision of life than the prince Gautama has, with the sole power of a spirituality based on the simplicity of the four Noble Truths of: *All Life is suffering, Suffering has a cause, Suffering has an end, There is a Way to the end of Suffering*: a message unrelated to imperial conquest or domination, or to any affirmation of the glory of the mortiferous acquisition of raw power. Gautama's attainment of his self-awakening in the forest and his enunciating of the fulgent Middle Way was a lightning bolt which breaks the whole spectrum of human suffering. It compares infinitely well with the martial pronouncement of Muhammad: "I was ordered to "fight all men until they say 'There is no god but Allah'. The Conqueror-Apostle thereby intimated, as the *nec plus ultra Dar-ul-Islam* glorifying The Only God. He was proclaiming the Allah-cherished ideal world envisaged as a spiritual emptiness due to the disappearance of all non-Islamic cultures. The World of Islam will offer the spectacle of an aesthetic and spiritual Wasteland of Mosques and hecatombs.[34]

Evidently it does not occur to the Mawlānā that the cosmology which the Quran adopts from the Old Testament is not the only one available. Every culture has its own autonomous cosmology. Before the birth of Muhammad the world had already been adorned with a variety of cultures, with different elevations of cultural refinement, each of which had its specific cosmology. They had been flourishing for centuries. Archeologists have unveiled the existence of past advanced civilizations like Troy, Mohenjodaro, Minos, Assyria, Shang, for example. The Museum in Bagdad exhibits tablets with prints of characters indicating the living use of a language which prevailed in a very ancient time, compared to which the language of the Old Testament would have appeared and matured at a later date. A comparison can be made if it is assumed, for example, that the French language took eight centuries to grow into becoming an independent

---

[34] Vide, Efraim Karsh, *Islamic Imperialism*, p. 1; Yale University Press, 2007.

One can today contemplate the state of Islam which, starting from the very first days of Islam in Medina, has been plagued with a never-ending mobility of the Believing populations. This violent mobility has persisted during the past fourteen centuries. It is further heightened with the present evidence of the ceaseless agitations in all the fifty-seven majority Muslim theocracies today. Faced with such an abundance of disquiet, as vindication of Muhammad's superhuman boasting, one can only lament the cosmic irony of the Violence of a far inferior doctrine withering - by the extolment of the primacy of Matter over the sanctity of mystical finality as the defining feature of Human life - such a superior, highly elevating *Middle Way* as taught by Gautama.

medium of expression from the mother tongue of Latin. In the VI century quite a few vibrant civilizations flourished in different parts of the world. The Incas, the Aztecs, the Mayans, were brilliant civilizations which the Spaniards, animated by the spirit of the Counter Reformation, deemed it their civilized task to wipe out. More than any other people the Indians had already produced the sophisticated original cultures of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism, in addition to a Christian community raised independently of any direct influence reaching it from the Near East where flourished the first generations of Christians.

The organic relation between the Biblical cosmology and the genocides pertaining to the revealed religions. The dogma that the Old Testament cosmology is the only True one, and all others are false or they own lesser moral or spiritual authority, has historically nurtured - by the influence of the European mind submitting to the primacy of the Idea of Jehovah - closed-mindedness, intolerance, arrogance, hardened with faked, gratuitous, superiority manifested with persisting violences. Genocides have been the exclusive signatures of the three religions revealed by God, in a striking contrast with the history and the merits of the Oriental religions. No genocide has been generated by peoples enlivened by the ethos of the man-made ways of living of the Orientals. But of all the three revelations, it is Islam which assuredly has accomplished the largest share of the totality of recorded genocides. In truth the genocides of the Jews belonging to the three Arabian tribes - Qainuqa, Nadir, Quraiza - were perpetrated by Muhammad himself at the beginning of his career as the Founder of Islam. They were Jews who had been living in Medina for more than five hundred years. Yet, the paradox of Muhammad's hatred of the Jews proceeded from the similarity of *his* revelation with the several centuries old Jewish faith: the antagonism was based on the Jews rightfully not recognizing Islam as the first Revelation supposed to have been debased by Jewish negligence and unbelief. The conflicts between the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic Christians present a parallel chapter of inter-religious bloodshed in the history of Middle Europe during the sixteenth century. Peaceful social mutual enrichment and amicable collaboration prevails in societies entertaining a plurality of religious beliefs, as has been evident in the histories of the major Oriental powers: India, China, Japan. Social harmony prevailed in the India of the three Dharmas, of the indigenous version of Christianity and of the small community of Jews, since the first century A.D. Iconoclasm and religious violences and conflicts constitute the "contribution" of an Islam using the sword as the means

of communicating its lethal, intolerant, culturally deficient ideology.

Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad's indifference to the abuses of Islamic hegemony. Even after the Partition of India, the Mawlānā did not offer any reflection on the majority Brahmanism emerging from the gloom of the hegemony of the Muslim and the British hegemonies with the pacifism of Mahatma Gandhi and of the majority of his non-Muslim followers. As a Muslim scholar directly involved in the history and in the meaning of that upheaval, he is not a solitary representative of moral insensitivity in the face of a catastrophe which had its *raison d'être* in the ideology and history of his own faith. Coeval with him, when confronted with the enormity of the Judeocide, no one among the world Rabbinate felt the need to reflect on the Old Testament having bequeathed to Humanity the Idea, or rather the cosmic maleficence, of the divine sanction for religious intolerance. It is significant that today there is an almost universal silence of the Biblical story of the genocide perpetrated by the Jews on the Cananaans at the request of Yahweh: they killed the men, they killed the women, they killed the children, they killed even all their animals. Chastised by the rest of the world, post World War II Christian Europe is afraid to mention the first recorded genocide perpetrated by the Jews on the inhabitants of the Canaan, on the order of Jehovah, for the crime of disobedience. Concomitantly the Muslims do not join their share of guilt of genocides with the Jews in relation to their own history of slavery and of an assortment of genocides on the cultures which they destroyed by the use of hammer and sword.

The concomitance of dualistic religions and of genocides. Nor has anyone among the different Christian sects shown any concern to examine the paradox of the universal brotherhood preached by Jesus and the many genocides which have punctuated the history of Judeo-Christian civilization. There is not even a word in any of the European languages to express the collective indifference to the genocides of the Gypsies, the Roms, the Jews by the Nazis and their collaborators. Likewise there is little awareness or knowledge on the part of contemporary Indians of the genocide (euphemistically called the Bengal Famine) deliberately master-minded and executed by Winston Churchill during 1943-44. The best example of collective indifference or of forgetfulness, worse than the Judeocide, is the Indian population, consisting of the Hindu majority, being blissfully unaware of the disappearance of the Buddhism which arose and flourished for nearly eighteen centuries, as the most humanely spectacular spiritual culture emanating from among the community of forest-dwellers

(*vānaprasthas*). The Holocaust did not totally eradicate the community of the Jews in Germany. They now have a synagogue in Berlin. But the sudden Muslim obliteration of the Indian Buddhism extends to the collective Indian mind being driven to forget that it did exist and flourished as a major component of Indian civilization. The total elimination of the defeated population is characteristic of the Biblical Jews towards the populations at war with them: the Jewish victory is marked by the downright elimination of the enemy. Muhammad introduced this concept of total war with thorough physical elimination of the people who happen to be on their way of expansion. By the ethnic cleansing of its minorities, Pakistan has maintained the Islamic habit of showing absolute intolerance towards any Dis-Believer who is viewed as a stain on the purity of the nation. In 2002, the elimination of the Bamiyan Buddhas was one more demonstration of Muslim intolerance of and the extinction of anything, or anyone, not Islamic in the Islamic space.

The three grades of minds according to the tradition of the Prophet. The three grades of mind are: *Islām, Imān, Ihsān. Islām* represents the totality of the doctrinal beliefs, the performance of the daily prayers, of the pilgrimage to the Kaba (the *Haj*). The Mawlānā omits mentioning the *Jihād.* In addition to *Islām,* the absolute conviction is said to be *Im*ān. The state of the mind of *Ihsān* is best explained by the context defined by the Prophet's advice: "Pray as if thou seest thy God before thee: and if thou seest Him not, pray in the conviction that God is, at any rate, seeing you."[35] In a dramatic statement which commands assent, Soren Kierkegaard says that he would die by being so blissfully overwhelmed if he were suddenly to find himself in the presence of God. His effulgent exclamation as a tribute to the glory of God makes the Muslim's *Ihsān* praying in the presence of Allah discouragingly trite. Indeed when the faithful Muslim finds himself in the presence of Allah, what would he have to be praying for? The narration of his *mirāj* does not describe Muhammad's emotion on seeing physically Allah, at a distance. He did not have any emotion which would have, even remotely, been akin to what Soren Kierkegaard expresses as his admiration of an imagined Jehovah! All the literatures about the Biblical God pale before the ecstasy of the Brahmanist's contemplation of the formless Supreme Being (*nirākāra*)!

The method of interpreting Islam. In the first state the Believer

[35] BCQ, p. 16.

enters the fold of Islam when he affirms the doctrinal beliefs and performs certain duties. The conviction of *Imān* occurs when Islam accedes to the mind and the heart. But the knowledge of Reality or 'real conviction' arrives later. It is the *Ihsān*, the state of personal, individual illumination. It is arrived at by personal endeavor. It is that state which can be grasped only by someone who has experienced a like state. Mawlānā Azad endorses the division of the three states with reference to Bukhari and Muslim, in contradiction of his criticism of the indigenous Indian Dharmas recognizing the graded understanding of the respective scriptures being grasped variously according to the intellectual abilities of the devotees. In his criticism of this recognition and allowance of levels of understanding of the fundamental texts of the Dharmas, Mawlānā Azad stresses that the Quran enables a uniform comprehension by all the Believers irrespective of whether one is learned or a goatherd. If indeed that is so, then why do Muslim societies, across the Umma of the fifty-seven majority Islamic countries, exhibit such a diversity of beliefs, interpretations, which are expressed most of the time with hate-filled conflicts and lethal inter-islamic hatreds ?

In reality the wealth of Islamic scholarship testifies to the fact that Islam is not different from any other religion in its scriptures being internalized according to the cognitive ability of each believer. More than anything else it is the violence of Allah which Islam harbours and calls for its activation with the approbation of the Umma who yield to it with dutiful application sanctioned by the verse **8.17** of the Holy Book. The murderous mayhem of Partition was carried out by the educated class leading the lumpen proletariat Believers motivated by knowledges distributed across the spectrum of *Islam, Imān, Ihsān/.* As in the battle of Badr where He won victory, Allah was once more active in perpetrating the realization of the Partition.

The ambivalent attitude of Maulana Azad towards Sufism. In shying away from unambiguously admitting the validity of the mystical experience of the Sufi, Mawlānā Azad claims identity with the essence of Allah. In the nocturnal flight to Paradise the Messenger himself stood at a distance from Allah whose face remained hidden from his sight. Traditional Islam, particularly in its Sunni version, zealously condemns as a heresy the claim of the Sufi experiencing essential unity with the essence of Allah who dwells uncontaminated with anything earthly. The absolute purity of Allah is diametrically opposite to the fundamental postulate of the Upaniṣad: *aham*

brahmā'smi. Although the Mawlānā would persevere in adhering to his notion of the absolute purity of Allah, a Congress Party Brahmanist would nevertheless assure him of his sincerity in telling him: *tat tvam asi*!

Heresy in Islam. The mystical finality that is enjoined as the desirable goal of human existence in each of the three Dharmas - as *mokṣa, or nirvāṇa, or kaivalya* - happens, in Islam, to be denounced as heresy and gets, as a result, ruthlessly suppressed in practice, as it has indeed been throughout the history of Islam. It is characteristic of the Sūtra texts of the indigenous Dharmas, that the goal of the spiritual aspirant, as mystical experience, is set forth in the very first sentence of the first section of the text. The end goal to be attained by practical fidelity to the way indicated is subsequently exposed by the author. In the Quran the very first short Surah postulates the right path to follow in order to lead the good life. *But it does not elucidate what the perfect life will be*. Gautama Buddha, exemplar extraordinaire, cryptically pronounces the four short sentences which define life as a suffering, the cause of the suffering, the end of the suffering, the means to bring the suffering to its end. These four truths, condensed in the history-shaking title *Dharma Cakra Pravartana* (The Setting in Motion of the Wheel of Dharma), proclaimed a colossal leap forward taken by Indian civilization. It was a fabulous gift to Humanity by an Indian forest-dweller. That such a sublime way of life would fall under the hammer blow of the Iconoclast, who submits to Allah's revelation of rules and prescriptions, confirms his stature as a Compleat Barbarian.

Maulana Azad's dismissal of the worth or importance of Sufism. Mawlānā Azad refrains from proposing his own personal, unambiguous endorsement of the generally quiet, peaceful, mystical Sufi experience.[36] He refers to the famous theologian Shah Waliullah who "goes to the extent of asserting: 'If I wish to prove the theory of the "Unity of Being", I can do so by a reference to the very text of the Quran and the Hadith."

In referring to Shah Walliullah's opinion, the Mawlānā apologetically comments: "As for the rest, says he, the perception of God through illumination which gnostics enjoy is certainly not in conflict with the

[36] The limitation conveyed by the word "generally" underlies the fact of those who claimed to be Sufis while undertaking military operations.

principles of the Qur'anic concept of God."[37]

It is a tactful double entendre which masks a disavowal of Sufism being an unquestionably authentic evidence of the Unity of God.

Moreover the Believer would not find any trace of mystical consideration in the biography of Muhammad and of the immediately succeeding Caliphs. In truth a lot of internecine bloodshed followed the death of the Prophet who was buried in his own house because there was no agreement among his followers and family members about a burial place for his corpse. Certainly not even an iota of Sufism graced the life of Muhammad. In the year 932 the Rector of the Islamic University of Al Azhar declared: 'Sufism is dead!' As a 'heretical' version of Islam, Sufism arose two or three centuries after the death of the Prophet. As a singular, privately indulged personal experience, the Sufi did not need the approval of the Caliphate or of the Imamate. Their threat to the central religious authority provided the reason of the Sufis being persecuted. A parallel situation occurred with the Gnostics being viewed as a threat to the power and authority of the Pope and of the authority of the anointed Kings of Christendom. Gnosticism was obliterated by the crusading action of the Church, to the detriment of European civilization. It has been a loss for all Humanity. In a congruent fate the Sufi presented a way of Believing which ran counter to the Caliph's power and to the centrality of Islam as a political ideology.

The difference between politics in the revealed religions and in the Dharmas. The monumental difference between the Dharmas and the Quran and Christian Orthodoxies lies in the fact that the former do not lend themselves to political talk and concurrent activity. In classical India politics pertained to the Dharma Śāstras and particularly their prescriptions of Rāja Nīti. In Europe the most prestigious philosophers chose to be associated with consecrated royal power: Aristotle with Alexander, René Descartes with Queen Christina of Sweden, Voltaire with Frederic II of Prussia, Diderot with Catherine II of Russia, Bernard Henri Levy with Nicholas Sarkozy. In China during more than two thousand years the Confucian elite faithfully served the dynastic powers of the Emperors. In India the commitment and the striving for *jīvan mukti* were invariably carried within the close, independent *guru-śiṣya* relationship. Moreover as each of the three Dharmas was not governed by a central authority or power, their correspondent votaries

[37] BCQ, p. 18.

had unlimited freedom to strive, without any impediment, according to their personal individual psychological and material resources, towards the finality of self-enlightenment in the present on-going life. Essentially Islam is a revelation supremely designed for the entire body of Believers, of the Umma. Mawlānā Azad stresses this particularity of Islamic religiosity.

The richness of the three psychic Islamic states and the meaning of the Day of Resurrection. The consideration of the substance and the meaning of the third state, *Ihsān*, leads to the realization of the immense distance separating Islamic religiosity from the spirituality of the Dharmas. The Quran, according to the Mawlānā, is all about conforming to a definitive legalism, as an obligatory response to Allah's imperative call. The Quran does not call for self-restraint, it does not celebrate the worth of self-sacrifice for the welfare of the Other, of the cultivation of high virtues like forgiveness, of selfless action, of compassion, of the attractiveness of knowing, of detachment, and of the exaltation of the merit of a heroic solitude filled with contemplative passion. On the contrary, the Quranic revelation, claiming to be a direct, physical communication of the Arabic words of God to Muhammad, fosters in the Believer the sentiment of being the possessor and the carrier of the divine words which place him at the pinnacle of Humanity. Though qualified by the Revelation the *Ihsān is nothing more than a vicarious action of submission to an external revealed law or rule, with its being agreeable to Allah.* For the Mawlānā ignores that a moral action is authentic, eminently virtuous when it has its source entirely in the depth of the executor's consciousness and draws its substance spontaneously from within the doer's personality, without the intervention or appeal of an external agent, however exalted it may be. The submitting Muslim is rarely, if ever, a genuine moral individual, as long as he claims he is right in willing conformity with the Allah's *Taqdīr*. According to the ethos of each of the three indigenous Dharmas, the action performed without any expectation of a reward, or of a delightful continuation of resurrected life in Heaven, that is, the *niṣkāma karma* (desireless action) confirms that since the earliest beginning of the Indian civilization, the Dhārmika Indian has been at all times been challenged into doing what is right, without any concern without the expectation of a reward: the desireless action remains unaffected by any consideration of Time. It was a collective *niṣkāma karma* when Independent India spontaneously offered Lord Mountbatten to stay a year more as the unconditional Governor-General of Independent India

with the additional right of holding the Ministry of Defence. It was a collective act of desireless action for the Indians to continue their association with the former Raj as a member of the Commonwealth. There is no action to which Mahatma Gandhi committed his soul, which did not bear the stamp of being *niṣkāma.* All these glorious examples of actions untainted by the hope of some material or other benefaction occurred, and will always be enacted, in the environment where beliefs are tied to thousands of deities.

The skin-deep morality of Muslim submission. With such a sentiment, inherited from the family and from the community, as a free legacy, the Muslim removes himself from any motivation to produce from within himself his independent, original moral or spiritual thought or action in the context of the social economy to which he happens to belong. It evinces no suggestion or invitation for the acquisition of the virtue of humility and for the search for detachment as a meritorious disposition. Submission, as such, excludes the maintenance and the expansion of the personal autonomy in action, as the prerequisite of the search for an ultimate self-fulfillment on Earth, without any concern for Heavenly pleasure. No impulse arises independently from within his own consciousness, by reflection of the merit of the inherited revelations which are proclaimed to have descended to the world as the Word of God. By means of the willing submission the Believer feels relieved of the obligation to act according to his private understanding of what is right or what is wrong. He surrenders his freedom to the trusting confidence in the Truth propounded by the all-Knowing God and as such assumes a gratuitous superiority over any other upholder of a non-revealed ideal mode of living. On the other hand, the Muslim feels a tremendous sense of freedom which, heartened with the conviction of owning the Only Truth, he unreflectingly translates into violence in its defense when confronted with a rationally consequential moral argument propounded by someone Other.

The reason specific to the Muslim. For the Muslim it must indeed be a source of permanent exhilaration due to his confidence of being naturally endowed with the knowledge of the divine rules and principles of the best of all possible ways of living. It is because of the elevating feeling of the immediacy of his being inhabited physically by God's words, that the Muslim, with advantage of the particular Arab or Islamic *reason*, assumes an infinite superiority over the entire spectrum of the followers of all non-Islamic religiosities or philosophies. The gratuitous particular privilege, assumed by the Muslim, has been

deeply enshrined in the psychology of the Umma by the use of the sword, from the first day of the revelation-based politics inaugurated by the Messenger in Medina. Bursting open as a military tsunami and racing along and sweeping away the living cultures spread all over the whole range of North Africa up to the Pyrenees, with the sword writing, with *jihādi* élan, the revelation transmitted to Muhammad. With the rider's sword aiding and the horses providing for the cavalries rushing along a vast horizontal sweep, it became easy for Islam to spread out from the emptiness of the Arabian peninsula. With the revelation of Allah raising a deadly simoom, the Islamic armies provided to the new Believers the means for the first *blitzkrieg* (lightning war) in History: they rode through a vast empty space stretching from the sandy peninsula up to the Pyrenees.

It is germane to the theme of this essay to emphasize that the expansion of Islam across a vast geographical empire scarcely comes up to a like measure of the spread across all Asia, by the peaceful activity and nobility of the efforts of the monks and scholars who transmitted the soul-elevating humanities nurtured by the Indian Dharmas, particularly the Bauddha Dharma. The wonders of Angkor in Cambodia, of Borobudur in Java, are two marvelous testimonies of Dharmas translated into monuments of Beauty as representations of transcendent Humanity. If, contrary to the success of the Christians reconquering the space which Islam had transformed into its al-Andalus, the Orientals could not get rid of the autonomous Islamic intolerances settled in their midst, it is due essentially to their Humanity lacking the required brutish ferocity for the purpose of such a liberation.

Here we pay homage to the Indian missionary monks at the beginning of Buddhism, even more to the Central Asian monks who showed the Middle Way (*Madhyama Pratipad*) to the Tibetans and the Chinese, and to the Chinese monks, who voluntarily, with charitable concern, went to share their spiritual knowledge with the Japanese. Over a period covering the first centuries of Buddhism, the wonderful dissemination of the pre-eminent way of living indicated by Gautama, stands as a prodigious refutation of the global dissemination of Islam. It is a cyclopean pretense that Islam does *as-such* provide the infallible evidence of its supernatural superiority, as Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad would argue with self-righteous casuistry, in the middle of the XX century, after centuries of genocidal violences perpetrated by his co-Believers submitting to the injunctions of Allah. Despite its unequalled Humanity, the Indian Buddhism got destroyed by the

Muslims with fanatical vigor. Nevertheless, with the aid of its undying metaphysics and its contemplative passions, Buddhism refutes all the pretentions which can be raised with the sophistry of arguments, based on the three revealed religions. For these arguments remain unconnected with the virtues of the life-enhancing, mystical spiritualities conveyed and taught by the indigenous Indian Dharmas.

The Islamic uses of hatred of the Other. In Islam, the absence of any spiritual enhancement, by means of whatever contemplative activities may be extracted from the body as a searcher's own instrument, helps to understand why the practicing Muslim would see meaningfulness in activities of hating, of iconoclasm, of the rejection of Others' persuasions and of the preference for violence as a winning argument to settle a contending argument. The Believer entertains a *vertical* allegiance to the revealed injunctions, without in any way being limited by the constraints which crop up along the *horizontal* path required by social obligations and the tribulations borne by Time. In such a predicament the Believer does choose to remain faithful to his *vertical* obligation to Allah, especially when he has to encounter Others categorized as Disbelievers. In theory and in practice, the Muslim sees his past, not *behind* him, but a*bov*e him, in Allah. With cohering to such a past, the Muslim is bound to clash with pre-existing cultures, which he strives to snuff out in order to bask in the sole certitude of the Revelation,

The dogma of *Imān* (faith). The dogma commanding the belief in the distant Day of Resurrection as the centrality of *Imān* relativizes the earthly existence: thereby it emphatically debases the life of the Other as an unworthy cypher the effacement of which incurs no feeling of guilt. It is true that the concept of the Day of Resurrection is central to the Jewish and the Christian Faiths. But their practical differences in comparison with the Islamic pronouncement need to be well understood. The Jews have throughout their history during the last two thousand years been a suffering minority which did not, and still does not, convert others: the Rabbinical orthodoxy rules that the Jew is born from the womb of a Jewish mother. As a religion Judaism coincides with the race.

In a supporting addition to dogmatic theology, the Christian benefits from the heritage bequeathed by the Greco-Roman antiquity. Thanks to the missionary activity of Saint Paul, the Greco-Roman legacy provides a cultural and a spiritual foundation to the Day of Resurrection presided over by Jesus. As the third member of the Trinitarian Deity, Jesus maintains a relationship of Love with the

faithful. In Islam Allah, with a strict solitude, instills fear, awe and, while promising a doom to every Unbeliever, forbids the Believer from committing the sin of apostasy, from conversion to a different faith, and from engaging with non-Believers as friends. In the vision of the world of the Dharmas, Time and the cycle of rebirths end with the finalities of *mokṣa, nirvāṇa, kaivalya* which are experienced in *the present time.* In any of the sophisticated languages a verb has ten tenses, distributed across the different 'moods', but Man existentially finds himself, in *all* places, at *all* times, to be living in the present. Whether on Earth, or in Heaven, one experiences only the present. The validity of the other tenses in the conjugation of a verb apply to the complexity of living within a civilized society for the fulfillment of the necessary and ancillary obligations. The indigenous Dharmas postulate, teach, inspire and lead to the bliss of each of their finalities.

The belief of having lived before the present existence. The Indian literatures are devoid of tragedies,[38] for death is not an absolute denial of life, in the view of human existence being a continuing series of rebirths, culminating in the unitive state of the *ātman* with the ONE (*brahman).* Death is believed to be change of the body, when the soul takes on another body, just as one changes one's costume which gets discarded in favor of a new one. Tragedy and the tragic sense of life do not have a preferred spot in Indian literature. Sorrow, grief, lamentation are caused by the separation (*viraha*) from the beloved relative or friend. But the cessation of life in the body is viewed ultimately with heroic calmness as the inevitable change into a different body for the continuation of the living soul's journey towards the ultimate experience of mystical self-perfection.

It is a major, elevating contribution to world culture that the history of India upholds this fundamental cultural and scriptural certitude of the supremacy of life despite having suffered the ravages inflicted by Believers adhering to an incomplete, inferior way of living. For the Straight Path does not lead to that ineffable happiness the like of which can only be bestowed by the realization of self-perfection attained in the body as a personal, private experience. It is designed and revealed expressly for the passage of the resurrected body to the Day of Judgement. Normal experience does support the belief that life proceeding along a straight path is a witless self-delusion. In reality, as

---

[38] Like those of Sophocles, Euripides, Aeschylus, of Corneille and Racine, of Shakespeare and Goethe, for example.

the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* cogently asserts it, moral life is spent by walking on a razor's edge all the time. It requires vigilance and heroic persistence in striving through the maze in which one is thrust by his Karma. On the other hand, the Straight Pat is predicated with the assumption that the child is born as a *tabula rasa,* a notion common to all the three Revelations. Common experience confirms the realism of the native Indian anthropology of the child being born bearing the sum of the impressions (*samskāras*) accumulated during the previous existences. Moral discipline then consists of the psychic exercise of the elimination of *samskāras.* Renunciation becomes accordingly an imperative for the detachment from all the bonds sealed by the activity of the senses and of the organs of knowledge viewed as impediments preventing the experience of self-enlightenment. There is no renunciation on the Straight Path. Mawlānā Azad could have known that the Indian Dharmas are ways (*mārga),* just as the Chinese too call their native religions by means of the word *ching* (way). The Japanese too dwell on the Way of the Kamis (*kami no mici*).

The difference between the ways of the Orientals which lead to their respective mystical finalities and the Islamic Straight Path, is that along the latter move Believers enjoined to hate and wage war on non-Believers. What Islamic religiosity does not bring to the consciousness of the Believer is that Hating the unbeliever however much it may be justified - it never was, nor can it ever be - does after all remain a "hating", a mode of thinking which is deleterious and contrary to any kind of morality or spirituality. The "hating of …" exists as a "hatred" irrespective of the object hated, either with good reason or with justification. That the Islamic *dīn* advocates the Believer's submitting duty to hate the Other implies that for fourteen centuries the Muslims have been content with their "hallowed" duty of hating all those who happened to have attributed to themselves the good fortune of not following the Straight Path!

The self-delusion of the belief in the Day of Judgement. What the belief or the dogma of the Day of Resurrection fails to declare is the reality of the individual living *at all times, in any place,* in the *present.* No one ever *lives* in the past, or in the future, though the related expressions, in any language, are, in meaningful discourse, frequently used in inter-social communication. But remembering the past is *existentially a present thought.* Symmetrically one does never existentially live *in the future.* Any hoping for a future attainment is a present thought. Assuming that the Day of Judgement is waiting to Be as a historic event, the Believer will still, on that day, be living

consciously in *his present.* Wherever one shall be, one will always be consciously living in the *present*. And that is what the Dharmas advocate: self-enlightenment or self-perfection described as, in Brahmanism, *sac-cid-ānanda,* as the *eternal* experience, represents a concrete, superior, more exalted, loftier attainment, adorned with bliss, than the fiction of the body rising out of the tomb and appearing before the cosmic judge for an evaluation of its sum of virtuous deeds or of sins. The *sac-cid-ānanda* experience *already exists, has always been in existence,* and is uncovered by means of the discipline of striving and of eliminating all the dross and the layers of ignorance which hide it and which can, by meditative and contemplative efforts be removed. The whole career of the individual soul is expressed with sparkling clarity by the *Bhagavad Gītā,* 2.20: He is never born, nor does he die at any time, nor having (once) come to be will again cease to be. He is unborn, eternal, permanent, primeval. He is not slain when the body is slain.

> And in *Bhagavad Gītā* (**8.21-22**), Śrī Kṛṣṇa says: This Unmanifested is called the Imperishable. Him they speak of as the Supreme Status. Those who attain to Him return not. This is My supreme Abode. This is the Supreme Person, O Partha (Arjuna), in whom all existences abide and by whom all this is pervaded (who) can, however, be gained by answering devotion.

Uttterly incomprehensible to the Muslim would be the sublime, immensely humane Brahmanist view of the life and the career of Man as co-essential with the Supreme Being, the ONE beside which nothing exists. Moreover, both in the Revelation and in the entire Islamic Scholarship, there does exist no philosophical or mystical category of thought which could be used as an intellectual foundation for a productive dialogue serving the need of a possible communal amicability.

But even if it were true that the Final Day be assumed to occur at a particular time in a distant history at the end point of the Straight Path, it is more than curious that in the literatures of the three revealed faiths - Jewish, Christian, Islamic - no one has given the slightest information on the logistics of the mode of travelling which would be used by the resurrected bodies. It is mind startling to conceive the billions of men, women, children, who had believed in the Revelations rushing freely to the heavenly courts presided over by Jehovah, Allah and Jesus. None of the revelation-based theologies have yet given any inkling on the mechanical modes of conveyance to be used by the three resurrected

crowds.[39] However absurd and insignificant this argument may sound, it is nevertheless valid in consideration of Pope Benedict XVII claiming that Paradise indeed does exist as a physical reality, although it has not yet been seen!

There is no tragic sense of life in the Indian Dharmas. It is a distinctive attribute of the Bhārata Land that it did not ever nurture a philosopher or a poet or a story writer or playwright who might have been tempted to envision a tragic sense of life. India never provided the reason for a thinker imitating the Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno writing *El Sentimiento Tragico de la Vida* (The Tragic Sense of Life). Indian civilization still remains faithful to this specific, luminous *Weltanschauung* which lauds Life as a priceless gift homogeneous with the ontological, mystical Bliss as its finality. Most unfortunately this gifted, blessed, humane civilization got traumatized by a cruel Fate which enabled God-talking barbarians believing in the Day of Resurrection to invade and hammer its conception in the mind with iconoclastic blows. Breaking the image inside the wonder-evoking temple at Ellora illustrates an act of quintessential vandalism, just as the obliteration of the Bamiyan Buddhas in 2002 was an expression of uncivilized ferocity, required as essential to the purity of a theocratic Islamic state. To call a spade a spade, in relation to the satanic force used on such an Indian scale by the traditionally violent Islamic Believers, does not detract from the impeccability of the native Indian tolerance as the age-old tradition of the native culture. It behooves the Muslim to reprove the barbarism of his iconoclastic zeal being dissipated into a possible humane-hearted Islamic holiness. But, during the present time hoping, the emergence of such a peaceful Islam could occur at a distant date in the Greek Calends. As things stand to-day in the Umma, the enforcement of purity as an important feature of Islamic piety dwells as a permanent threat to Kaffir monuments and

[39] I confess to my inability to admit, as a future reality or fact, the actual rising from the tomb of all the Jews, Christians, Muslims who have died since the beginning of the history of their respective religions, to rise from their tombs and travel physically through the gravitational space to the heavenly court of justice. I do experience difficulty to understand my believing Christian friends who really think they are going to meet their beloveds on the Day of Judgement. It is a belief entertained by university educated believers, as well as by untutored farmhands, as consolation and as hope in the physical reality of the Final Day being connatural with the calendar time of their living.

representations of Beauty. The submitting Muslim happens not to be endowed with the sensitivity which could enable him to evince appreciation of the Indian's predilection for the adoration of his Favourite Deity with representations of Beauty and with soul-elevating signs of the sublime. Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad would not have known of Ananda K. Coomaraswamy's distinction between *desha* and *mārga* forms of art. A *desha* art is a piece of art which, however beautiful, appeals to only a few people, for a short span of time, like the miniature paintings of Kings and Courtiers: they cease to have an appeal to those who live beyond the circle of those who hired the artists. Leonardo da Vinci's *La Joconde* at the Louvre is *desha* art. But the *marga* art is an artistic creation which appeals to a large community of men and women drawing spontaneous feelings of awe and holiness which they faithfully maintain over a long period of time. A picture of Hanumān, however rough it may be, may still generate fervor in countless generations of pious men and women, lasting through many centuries. Coomaraswamy insists that for sustaining the authenticity and the durability of the piety, the art work does not need to be necessarily beautiful.

How does the mind get closed? In view of the categories of Ananda Coomaraswamy, the anti-art interdiction of the reproduction of images, promulgated by Jehovah, with Moses kneeling in agreement to His commandments, and consequently endorsed, with greater fervor, by Muhammad, has closed the mind and the heart of the Muslim to the appreciation and the production of beautiful expressions of the human body, which, according to the canons of Hindu art, is the most beautiful of all forms. And the *nirākāra brahman* can still be represented by a stone or a sound. Only Hinduism can nurture, and has nurtured for all time, the rousing concept of *nāda brahman* (Brahman as Sound). The National Museum in Chennai has the exhibit of a rough stone statue of Lord Śiva with his upper body and head, slightly askance towards the left shoulder, as if in ecstasy while playing on a *vīṇa* slung across his chest. And the *Bhāgavad Purāṇa* describes Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī delighting in the show of acrobats, of clowns, of musicians. To grace the welcoming of his son Arjuna, Indra asks him to sit beside him on his throne to watch Urvaśī, the beautiful Apsarā, dancing for their pleasure. There is a whole world of Beauty which, as expressions of ineffable purity and of the exaltation of divinity, lies beyond the ken of the Mussalman. It is an infinite blessing that the public art of the Pharaohs do still offer, to the world of admirers in all cultures, the beauty of the human form. In defiance of the crude

vulgarity of the fundamentalist Muslim's iconoclasm, the public stone and marble art works representing the human body on the walls of the classic Hindu temples and those exposed in the Museums, will remain as testimonies of the cult of Beauty as the adornments of the indigenous Dharmas. Islamic iconoclasm against representational art is a violent form of transcendental ugliness. Thereby the Muslim ignores the fact of Beauty being also a form of sublime knowledge.

The Unity of the Attributes of God: *Rubūbiyat*. In the first chapter of the Quran, Mawlānā Azad explains the meaning of the prime attribute of Allah's Providence (*Rubūbiyat*) deriving from the semitic word '*rabb*' which means 'nourisher', one who provides the means of subsistence. It indicates a 'natural first approach to God which the early Semitic mind could conceive of.[40] The word also means 'teacher, master, lord, God'. The meaning of the word is so wide that, according to the leading lexicographers, the term "*Rubūbiya*t"means: "To develop a thing from stage to stage, in accordance with its inherent aptitudes and needs, in order that it might attain its full stature or perfection." The Maulana interprets this definition as implying a touch of tenderness. He uses the metaphor of the mother who gradually feeds her child from the moment of its birth to adolescence. She lovingly provides, with constant care and affection, the necessary food conforming to the different stages of the child's growth up to adolescence. The mother's care is due to God's wisdom of instilling *'Rubūbiyat'* in her mind up to the time when the child has learned to be independent. *'Rubūbiyat'* is thus a continuous process of providing one with all that one needs in every situation and at every stage. In like fashion, the Quran attributes the expression *'Rabbul Ālamin*' to God in his role of 'Rabb'. Intent on adducing a certain universalism to the attribute, the Maulana stresses that God is 'Nourisher' or 'Rabb' not for a particular community, but for all mankind and for all that lives in the universe.[41] God displays His *Rubūbiyat* in all the forms of life, in their activities, in all the moments of their existence. The protecting eye of Providence rests on the ant, on the worm, on the bird, on the elephant, in the movement of the stars. For all these creatures God provides the requisite necessities for the fulfilment of their respective purpose. Mawlānā Azad expressly points out that, on looking within himself, Man can see 'a world of activity propelled by the *Rubūbiyat* of God, in

[40] BCQ, p, 19

[41] BCQ, p. 21

support of which he quotes from the Quran: "And in the earth are portents for those whose faith is sure, And (also) in yourselves. Can ye then not see?" (**51. 20-21**).

Comment. To Allah's question in the verses above, Gautama Buddha would respond by dismissing the necessity and the obligation of believing in a Supernatural Transcendent Divinity because they are irrelevant to the pursuit of the extinction of *suffering as time*. Buddha argues that neither God, nor any Demon, nor any learned Brāhmaṇa, nor anyone else can ever prevent Time from passing. Not Being, but Becoming is the reality of living and of History. Nowhere else but in Becoming does the reality of Nirvāṇa lie and emerges in consciousness as the end of suffering. Not only does Gautama Buddha dismiss the obligation to believe in the absolute existence of a Providential Deity, but that, irrespective of the possible existence of a God, the very word or concept or image, of the idea of a Supreme Being, is, as an object of thought or of the imagination, a clinging, an attachment, an impediment to the right mode of living towards the discovery in oneself of the ever present ontological essence of Nirvāṇa. It is the *nirvanized* experience which confirms the authentic self-essence (*sva-bhāva*) of the individual human being.

Comment (continued): the antipode of Buddhism. By postulating the particular concept of the *Rubūbiyat* (Sovereignty) of Allah, Islam lies at the antipode of Buddhism. The infinite difference between the Islamic and the Buddhist histories has been illustrated by the fiendish malignancy of Islam obliterating the Buddhist cultures of Indonesia, India, Afghanistan, Central Asia, Den Huang. That the history of such a wide swath of longitudes and latitudes, earlier covered by the peaceful humanity and beautiful culture of the Buddhists, would suffer extinction, under the hammer blows and the burning torches of the Believers, highlights the series of genocides the awareness of which has not yet been shared by even all the Indian communities, let alone by the wide world elsewhere. The Buddhists of Indonesia had produced the wonder of *Borobudur*, unparalleled in the world.[42] Bodhidharma, the great Buddhist monk of Central Asia, gave to the world the original spirituality of Chan Buddhism.[43] These were

[42] It is a great pity that the monumental work Borobudur by Paul Mus has not yet been translated into English.

[43] *Chan* is the Chinese translation of the Sanskrit *dhyāna*, the 7th limb of Patañjali's Yoga. Chinese Buddhist missionaries established the *chan* version which has become known as *zen* in Japan.

creative Buddhist cultures which gave to the world, in addition to an exalting metaphysics, an extraordinary production of beautiful art works, as witnessed by the artefacts in the Guimet Museum in Paris. All that wealth of knowledge and of aesthetic accomplishments got wiped out by an Islam which did not give back anything cultural in return. On the contrary, it shows how, without ever acknowledging it, Believers in God's *Rubūbiyat* do lust for genocidal conquests! The National Library in Paris and the British Museum in London still hold scores of crates of Central Asian Buddhist literature which await editing and publishing. It is a pity that, because of the language barrier, Indian archaeologists and historians seem to be unaware of the contributions of French archaeologist Paul Pelliot who saved hundreds of the Buddhist manuscripts of the monasteries of Den Huang. In the vaults of the National Library in Paris lie crates of manuscripts which await their being edited and getting published.

The graciousness of God: *Rahmat*. The *Rubūbiyat* aspect of Allah encompasses his graciousness (*Rahmat*) which refers to the good things of life and to the measure of their being apportioned to every object in the world. Mawlānā Azad uses the example of water to explain the meaning of *Rahmat*. Allah sends down water drop by drop and makes it reach every corner of the earth at the right season and enables the tiniest particle to quench its thirst. The confirmation comes from the Quran declaring:

> "And we send down from the sky water in measure, and we cause it to settle in the earth, and lo! We are able to withdrawn it. Then we produce for you therewith gardens of date palms and grapes, wherein is much fruit for you and whereof ye eat; And a tree that springeth forth from Mount Sinai that groweth oil and relish for the eaters." (**23. 18-20**)

Allah is concerned with the value of the good things of life and measures out to each living object its due portion of its worth, under a particular.[44]

> "And there is not a thing but with Us are the stores thereof. And we send it not down save in appointed measure." (**Q. 15.19**)
>
> "Allah knoweth that which every female beareth and that which the wombs absorb and that which they grow. And everything with Him is measured." (**Q. 13. 8**)
>
> "Lo! We have created everything by measure." (**Q. 54. 49**)

Without giving any explaining the *Basic Concepts of the Quran* retains only the second sentence of the quotation (**13. 8**) with the version:

[44] BCQ, p. 22-23

"With Him everything is by measure." Would the Mawlānā have been loath to explain the growth of the foetus as a divine act of *Rahmat* independently of the 'female'? But he explains Allah's graciousness with an analysis of the function of water. It is due to the *Rahmat* of Allah that the Sun pumps water into the atmosphere, where the winds shake the drops over the surface of the earth, a portion of which sinks down to a certain depth. It is due to the divine *Rahmat* that snow accumulates on mountains and elsewhere when it melts and runs down to form rivers. All such events are due to the activity of God's graciousness, to his *Rubūbiyat* the proof of which is given in the Quran as follows:

> "And of his signs is this: He sendeth herald winds to make you taste his mercy, and that the ships may sail at His command, and that ye may seek His favour, and that haply ye may be thankful."(**Q. 30. 46**)

Mawlānā Azad argues that Allah apportions the due measure of natural provisions for the sustenance of life according to the respective climate. The most important thing which is needed is air which is universally available. Next in importance is water and next to water is the need for food. The Sun gives light and heat and helps to draw water from the ocean. The winds produce warmth and coolness and sometimes waft particles of water up into the skies and spread them out into formations of clouds which release water as rain coming down to the earth. In its turn the earth provides plants and foods. Thus are provided the resources which enable an egg to deliver an ant and the peasant to grow his field of grain. And the Mawlānā approvingly quotes:

> "And hath made of service unto you whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth; it is all from Him. Lo! Here verily are portents for people who reflect." (**Q. 45. 13**),

Jean Jacques Rousseau speculates that when Yahweh created the world, he looked at it as it stood vertically straight up and He then gave it a slight flick with his index and the world inclined by ten degrees. As a result of this inclination the earth acquired the different climatic zones: some temperate with an abundance of useful products and some bare where earning a living is much harder. The Quran does not explain the drastic differences between the climates in different zones of the planet. Nor do Allah's *Rubūbiyat* and *Rahmat* explain the destructiveness of Nature in its convulsions on land and on sea.

Persisting in his praise for Allah, the Mawlānā sees simplicity and methodical uniformity in the manifestation of *Rubūbiyat* and *Rahmat*.

The stone and the fragrant flower receive their sustenance and their growth in the same style. So do the child and the plant: they appear to be different, but *'a single system of life and growth binds them together'*.

Whether it is a slab of stone, a bud of flower, a human child, or an ant's egg, everyone has its time of emergence, of its birth; and the means of sustenance for one and all are provided in advance ere they emerge into life. The principle of growth and decadence, of rise and fall in life, is common to one and all.[45] He quotes:

> "Allah is he Who shaped you out of weakness, then appointed after weakness strength, then, after strength, appointed weakness and grey hair. He createth what He will. He is the Knower, the Mighty." (**Q. 30. 54)**
>
> "Hast thou not seen how Allah hath sent down water from the sky and hath caused it to penetrate the earth as water springs, and afterward thereby produceth crops of divers hues; and afterward they wither and thou seest then turn yellow; then he make them chaff. Lo! therein verily is a reminder for men of understanding." (**Q. 30. 21**)

Mawlānā Azad compares the life of a new born babe and that of a chick. One wonders whether he is directing his commentary of the Holy Book for the edification of children at kindergarten level. Allah's Providence extends to the nature of the mother's love for her child, for whose sake there is no sacrifice too great for her to bear. But this love diminishes in intensity as the child grows and in due time the maternal feeling dies off, though not as completely as it does among animals. It is due to Allah's *Rubūbiyat* that the mother initially felt the sudden rise of love when a child is born. And there is little difference between such a love and the love of the offspring of an animal. A chick coming out of its shell does not need milk, but it seeks its food by itself with the mother hen helping out. In such an occurrence too Allah's providence is present. The unreflecting reading of, and the belief in, such a labored triviality in favor of the perception of Allah's working within the smallest living and non-living aspect of the world, it becomes easy to grasp the disenchantment of the universe as the foundation of the Muslim's hatred of the Other. For both the Quran, and the Mawlānā, do not explain the relationship of Allah's *Rubūbiyat* with the activities of the Disbelievers.

The Mawlānā would not have understood Goethe stopping, during one of his afternoon walks, and picking up a leaf which he gently

---

[45] BCQ, pp. 25-26

places in the palm of his hand. He gazed at it and for a long moment felt transfigured by the contemplation of the beauty and mystery of Nature. In fourteen centuries no Muslim has produced a single landscape painting to commemorate Allah's *Rubūbiyat* in the creation of Nature's beauty and its fostering the inspiration for a corresponding fine art! In a thousand years of co-existence, punctuated by Islamic intolerance and violence, no Muslim ever expressed any understanding of the Upaniṣad stating that "all this world is indeed the ultimate reality" (*sarvam idam khalu brahman*). From the same viewpoint the belief in the action of Allah as a cosmic operator who directs rain drops into the earth or guides the mother hen in helping the newly hatched chick to find its food, and manifests itself as an all-inclusive celebration of Man's ineffectiveness.

Allah and *Taqdīr*. To complete His Providence and Graciousness, Allah exerts also His inner aspect by determining both the inner and the outer aspects of every created object in harmony with its environment and vice versa. Such a condition of life cannot be otherwise, because it conforms to what the Creator has fixed for it. The law of *Taqdīr* extends to the entire creation of moving and unmoving entities. Mawlānā Azad produces the apt quotes from the Quran, in support of Allah's cosmic attribution of *Taqdī*r:

> "He unto whom belongeth the sovereignty of the heavens and the earth, He hath chosen no son nor hath He any partner in the sovereignty. He hath created everything and hath meted out for it a measure. (**Q. 25.2**)
>
> "A token unto them is night. We strip it of the day, and lo! They are in darkness: And the sun runneth on unto a resting-place for him. That is the measuring of the Mighty, the Wise." (**Q. 36. 37-38**)

The Chapter 36 of the Qu'ran celebrates the virtue of Allah as the sole power ordaining all that exists. In *The Idea of the Holy,* Rudolf Otto mentions the classic Islamic example of a man who, informed of the Caliph having ordered his execution, secretly saddled his camel and escaped at night to another city. On arriving there the next morning he saw, standing at the gate of the city, the executioner, equipped with the sword, waiting for him! That is, Allah had exerted the *Taqdīr* of the Caliph's decision, of the condemned man's escape, and of the executioner waiting for him. The wills and desires of all the three characters in the story were commanded by Allah's *Taqdīr*. The Muslim does not see in *Taqdīr* a denial of his humanity, of his freedom and of his individual autonomous responsibility. He sees comfort and strength in the divine source of the *Taqdīr* vertically accompanying his thoughts and activities at all times, in all situations.

He feels the immanence of Allah's *Taqdīr* in his hating the Other and in the innocence of waging war against the Other for the realization of the *Dar-ul-Islam.*

On the other hand, in fidelity to the teachings of the native Dharmas, the individual sees and seeks comfort and reconciliation in all felicities and misfortunes in his freely chosen Karma, in the singular acceptance of his hardships and sorrows when he suffers and in his striving to overcome his wants and afflictions in the search for self-contentment. In reference to the above mentioned Quranic verse (**25. 2**), Mawlānā Azad omits the first sentence which proclaims Allah's absolute Unity, in a blunt rejection of the Trinitarian Doctrine of Christianity. The Son refers to Jesus and the partner stands for the Holy Spirit. In the dramatic rejection of the Nicene Creed of the Holy Trinity, the Qu'ran opts for the ethics of total submission to Only Allah and His call, with the adoption of an attitude which fosters in the psyche of the Believer a sentiment of superiority translated as a contemptuous violence against the Other. For the hatred and the violence directed to the Other are contingent to the Dionysiac expressions of the divine *Taqdīr.*

During the days when Angel Gabriel came down from Heaven to recite the celestial Quran to Muhammad, nobody believed that the Earth moved around the Sun along an elliptical course. But the *new* knowledges promulgated by such Christian astronomers like Copernic and Galileo do not disturb the Muslim's submission to the Quran and to Allah. For Allah would have the reason of *Taqdīr* to enable the bestowal of knowledge at the right felicitous time. But the mental gymnastic of the Muslim does not abrogate the merit of the originality of those who do contribute new knowledges for the welfare of Humanity, without their having sought the beneficence of All-Knower and Merciful Allah. Muslims are legitimately proud of the brilliance and fame of the scientific progress during the early Abbasid Dynasty when they felt the glory of Baghdad as the cynosure of admiration by the whole intellectual world of that time. But the discoveries in science and in the promulgation of laws based on new philosophies during the XVIII-XIX centuries, and the progress which they generated for about two centuries, were unquestionably the glorious inventions of Reason, as a superlative homage to Humanity, unrelated to the Only God of the Revelations. And where Humanity excels in the initiatives undertaken by men and women with their own self-dedication, there is no need or justification to disparage their humane contributions by attributing them to the intervention by some fictitious denizen living in the deep space beyond. The Age of Progress was illumined by the efforts and

the minds of men and women relying solely on their intellectual and moral resources. It was an age which hailed the independence of Man from all the unearthly solicitude of Allah in his unencumbered dedication to the furtherance of his beneficent initiatives. The emphasis on Evil relates to the particularity of Man's resourcefulness in devising implements for the pursuit of military purposes.[46]

Allah as the guide (*Hidāyat*). The word means 'to show the way, to guide'. According to the Mawlānā, *Hidāyat* opens out for every entity of Creation the appropriate avenues of nourishment, and stimulates its wants and directs them to the means of its satisfaction. As an expression of Providence (*Rubūbiyat*) it is the direction, the instinctive urge of Nature. It is the talent inherent in sense-perception. It is the inward force which actuates a thing to be drawn to its means of sustenance, like a babe seeking the mother's breast to feed itself. In short *Hidāyat* is the instinct which impels all living beings to the measure of their respective needs.[47]All these labored arguments are based on the assumption of a causality drawing its authority from the author of the Quran and of the interpreter like the Mawlānā. It is all a matter of a dogma pronounced as an act of faith, without the support of any empirical evidence. When one contemplates an apparently dry, leafless tree during the whole of autumn and winter, suddenly becoming alive as spring starts and soon, by drawing moisture from the apparently dry soil, lifts the water through the solid mass of its trunk and directs it to the smallest tender bud and to the millions of leaves, one must perforce see in this transformation a miracle. Even if it does not resemble the reason of the human being, the tree does in reality have, of its own, a reason which oversees the production of the miracle of feeding itself in conducting the moisture hidden in the soil-womb clasping its roots. The attribution of *Rubūbiyat* and *Hidāyat* to Allah, as the author of the miracle performed by the tree, demeans the sacredness of the marvel by which it silently, with unlimited magnanimity, feeds the world with the beneficence of the bounty of its immobility, in providing fruit to men and animals, refuge to the birds, shade to the tired wanderer.

---

[46] The reader may be aware that the Idea of Progress, as the permanent development of the resources and achievement of the Socratic Reason, has been debunked as a fiasco, as a false “religion”. No philosopher today would advance the idea of endless development based on Reason, especially after Europe staging two World Wars in the XX century.

[47] BCQ, p. 30-32

Knowledge formation according to the Quran and the Vedānta. Furthermore it behooves this essay to bring forth the genius of Śaṅkarācārya to view the world as a 'Thou' (*asmat*) *who* impinges upon the individual's consciousness and thereby forms within it the superimposed knowing (*adhyāsa*) which combines with the knowing generated by activity of the sense organs and of the mind. Besides Allah does not, according to the Vedānta Mysticism, grace the present consciousness of the seer with any of His attributes. The mutual imposition of the knowledge generated by the mind with the activity of the sense organs of knowing and of the knowledge which the outside world generates in the mind does not require the adjunct of an external source however exalted it can be imagined. It is purely a dynamic occurrence depending on the interaction of the seer's knowing and the invasion of the knowledge projected by the external environment. None of the attributes of Allah contributes anything to the contents of the present consciousness of the seer, a consciousness which causes the empirical delusion of the Ego-Sense. Hence the epistemology contingent upon the Quran does not in any manner lend itself to the acquisition of a transcendental mystical knowledge.

The difference between the Islamic anthropology and the anthropology according to the Sāṅkhya doctrine. According to the philosophical anthropology of the Sāṅkhya doctrine, the visible organs of knowledge have each its subtle hidden indispensable correspondent, which effectively enables the sense organs to convey to the mind the desired knowledge. One sometimes does not register the awareness, or the knowledge, of an object in front of oneself, because of a freak disconnect between the subtle and the gross organ of sight, the eyes. During the time of the lack of awareness of the desired object, the light waves were connecting the object to the eye. The consciousness of the perception was not happening until the connection with the subtle organ is restored. Only then does the perception occur. It is completed with the co-existence, at the same time and at the same place, of the object and its mental reflection, without its being contradicted by or with some subsequent other experience. When these requirements are united a simple act of perception occurs. The pattern serves also all the other sense organs of knowing. The concept and the reality of the subtle corresponding organs are physical components of the body-complex, which has nothing to do with Allah's *Hidāyat*. None of the millions of Brahmanist divinities claim any *Hidāyat* for the simple knowledges of seeing, touching, hearing, tasting, smelling.

The Providence of Allah does not enchant the universe and the

meaning of idol worship. The elaborate, disconcerting combination of *Rubūbiyat* (Providence) with its secondary attributes of *Rahmat (*divine graciousness), *Taqdīr (*measure), *Hidāyat (*guidance), does not transmute the disenchantment of the world created by Yahweh. If it is true, as the Mawlānā believes and argues, that Allah's Providence extends to his directing the drop of water from the cloud to the right spot on earth, and measures all things each to its purpose, He still does not *enchant* the Creation.

Muslims revile the Hindus, for example, for their Idol worship, without being able to overcome, or to qualify however slightly, their ignorance or their incapability to grasp *the poetic feeling in the perception* of the sacredness of a material object, be it a tree, a stone, a lake, a river, a mountain, or simply an image or idol representing the favorite deity (*iṣṭa devatā).* The Muslim does not receive from Allah the endowment enabling him to 'see' Poetry in the thick of History. The Brahmanist Kaffir does not need to see, or imagine, or believe, that God, endowed with an anthropomorphic constitution and writing a book, in Arabic - in imitation of humans having been doing so in other languages since a few thousands of years - telling of his intervention in the mother hen's guiding the new-born chick how to pick and choose its food. On the contrary, the Brahmanist sees the earth as the provider of food and as a life provider, and consequently *sees* the earth as worthy of reverence and gratitude, as Bhū Devī (Goddess Earth). Of all races the Brahmanist happens to be the only worshipper of the Earth as the sustainer of Life. Fundamentally believing that Life is the unexcelled priceless 'entity' in the world, the Brahmanist sees the Earth as the Mother (*Dharatī Mātā*) to which he bows with profound reverence. When the Muslim derides the Brahmanist for being an Idol Worshipper he in reality manifests an ignorant, rudimentary sentiment which has its root and its *raison d'être* in Allah's *Rubūbiyat* and its secondary attributes of *Hidāyat* (guidance), *Taqdīr* (measure), *Rahmat (*divine graciousness).

Between the Brahmanist's reverence for the enchanted Life-Provider, and the Muslim's reviling mockery, lies a monumental chasm filled with Allah's *Rubūbiyat*, and *Rahmat* (divine graciousness), and *Hidāyat* (guidance) and *Taqdīr* (measure).These manifestations of Allah have presided over all the genocides which Islamic belief has inspired, without any Muslim feeling the slightest regret, let alone any iota of guilt. These callous foibles too were measured out by Allah according to the several quotes mentioned above. Mawlānā Azad

would have had a personal experience of Allah measuring all things to their purpose when the Indian Muslims received the backing of the British power to promote the mayhem of the Partition. That too was an effect, an act of well adapted measurement, a demonstration of the wisdom of Allah's *Rubūbiyat.*

The Spanish Jesuit philosopher Baltasar Gracián(1601-1658) says:

> "Human means must be used as if there were no divine beings; and divine means must be used as if there were no human beings." [48]

Mawlānā Azad's depiction of the attributes of Allah and of the totality of his dispensing needs to the relevant purposes, in all things and in all beings, leaves no room for humans intervening in the management of the world and of all moving and unmoving realities. That is why perhaps he maintains a studied silence over the practice of slavery by the Arab powers, in the Mediterranean and in parts of Africa.[49]

The superfluity of *Hidāyat*. Allah's *Hidāyat* (guidance) is superfluous in the presence of the verifiable fact of the subtle organ being indispensable for the normal functioning of the relative sense organ. The Buddhist uses the entire spectrum of the reaches of the *Manas* and of the *Buddhi* prescribed by Patañjali, as if there were none of the millions of Brahmanist deities. Buddhism is a perfect example of Baltasar Gracián's aphorism: the follower of the Buddha adopts means of spiritual life as if there is no God. It is to the infinite glory of India that it is unique in having produced an eminently peaceful, heroic pursuit of the highest spirituality without the recourse of a belief in a Supreme Being. The destruction of the many Buddhist cultures by the violent iconoclasms of Islam still calls for an accurate measure of Allah's *Rubūbiyat*, of His *Taqdir* and of His *Hidāyat*, which, as divine sentiments, have provided the Believers with the innocence of their many genocides wreaked upon the noblest and most humane spiritual traditions.

The Hidāyat does in effect deny the responsibility and the autonomy of the individual even in the involuntary exercises of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, touching when one is lazing or getting bored! It would spoil the pleasure of taking part in some amusement, or in attending an art festival, or in executing a Mozart sonata, to ruin the pure emotion of disinterested joy by adulterating it with the *Hidāyat*

---

[48] Baltasar Graciàn: *L'Homme de Cour*, Éditions Gérard Lebovici, Paris, 1990.

[49] Malek Chebel, *L'Esclavage en Terre d'Islam*, Fayard, Paris; 2007; 387 pages.

and *Taswīyah* (balance) appropriate to the *Taqdīr* of Allah. Maulana Azad has the temerity to support the immanence of *Taqdīr* with the quotation: "Praise the name of thy Lord the Most High, Who createth, then disposeth: Who measureth, then guideth, Who bringeth forth the pasturage, Then turneth it to russet stubble." (Q. **85. 1-5**)

In reference to the above quote from the Pickthall bilingual version of the Holy Quran, Mawlānā uses this version: "Praise the name of Thy Lord, the Most High! Who hath created, and balanced *all things,* who hath fixed their destinies and guideth them." (**87. 1-3**).

The near absence of Man and the Allness of Allah in the Quran. In Pickthall's version the words *all things* (underlined) indicate the importance of the cosmic sweep of Allah embracing all that exists within His Providence. He adopts the position of the observer who, from outside, surveys the activity of Allah operating, from beyond, on the world around him. He literally interprets the Quran in the manner cryptically defined by Baltasar Gracián: that is, Allah provides *all for all* as if there were no humans. No wonder that the Quran gives almost no room to Man to fashion his own destiny, to adopt the convenient ways of his striving to attain the goal of living according to his unconstrained choice and with his own limited psychological, physical and moral resources. All that exists, including the minute preoccupation of the sightless worm in search of moisture, happens as the activation of Allah's will according to His Measure (*Taqdīr*). With Mawlānā Azad's enthusiastic exhorting his reader and āthe faithful Believer brother to believe that there is no nook, no flutter of a bird's wing, no leaf chewed by a monkey, no blade of grass eaten by the meanest donkey, no deer meant for the lion's lunch, no lamb measured out as food for the tiger, but all that, and infinitely more, in all that the Believer thinks, or says, or does, happens according to Allah's Measure. Such an argumentation helps to understand why, when he kills innocent, defenseless men and women, who happen to be different, the Believer exults with triumphantly trumpeting: 'Allahu Akbar'. He justifies Voltaire saying: "What answer can one give to the man who tells you that he prefers to believe God instead of Men and, as a consequence, has the assurance of deserving Heaven by murdering you?"[50]

Mawlānā Azad willingly wears blinkers by reducing the universe as the handiwork of Allah who presides over the minutest movement of

[50] Quoted in Henri Rey-Flaud's *La France s'éteint*, l'Islam s'embrase, p.40; PUF, Paris, 2020

the smallest creature to the entirety of all that happens, and does not happen, in the world contemplated by Him. The Mawlānā's fundamentalist vision of the world and of history excludes even a minimal, charitable grasp of the wealth of meaningfulness abounding in the plurality of faiths motivating the majority millions of Indian citizens. With hindsight one cannot help wondering at the disparity between his belief and his politics in solidarity with the Congress Party during the struggle for the independence of India from British rule. In all his descriptions of the functions of Allah, he does not discuss them in relation to the foreign rule of the British, while not sparing himself the negative interpretations of the indigenous Dharmas. Mawlānā Azad did not propose a single word from the Quran as a call for Independence. He evinces nary a word of acquaintance with the epic resistance of Abdel Kader who used the verses of the Quran to invigorate his followers' struggle against French imperial power. Nor is there anything in Mawlānā Azad's interpretation of the Quran which bears any similarity with the mystical poetry of Abdel Kader. His theological proficiency carried no weight on the mind of the Muslim Kaum dedicated to the Two-Nation doctrine for it was powerless despite its fundamentalism which got blown off in the Partition storm. Otherwise he would have experienced the overwhelming ravagement sponsored by Dajjal whose reality does not seem to have a privileged mention in his exegesis of the Quran.

The purpose of the Creation. Mawlānā Azad attributes a purpose to the nature of life at work in the Universe: "it is to serve and to offer the proof or evidence of the Unity of God on the one hand, and to bring home to the mind of Man, on the other, that every object in the Universe is designed to fit every corresponding other, under a single principle of life and that every object is laid into this scheme for its specific purpose so that nothing is created in vain."[51]

The relevant verses are:

> "As for these similitudes, We coin them for mankind, but none will grasp their meaning save the wise." (**Q. 29. 43**).
>
> "Such as remember Allah, standing, sitting, and reclining, and consider the creation of the heavens and the earth, (and say): Our Lord! Thou createdst not this in vain. Glory be to thee! Preserve us from doom of Fire!" (**Q. 3. 191**).

Mawlānā Azad interprets the purposive aspect of creation as *Takhlīq*

[51] BCQ, pp. 33-34

bil-Haq, that is, creation for a serious end. He stresses that the expression *bil-Haq* occurs in various places in the Quran in order to emphasize that nothing exists without its value in life. Moreover Nature itself desires that whatever is to be fashioned should be so completed that it must contain within it all that it needs for its subsistence. He further canvasses the Quran in support of his understanding of the manner of Nature's functioning.

> "He hath created the heavens and the earth with truth. He maketh the right cover the day and He maketh the day cover the night, and He constraineth the sun and the moon to give service, each running on for an appointed term. Is not He the Mighty, the Forgiver?" (**Q.39. 7**)
>
> "He it is Who appointed the sun a splendor and the moon a light, and measuredfor her stages, that ye might know the number of the years, and the reckoning Allah created not (all) that save in truth. He detaileth the revelations for people who have knowledge." (**Q. 10. 5**)

It fascinates the intelligence to internalize the infinite capacity of Allah, a literally personal God witnessed by the Apostle at the end of his nocturnal flight to Heaven. Allah acts as the Initiator and Supervisor of all the manifestations of Nature, while all the time doing so with unceasing alertness directing all the visible and invisible satisfactions of Nature. The fascination arises from Allah's faithfully conducting the infinite movements of the world without spiritualizing it into an enchanted creation. Allah does not confer sacredness to the materiality of Nature. Till the advent of Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), Nature was a static object with a centrality around which all the stars, spheres and planets gravitated. But the Muslim mind is not disturbed that the pre-Copernicus world of the Quran was different from the planet rotating while moving around the Sun, according to Galileo.

The Epic view of the moving world. The *Mahābhārata* relates the dramatic scene of the field of Kuru, where the two armies have assembled, arrayed for the battle which was about to start. Awed by the prospect of his having to kill, on the enemy side, his own relatives, and men of valour of high moral standing, especially the old patriarch Bhīṣma whom he loved and venerated, he dropped his sword, bow and arrow, and sat down in his chariot. He told his friend Śrī Kṛṣṇa that even acquiring the dominion over the three worlds would not be worth his having to kill those whom he loved and respected. In replying to him, Kṛṣṇa said that he was under the influence of a great illusion if he believed that he can take refuge in inaction and in not doing his duty. For Arjuna could not retreat into inactivity with the belief of escaping

from doing a duty which required the death of his friends and relatives, because the world was itself in a perpetual movement. That argument about the world's ceaseless movement is spoken by the avatar of the Supreme Being, Viṣṇu. The perpetual movement of the world *as such* is as banal as the existence of the locale around oneself. And the wonder of the Brahmanist cosmology lies in the banality of the very place of the individual being *endowed with sacredness* for being the presence and the witness of the Ultimate Reality. In simpler terms the Brahmanist views the *knowledge* of the pavement he is walking on being *homogeneous with his knowledge of Brahman. Hence the whole world, internalized as: the knowledge of the whole world is One with the mystical knowledge of the ONE beside which there is nothing*. According to the Quran there is nothing mystical in the cosmic preoccupations of Allah with his measuring and administering all the causes and effects of a disenchanted Nature.

Moreover the beauty of the garden and the landscaping grandeur as complement to the architectural marvel of Versailles had nothing to do with Allah's intervening in Nature and measuring out the needs and the provisions of every piece of moving and unmoving element of Nature. The garden of Versailles reveals and radiantly celebrates with paeans of silent homages to André Lenôtre (1613-1700). Christians have the good sense of not attributing all that beauty to the Holy Trinity. Catholic Louis XIV, the Sun King, loved Lenôtre: on one occasion he volunteered to push gently the wheel chair on which the old master landscaper was seated. It would not have dawned in the King's mind that Allah would have extended His Hidāyat (Guidance) to the genius of André Lenôtre! Nor needs Allah adduce His Hidāyat (Guidance) to the housewife who tends her flower bed in front of her house, for the delight of the passer by walking her dog.

All those who built Versailles did not know anything about Allah. They were worshippers of the Holy Trinity. And the names of the Architects and Builders are remembered with affection and gratitude. They had nothing to do with *bil-Haq* (that which is lasting) which the Quran uses to mean the beauty of Nature, or to suggest that within Nature there is at work a law of beauty or harmony which demands that everything that fashions or shapes itself within it, should be a thing of beauty or perfection. The Mawlānā quotes:

> ''He created the heavens and the earth with truth, and he shaped you and made good your shapes, and unto Him is the journeying." (**Q. 64. 3**)

Allah and the attribute of *Takhlīq-bil-Haq*. According to the Quran

Allah makes the law of causation implicit in the *Takhlīq-bil-Haq*, which means that everything in the universe 'has a talent appropriate to its role in life and which in its manifestation has to produce a specific result. Good and evil actions will always produce their corresponding results. Nor can the Law of Nature operate only in human actions.'

> "Or do those who commit ill deeds suppose that We shall make them as those who believe and do good works, the same in life and death? Bad is their judgement! And Allah has created the heavens and the earth with truth, and that every soul may be repaid what it hath earned. And they will not be wronged." (**Q. 45. 21-22**)

The *Takhlīq-bil-Haq* includes life hereafter, or life after death, for everything in the universe serves a purpose and moves toward a specific goal. This principle applies to Man also, for it is unthinkable that the life of Man is meant to be limited to only a few moments and then gets completely annihilated.[52]

> "Have they not pondered upon themselves? Allah created not the heavens? Allah created not the heavens and the earth, and that which is between them, save with truth and for a destined end. But truly, many of mankind are disbelievers in the meeting with the Lord."(**Q. 30. 96**)

So far the previous quotes referring to *Takhlīq-bil-Haq* consolidate the idea of Allah being concerned with the totality of the universe and all that happens in it. It is significant to observe that in all His physical interventions in all that happens and do not happen in the world, Allah remains distinctively separate from the world. The Revelation does strictly avoids his being immanent in the world. The only function which pertains to the personal initiative of the individual Believer is assent and submission to believing in the truth of the revealed verses. Yet Allah does not address Himself to the singular individual person. His rules and prescriptions are directed to the Umma. The division of humanity into those who are evil and those who are good (**Q. 45. 21-22** above) is stark, leaving no scope, no hope, for the evil doer who, repenting, would strive for returning to the Straight Path.

With characteristic consideration of the absurd, of the unusual, of the exceptional, which mysteriously punctuates the particular individual in social life, the *Mahābhārata* offers the reason for a valid suspension of Truth when a situation arises when telling a lie would save a life. Concurrently the epic condemns as an absolute evil the telling of a truth which causes the death of a person. Further, in an exception to its fundamental advocacy of Non-Violence, the epic does condone the use

---

[52] BCQ, p. 35

of violence in order to protect one's dependents and their means of living from a mortal threat posed by an evil aggressor. Allah does not allow such exceptions favorable to the preservation of a humane loyalty to Truth and *Ahiṁsā*. Mahatma Gandhi approved the Nehru Government's mobilizing the army to repel the Muslim hordes invading Kashmir in 1947.

Allah's sovereignty requiring the submission of the Believer. In comparison with the morality which pertains to the belief in the Holy Trinity of the Christian faith, the *Rubūbiyat* and its several expressions mark a definitive regression in the individual Believer's faith in all that Allah claims to Be, and stands for, in His management of the universe. The revealed verses do paradoxically demonstrate, with an unqualified clarity, how a deficient religious ideology can exert its hold on a billion and a quarter of Believers. It strains the imagination that Islam would not inspire its elites to entertain, with undoubting self-satisfaction, its inadequacies in regard to the unrevealed humanities which are demeaned and victimized by iconoclasms perpetrated by the Believers claiming moral and spiritual superiority. It overwhelms the mind to contemplate the insensitivity of the Believers translated as contemptuous hostility towards the aesthetic and moral accomplishments of the societies to which they choose to migrate. All the migrations which Muslim have effected with violence have had the immediate result of obliterating the culture of the invaded space and replaced by a culturally deficient Islamic presence. In nearly half a millennium Islam has given next to nothing to the earlier Christian culture of the Balkans, in comparison with what the Spaniards replaced the cultures of the Aztecs and the Incas after their genocidal obliteration. Driven by the ardor generated by the Counter Reformation the Spaniards brought, in the emptiness brought about with the use of steel and fire: a sophisticated language endowed with a rich literature, a Roman Catholic religion and its attendant fine arts, social laws, medical science, the three levels of education, a scientific disposition of the mind, and an admission to the cultures of the Romans and the Greeks. It is enormously enlightening to compare the substance of the Spanish replacement of the Aztec and Inca cultures with the total reduction to zero of the Buddhist and Christian cultures replaced by Islam, in Indonesia, in India, in Afghanistan, in Gandhāra, in Central Asia, in the Balkans.

The meaning of Believing in a disenchanted world. In the empty space which Allah leaves between Himself and the material world which he does not enchant, Man has no other recourse but to submit

and believe. The Muslim does not have to exert his freedom to think or reflect on a higher vision of a world where compassion, friendship, creative collaboration for the attainment of beatific fulfillment, would be desirable in preference to the duty to hate the Other or the reason of his being different and accordingly destroy his culture and civilization. Suddenly, during the past four decades, the citizens of secular, liberal countries in Europe belatedly discover the threat of their being replaced by an alien coarseness of migrating invaders led by the will to convert the Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian space to the reduction of the habitat for a section of the Sharia-loving permanently violent Umma. The Muslim cannot grasp the Christians' claiming to entertain a relationship of Love with the Triune Divinity heightened by the belief in Jesus cherished as their Savior. Allah entertains no relation of Love to the world.

Since the VII century Allah has been claiming to be alive as the cause of all that happens in every nook and corner of the universe. Yet there is not a single man-made sacred sign in honor of Allah's intimate association with the material universe. The *Dome on the Rock*, for example, celebrates Muhammad and Buraq flying up to Paradise and witnessing the Abode of Allah. It consecrates the Prophet's miraculous *mirāj* which over-rivals the miracle of the three-day old corpse of Jesus 'ascending' to Heaven.[53] He prevailed by establishing the fact which neither the Jews, nor the Christians, could contradict: he saw the real male body of Allah whose revelations are beyond all doubts. With the miracle of his flight Muhammad could establish the existence of a heavenly, superhuman, able-bodied anthropomorphic male as the unique concretely real God more believable than the imagined Jehovah of the Old Testament or the Triune God concocted by theologians gathered for discussion in a council held at Nicea. Muhammad's flight was more prestigious than the banal story of the Book of Genesis describing Jehovah walking on the surface of the earth and meeting Moses to whom He gave the tablets on which he had inscribed the Ten Commandments. The Arab claims he has seen – physically – God, during his living and he accordingly prevailed to have his testimony accepted by his companions either out of fear or out of credulousness or out of a predilection to believe to avoid any effort to doubt and to bear the burden of an independent thinking. Muhammad evinced the

[53] There is no eye witness of Muhammad's nocturnal flight. In his *The Words of Jesus and the Wisdom of the Orientals* Emile Gillabert rejects the realism of the few women who reported having seen the resurrected Jesus.

prodigious cunning to couple his flight to Heaven with the descent from Heaven of the angel Gabriel communicating the words which Allah had written in His Book! It was a stroke of genius unique in the annals of world conquerors! Undoubtedly it was a hitherto unsurpassed fiction which did initiate a world religion maintaining itself with the substance of an unrepentant violence coterminous with the reverence paid by the nearly three billion Jewish-Christian-Islamic respondents to the three Revelations.

The transcendent power of the two fictions in dualistic belief. It does not disturb the reason and the composure of the intelligent Christian that Easter, the second most important festival, after Christmas, in the Judeo-Christian civilization, would be based on the belief in the scientific absurdity of the corpse of Jesus rising, on the third day after the Crucifixion, from his tomb and ascending vertically to rest as a healthy, full able-bodied resurrected Jesus who will preside as the supreme Judge on the Day of Resurrection. This miracle is further enhanced, in the addition the martyred body of Jesus, by all Christians believing in the resurrection of their bodies on the Final Day. Such a stupendous belief is also shared by all the Muslims and the Jews. In reality, the notion of the resurrection of the body is a central belief in the Jewish faith. Nobel Prize winners, scientists in all the Universities in the West and in the Muslim countries, do not find it in any way absurd that Muhammad rode his horse Buraq flying off to Heaven where the Messenger could witness the presence of the able-bodied Allah standing in His distant garden. Flouting the gravitational power of the Earth, the resurrected body of Jesus ascending by its own power across the limitless space to Heaven, and Buraq flying with Muhammad on its back to the garden of Allah, are supposed to be miracles attired with historical authenticity. But miracles do not appear in the history of the Oriental spiritual traditions. Miracles are specific to the Revelations and they constitute the substance of the sturdy belief of the nearly three billions of believers in Judaism, in Christianity, in Islam. In the Roman Catholic tradition miracles do play a decisive role in the widely spread belief in miracles in elation to the confirmation of sainthood by the Vatican bureaucracy and in the popularity of the Shrine at Lourdes where pilgrims flock with he hope of the miraculous cure of some particular physical affliction. The history of Christianity has maintained the tradition of fervor in miracles having their prestige and their origin in the examples of the miracles performed by Jesus, in particular, his bringing Lazar back to life on he fourth day after his death. Reason defying miracles still exert an extraordinary appeal in the Roman Catholic tradition. In Brahmanism, it is not uncommon for

someone to undertake a certain period of penance in favor, most of the time, of the cure of an ailment suffered by a member of the family.

The relevance of the miracle and of the myth. However, more meaningfully, the difference in Brahmanism consists of the abundant usage of myths, as illustrations of values and desired moral or spiritual goals, attainable on Earth by human effort and by the searching for the absolute self-enlightenment. But the monumental difference between the three dualistic Revelations and the Indian Dharmas, in particular, is in favour of the latter having never initiated any belief or form of thought associated with the physical occurrence of a miracle. With one major difference: deemed to be essential, miracles, in the context of the history of the Judeo-Christian traditions, are awarded the high esteem and the indispensable prop of the faith which, paradoxically, exerts its authority with violence and intolerance. On the other hand, the prevalence of the mythic thought leaves the native Indian's mind free to interpret it in harmony of his particular personal need, which may be different in the life of another individual. Moreover, particularly in the Christian tradition, miracles are often associated with death or with physical abnormalities or with experiences of distress, never in relation to mystical perfectibility. The miracle of the resurrected Jesus, on the third day after his death on the cross, is joyously remembered on the occasion of Easter. The miracle of the resurrection of Jesus constitutes the centrality of the Christian civilization and will remain as its undying heritage. On the part of the Orientals, myths foster Dionysiac joyfulness and the love of all the forms of life. Brahmanism does not celebrate a single public festival based on a historical event or person. It holds that there can be nothing more valuable, in harmony of the purpose of the Dharmas than the priceless gift of 'life'. Moreover, Daisetz Suzuki, the eminent scholar of Zen Buddhism confidently affirms: "Miracle? I am hungry, that is a miracle! I eat, that is a miracle!" The novelty of every single moment, in the impermanence of Time, is a miracle! Every moment of existence if full with the wonder of its being a miracle!

The unique example of India where the majority superior civilization got worsted by an inferior culture. The quotes which Mawlānā Azad marshals above are characterized by their spiritual indigence. Nevertheless he uses them to signify his purpose of definitively establishing the supremacy of the Quran as the *nec plus ultra* statement of Truth and of Religiosity. Thereby, in the midst of the sub-continent which has fostered the coexistence of a variety of polytheistic religiosities and of monotheistic visions of the world, he

does, without seemingly being aware of it, offer one more example of how an inferior culture can upset and defeat a genuinely superior civilization and replace it. Islamic replacement has invariably been carried out by the ministration of Allah-enjoined raw violence pronounced to be morally justifiable as the duty of waging war for the transformation of the world into the *Dar-ul-Islam.* The ensuing violence is actually the setting in motion of the ideology of Islam according to will of Allah. The sole exception of the indigenous Indian civilization surviving the hegemony of Islam has not been noticed by historians, even by Indian academic historians. Mawlānā Kalām Azad might not have willingly intended to abstain from admitting the recognition of the survival of India and of her Idea, in conjunction with his reverence for the infallibility and the pre-eminence of the Quran and of Islam. Yet, whatever be the merit of the Mawlānā's fundamentalist appreciation of his faith and of the Holy Book, he does nevertheless justify – undoubtedly without his having ever been aware of it - the reason to acknowledge the reality that India, in the context of world history, *evinces the only surviving example of a sophisticated civilization which has had to bear the catastrophic experience of having been diminished and wrecked by the hegemony of an inferior political ideology*. Indeed, under the guise of an anti-Kaffir obligation for the snuffing out of *all* other thought structures, however enlightening they may verily be, *Islam, as the work of God, has inspired, with the world map illustrating, the iconoclastic devastation of a plurality of well-established moral and spiritual cultures.* The moral barrenness of the monumental replacement of the live, high cultures by Islam, is revealed and confirmed by the strains and stresses within the Pakistani Theocracy seeking to establish a permanent combination of Law and Order by a reliance on secular laws and rules borrowed from the remnants of the British India Act of 1937. Pakistan represents the classic example of an Islamic replacement as cultural negation.

The Revelations heralding the belief in the Unity of God as cosmic causality. The Quranic idea of the Unity of God implies the working of the Universe regulating itself in such a way that everything therein contributes to life and growth. It provides the substance required by every earthly situation and condition. Thereby it does instinctively raise the conviction in man that there exists a cosmic being who provides life to the entire universe and looks after its well-being. For that purpose it must necessarily possess certain attributes, without the display of which, such a complete and flawless machinery of existence

would never have taken its rise. The Quran asks: "Can the instinct of man ever impel him to believe that all this machinery of life has come into existence by itself, and that no aim or purpose underlies it? Is it possible that this machinery of existence, such as it is, has no designer for it whatsoever? Does this entire order of life owe its existence to just a blind and deaf Nature, a lifeless matter, or an insensitive electron, and not to a being possessing a will of its own and a directing intellect?"[54]

The banality of the answer to these questions had been evident for a long time before the Mawlānā was born. It has been published many centuries before the birth of Muhammad and the earthly visit of Angel Gabriel to a camel driver in Mecca. During several millennia, before the birth of Muhammad, the native Indian philosophers and Sages have been proclaiming the eternal existence of all that exists as the ONE, as the Fullness, which has always been in existence and will always be in existence. There has never been a time when the ONE was not; and there will be never a time when the ONE shall cease to be. The cosmology of the Brahmanist is a negation of the concept of a beginning as proclaimed by the Book of Genesis: the pathetic philosophical indigence of the Creation by a fiat of Jehovah has, due to the advantage of the imperial advantage drawn from military superiority, been the mortiferous consequence of the displacement of more humane, spiritually more advanced Oriental cultures defining the world as an eternal spiritual Fullness.

The Industrial Revolution: a critique of the omnipotence of Jehovah. Moreover the entire logic of the Mawlānā's asseveration has been refuted by the beneficial products of the Industrial Revolution and the rise of the positive sciences based on experimentation. What the Quran vitally misses is the irrefragable evidence of the external, Euclidean space not being the indispensable repository of the reason to believe in a transcendental absolute deity. In the sixth century B.C. the Chinese mystic philosopher Lao Tzu decreed that all that exists is a manifestation of the Tao, which is homogenous with the totality of the constitutional essence of Man. As an absolute negation of the disenchantment of a world created by Allah, the Tao is not the unity of a superlative anthropomorphic God-out-there, somewhere in the Euclidean space, endowed with the power of remote controlling every small and big occurrence in the movements of the spheres and in every parcel of the hither planet. The benefits of the Sciences resulting from the discoveries which have led to the control of diseases and of other

[54] BCQ, p. 36

causes of suffering are man-made blessings undreamed of by the writers of the Biblical revelations. The intellectual and material products of the Industrial Revolution, all made by Men and Women laboring with their intelligence and effort, have had nothing to do with the Ten Commandments or with whatever possible prescriptions attributed to Jehovah or Allah.

It never occurred to any non-Hebraic Man to appear in the dream of some spiritually weak individual and ask him the abomination to sacrifice his son as a proof of his loyalty. There is none, among the hundreds of myths of the Brahmanist literature, which compares with the abomination of Jehovah asking Abraham to kill his son to prove his loyalty to Him, the Only God. It is an abomination celebrated every year by the Muslims with the joyous festival of Bakr Eid, the celebration of animal sacrifice testifying to venerable Abraham's perverse fidelity to Jehovah. Eid represents the Islamic contempt for the animal world, of which the number of voluntary associations for the protection of the animals today offer the prospect of a universal critique of the celebration of the Abrahamic norm-setting faith as supreme submission to the sovereignty of Yahweh. It is at the very source of the Biblical cosmology that there lie all the divine absolutes which have bequeathed all the forms of thought, of all the justifications, suitable for the realization of all the murderous religious violences of which the Islamic are the most merciless and impenetrable to Goodness and Compassion. It is quite logical that the two atom bombs which fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were due to a decision the morality of which had its source in Jehovah's mode of thinking and of the conduct of the world.

The elevated conception of the Indian cosmology. The cosmology of the Indian Dharmas postulates the immanence of the Supreme Reality in and as the Universe. It is all-pervasive and is homogeneous with the essence of every form of life. In India the contemplatives discovered the higher reality of *mental* space as the geography where divinity resides, in the 'here', within the consciousness of the individual. It is in the silence of reclusion, in the contemplative withdrawal from the hubbub and the distractions of domestic and social allurements, that the mental space gets explored and rendered worthily hospitable as the residence of the Supreme Being.

The discovery of the essence of the Ultimate Reality, qualified as Īśvara, grasped and qualified by every individual mind by a chosen name, is immediate, self-proven by its *immanence* in the acts of sitting, of walking, of speaking. The proof and the evidence of God-

Knowledge radiates from within the singular self, into the ordinariness of existence, in the relationship with all moving and non-moving (*carācara*) realities, on earth and in the beyond. The transfiguration of ordinary existence into the silent unitive association with the Absolute reality, thanks to the magnanimity of the Ācāryas, has been gifted to all humanity as the *mahāvākyas* of the Upaniṣads: *sarvam idam khalu brahman, (*All this indeed is Brahman) *tat tvam asi*, (Thou are that), *aham brahmā'smi*,) (I am Brahman), *atman brahman aikyam* (Ātman and Brahman are One). The ultimate knowledge *of* Brahman is understood as neither Object nor Subject; "It" is not proved by "some entity" distinct from "It". Brahman is not proved by a knowing *external* to it. *It is its own proof*. Such a mystical knowledge lies beyond the farthest reach of Islamic piety, or of the piety of the other two revealed dispensations.

The unity of the One with the Ego. Indeed it is the homogeneity of the I-essence and the Brahman-Essence which is real, as the personalized manifestation walking on the surface of the earth. That unitive attribute as the substance of the individual's authentic mode of living does not receive its meaningfulness in Belief, but in and as immediate, private, personal Experience. For, as a banal matter of fact, the Mawlānā's argument consists of the exclusive Unity of Allah characterized with its owning the causality of the existence of all things and their related ends and purposes in the material universe. Allah as the source of the cosmic causality triggers the individual's private rational exclaiming: "So What"? The stark simplicity of a Unitive God who, as the master builder and producer of all that exists, hates non-Believers and calls for their elimination, may serve a utilitarian purpose in a lullaby. But, contrasted with the *Weltanschauung* of Brahmanism, it represents an alienation from the spirituality of the finality of human existence as the mystical experience of the essence of the Supreme Being. In the world view of the ONE, the ultimate reality, Brahman, is *naturally* the dweller *in*, and *as*, the essence of the contemplative seeker's "soul". *The naturalness of the identity expressed as* aham brahmā'smi *bears no common element with the state of the newly born according to the Biblical view of the infant child being born with the original sin.* On the contrary, the 'original sin' contingent upon birth is infinitely distant from the fact of being born as co-essential with the essence of Brahman, as the ONE. The infant child is born as a manifestation of the ONE, as the locus of the presence of Īśvara as *antaryāmī* (the in-dweller). The Brahmanist speaks of this ultimate self-realization as *sac-cid-ānanda* (truth-

knowledge-bliss). God is not an inhabitant in a remote spot in the far beyond. It is the Brahman-charged experience of sitting, of walking, of speaking. Instead of the arbitrary notion of the "original sin", the follower of each of the Dharmas knows and believes that he comes to the world at birth endowed with the *samskāras*, the totality of the psychic impressions of all that he has done and not done in the previous births. No one, according to the teachings of the Dharmas, is ever born as a *tabula rasa* to which impressions subsequently aggregate. Western psychology does not recognize the reality of the *samskāras,* one of the five components of the human personality.[55]

The Biblical God is not indispensable to personal spirituality. No effort is required to believe that Allah is the Sole deity of the world and the presider over all causes and effects. Mawlānā Azad may perhaps not have been aware of the existence of the Indian Buddhism, so effective had been its elimination by his community's practice of iconoclasm as a sacred duty. But all the Buddhists who prosper beyond the frontiers of India do live vigorous lives of self-fulfillment without the obligation or necessity to believe in a Creator of the world or in the need for a deity presiding over the pursuit of a beneficent, peaceful, compassionate existence. The difference between Allah and Īśvara leads the mind to compare the cultures which each concept has inspired. Allah intervenes with the ant which lives the fullness of its lot without being endowed with eyes, and with the elephant in his slow tread towards a tree rich in foliage for its food. But Allah does not inspire artists to celebrate His Unity in painting, in music, in sculpture. Īśvara provides the leitmotiv for the abundance of fine arts, of which the monuments all over the Indian territory bear testimony. It is significant that both Judaism and Islam do not have fine arts corresponding to the belief either in Yahweh or in Allah related to the commandment prescribed to Moses prohibiting the production of images as an offence to the Only God. Though the Holy Trinity maintains a filiation with Abraham, as do the other two revelations, yet the fine arts - painting, music, sculpture - of the Judeo-Christian society has historically cultivated an enriching affinity with its pagan Greco-Roman antiquity. At the Louvre Museum in Paris the visitor may contemplate the stunning irony of Michelangelo's magnificent marble bust of Moses who, with his commandment against the

[55] The other four are: *rūpa* (the body), *vedanā* (sensation), *saṅjñā* (perception), *vijñāna* (consciousness). These are the five *skandhas*, the five constituents of the body, according to the Buddhists.

representation of figures, is the progenitor of all the iconoclastic devastations of peerless artworks carried out as sacred acts enjoined by Yahweh-Allah. When Believers revile idolaters and claim to be more moral or religious by breaking the images which the latter worship, they actually bring out the *Takhkīk-bil-Haq* of Allah from the depth of their consciousness, that is, the indigence of their benightedness and the insensitivity towards man-made works of Beauty, as homages to hallowed divinities, whose perfect bodies remind the devotee of the potentiality of his '*antaryāmī*' fullness. What wealth of adornments have the pagan divinities indeed inspired for the heightening of the earth's enchantment! The culturally ignorant and deficient Believer represents the inferior individual who, always eager to use brutish force, gloats over wreaking havoc upon the excellence of the hapless creator of art works.

The indifference and the insensitivity of the Believers to the sufferings of their victims. The whole world has witnessed the expressions of contrition by the leaders of Germany for the crime of Judeocide perpetrated during the World War II. The children and the grandchildren of those, who fought in the war, still struggle with the thoughts of remorse and of suffering generated by the sense of guilt and regret for the shame of the mass murder committed by the generation who supported the Nazi state. *Learning from the Germans*, with the sub-title *Race and the Memory of Evil* is an exhaustive study of the memory and of the anguish still being felt in contemporary German society in regard to the Jewish question. The author, Susan Neiman, is an American Jew who does not have any member of her family having been victimized by the Nazi regime.[56] With delicate sympathy she records the many aspects of the Germans struggling with the sentiment of guilt and of their own suffering during the long five-year war waged with brutality on both sides. At the same time she analyses the history of the United States and criticizes the indifference of the general American population not recognizing the genocidal harm which the early generations of settlers wreaked upon the indigenous populations. She could have extended the scope of her study to include the indifference and insensitivity of the British people to the practice of the slave trade, and especially to the many man-made genocidal famines, the impoverishment and the cultural dislocation of the Indian people.

---

[56] Susan Neiman, *Learning from the Germans: Race and the Memory of Evil*. Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, PP. 384; + Notes & Index up to p. 415; 2019.

Like the Americans in regard to the descendants of the Slaves and to the minority of the Pre-Columbian peoples, and the British with their self-righteous indifference towards the demeaning and dehumanizing of the denizens of the former Indian empire, the Indian Muslims, together with the Muslims of Pakistan and of Bangladesh, remain adamant in not owning the ravages inflicted upon the indigenous majority of Brahmanists, Buddhists, Jainas. On the contrary, they display a cynical inversion of their own history by claiming a victimhood when, despite their having been a minority, the reality consists in their having been able to prevail, with the favour of their military dominance, in "inferiorizing" the far more advanced native majority! When reminded of their inglorious past, the Indian Muslims do never fail to react with an ostentation of delicate grievance like the squinting eyes of a cockled snail recoiling at the slightest touch.

The Quran's definition of the relation between Allah and Man. Gautama Buddha says that neither God nor any demon, nor any learned scholar, nor anybody else can prevent Time from passing. It is on the impermanence of life that he builds his doctrine of the *Madhyama Pratipad* (The Middle Way). Thereby Buddhism proclaims Becoming, not Being, as the foundational reality of existence. All other philosophies and religiosities - Western and Oriental - are founded on the concept of the illusion of Being.

But Mawlānā Azad posits: "The Quran points out that it is against the nature of man that he should ponder over the working of the universe and yet deny the existence of an all-embracing Providence."

He assumes as a fact that, on looking around, Man can find the hand of a fixed, external Providence being at work everywhere, and his very nature will proclaim that what he beholds cannot exist without a Provident Allah as its cause. It is indeed curious that Syed Abdul Latif would transmit the Mawlānā's fundamentalist view by belittling Man's "postulates and his intellectual poses and to base its argument thereon".[57] The appeal of the Quran rests on Man's natural instincts and aptitudes, with the gratuitous statement that the sense of God is inherent in human nature. With the fullest conviction and sincerity the Mawlānā stressed the fact of the Providence being at work everywhere and in all things. Nevertheless he would find it a high Islamic duty to combat, as blasphemy, the transferring of the idea of Īśvara as the in-dweller (*antaryāmī)* present as the essence of all forms of life. It does

[57] BCQ, p. 37

immensely surprise the mind that he would not have seen a causality between the conviction of the Immanence of the Fullness of the ONE being *naturally, as a matter of fact, co-essential with the fullness of the individual person, of every form of life* as the reason of the history of no Indian ever going beyond the frontier of the sub-continent to conquer, to pillage, to kill, to subdue, to humiliate, to impoverish the Other!

In support of the wisdom of the Providence, the Mawlānā adduces this warning to the doubter: 'If one denies it through indifference, he needs to be warned against this indifference. But the method to employ for this should not wholly be intellectual in character! On the other hand, it should be such as could touch his heart and rouse his argument against himself.'[58]

Mawlānā Azad lays down a proposition which pronounces its validity as a statement of fanaticism, a form of knowledge which is not based on Reason. On the contrary it relies on a superficial sentimentality which cements the Believer's unreflecting acceptance of Providence. He does it with a condescending self-righteousness, impervious to any persuasion in favor of the possible alternative of a more satisfying and wholesome point of view. The reference to Gautama Buddha's *Middle Way* provides, in contrast, a historically significant religiosity which gratifies all the spiritual needs of the follower who seeks refuge in the Buddha, in the Dharma, in the Sangha. But, persisting, the Mawlānā buttresses his submission to the Providence of God with:

> "Oh, but man is a telling witness against himself! Although he tender his excuses" (**Q. 75.14-15**)
>
> "Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Who provideth for you from the sky and the earth, or Who owneth hearing and sight; and who bringeth forth the living from the dead and bringeth forth the dead from the living; and Who directeth the course? They will say: Allah. Then say: Will ye not then keep your duty (unto Him)? Such then is Allah, your rightful Lord. After the Truth what is there saving error? How then are ye turning away!" (**Q. 10. 31-32**)
>
> "Say (O Muhammad): Praise be to Allah, and peace be on His slaves whom He hath chosen! Is Allah best, or (all) that ye ascribe as partners (unto Him)?
>
> "Is not He (best) Who created the heavens and the earth, and sendeth down for you water from the sky wherewith We cause to spring forth joyous orchards, whose trees it never hath been yours to cause to grow. Is there any God beside Allah? Nay, but they are folk who ascribe equals (unto Him).

[58] BCQ, p. 37

> "Is not He (best) Who answereth the wronger one when he crieth unto Him and removeth the evil, and hath made you the viceroys of the earth? Is there any God beside Allah? Little do they reflect!
>
> "Is not He (best) Who guideth you in the darkness of the land and the sea, He Who sendeth the winds as heralds of His mercy? Is there any God beside Allah? High exalted be Allah from all that they ascribe as partner (unto Him)?
>
> "Is not He (best) Who produceth creation, then reproduceth it, and Who provideth for you from the heaven and the earth? Is there any God beside Allah? Say: Bring your proof, if ye are truthful!"(**Q. 27. 60-65**)

These rhetorical questionings do not explain why Allah would bring forth natural upheavals which inflict stupendous disasters like floods, earthquakes, volcanoes which entail the deaths of innocent children, together with the sufferings of adult men and women. The Quran leaves out the connection of Allah's Providence with the death of innocent children struck by natural tragedies. Voltaire wrote his long poem questioning the Catholic faith in a benevolent heavenly God, who oversees everything in His creation, in relation to the death of innocent babies and children in the devastating earthquake which struck Lisbon in 1785. But the example of Voltaire apparently made no dent in the Mawlānā's unconditional faith in Allah's Providence. He did not notice even the many genocidal famines which punctuated the domination of the sub-continent by a Christian power, nor even the ambiance of the ugliness of the man-made extreme poverty swilling all around him. But he labors on with Allah being concerned with the provisions measured out for the ant and for the elephant with each fulfilling the aim of its life in its respective environment. The Mawlānā does not consider the role of Allah in the broken natural order when a child dies before the parents. In relation to the Judeocide perpetrated by the Nazis, the Jews were troubled by the fact that the personal Supreme God, Yahweh, did not make any sign from beyond the clouds in favor of the protection and the saving of the innocent Believers. The silence of Jehovah was incomprehensible in the face of a tragedy of such immense proportions. The indifference of Jehovah, if indeed He was “there” and knowing what was unfurling in the middle of highly cultured Europe, does confirm the worthiness of Gautama Buddha’s reliance solely on Humanity as the bestowing provider of absolute security.

The spiritual emptiness of the world according to the Quran. It is known that atheists can, most of the time, if not all the time, lead perfectly moral lives which have benefited mankind with the example of their irreproachable way of living, with the nobility of their ideas

and with the courage to stand against the crowd and against the abusive use of raw power. Moreover they provide the inspiration to others to stand alone with the reliance and self-confidence of their individual strength and the rightness of their conviction. In ancient India the merry-making, free-thinking Cārvākas were never persecuted. They disappeared as a recognizable group with no one noticing, verily as the outcome of their irrelevance, in the long memory of their short history, on the scale of the history of Indian civilization. The Quranic celebration of Allah as the unique creator of the world and all that pertains to it represents a variation of Yahweh the Creator in the Book of Genesis of the Old Testament. The relevant verses quoted by Mawlānā Azad describe a Creator who has attributes which match those of Yahweh prior to the pronouncement of such precepts as the Ten Commandments. The rhetorical question in verse **27. 64** of the Quran, asking if there is any God beside Allah, has been answered in as many ways as there have been men and women reflecting upon the wonder of the world around them. Stripped of the choleric verses which enjoin hatred of, and gratuitous hostility towards, the Other, the Quranic description of Allah would correspond to the evocation of the Manitou in the religion of the First Nations of Canada. The Feathered Snake God Quetzalcoatl of the Aztecs and the Toltecs is more humane than the God which inspired the Spaniards of the Counter Reformation to undertake their irrevocable genocides at the time of their glory and active development. The Egyptian God Osiris is forgiving, gentle, compassionate, loving, and yet loses to Yahweh who is irascible, hateful, vindictive, cruel, and nevertheless wins as the source of all the subsequent religious intolerances and their corresponding destructive violences. The charming Indian myth of the Gods and the Demons churning the ocean of milk to produce the world contains a complex, intellectually challenging narrative of the simultaneous emergence of both goodness and evil at the very beginning of the created world. Brahmanists still revere Mahādeva Śiva as the savior who holds the cosmic poison in his throat. The image of Śiva as the archetypal Yogi never fails to show his throat tinged with the blue stain in the works of miniaturists as well as in popular, mass-printed, garish colored pictures adorning cheap calendars. Moreover Brahmanism does also represent Brahmā seated on the flower of the lotus stem growing out of the navel of Viṣṇu reclining on the snake Śeṣa floating on the surface of the Ocean. Subservient to Viṣṇu, Brahmā goes into a deep meditation and out of his contemplative thought issues forth all that exists. Metaphysically and aesthetically the mythic representation of the Creation by the humane Brahmā generates a multi-layered design of

Creation which is homogeneous with the concept of a cosmic genesis with a moral and spiritual fabric. The greatness of the native Indian speculative genius manifests itself in the unparalleled contingency that in the same geographical space, among a community animated by the untrammeled freedom of thought, Gautama Buddha would emerge and, at the age of thirty-five, pronounces the Dharma-Cakra-Pravartana (*The setting the Wheel of the Dharma into Motion*).Turning the wheel of his Dharma embraced the totality of Man's spiritual life and the finality of earthly existence in the four Noble Truths which dispense with any belief in a cosmic Deity, whether it be Jehovah, or Brahmā, or Quetzalcoatl, or the Manitou, or any other however superlatively heralded as nonpareil.[59]

The worthiness of the spirit of renunciation according to the Dharmas and the world viewed as a mere object in Islam. At the root of the Bauddha Dharma, and as its essence, lies the rejection of all the forms and contingencies of clinging, of attachment. Gautama Buddha offers a radical opposition and a commensurate rational rejection of the concept of a cosmic, anthropomorphic producer and director of all that exists in the universe, such as obtains in the Islamic scriptures in their celebration of Allah as a real knower of all that exists, down to the slightest thought or gesture of every man or woman. Gautama places the individual believer of the Four Noble Truths as the sole responsibility of all that he thinks and does not think, of all that he does and does not do. It is in the Dharma of Buddha that Humanity acquires its moral and spiritual fullness with the renouncer seeking the good fortune of self-perfection by means of the Eight-fold Path leading to *nirvāṇa* realized in the body, as a personal individual experience, on the surface of the Earth. It is this Buddhist society of men and women seeking the monumental achievement of *individual* self-perfection, which the zealots of Allah chose to destroy, without, till this day, any Mussalman having the least scruple of acknowledging the immensity of such a considerable cultural diminution of the Indian civilization. It is remarkable that fanaticism would dull the Indian Muslim's sensitivity to the extent that he does not internalize the irony that the destruction of the Indian Buddhism was a loss also to his own intolerant social environment. For he fails to acknowledge his unwillingness to expand his aesthetic curiosity enabling him to appreciate the Beauty of the Kaffir Other's art work.

---

59 The four Noble Truths: *All life is a suffering. Suffering has a cause. Suffering has an end. There is a path which leads to the end of suffering*.

The world as an Idol in Islam. Throughout the Quran, the celebration of Allah refers to the Creator who continues to be involved with the workings of the world of matter in measuring out every object to its purpose. He does actually foster in the mind of the Believer a sentiment of gratitude and of a sturdy reverence for all sensuous objects. It is characteristic of Islam that it does not call for the indispensable moral requisite of renunciation and of detachment from the attractiveness of the world. On the contrary, as the verses quoted above persuade, the Quran commands admiration of the world in which every wisp of matter is glorified with the presence and the measure (*Taqdīr*) of Allah. The Believer consequently submits to this veneration of the world as it appears to his eyes. Allah thus enforces the belief in the world as a total Idol, an Idol propitiated with the sacrifices of cultures exhorted as Faith and as response to His call for the war against the *Dar-ul-Harb*. It is the presence of Allah's Sovereignty over the disenchanted world of Matter which does not tolerate the co-existence of Kaffirs corrupting the purity of the cosmic disenchantment. For that reason, Allah asks for their elimination, to the fulfillment of which the Believers offer their submission, with the prospect of being rewarded with an eternal bounty of sensual delights in Heaven.

The Brahmanist aspires to *become One with Brahman*. The Muslim dreams and yearns to *be One with the Dar-ul-Islam.* The Brahmanist yearns to be one with the Universal Immanent Spirit. The Muslim seeks and strives for endless jubilation contingent with residence in a material paradise as the reward for his right submission consisting mainly of the abomination of all Kaffirs and Hypocrites and of the will to wage war for the fulfillment of Allah's wish to have all that exists as the *Dar-ul-Islam*.

However the native Indian's quiet, silent heroism, is implicit in the conscious act of detachment, as an exercise of personal freedom. It represents a decisive difference between the ethos of the Dharmas, recommending the voluntary act of renunciation, and the will of Islam determining the Believer's partiality for the spiritually barren world of matter, as the stage where he acts out his submission with the desire for sensuous delights in Heaven.

According to the indigenous Dharmas the psychological and spiritual training required in the struggle for self-perfectibility includes the rejection of the attachment to the idea, or the mental image, of an immutable, external cosmic God. For however much can be the exaltation of a Creator God, He never ceases to exist as *an object* of

thought or of the imagination. An object held in the hand and a distant star in the sky are ontologically *equal objects* perceived and known by the mind. The subjective conception of a God in the sky is as much an object of the mind as the nearest tree can be to the mind understanding it as an object of perception. Relying on the Yoga of Patañjali, the striver for genuine spirituality does not, in the practice of *pratyahāra* (i.e. withdrawal of the mind from *external* objects) entertain any exception to the obligation of freedom from all attachments to the allurements of the external environment. By means of *dhāraṇā*, he strives for a similar, but higher freedom from attachments to the *mental* objects however ultimately noble and eminently exceptional they can be. All the indigenous Dharmas, with their roots and traditional modes of striving (*sādhanās*), grounded in Pātañjala Yoga, enable the *sādhaka* (striver) to recognize the limitations of the Cosmic Provider of Revelation who limits Himself to the perception of the Euclidean space and the calendar, astronomical Time of the world. And thereby the Submitter discards nothing from the mass of moving and unmoving *carācara*) objects within or beyond his purview. At the due date in the Greek Calends of the Final Day of Resurrection, he will rise from his grave and bear the weight of his attachments to face the Judgement of Allah (Jehovah).

Far above everything in the world, Allah leaves no space for Man and for any private initiative of his own. Whatever personal or original work would a Believer imagine or think that he is the doer, is, even it be unknown to him, due to the *Taqdīr* of Allah. Whether the earthly action or decision seems to be predestined or otherwise carried out, the Believer has the confidence that what he does, he does with the full knowledge and agreement of Allah. The belief or the independent reality of predestination becomes immaterial in the Believer's estimation of his life and of his fate being under the vigilance of Allah.

The Dharmas offer *mokṣa,* or *nirvāṇa,* or *kaivalya* as their respective finalities available to any individual, as the conclusion of self-effort, by both genders. Each of these three finalities is universal, because they are available to all beings, irrespective of the history and geography of India. Each is a finality realized as a private, personal experience, in the body, on the surface of the earth, in a calendar time. The finality of Man in Islam is death, with the rider that the dead body will resurrect itself in order to appear before Allah on the Day of Resurrection, in the expectation and acknowledgement of the judgement measured out with his thoughts and actions during his lifetime on earth. The entrance into Paradise on the Day of Resurrection is limited to the Believers in the

revelations. It is not universal. The concept and the mode of its realization as universal salvation is *the* unique contribution to Humanity.

Allah at the centre of the world in Islam and Man at the centre of the world in the cosmology of the Dharmas. In the *Weltanschauung* concomitant with each Dharma, Man is at the centre of the scriptures and their prescriptions. As the fundamentals of Brahmanism the four *puruṣārthas* (aims of life) are: *artha* (economic and material prosperity), *kāma* (aesthetic and sensuous fulfilment), *dharma* (moral accomplishment), *mokṣa* (liberation, self-fulfillment, enlightenment). The Quran does not proclaim an equivalent of the four *puruṣārthas*. It does not and cannot accept or condone the meaning of *aham brahmā'smi*, or of *ātman brahman aikyam* and, in a mighty contrast, independent of the existence of a Supreme Being, of a possibly existent Almighty God. The Holy Book does not recognize the experiential validity of *tat tvam asi*, even if a Brahmanist would 'see' his Muslim neighbour being homogeneous with him, as a *tvam* identical with the *aham*, both being manifestations of the *tat.* The Believer would faithfully interpret the *aham brahmā'smi* or the *tat tvam asi* as statements of blasphemy. There is no evidence of the Mawlānā recognizing the *tat tvam asi* animating his colleague and political partner, Mahatma Gandhi, who viewed the person of the British administrator of the Raj as a *tvam.* There can be no other explanation than the Mahatma's faith in the *tat tvam asi* in his having never, in any of his speeches or writings, used a single word of abuse, of anger, of hatred, directed to the person of the imperialist Other.

The Believer's submission and the absence of an earthly finality of human existence in the Quran. According to the Quran, and during the past fourteen centuries, the Islamic Man has remained a Believer who lives his belief in *submission* to the laws prescribed by Allah. Whatever initiative he can take by himself, based on his own independent understanding, would be viewed by the Umma as an alienation from the Truth proclaimed by the revelation and from faithfulness to the only true God. Any departure from the orthodox interpretation would be sternly rejected as a violation of the word of Allah, if not as a repudiation of Allah after having earlier adhered to His revelation. An independent rational interpretation which disagrees with orthodoxy would be immediately denounced as a blasphemy which, according to Islamic jurisprudence, would earn a death sentence. Such an inflexible mentality implied in the believer's submission does not exist in any of the Indian communities guided by

the fundamentals and purposes of the Dharmas. In fact in the XXI century, Islam is the only dispensation which prescribes the extreme penalty for the offence of any kind of difference from established orthodoxy. It is a feature of Islam which discourages or forbids any sober discussion designed to promote mutual understanding between, within the pluri-religious Indian nation, the Muslims and the Brahmanists. During all the centuries of the Muslim presence in India, there has not been a single dialogue between Hindu philosophers and Islamic theologians.

For a long time into the future it would still be standard knowledge in the West that the present twentieth-century Individualism is a variation on the theme of the Individualism which arose in Florence, in the XVI century, in the midst of the Roman Catholic society.[60] It is immensely commendable that each of the Indian Dharmas is rigorously emphatic in prescribing the ultimate self-realization as the pursuit of the Individual striver (*sādhaka*) for the experience of the *tat* which ends the series of rebirths (*punar-janma*). The mystic glory of the Indian Individual has, more than in any other dispensation, a history going back millennia to the distant past of Indian civilization. In the history of Western Philosophy and of Christian Theology, the Ego is the foundation of the truthful knowledge advocated by René Descartes who immortalizes it in his famous statement: *cogito ergo sum* (I think therefore I am). An unbridgeable chasm separates this idealization of the "I" hallowed by the Western civilization from the Oriental, and in particular, the Indian civilization based on the notion of the Ego being the block which impedes the attainment of the authentic destiny of Man. The finality of the Dhārmika Man's existence consists of the im-mediate knowledge of his being co-essential with the essence of the ONE, beside which nothing exists. It is im-mediate for not being a Knowing conveyed by any of the organs of knowledge. It is "itself" as pure knowing, transcending even the attachment to Goodness, to Beauty, to Truth.

Sufism as an unorthodox fringe of Islam. The Sufi who exults in his identity with Allah is immediately suppressed as a heretic, which explains the absolute attainment of union with Allah having not yet advanced to the centre of the Islamic piety and way of life. No Believer would dare extend the pronouncement *sarvam idam khalu brahman* (all this indeed is Brahman) to the essence of Allah for thereby he

[60] Vide Jacob Burchardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, Chapter One.

would run the risk of losing his life. In Islam the concept of the absolute separation of the perfectly pure Unity of God from any contamination with the world will remain a permanent wall preventing the recognition, by Islamic Orthodoxy, of a mystical self-fulfillment as the finality of human existence. In the three revealed religions the notion of God preserving His purity as evidence of His divinity remains an adamant attribute which does not allow any qualification involving physical earthly contact. The permanence of, on one hand, the duality consisting of the distance between God's Unity and the Believer's 'soul' according to the religions derived from the Biblical revelation, and, on the other hand, the Indian Dharmas with the totality of the One comprising all the *carācara* (the moving and the unmoving realities) will maintain between them an abysm which no Divinity or Demon will be able to obliterate. Mawlānā Azad delights the mind with stressing the art of Allah who measures all living creatures to their fixed purpose. If this be true, then one may imagine the terrible prospect of the chasm being filled and, as a result, the world being immersed in an eternal darkness, when the Believers shall vanquish, in faithfulness to Allah's decree, the seven billion non-Believers still living in the *Dar-ul-Harb* and either annihilate or force them to submit to Islam. Till then the chasm shall remain, as a boon to Humanity.

The irrelevance of negation in the revealed religions. This negation of the convergence of the main world religions has not prevented the emergence of spectacular cultural achievements in each of the cultures nurtured by the three Abrahamic revelations. Great Beauty in Literature, in Music, in Sculpture, in Painting, in Architecture, has illumined the Christian civilization in particular. In 1804, Chateaubriand published the *Le Génie du Christianisme* as a refutation of the atheist’s view of the Christian faith and of the influence of the Church. His book is a heroic, faithful reminder of the beauty and greatness which he rightly attributed to the history of Christianity in Europe. Baghdad during the reign of the Abbasid Dynasty came alive with the two centuries of a fulgent boom of spectacular learning and scientific development. The prestige of the Arabic language is well illustrated by Maimonides, the eminent Jewish philosopher, taking pride in writing in it. Nevertheless these examples of significantly extraordinary blossoming of cultural splendors did not, and still do not, admit of a human finality in the present life of the striver for the absolute perfection of transcendental knowledge. The culture of the Abbassid Dynasty was distinguished by the absence of a transcendental view of Man. The citizen of glorious Bagdad of the

Thousand and One Nights, was not aware of his being fortunate to have obtained Life and to feel grateful for this infinite gift, which enables him to seek the finality of his existence in the transcendental experience of the mystical self-realization and of the im-mediate knowledge of the ONE in and as his own self. Without the vision of a transcendental finality of one's Humanity, as the individual destiny, a civilization is bound to perish. India has suffered subjugation by alien hegemonies. But she has preserved her soul, a unique cultural accomplishment as a homage to the wisdom of the ancient Ācāryas.

The spiritual acedia of the civilization of consumerism: its connection with the belief in the Day of Resurrection. According to the three dualistic revelations, that the world does not provide the space and the time for their singular believer to realize the perfection of his co-substantiality with God, must be the explanation of the psychic emptiness of a universal consumerism. The forgetting, or the blissful unawareness, of the realizable self-fulfillment happens to be too easily compensated by the hatred of the Other and the contempt of his accomplishments. Yet the similitude of beliefs in the resurrection of the body, the Biblical source of their origins, the shared centrality of the theological concept of the Day of Resurrection, the compulsion of the idolatry of Jehovah, have not prevented the baffling paradox of endless animosities, savage wars, enduring enmities which still fill the order of the day within the revealed religiosities and will perhaps last till the end of the Kali Yuga. All the will to generate conflict and mutual hatred, as religious faith and duty, will last so long as the three revealed religions remain incomplete till the dawn of the Day of Resurrection. The exception could have been the Christian experiencing, in his body, the communion with the blood and the flesh of Jesus Christ as a constant self-sacrifice in the concerned striving for a private self-transubstantiation. But it got overshadowed by Saint Paul prevailing in fatefully entrenching the creed of the Day of Resurrection, as the realization of the finality of human existence, consolidated with the installation of the cadaver of Jesus on the Cross as the sole object of worship. The finality of human existence in the Day of Resurrection, will supposedly, according to the Dogma of the three Revelations, will occur at some time in the distant future. In reality this cosmic occurrence will be an event at a date in the Greek Calends. Even if it does not, it does nevertheless deprive the Christian and the Muslim of the certitude of the personal experience of self-perfectibility in the midst of living on the surface of the earth. The deprivation of the reality of a transcendental vision, of an ontological

experience of the spiritual fullness as mystical self-knowing, leaves a permanent void in the sensibility of the Muslim and the Christian. The sentiment of incompleteness consequently seeks its elimination by means of a mobility, of a rushing across empty spaces to *have* what is lacking, instead of a way to *be* in the quietude of silence, of forbearance, of detachment, with the self-promise of the transcendental blissful experience. Dogmatic Theology, hostile to the ideal of self-perfection has enabled the infinite loss to all Humanity by its sponsoring the Papal crusades against the mystical traditions of such religiosities as the Druids, the Cathars, the Gnostics, the Manicheans.

The norm for the evaluation of the revealed religions. Nevertheless, in practice, the question of which dispensation is incontestably perfect or is better than any other, can be established on the basis of one humane criterion: does a religion have to prove its truth, its beauty, its goodness, by the asseveration of violence, of hatred, of violence? Or must it forgo the very question of its hypothetical or authentic superiority demonstrated by the usage of *force*, physical constraint, military potency, or as the corruption of mankind by degrading human nature into endorsing the revealed religion as a materialistic political ideology? The world has almost forgotten that, close to the Vatican, Mussolini could pronounce that it was the Fascist State which conferred a soul upon the citizen! No wonder then that it has been these forms of religious depravation which have pushed the frontiers of Europe and of the entire Christian West into a rudderless environment lit with soulless gadgetries, an environment where the dryness of Right has blighted the civilizational luxurious lush of obligations, of service, of gentleness. Must it be an imperative to damn or kill the Other because of his preference for a different *Weltanschauung* and a different finality for human existence? Was difference of opinion or of belief the ultimate offense which deserves to be physically obliterated? In India the followers of each of the three Dharmas were never preoccupied to prove their respective superiority, apart from civilized oral or written debates, based on persuasion and on reasoned argumentation aimed at a conclusion with an irrefragable certitude. All the Dharmas have remained alive and mutually enriching till today. No religious difference among the three Dharmas has been characterized by mutual hatred, or disputes settled by military triumph, or by such forms of conversion as have been practiced by Christian and Islamic missionaries.[61] These negations project the norm which deserves to be

[61] Before the demolition of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya, Brahmanists never razed a Church or a Mosque over the vast Indian sub-continent. The Babri could have

adopted and joyfully embraced by all concerned citizens desiring a universal outlook inspiring a creative, mutual respect and joyful universal co-existence devoid of any hidden desire for supremacy acquired by the use of brutish force. Acquaintance with the ideas and the vision of Mawlānā Abdul Kalam Azad published as a standard Islamic standpoint, particularly for the information of the Indians of the Dharmas, rationally invalidates the vanity of crying for the Moon of the realization of an inter-religious Indian pacifist humanism. It is so unfortunate!

---

remained standing if only, in a free India governed with the authority of an enlightened, liberal Constitution, the Muslim community had evinced even a semblance of tolerance and allowed those, who have lived since time immemorial in a city they venerated as a sacred place dedicated to Lord Rāma, simply to have their *mandir*. Not necessarily as a *symbolic* atonement for all that *they*, the Muslims, destroyed: temples galore, all the universities of the Hindus and the Buddhists, libraries, and more. But merelys as a naturally simple courtesy!

==========

CHAPTER SIX

The Quran: Part II

In reference to the previously quoted verses of the **Quran** (**27. 60-65**), Mawlānā Azad argues that each refers to the universally recognized factor of the human nature. The foundation of the Quranic argument, the Unity of God, supports the innumerable references ''to the means of life provided to every object in the universe and to the diverse aspects of the system of providence''.

To this effect he quotes:

> "Let man consider his food: How We pour water in showers, then split the earth in clefts; And cause the grain to grow therein, And grapes and green fodder; And olive trees and palm-trees; And garden-closes of thick foliage; And fruits and grasses; Provision for you and your cattle."(**Q. 80. 24-32**)

The spiritual emptiness of the world according to the Quran. The expression "Let man consider his food" fascinates Mawlānā Azad who interprets it as a compelling acquiescence to Allah's extolling the bounties of the earth and their indispensability to the needs of Man. He says: "However indifferent man may grow, or avoid to face the realities of life, these realities, will in their extent and universality, always stare him hard in the face."

The enthusiasm of recognizing the agricultural benefits which the Earth prodigiously supplies to Humanity for the satisfaction of its vital needs does not necessarily require attributing them to the natural largesse to Allah. "A thing which has been devised with such meticulous care and circumspection has always a meaning to offer and a purpose to serve."[1]

It excludes the fact of the Earth's generosity in providing all that Man needs. It does further exclude the fact that all that exists is the One, inclusive of the Ultimate Reality, of the world and of Man, the observer in homogeneous solidarity with all that moves and does not move. The vision of the Mawlānā posits himself as the external observer who looks at the world *outside* and accordingly attributes to the *objective* world as the effect of Allah, the primal cause. This fundamental concept of God

[1] BCQ, pp. 41-42

as an external Creator who projects a universe separated from Him is a Biblical cultural viewpoint: it pertains to the civilizations and the communities which have their roots and their *raison d'être* in the revealed religions. Other cultures and civilizations have their own distinct, respective cosmologies and corresponding ways of living. What the Muslim believes as "absolute" dwells within the allegiance of the Umma; it is not shared, within the Indian population, by the adherents to the Three Dharmas. The Brahmanist, for example, sees the whole world as a unitive Brahman, as the ONE, beside which nothing else exists. Indeed the Peace Invocation of the *Bṛhad Āranyaṇyaka Upaniṣad* lucidly states the existence of the ONE:

> *Aum pūṃam adah, pūṃam idam pūṃāt pūṃam udacyate/*
>
> *pūrṇasya pūṃam ādāya pūṃam evāśiṣyate //*
>
> *Aum! It is the (Supreme) Plenitude, and it is the plenitude (as the world), (for) the plenitude arises from the Plenitude; by Plenitude grasping the plenitude, there remains (always) the Plenitude.*

The Cosmology of the One is further stressed in the two verses of the Īśa Upaniṣad:

> *īśā vāsyam sarvam yat kiṁcana jagatyām jagat/*
> *tena tyaktena bhuñjithā mā gṛdhah kasyasvid dhanam//*
>
> *(Know that) all this, whatever moves in this moving world is enveloped by God, Therefore seek your enjoyment in renunciation; do not covet what belongs to Others.*

Paradoxically enough, the concept and the reality of the ONE, understood as That, beside which nothing exists: has not been internalized by anyone in the Judeo-Christian West. The failure of the West to understand the meaning and the cultural consequences of the belief in the ONE has manifested itself even in all the international dealings which India has engaged with the West, during the past centuries since 1492, when Columbus *discovered* "America". India has persisted since all that time though earlier she had entertained a regular commercial interchange with Rome during the centuries straddling the advent of Jesus. The difficulty of the West to grasp the meaning and the historical expression of the One lies in the context of the international realpolitik where prevail the anti-Indian prejudice based on an insufficient understanding of the psyche undergirding the essence of Indian political thought and the particular source of its philosophical

brilliance.

The Brahmanist vision of the Unitive Universe, inclusive of Man homogeneous with its substance, bolsters the veneration derived from its homogeneity with the One. It is a homogeneity which pervades the individual's consciousness. The Brahmanist strives to unveil the transcendental Brahman dwelling in him as *his* authentic personal experience, not as the submission to a command by some Revelation, most particularly, the Quran. The closed Islamic mind of the Mawlānā prevents him from having even a negative opinion of the Brahmanist's veneration of the Earth as a Goddess, as *Bhū Devī,* who is the provider of life sustaining food. The attribution of the responsibility for the assurance of the provision of food indispensable to life imparts to the "external" material world its noblest enchanting function. To believe that the smallest leaf eaten by a goat is due to Allah's graciousness is to demean, with ingratitude and insensitivity, the bounteousness of Nature in its providing the requisites for the sustenance of life, compared to which thee can be nothing more venerable. The celebration of Nature as a life-giving Goddess further bears witness to the freedom of the Nature-loving Brahmanist from a Divine Semite commanding submission as belief from His abode in the pitch-black darkness of the distant void.

The spiritual deprivation of Man and Nature according to the Quran. In the Quran the exclusive attribution of the totality of all that exists to Allah obscures, or rather eliminates, the consideration of conferring spiritual dignity upon the living interaction of Man and of Nature. As the extension from the Old Testament, the Nature of the Quran is a lifeless "Thing" which passively submits itself to the laws and to the arbitrariness of Allah. It is repugnant to the mind and to the heart of the Believer to entertain the least thought of associating the disenchanted world with the Unity of God. And as much as Nature submits to the action and the will of Allah, to the same measure has Man too to perform his religious duty in submitting himself to the laws which He has prescribed. The Believer does not assign any sacredness or spirituality to the created world of matter. By endorsing the Quranic vision of the materiality of Nature, Maulana Azad ignores the abundance of representations of natural objects in the decorations of the temples of Brahmanism. The fresco of the Bodhisattva Padmapāṇi at Ajanta represent a classic characteristic example. The architects and sculpting artists felt the need to contribute their art to the world of Creation

centuries before the Jesuit sage Baltasar Gracián (1601-1658) wrote:

> "artificial training, and every kind of excellence needs some polish. There is no beauty unadorned and no excellence that would not become barbaric if it were not supported by artifice: this remedies the evil and improves the good. Nature scarcely ever gives us the very best; for that we must have recourse to art. Without this the best of natural dispositions is uncultured, and half is lacking to any excellence if training is absent. Everyone has something unpolished without."[2]

In the history of India, as the ruins which litter the soil of the sub-continent bear witness, the Believer, acting as the proxy of Allah, exerted faithful conformity to the revelation by obliterating, off the Straight Path, the art works adorning the sacred monuments of the original Kaffirs. With silence as a sign of his approval, the Mawlānā is not disturbed by the iconoclastic cleansings of "impurities" offensive to Allah. Indeed it is ironical that his Kaffir companions in the struggle for Independence did not bring to his notice the irony of his indifference to the history of iconoclasm, in his thoughts and in his writings. But this essay records, in his favour, that in his *Discovery of India*, written in jail during the years of the World War II, Jawaharlal Nehru does not have a single sentence on the ravages wrought by Muslim piety as iconoclasm: it was like his not being aware of the existence of the sea while walking on the beach collecting coloured shells. The blinkers which Nehru wore illustrate, on the part of most Brahmanist historians, the mimetic pusillanimity which still awaits its erosion with a well-researched publication of the history of Iconoclasm in India.

Disenchantment of the world since the very first moment of Creation according to the Bible. The Old Testament disenchantment of the world, which the Quran intensifies to its *ne plus ultra* extremity under the authority of the Unity of Allah, dooms the Kaffir with his having to live in a space which the Believer deems to be utterly deprived of any spirituality. As the history of Indian Islam abundantly testifies, the perception of the meritless sterility of the Kaffir's status explains the Believer's conscientiously hating him, all the more with the Quran explicitly enjoining it. The contempt for the Kaffir has its counterpart in the pious Christian "seeing" the non-christened individual as limitedly "natural", devoid of the supernatural soul conferred by baptism.[3] The

---

[2] Baltasar Gracián, *The Art of Worldly Wisdom and The Critick,*, Tr. By Joseph Jacobs, Neo Books, 2018; p.22, # xii

[3] It was as late as 1870 that a magistrate in the United States of America pronounced

Christian makes a theological distinction between himself and the pagan. The Jew dwells within the shell of his race and views himself as ethnologically distinct from every other race by the will of Jehovah who created Adam and his biological descendants. These revealed views of biological or theological ascendance do not apply to any other faith, and more importantly for the purpose of this essay, to the followers of the Dharmas. In the latter it is the Law of Karma which constitutes one of the two common prominent features of their teachings, the other one being the practice of Yoga according to Patañjali.

The Believer's perception of the Pagan. In the mind of the Believer, the Indian Pagan, as a natural being, has the same status as a dray horse. The acquisition of the supernatural promotion of the Christian Believer could then wink at, or supersede, the precept of loving the neighbor as oneself and enslave, by using as a dray horse, the vulnerable natural man and woman. In India no supernatural Christian voice, either of a layman or of a priest or of a missionary, was raised against the many genocidal man-made famines initiated by pious imperialist Christians, consciously bearing the burden of elevating the condition of the native pagans with the benefit of the Christian ethos. The Islamic and the Christian dualities of Nature and the Supernatural have, each in its respective history, enacted a corresponding ethical presupposition characterized by a dire treatment of the Other fatefully trapped in a situation of physical, and particularly military, weakness. That is why it will be in the nature of such an Islamic faith, as cherished in India by Mawlānā Azad, to maintain the abyss between the Believers and the indigenous non-Believing Kaffirs well beyond the Day of Resurrection, as the central belief of the three revealed religions. It has been a misfortune for India that the reason of the persistence of this chasm has remained, to a large extent, beyond the purview of the thinkers and leaders of the followers of the Dharmas.

A Quranic world devoid of sacredness. Nature is not an inert, soulless object. The planet has a reason of its own, even it be not connatural with the Socratic rationality. It moves. It effects a regular annual coursing along an ellipse around the Sun. It generates climates, seasons; it brings forth infinite forms of life with infinite magnanimity. It manifests anger at times, cruelty at other times, with irresistible ferocity. It constantly achieves the main purpose of giving to Man the food which he needs to create civilizations, significant works of Beauty

---

that the pre-Columbian Native too had a soul.

and of Goodness; in its demoniac moods it contributes to men waging war, even world wars, with their limitless conscientiousness and their self-rewarding righteousness documented as academic history.

The Brahmanist worships Nature and the Earth as the provider of Food, as the indispensable benefactor to which he then pays grateful homage. Nevertheless if Allah indeed is the author of the seed and the sheaf of wheat, it is Man who bakes a bread. If Allah creates the clay, it is Man who fashions it into a beautiful earthenware art work. If Allah generates a low grade rice plant, it was an agronomist Nobel Prize winner who grew a strain of rice which staved off food shortage in India. There is nothing in the creation of raw Nature which has not been improved or embellished by the genius and the effort of Man. In the image of the world represented in the Quran one does not come across the evidence of the accomplishments of the Greeks and the Romans, the maturity of the sophisticated civilizations of the Orient, in particular the spread of the Veda learning expressed with poetic excellence. The Quran does not acknowledge the birth of Gautama Buddha, the most saintly, the purest, the noblest Son of India, who gave to the world a doctrine and a way of life bereft of the least iota of violence, with the promise of bliss for all Humanity. Full like an egg, but with compassion, the Middle Way of the Buddha gave to the whole world the unparalleled spiritual Superman of the Bodhisattva who takes the vow of renouncing the ultimate goal of Nirvāṇa, when he is on the verge of attaining it, in order to be reborn and reborn till the last blade of grass is saved! There can be no *ne plus ultra* beyond the Worth and the heroic spirituality of the Bodhisattva. And was not Jesus preaching the knowing of the Kingdom of Heaven in oneself as salvation? Would he have received the knowledge of the Kingdom somewhere during the twelve year absence spent beyond Nazareth? The greatest tragedy in History happened with the crucifixion of Jesus for preaching the humane experience of the Kingdom of Heaven within one's self, in lieu of the hypothetical Day of Resurrection! The Quran does not propose an equivalent of the Kingdom of Heaven. It ignores it. For the Buddha's compassion is antithetical to Muhammad's politics and his military activities. It is the *ne plus ultra* of decadence to train a Mujahid suicide-bomber to kill innocent, defenseless men and women lured by the prospect of the reward of sexual gratification in the company of seventy-two virgins who remain eternally as virgins! Only the abdication of common sense and reason can co-exist with the acknowledgement of such a grotesquely aberrant sensuality as heavenly reward, characteristic of a dispensation revealed by a god who proclaims he is the only God, who wrote in Arabic that

Muhammad, at the age of fifty-three could take six-year old Ayesha as one more wife!

The contradiction in the belief in God's absolute power and the invisibility of His goodness. Why would Allah place a volcano or an earthquake at one place and not in another? What would Allah say to Voltaire asking, in reaction to the explanations of priests and theologians shortly after the destructive earthquake which shook Lisbon on 1 November 1755, why had God (or Allah) killed innocent infants resting on the bosom of their mothers? Would the world have been worse without the earthquakes which have in the past wreaked material ravages and the deaths of countless beings, including innocent children? [4] Was Allah a party to the occurrence of the genocidal famines inflicted by the British power operating in obedience to the King (or Queen) whose majesty was, as it still is, characterized as the Defender of the Faith? Why did the Believers remain silent when the famines flared up over so much of North India during the reign of the Christian Believers? Did even a single Indian Christian priest reflect on the Bengal Famine willfully perpetrated by the British authorities with whom the Indian Christians were collaborating? Did Allah inspire the Believers in the convulsion of Partition in 1946-47? If he did, why could He not have inspired a civilized, humane implementation of Partition? A sober, dispassionate consideration of the Bengal Genocide coinciding with the *Satyagraha* and the *Ahiṁsā* of Mahatma Gandhi bears authenticating witness to the bankruptcy of the Christian faith degraded, in its application, as brutish power for the sole accumulation of greed and the glamour of cannibalism attired with the cloak of Imperialism as the White Man's Burden.

Allah and the barren temper of Islamic triumph in India. But, with the Mawlānā's unconditional approval, his emphatic reiteration of Allah, endowed with Absolute Unity, creates a perfectly barren, lifeless world, utterly devoid of any sacred object or space, with the sole exception of the Kaaba in Mecca. In such a spiritually barren Earth created by Allah's Providence, Man is absent. For he is only a creature born to adopt the rectitude of his existence by submitting to the revealed injunctions and hence walking on the Strait Path prescribed in the very first Surah. He does nothing personal and original, of his own, which

---

[4] Voltaire, *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne*, in Mélanges, Editions Gallimard, 1961; pp.304-309.

would be beneficently creative and carried out without any desire for a material reward on Earth or in Heaven. But the Quran insists that whatever the Believer thinks and acts, in whatever he does and does not do, is a measure of Allah's Taqdīr. It is this feature of the Revelation which, in Islam and in Christianity, blocks decisively the mind of the Muslim and of the Christian with the inability to cognize the limitation of their respective perception of the Other and of the latter's vision of the world. Owing its origin to the concept and the success of the invention of Jehovah, this strategic theological limitation has been the reason and the inspiration of countless forms of violence which, all too often, got draped with laws bestowing legitimacy for the occasional justification. Neither the Quran nor the Bible do, both as such, bear the slightest testimony of the awareness of a transcendental individual experience unlimited by any word, or any sign of the imagination.

All the theologies and the knowledges derived from the three Revelations dwell permanently in organic unity with the words of their contents which, with each claiming to be the absolute truth, enforce believing in their being indispensable spiritual dominions as the foundations of their respective civilization. All the blood spilled, during the last two thousand years, in the name of the Sole Revealed Truth centered in the idea of Jehovah, has not been able to authenticate the conviction that the fanaticisms of holding to the verbalized Truth has been, in the summation of History, not worth the killing of one man. All the aesthetic wonders which the blood spilling have inspired in the fine arts, in high literatures, in the histories celebrating the countless heroisms of crusaders and of their enemies, have not in any way curtailed the enthusiasms of killing and of being killed, of intolerances and of fanaticisms, of wars and of genocides.

Nothing proves the closed-mindedness undergirding the limitations of the revealed religions than their unwillingness, due to their dogmatic inability, to provide due mental space for the accommodation of a contemplative *modus operandi* borrowed from one of the Oriental dispensations in which meditation and contemplation constitute the highest forms of spiritual effort, freed from intellectual servitude to words, however sanctifying they can be, for example, in prayer. The argument acquires coherence and meaningfulness with the test, particularly among the adherents to the revealed doctrines, of their conversion to the ease of believing in a non-anthropomorphic representation of God. At the close of the first quarter of the XXI century, there is little evidence, if any, of the Judeo-Christian Man generating the 'taste' of a *formless* Supreme Being, *unrelated* to

Jehovah, the origin and the source of all non-natural calamities, all as burnt offerings in the name of His being the Only Truth.

The simplistic causality assumed by the Quran in relation to the world. However, it is a boon for Mankind that, in his *Weltanschauung,* the Brahmanist reveres the earth, as the provider of all his needs. He sees himself as a collaborator who owes to It his life and the means of realizing his self-fulfillment. On the other hand, the Believer in Revelation rejects the seductiveness of this mystical self-realization. He abides by the dogma that the end of human existence lies in death and in burial. There he rots as food for worms, as a waiting for the Final Day. The judgement on this fateful day is believed to be the best of all possible ends of human existence. Whether he be a learned nuclear scientist measuring the potential of the atom or a butcher slicing meat on his trencher, the Believer abides by the dogma of submission to the Sovereignty of Allah with faith in the certitude of his infallible, divine wisdom.

The historicity of Jesus and of Muhammad coalescing with the myth of the Day of Resurrection and the difference with the Oriental dispensations. The Believer can still counter the previous argument by qualifying it as being subjectively partial. As an unofficial opinion it may not have any validated authority in regard to the Day of Resurrection first proclaimed by the Old Testament. Nevertheless the theme of this work relies on the evidence of Everyman never experiencing Time passing as, or in, a straight line, and coalescing with History beginning with natural birth tainted with the Original Sin inherited from Adam's and ending with the Day of Judgement. No one ever experiences life being expended along a straight line. No one, either as a Believer in any of the three revelations, or in any other dispensation, ever experienced, or experiences, or shall experience, living along a straight line. All living beings have only the consciousness of living in the *present,* with the past transmuted as a present memory and the future signified by Hope, entertained in the present time. I

It is extremely bewildering that, despite his dominant personality and wisdom, Saint Paul would have prevailed in disowning the living Jesus to whom he does not refer in any of his epistles. Instead he fatefully chose to glorify the fiction of His resurrected body *as a historical event*. By so doing he succeeded in placing the crucified body of Jesus at the center of worship. Thereby Saint Paul cast into the background of the Believer's faith-full consciousness the centrality of the teaching of Jesus which consists of the reality of the all-pervasive Kingdom. Most probably he had used the popular remembrance of the

resurrection of Lazarus to extend the prevailing Jewish belief to the faith of the newly emerging Christian community. Saint Paul succeeded in reducing to naught Jesus's ardent appeal to his followers to seek the reality of the mystical Kingdom within themselves instead of hoping for their being judged on the Last Day. Michelangelo's fresco of the Day of Judgement at the Sistine Chapel is an artistic work of great beauty consecrating the fiction at the heart of the three revelations. However much it can be a holy fiction, to the same degree as the belief in Muhammad's nocturnal flight to Paradise, the expectation of the Day of Resurrection constitutes the most meaningful article of the Christian's faith.[5] Michelangelo's masterpiece belongs to the history of European art. It does not represent a historical event, despite the authority and the prestige of the Old Testament prophets and of Saint Paul. The Dome on the Rock in Jerusalem is a historical monument of significant beauty. But it is reminiscent of the fantastic story of an unwitnessed *phantasmal* deed accomplished by Muhammad in the dead of one night and believed as a *historical* act of faith by a billion and a half of men and women. These unwitnessed extraordinary miraculous events are assumed, however absurd, by their corresponding believers, to be *historical components of faith*. In an immense contrast, at no time in the history of Brahmanism, in reality of all the Oriental cultures, has the "miracle" been used as a substantive element of religious belief. In none of the Eastern religions can one find the equivalent of the three-day corpse of Jesus ascending to Heaven, nor of Muhammad's horse Buraq flying from Jerusalem to Heaven and returning to the same spot during the span of one night. In a broad perspective the Western civilization is encompassed between the dualistic metaphysics of the Greeks and the miracles of the Judeo-Christian dispensations. The Indian civilization is constructed with the stuff of meta-psychic flights of the individual Dharma-devotee into mystical experiences. These are conveyed by the dialectical reasoning hinged to normative myths which the Poets, the Ācāryas and the Ṛṣis have elaborated as materials bequeathed for the acquisition of absolute knowledge.

The saving merit of the fabulous stories in the Revelations. However the fabulous substance of the nocturnal flight to Heaven of

[5] During the 1960-70s, Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith, the Director of the Centre for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University, interpreted the notion of the Day of Judgement as inspiring the Christian to live every moment of his existence as if he is in its presence.

Muhammad and of the resurrection and the ascent to Heaven of the body of Jesus Christ, on the third day after His death on the Cross, do not deserve to be demeaned by the Sceptic disclaiming their being held by their Believers to be infallibly true. Fictions such as these, lodged in the fissures of rationality, spur modes of belief and of action which enhance the purpose of the follower's way of living. At no time in History has Reason served as the exclusive provider of either a doctrine or an itinerary for a practical attainment of a personal, private ontological self-fulfillment in the present life. For the preservation of Man's mystical inheritance, Reason seeks and draws, from language, resources evoked by the appropriate combination of words. Subsequently the signs and words, combining in meaningful assimilations, suffer, not rejection, but transformation into transcendence, at the right moment when, like seeds, which die in order to give rise to new life in the tree. Particularly in relation to the history of India, the rider, in the stories of the miracle of Jesus ascending as a corpse and of Muhammad flying up to Heaven, happens to animate the belief of their specific, assumed abstract perfections of their religiosities, as justifications *also* for their intolerance, their violence, their genocidal unscrupulousness. That is, the Revelations mainly act, each in its specific civilization, by displaying both their Day side and their Night side. In truth it has been an enormous accident of history that the rational paralysis of reason, which the Christian fable of the corpse of Jesus "ascending" to Heaven and Muhammad's fairytale of his *miraj*, would have served to consolidate the closed-mindedness of their adoptive dispensations, with consequent devastations exerted by brute military superiority used and applied, in their Night affirmations, to the obliteration of a plurality of well established civilizations.[6]

Mawlānā Azad sees in Nature a conscious organization at work and wonders that it must have an organizer to direct its operation. Allah has a concern for the little things that exist in the entire landscape before one's eyes. This is what He says in the revealed verses which gratify the Mawlānā's enthusiasm:

> "And lo! In the cattle there is a lesson for you. We give you to drink of that which is in their bellies, from betwixt the refuse and the blood, pure milk

[6] The Night side of Islam was fully displayed in the orgies of iconoclasms and again in the violent horror of the enactment of the Partition of India in 1946-47. It is further visible in the second half of the XXI century in Western Europe.

palatable to the drinkers.

"And of the fruits of the date palm, and grapes, whence ye derive strong drink and (also) good nourishment. Lo! therein is indeed a portent for people who have sense.

"And thy Lord inspired the bee, saying: Choose thou habitations in the hills and in the trees and in that which they thatch;

"Then eat of all fruits, and follow the ways of the Lord, made smooth (for thee). There cometh forth from their bellies a drink diverse of hues, wherein is healing for mankind. Lo! Herein is indeed a portent for people to reflect." (**Q. 16. 66-69**)

The world order of life and growth in the Universe does not only prove the existence of a directing mind. It does actually establish the fact that this order is flawless and complete, as is the Mind which regulates it. Mawlānā Azad notices that "everything in this world needs sustenance and there is a Provider for it, while not being Himself in need of sustenance." And he refers to the following verses in support of the Providence of Allah:

"Have ye seen that which ye cultivate? Is it ye who foster it, or are We the Forster? If we willed, We verily could make it chaff, then would ye cease not to exclaim: Lo! We are laden with debt! Nay, but we are deprived! Have ye observed the water which ye drink? It is ye who shed it from the raincloud, or are We the shedder? If We willed We verily could make it bitter. Why, then, give ye no thanks? Have ye observed the fire which ye strike out; Was it ye who made the tree thereof to grow, or were We the grower? We, even We, appointed it a memorial and a comfort for the dwellers in the wilderness." (**Q. 56. 63-73**).

The interrogative form of the argument, in favor of the absolute supremacy of Allah as the Provider, adds weight to the strict causality which binds Him to every minor or major occurrence in the world. It defies normal logic. It defies all the forms of logic, with each pertaining to its corresponding culture. Jews too believe in Yahweh as the Provider of all that exists and Yahweh continues to be worshipped in every synagogue even though the Holocaust was being carried out under a cloudless sky. From Yonder, in the midst of the heavenly silence, Yahweh witnessed the Holocaust unfurling without giving any sign of concern for saving His Believers.

Allah's meticulous guardianship of the universe. The expression *Takhlīq-bil-Haq*, which refers to the life hereafter makes it unthinkable that man would be created merely for him to enjoy a few moments and then to disappear completely. Man lives to serve a purpose. Allah speaks with the habitual rhetorical interrogative righteousness:

"Deemed ye then that We had created you for naught, and that ye would not

be returned unto Us?" (**Q. 23. 115**)

"Have they not pondered upon themselves? Allah created not the heavens and the earth, and that which is between them, save with truth and for a destined end. But truly, many of mankind are disbelievers in the meeting with their Lord." (**Q. 30. 8**)

Mawlāna Abdul Kalam Azad had the good fortune of the close companionship of a coeval gathering of superlative Brahmanist intellectuals and men learned in the scriptures of the Dharmas, in addition to the theologians of the Jewish and Christian faiths. To explain the meaning of the *Takhlīq-bil-Haq*, he enthusiastically refers to the theory of Evolution apparently borrowed from Darwin's *Origin of the Species*. Syed Abdul Latif writes, interpreting the thought and argument of the Mawlānā:

"Visualize to yourself that far off distant event when this planet of Earth was thrown out of the molten mass of matter, the Sun, and the long period it must have taken to cool and acquire equable temperature and become fit for life to grow thereon. Who knows how long did it take before the first germ of life, now called protoplasm, could emerge, or how long it took to mold a body for it, and carry it forward from a lower form to a higher, and so on, till it could assume its present human shape. And even then, who knows how long it must have taken to build the requisite intellect for him before man could take his station on the cultural place. We shall not be wrong if we assert that what all that has been wrought since the formation of the Earth is but one long story of man's growth and development." [7]

To all this fatuous speculation, the Dharma-centered seeker for the ultimate self-enlightenment prefers the simplicity and the aesthetic preference of visualizing the universe as ONE, full with the divine essence of the formless Supreme Being, a fullness of which the individual soul is eternally homogeneous.

The absence of curiosity in the Muslim mind. Syed Abdul Latif's argument displays the pretense of being acquainted with modern sciences with the resulting calculation that they can be forced into the bed of the Quranic Procrustes in order to adapt it to the measure of Allah's Strait Path. It is an indisputable evidence of the absence of curiosity in the Muslim mind. Despite the acquisitions of certain duly recognized sciences arising from the discovery of the scientific accomplishments of the Greeks, the Islamic mind resolved to close itself within the assurance that Allah has communicated all that is necessary and worthy of being known and there is nothing beyond the perimeter of the revelation worth knowing. It is this sentiment of their already having the perfect knowledge which fosters within the Umma the

[7] BCQ, pp. 42-43

mentality of a contemptuous ignorance of the indigenous wisdoms of India. It was a ferociously *active* ignorance which presided over the physical liquidation of all the Centres of High Learning which flourished for many centuries before the Islamic vandals obliterated them for the sake of Allah's pleasure.

But suddenly the Mawlānā discovers the physical reality of the prodigiously long astronomical Time spread across the ages preceding the emergence of organic life on Earth. He lets it be assumed that it would take as much time for the Indian Muslim to acquire a socially beneficial understanding of the metaphysical knowledges which precede the mystical calls of the indigenous dispensations.

It took a long time for the Indian Muslims to have a school, and that too, due to British political generosity. It took a long time indeed for the Indian Muslims to establish a learning center for themselves: they obtained it thanks to the interested liberalism of the British authorities in the inauguration of the Anglo-Muslim School in Aligarh in 1875, which later was promoted to the Aligarh Muslim University in 1920. During a thousand years of their hegemony the Muslims destroyed all the existing centers of high learning, without themselves building one single school or center of learning.

The deadened sensitivity of the Hindus unable to discern the enmity of the Muslims in the first half of the XX century. It defeats sober reasoning that the sudden rise of the demand of Partition as a cognate culmination of the past ravages of the indigenous civilization would not have roused the curiosity of, in particular, the Hindu leaders in their perception to the extent of recognizing hatefulness as the paramount constitution of the essence of the Islamic faith. It defies imagination that the Mahatma Gandhi-Valabhbhai Patel-Jawaharlal Nehru led Congress Party would not have had, with scholarly Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad as their close companion, the slightest understanding of the Muslim Kaum as a deadly enemy, who had manifested its lethal intolerance for so long, with the culmination of success implemented by the Dajjal of Islam against Infidels, in the action for Partition. It is all the more perverse that this myopia exhibited by Brahmanists persists in their perception aided by minds inhabited by an inverted form of the traditional tolerance, which resulted in the inability to grasp the deadly destructiveness of an enormous Islamic hatred, active in the nurturing of the Muslim Kaum's lethal exclusivism.

The concept of Time in the revealed religions and in the Dharmas. The three revealed religions assert the ordinary common

sense view of the reality of Time in the Creation story of the Bible. It is the astronomical, calendar time. The Bible assumes the passing of time as the commonly accepted banality in everyday use. It asserts as a fact that the world was created from Chaos on the first day. And all the components of the universe were created during six days, each day being mentioned and qualified with a particular creation, and on the seventh day Jehovah takes a rest. Gautama Buddha declared that the fact of Time passing occurs by itself, with its impermanence being its essence. The 'passingness' is *sui generis.* It is not an attribute of time. It is Time *as such.* One postulates the common experience of Time passing without anybody, be it God, or a Demon, or anybody however learned or powerful, being able to stop the fact of the Impermanence of Time, as a cosmic reality. It is on the commonplace, universal experience of the temporal impermanence**,** that Gautama bases his doctrine and teaching on *Becoming, as the fundamental universal reality*. It was a metaphysical novelty in the fifth century before the advent of Jesus that a religious philosophy would have, as its foundational principle, the extreme banality of fleeting time, as universal Becoming. It still arouses a sense of wonder that the foundational uniqueness of Buddhism is kept alive in the lives of Buddhists all over the Asian continent. And it teases the mind to wonder why only Gautama would have envisaged the marvel of establishing a universalist doctrine as the ground for the proclamation of a way to universal salvation! Such a sublime simplicity as the essence of a magnificent *modus vivendi* does, after twenty-six centuries astonish the imagination! One feels like needing one more sense of knowing to enable the fullest grasp of such a wonderful discovery, made in the fifth century B.C., by a young thirty-five year old mendicant prince, while meditating at the base of a tree in an Indian forest!

The Buddhist denial of the existence of God and of Being as an indispensable belief. Indeed Gautama Buddha was the first and only Man who ever said, in a philosophical challenge which has remained unanswered, that neither God, nor Demon, nor any learned scholar, nor any one, can prevent Time from passing.[8]

[8] Buddhism did actually disappear in the land of its Birth after it had been flourishing for nearly seventeen centuries. Muslim iconoclastic fury practiced with sword and torch did, for the infinite pleasure of Allah, bring about the obliteration of Indian Buddhism. The Islams of Indonesia, Afghanistan, Gāndhāra, Centra Asia, Den Huang are replacements of Buddhism, executed by fire and iconoclasm, not by peaceful missionary work undertaken by monks. The creative Central Asian Buddhism had lasted more than a thousand years. It produced the Monk Bodhidharma who invented Chan

Impermanence is the inalterable fact of life. It pertains to the essence of all that exists, in all that moves and does not move. In addition to the Impermanence, as the universal reality, all the three Dharmas postulate the reality of the individual's mental time, within which the transcendental experience is sought, by the means of the travail of a moral existence directed by the imperatives of meditation and of contemplation. The resulting personal evolution proceeds within the *psychic* time, the rhythm and contents of which are specific to each individual. The Quran and the Hadiths do never refer to the *psychic* time within which the Believer seeks to practice the right submission to the laws and rules set by Allah. They are not even aware of the reality of the psychic time and of the psychic space, the areas favorable to the blossoming of metaphysical or preferably of metapsychic experience as *nirvāṇa* or *mokṣa*. The follower of the Dharma acts on his own, with faith in the guru's guidance. Even when the Muslim thinks he is implementing his own private decisions, he actually is moved by the ubiquity of Allah's *Rubūbiyat* (Providence), *Taqdīr* (Fate), *Takhlīq bil-Haq* (purpose of Creation), *Rahmat* (Mercy), *Hidāyat* (guidance).

In the perspective of Allah's ever conscious presence in the totality of his submission, the Believer has only the illusion of possessing the integrity of his psychic time as well as the time measured by the rotation of the Earth. In particular, the Indian Muslim, claims superiority over the benighted Brahmanist by buttressing his hatred of the Kaffir with his submission to Allah's revelation as the only Truth. He extends this submission to believing that Muhammad is the best of all possible past, present and future men. Wherever he may find himself the Muslim ignores that he dwells permanently as an individual mentally colonized by the Arab. Spiritually the Indian Muslims, comprised mostly of converts from Brahmanism, live a subsidiary existence of being colonized by Arab religiosity, in a contrast with the Indian Christians who belong to an original Christianity founded by Saint Thomas, one of the twelve disciples of Jesus and has remained fossilized as such ever since that early time. Every year the Indian Muslims celebrate their

---

Buddhism, which the Chinese monks later transferred to Japan where it is known as Zen Buddhism.

colonized status by travelling to Mecca for the celebration of the Haj and the worship of the Kaba. The Indian Muslims ought to compare themselves with the Japanese who belong to an unbroken history going back to two millennia before the advent of Jesus and have developed a refined, sophisticated national autonomous culture. With the falsehood of their pseudo-minority fanaticism, it behooves the Indian Muslims to consider the fact of their demography being almost double that of the 126 million Japanese and ask themselves why they still wallow in a backwardness characterized by the extreme sensitivity of exploding in violence at the slightest provocation. Certainly it is not the responsibility of the Kaffir majority to carry the burden of the colonized Muslim pseudo-minority locking itself within the grip of pure Arab religiosity.

The fundamental difference between the revealed religions and the Dharmas of India. The fundamental difference between the revealed religions and the indigenous Dharmas of India consists of this: the Dharmas are not concerned with the beginning of the world or of life. Nor do their literary expressions coincide with the origin of the discovery of language and of writing. They became alive with the first, hoary usages of the concepts used in the scriptural texts. However much it is important for the Biblical religions, the Genesis of the world does not have any relevance to the moral or spiritual life advocated by the native Dharmas. In his aspiration for the highest reach of living the native Indian is simply concerned with and directed to how best, in the present moment, must the next step be when walking. It is futurity, it is eternity, it is transcendence, it is the striving for the ontological experience of the self (*ātman*) as *Brahman*, as the finality of mystical perfection, which determines the way to choose for living the right life. It is the search of the contrary of life, not as Death which is all the time behind the moment of consciously living, but as the transcendental non-distinction with what Is in its being homogeneous with taking the present step in the dust.

The gratuitous interpretation of the Book of Genesis as History. Taking their sources in the Book of Genesis of the Old Testament, the revealed religions propound the existence of the World beginning with the first day of creation and with the Semite Adam as the Origin of the Species. In a fastidious, but eminently faithful, literal interpretation of the Bible, the Witnesses of Jehovah, for example, believe that the World was created some four thousand years ago. They are cheerful, earnest Believers who passionately canvass private homes with refined courtesy in a commitment to spread their good message for the betterment of mankind which they believe has lost its authentic moorings. Likewise,

while all the time celebrating the absolute Truth of Allah as the sole Unity of God, as the Creator, the Mawlānā does not seem to be aware of the contradiction inherent to his marshalling the millions and millions of years of the material evolution of the Universe up to the moment of the advent of Man and of the state of the world with all its provisions needed for the fulfillment of the purpose of the Abrahamic race. The labored explanation of the evolution which has, after countless millions of years, produced the first Semite, spares the Mawlānā the task of comparing, on philosophical terms, the highly developed learnings of the Dharmika literatures which testify to the abundance of their historically recorded applications in their corresponding modes of living. Unfortunately, or by choice, the Mawlānā avoids mentioning the reasons for his refusal to compare, on the basis of the well recorded evidence of the native pronouncements of the attainment of human finality *in the present life*, and not in the hereafter. The reasons must be: (i) there exists no cognate category of thought in the Muslim mind to grasp the meaning of *jīvan-mukti,* or *nirvāṇa,* or *śūnyatā,* or *kaivalya;* (ii) the irony of the fear that the possibility or, worse, the obligation to acknowledge the merit of the Dharmas invalidating the choleric verses of the Quran which enjoin and command the hatred of the Other, the Kaffir; (iii) the recognition of the One as Immanent in all *carācara* (the moving and the unmoving entities); (iv) the acknowledgement of the culture based on the belief of the homogeneity of the essence of the One and of the Supreme Being as the *antaryāmī* (in-dweller) and the essence of the individual *bhakta* (devotee); (iv) the inability of the Muslim mind to conceive of Idol-Worship as the devotee's appropriation of the enchantment of the material world and as a rendering alive the reminder of the immediate presence of the *iṣṭa devatā* (favorite deity): the Jehovah of the second commandment prohibiting the making of an image was ignorant of the beautiful, elevating sentiment of the Heavenly Deity's loving nearness in the idol during the moment of the Bhakta's contemplating it ; (v) the practical validity of the concept of the *iṣṭa devatā* as individual plenitude which is fundamentally contrary to the monotheism of the revealed religions in relation to their fundamental proposition of the infinite distance separating the individual from the Creator.[9]

The Quranic concept of the hereafter. Interpreting the thought of

[9] The Hadith which claims that Muhammad encouraged his disciples to learn

the Mawlānā, Syed Abdul Latif writes: "The question arises: "Shall an object in the shaping of which Nature has had to make such prolonged careful arrangement was meant just to eat and drink for a little moment on Earth and get extinguished forever?'"

Adhering to the linear view of the process of the cosmic evolution, he asks rhetorically why must the present life of man, which had gone through a long process of evolution till he reached the present state, disappear if not to assume a still higher form? The Mawlānā affirms a willingness to discard all skepticism about the final destiny of Man by arguing in favor of extending the straight line of evolution and of postulating a hypothetical higher form in the future of the world.[10] The Quran provides the supporting verses:

> "Thinketh man that he is to be left aimless? Was he not a drop of fluid which gushed forth? Then he became a clot; then (Allah) shaped and fashioned; And made of him a pair, the male and the female. Is not He (Who doth so) able to bring the dead to life?" (**Q. 75. 36-40**)

> "That ye shall journey on from plane to plane." (**Q. 84. 19**)

Both the Mawlānā and Syed Abdul Latif have an unqualified faith in Darwin's theory of Evolution which they deem to be right since it conforms to what Allah reveals. Their preoccupation to maintain the integrity of the Revelation they evince their ignorance, or their avoidance, of the reality of the transcendental experience of self-fulfillment as advocated and prescribed by the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. Darwin's theory of Evolution has not exerted any influence on the substance of the teachings of the Dharmas. The ONE or the Plenitude IS: there was never a time when It was not, and there will never be a time when it will not Be.

Providence and the proof of Revelation. From the notion of the Providence (*Rubūbiyat*) the Holy Book draws the principle of Good and Evil which, while being indispensable to the life of Man, justifies the argument for the divine revelation. Mawānā Azad declares his faith in God of all the worlds, that is, "*Rubbul Ālamīn*" as the provider of the

---

even from the people of China has had no historical realization. In truth the Arabs borrowed the Numbers I to 9, plus the Zero, from the Brahmanists and transmitted them to the Europeans who called them Arabic numbers. The Arabs also borrowed from the Hindus the Lunar Calendar.

[10] BCQ, p. 43

means of physical growth and development to everything. Such a God provides all the more for the welfare of the spirit. That is why He has "devised a system or law of life which could attend to the spiritual needs of man.

> The revelation of the scripture is from Allah, the Mighty, the Wise." **Q. 5. 2**)

On behalf of the Mawlānā, Latif says: "The Quran is certainly aware of those who doubt the principle of Revelation."

In support of this vague statement, he quotes only the first sentence of the verse **6.91**: "And they measure not the power of Allah its true measure when they say: Allah hath aught revealed unto a human being").

The complete verse in the version of Picthall's translation reads as follows:

> "And they measure not the power of Allah its true measure when they say: Allah hath naught revealed unto a human being. Say (unto the Jews who speak thus): Who revealed the Book which Moses brought, a light and guidance for mankind, that ye have put on parchments which ye show, but he hide much (thereof), and by which ye were taught that which ye knew not yourselves nor (did) your fathers (know it)? Say: Allah. Then leave them to their play of cavilling." (**Q. 6. 91**)

The vagueness of Latif's statement would induce the reader to think that Allah (or Muhammad) was alluding to doubters among the Qoraish tribe hostile to the Prophet. Picthall unambiguously points out that the verse is directed against the Jews. Even then the verse lends itself to being understood as an ambiguity if it applies to the Jews who invented the idea of a supernatural source of revelation, of an Almighty Yahweh-out-there. However, according to the Mawlānā, the Quran offers the analogy of the physical world providing for the satisfaction of the material needs of Man with the provision for his spiritual needs. It all arises from Allah's attribute of Raḥmat (Graciousness).[11] But the Mawlānā's claim that Allah's dispensation extend to "all the worlds" (Rubbul Ālamīn) naively, if not blindly or fanatically, ignores not only the established ways and spiritual formations available in the sub-continent, but also the peoples of the Holy Book, that is, the Jews and the Christians. Socialists and Communists, as well as Atheists, live as happily as do Christians and Jews, without having to believe in a transcendent God. In particular the Mawlānā ignores the spiritual

[11] BCQ, p. 44

traditions of the Buddhists and the Jainas which dispense with the obligation to imagine the reality of a transcendent God. On the contrary they do strongly preach the merit of the moral freedom consisting of the severing of the bond of attachment to an external entity, even if it be visualized as God endowed with infinite power.

The graciousness of Allah. The importance of the divine graciousness is trumpeted by Allah in:

> "And ordain for us in this world that which is good, and in the Hereafter (that which is good), Lo! We have turned unto Thee. He said: I smite with My punishment whom I will, and my Mercy embraceth all things, therefore I shall ordain it for those who ward off evil) and pay the poor-due, and those who believe our revelations." (**Q. 7. 156**)

Again the Mawlānā emphasizes only a part of this verse: *My Mercy embraceth all things.* In the full verse this statement of the Mercy occurs in the same sentence with the first part referring to Allah as the unconstrained punisher. Allah is the only God who is concerned with punishment of what He judges to be evil. In the history of Islam all those who believe in the Dharmas are evil doers who, for believing in untruths and in errors, attract the wrath of Allah against them. The Islamic scriptures do not know the Law of Karma which, whether God exists or does not exist, works inexorably in rewarding the practice of virtue and in attributing the just deserving to the evil doer. Karma works within the space of the individual's existence and in association with his freedom. The Law of Karma and the habit of taking it for granted, by all native Indians, constitutes the guarantor of the Individualism of the devotee. It is this specific character of Individualism which assures the validity of the 1950 Constitution and its provision of civic equality pertaining to the Individual.

In spelling out the importance of Allah's *Raḥmat* (Mercy), Mawlānā Azad highlights its mention in the second verse of the first Surah of the Quran, the *Sūrat-ul-Fātihā*, in the words: *In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.* According to Mawlānā Azad these words *Ar-Raḥmān* and *Ar-Raḥīm* are derived from *Raḥmat* "which denotes the type of tenderness which expresses itself in kindness to others for its own sake and covers in its connotation every aspect of love, affection, benevolence and generosity." He further insists on *Ar-Rahman* meaning the being who possesses *Raḥmat* and *Ar-Raḥīm* the being who not merely possesses *Raḥmat* but gives perennial expression to it, or a being from whom everything in the Universe derives goodness at every

moment.[12] Buddhism, for example, advocates the desirability of the Individual striving to be an *Arhat* (Worthy) as the perfected state which is distinguished by spontaneous, effortless Compassion (*karuṇā*). The Buddhist believes that *Karuṇā* (Compassion) should be the lot of Man, that is, of all human beings, on earth. Islam requires the Believer to submit to the law of Allah who, in Heaven, is merciful. The two world views do not meet; they have nothing in common. Buddhism prescribes the perfections of the fundamental virtues to be expressed and delivered as the features of Humanity. In the Duality of the World and of Heaven, Buddhism advocates the heroism of conceiving, teaching, and the way to the realization of the promise of all the perfections which constitute the finality of human existence in self-fulfillment within Humanity, not in the airless, pitch-blackness of the distant void..

The irony of the death of Mercy caused by Believers. Mercy, as the defining attribute of Allah in reference to its particular meaning related to the violent genocidal history of Islam, provides the norm for the right measurement of the travesty of the loss to Humanity due to the annihilation, by spiritually barren Muslim hegemonies, of the many Buddhist cultures which, for more than a thousand years, once championed Compassion as one of the superlative virtues attainable by self-effort. That the Mawlānā would nevertheless advocate Allah, as the Merciful God for all peoples, cries out as an indecent incongruity which actually recalls the many genocides inflicted by Believers' submission to the Revelation. What Mercy indeed can come from Islam according to which Allah showers contempt upon the humanity of the Other who strives for compassion as one of the *pāramitās* (ultimate perfections).[13] The Mawlānā actually lived as a close companion of Mahatma Gandhi, the noblest pacifist who ever lived, upon whom the submitters to Allah's "Mercy" poured venomous contempt. It baffles the mind when it is confronted with the statement of a high Muslim intellectual extolling, in unmitigated seriousness, the Mercy of Allah, without the least scruple of historical veracity concomitant with the genocide of Buddhism by the faithful Believing Submitters.

Allah's Providence contrary to the existence and the worth of

---

[12] BCQ, p. 45

[13] The perfections are: *dāna* (gift), *kṣānti* (forbearance, patience), *vīrya* (heroism), *dhyāna* (concentration), *prajña* (true wisdom). Some texts add: *satya* (truth), *adhiṣthāna* (benediction), *maitra* (friendliness), *upekṣā* (endurance).

the Dharmas. Mawlānā Azad explains: The *Rubūbiyat* (Providence) of Allah sustains the Universe, though this is not the sole purpose of life.

> "The machinery of life was not worth coming into existence if every action of it were not endowed with the talent to promote steady self-perfection."[14]

The reference to 'self-perfection', central to the ethos of the three Dharmas, is certainly not an Islamic proclamation of the finality of human existence. Islam, in harmony with Judaism and Christianity, fixes the finality of human life in the Day of Resurrection. Nor has there been any *Raḥmat* evinced towards all the peoples, from Spain to Bengal, over whom Muslims established their hegemony. The ravages perpetrated by Muslim iconoclasm, the practice of *Dhimma*, the imposition of *Jaziya*, the forced conversions, the abuse of the sword and of the hammer in the destruction of art works and learning institutions, *represent terrible denials and dehumanizing negations of all that goes under the rubric of Mercy*. To the devastations wreaked upon Humanity by the Muslims, must be added their numerous genocides of the Buddhists, of the Christian powers in the Middle East and Eastern Europe and in North Africa, all executed with the sword and deliberate devastation. In the history of Islam, the Believer evinces an enormous self-righteousness allied to an immense heartlessness when he steels his heart when, unmoved, he contemplates the Kaffir's suffering with naturally blinkered eyes in order to earn Allah's Beneficence and Mercy.

The oddity of a philosophical explanation of Allah's Providence acting in Nature. The Indian Universities do not include Islamic studies in their departments of Philosophy. Even the Faculties of Law leave out the inclusion of Islamic jurisprudence.[15] Nor do the Universities in Europe include Islamic studies in their courses on Philosophy. They do not even teach the lofty Indian Philosophies which rival, if not surpass in depth, the metaphysics of the Greeks and the Germans, as Friedrich Nietzsche discovered in the second half of the XIX century. In the view of such scarcity of interest in Islamic thought, one cannot but wonder why Syed Abdul Latif, interpreting the thought of the Maulana, would write:

> "Philosophy points out that the urge of Nature is to aim at form and beauty. Form

[14] BCQ, p. 46

[15] One is surprised by the incongruity of the large number of lawyers in the top leadership of the Congress Party not being cognizant of the role played by Islamic jurisprudence in the demand for Partition.

> demands proportion, and beauty demands harmony. The two constitute the harmony alone, and not the reverse of it? Philosophy fails to give an answer to these questionings. In the words of a renowned philosopher 'where "why" begins, philosophy 'ends'. But the Quran offers an answer. The compulsiveness, it points out, is the compulsiveness of Divine graciousness. The grace of God demands that whatever comes into being must be good and beautiful, and so it is. Asks the Quran: "Say: Unto whom belongeth whatsoever is the heavens and the earth? Say: Unto Allah. He hath prescribed for Himself mercy, that He may bring you all together to the Day of Resurrection whereof there is no doubt. Those who ruin their own souls will not believe." (**Q. 6. 12**)

The verse **6.12** does not contain a rational reference to the argument about proportion and harmony in the reasoning which prefaces it. The reference to "philosophy" is odd, in particular, because it does not provide its context, nor is it in any way applicable to a statement of faith which, as a rule and according to the history of the revealed religions, bears no relation to the Socratic Reason which undergirds the entire range of Western Philosophy and consequently of Christian Theology and Jewish Rabbinical thought. In truth for a thousand years the Church forbad the reading or the study of the Greek Philosophy for being 'pagan' knowledge contrary to the Revelation. However learned he can be in his praise of Islam as the perfect ideology, a Muslim speaking in praise of Philosophy in the XX century, takes advantage of his democratic right to freedom to make a mockery of the patience of his listener or of his reader. In India the Darśanas have their foundations on the Sāṅkhyan anthropology which steers all meta-psychic speculations in ways and directions thoroughly different from the Western philosophies which, for a while during the Middle Ages, held some Islamic speculations in their tow. The utter shallowness of Abdul Latif and his fanatical, simplified view of Allah's laws and rules superseding Western Philosophy with His graciousness, cry loudest against the sacred, but barbaric, duties of iconoclasm practiced against Kaffirs' centers of learning and of religious and aesthetic monuments, in addition to the multiplicity of the genocides of a number of supremely moral civilizations. In reality, it is beyond comprehension that within the entire Judeo-Christian community, one finds no awareness of the monumental absurdity of Jehovah being the source of all the genocides perpetrated by the Believers in all the three dualistic religions issued from the Bible. There is not a single page written by a Western thinker pondering upon the fact of genocides being absent in the history of the Oriental religions.

The Quranic claim of the goodness of creation. In the support of this fanciful assertion, the Mawlānā marshals the Quran:

> "And hath made of service unto you whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth; it is all from Him. Lo! herein verily are portents for

people who reflect." (**Q. 45.13**).

"There is not an animal in the earth, nor a flying creature flying on two wings, but they are people like unto you. We have neglected nothing in the Book (of our decrees). Then unto their Lord they will be gathered (**Q. 6.38**)

as evidence of Allah's *Raḥmat*. Mawlānā Azad explains the principle of *Raḥmat* working in such a way as to enable all living objects to be served with what they need without any distinction. He illustrates this argument by the example of a wealthy man feeling that all creation exists for his pleasure. And so does an ant think that the rain offering it the needed moisture and the air laden with the smell of sugar are designed for its satisfaction. He concludes with the conviction that the blessings of Nature follow a universal law which regulates the function of all existing things, as is confirmed with the above-mentioned Verse **6. 38**.

It certainly does not cause any harm to anyone, nor is it immoral, to show respect for what Nature *as-such* is without minimizing its worth and its beneficence by submitting these bounties arbitrarily, without any moral necessity or imperative, to the meddling authority of God. Endowed with life and with its own rationality, beneficent Nature is endowed with the convenient wisdom which enables It to be productive of life, as well as, for reasons unknown to Man and to Allah, when it decides to manifest Itself with destructive extravaganza. In reality whatever devastations does Nature manifest as earthquakes, floods or volcanoes, It does never match, in the scale of destruction of lives and properties, as have the fervent Believers in their genocidal orgies in ardent submissions to Allah's revelations.

The Mawlāna's apology of Allah's beneficence manifest in the Creation does not explain why Islam flourished in places far from its place of birth: Cordoba as an architectural beauty and the Taj Mahal in the center of North India adorn the two extremities of the Islamic civilization. These two expressions of beauty happened to emerge in places where Islam came into contact with alien Gothic-Christian and Brahmanist cultures, both of which fortunately had earlier flourished beyond the range of Allah's influence and His *Taqdīr*. The aesthetic allures of Cordoba and of the Agra Mausoleum do not represent signs of spiritual elevation towards transcendental beatitude as the Chartres Cathedral does as the expression of the lofty language of the Middle Ages. Nor do they stimulate the heart to a transcendental vision as does the marvel of Ellora or the Trimurti of Elephanta.

Quranic optimistic view of Nature. It would appear that in stating

that the world is the best of all possible worlds, Leibniz would have been inspired by the Quran! For within the Quranic verse **30. 24**:

> "And of His signs is this: He showeth you the lightning for a fear and for a hope, and sendeth down water from the sky, and thereby quickeneth the earth after her death. Lo! herein indeed are portents for folk who understand."

The Mawlānā draws the conclusion that all the natural catastrophes – floods, earthquakes, volcanoes – must be compared with the carving of stones in order to make a thing of beauty. That is how Nature, under the aegis of Allah's *Raḥmat*, proceeds: an obstruction is followed by a construction, a destruction is the condition for a beautiful construction. "Nature", says the Mawlānā, "builds every corner of life's edifice assiduously. In the interest of beauty, it counters obstruction. It is this urge for protection which sometimes has to produce many convulsions or catastrophes, those are not, in reality, evidence of destruction."[16] As there is no evidence of the Mawlānā having any acquaintance with the works of Voltaire, in particular his popular *Candide*, it teases the mind that Candide's reasoning runs parallel with that of Pangloss, the Leibnizan optimist. Voltaire's indignant denunciation of theological apologetics that all that God does and does not do are in reality good and worthy of the believer's uninterrupted faith in Him. The Mawlānā's reconciliation with natural disasters being beneficent in relation to their subsequent corresponding happy endings does conveniently wink at the tragedies which befall the innocent, in particular, infants still tugging at the hands of their mothers. The vanity of the Mawlānā attributing to Allah the authority of providing all that pertains to Nature actually eulogizes the poverty of thought consisting of a denial of the preeminence of Nature which has its own reasons to be what It is and do as It chooses without any interference by a fictitious Arab God whom Muhammad claimed he had seen at the end of his nocturnal flight. Far subtler and more humane is the Brahmanist view of all that exists is a Plenitude which remains a Plenitude, inclusive of its pervasiveness in the Individual's *ātman.* Nature explains Itself by Itself: It commands reverence as a provider of life and had been a provider of life for millions of years before the birth of Muhammad. It is an immense diminution of the reverence due to Nature by the one and a half billion Muslims denying Its dignity by viewing It as the finished product of a God perversely revered for His delirious abomination of all men and women who belong to the non-Islamic humanity. There is no hatred in Nature.

---

[16] BCQ, p. 47-48

It is all Fullness, homogenous with all Time and pervasive in the *ātman* of the individual. It compels the Brahmanist to view the hating Muslim as essentially homogeneous with the ONE, even when the latter, as God's proxy, raises his sword to strike the Kaffir's neck.

Nature and iconoclasm. Nature did not produce a redemption of the volcano's breaking of Pompeii. Likewise no beauty came out of the many iconoclasms suffered by the Kaffir civilizations. The Buddhism of Indonesia produced the beautiful monument of *Borobudu*r. Islam put nothing with a comparable splendor subsequent to the elimination of the previous humane Buddhist culture. The world and Humanity became poorer, more violent, less beautiful, with the senseless triumphs of Muslims over the Buddhists, the world over. The destruction of the latter has remained as an unmitigated loss for Humanity.

Indian civilization will remain incomplete so long as the indigenous Buddhist culture, devastated by iconoclastic Muslims, be not fully restored. It troubles the mind and strains the natural impulse of tolerance to contemplate Mawlānā Kalām Azad's dense insensitivity towards all the ravages which the Believers of his faith have inflicted upon the Indian civilization. Living in Delhi he should have seen, littered on the soil all around, the remnants of the buildings and monuments destroyed in enthusiastic submission to Allah's rules and principles. Nor did it ever occur to him that faith in Allah requires not making images, while Allah is happy with images being broken and man-made beauty is made to disappear forever, as has been the demolition of the Bamiyan Buddhas in 2002, as an ostentation of Allah worship. Believing in the Quran, in the Hadiths, in the Sirah of the Prophet, deadens the mind and the heart with self-righteousness, utter remorselessness in relation to the victims of the brutish treatment and lethal violence kindled by the Muslim's blind submission to revelations enjoining dire hostility to the non-Believer.

Beneficence of Mawlānā Azad's optimism based on his faith in the Quran. Whatever may be the beneficence of the Mawlānā's entertaining an unqualified faith in Allah, the facts of history do confirm neither his optimism not the implicit or realistic affirmation of the Quran that all that happens in Nature is to be attributed to a perfect Cosmic Providence. Nothing more beautiful, more spiritual, more soul-elevating came out of the destruction of the many Buddhisms and Christianities followed by their being replaced by an Islam which put nothing as compensation in their place. Ironically, it may be still time for Indians to conform to the Mawlānā's optimism that Partition of the sub-

continent has been good, particularly to the Muslims, who most desired it with their commitment to the use of brute force. Sincerity to the rigid faith to the revealed laws of Allah is the easiest to maintain, compared to what is required in any other religion. It is upheld by the unmitigated freedom to hate the Kaffir as its obligatory evidence. Considering that there are today more than seven billions Kaffirs living, the Mussalman has practically an infinite scope for him to give substance to his hating whoever does not fall within the purview of the Revelation. The freedom to hate as *dīn, as religion*, must dispense the ultimate exhilaration as the infinitely enduring bond to Allah's rules and principles. In this apparently aberrant feature of the Muslim faith, Islam has proved to be more lasting than Christianity. Roman Catholic elites in Europe, for example, lament the poor attendance of the faithful in the churches, even on Sundays to attend the solemn Mass, the Muslims, in France, gather in large crowds even in the streets to attend their *nāmaz.* There is nevertheless a qualitative difference between these two forms of worship: the Muslim reciting the Obligatory Fatiha,[17] the Islamic equivalent of the Christian "Our Father which is in Heaven" (*Pater Noster*) expresses contempt for the Jews and for the Christians. The large attendance of the believers in their mosque corresponds to faithfulness to the *dīn* practiced as hatred of all non-Believers. The Sunday Mass of the Christian rests on the faith defined by the obligatory duty of loving the neighbor as oneself, in contemplation of God as a loving father.

In defending the absolute goodness of Allah in Nature Mawlānā Azad argues that any apparently unfortunate natural event is always compensated by a better replacement. He used the metaphor of the need to breaking a stone in order to make an art-work of beauty. It is a metaphor which fails to explain the First World War as the breaking of a stone which gave birth to a more devastating "art-work" as World War II. A disconsolate Mother who has lost a beloved, innocent Child finds no relief from her pain by being told by the parish priest that God has

[17] The Fatiha is the short first chapter of the Quran: "In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful, Praise be to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, The Beneficent, the Merciful, Owner of the Day of Judgement, Thee (alone) we worship; Thee alone we ask for help. Show us the straight path, the path of those whom thou hast honoured; Not (the path) of those who earn Thine anger nor of those who go astray." The expression "those who earn Thine anger", refers to the Jews; "those who go astray" refers to the Christians.

acted mysteriously out of His Mercy!

The godless wisdom of Buddhism. But that is not all: Gautama Buddha repudiates the totality of all past, present and future theological humbuggeries by postulating the basic fact of all life being a suffering which can be cured by self-effort, without any reliance on the belief in celestial busybodies. Even with a concession to the unyielding belief in the Unity of God, in accordance with the Biblical heritage of the three revelations, or to the polytheistic belief of the Brahmanist, the staggering fact, which eludes the blinkered vision of the Mawlānā, is that he resolutely refuses to acknowledge that monotheistic beliefs have spawned a host of macabre legacies of massacres, of wars, of genocides, while polytheist cultures have been peaceful, tolerant, creatively amicable. It astonishes the mind that this distinction would not have dawned in the mind of the Mawlāna, in particular, with the evidence of there have been no conflict, no war among the three communities abiding by the three different Dharmas. Indeed how could the Mawlānā not acknowledge the religious tolerance of native India manifested with the magnificence of the cave temples of Ajanta? For he has been at the center of the politics, as well as having been active in the generation which set into motion once more the essential vitality of Islam in the murderous violence of Partition vindicating the monotheistic belief, of which he was a scholarly fervent votary. Be it said, in his favor, that the mitigation of his deadened numbness, towards the brutish violence inherent to the history of his faith, bears an abundant similitude to the numbed insensitivity of the theologians and thinkers of the dualistic, revealed religiosities extant in India. As the advocate of a non-existent, blemish-free Islam, the Mawlānā of the Congress Party of India could find secret solace in the company of the self-righteousness of his compeers upholding the other two revealed religions the believers of which, in spite of their earlier collective peaceful heritage, eagerly extended support and encouragement to the brutish power of the Empire.

The beauty of Nature in the Quran. The Mawlānā says: "The greatest blessing of Nature, says the Quran, is its beauteous aspect which is but a reflection of the Divine *Rahmat*. Nature does not simply destroy and construct. It constructs in a manner pleasing to the eye."

Believing in his fable, the Mawlānā brings forth the following verses which exalt the beauty of Nature as expression of Allah's Grace. He sees color, light and shade, rhythm and melody which enhances the beauty of Nature in:

"Such is the Knower of the invisible and the visible, the Mighty, the Merciful:

> who made all things good which he created, and He began the creation of man from clay." (**Q. 32. 6-7**)

It is by a magic *tour de force* that the Mawlānā can see in these two verses color, light and shade, rhythm and melody in the beauty of Nature. In reading the following verse:

> "The seven heavens and the earth and all that is therein praise Him, and there is not a thing but hymneth His praise; but ye understand not their praise. Lo! He is ever Clement, Forgiving!" (**Q. 17. 44**).

the Maulana performs some esoteric mental acrobatics which move him to define his aesthetic theory thus: "There is no doubt that we meet in life things of ugly bearing lying close to objects pleasing to the eye. We listen to the melodious note of the nightingale along with the disturbing cry of the crow. The composite melody of life is to be composed of a diverse variety of notes. Such is he law of harmony in life."

The reference to the nightingale reads like a demeaning mockery of John Keats' *Ode to a Nightingale*, undoubtedly the most exaltingly beautiful homage to a bird's song in the entire literature of the world. The bone-dry praise of the power of Allah's graciousness fails to evoke even the cry of the crow which must have a reason to be what it is, according to the *Raḥmat* of Allah who measures all things each to its appropriate purpose.

In the following verses:

> "O man! What hath made thee careless concerning thy Lord, the Bountiful, Who created thee, then fashioned, then proportioned thee?" (**Q. 82. 6-7**)
>
> "Praise the name of thy Lord the Most High, Who createth then disposeth" (**Q. 87.1-2**)
>
> "Who hath created seven heavens in harmony. Thou (Muhammad) canst see no fault in the Beneficent One's creation; then look again: Canst thou see any rifts? Then look again and yet again, thy sight will return unto thee weakened and made dim." (**Q. 67. 3-4**)

while building up his theory of Beauty, the Mawlānā sees in them the beauty of Nature depending on 'balance and proportion, without there being any flaw anywhere.'

In the verses quoted above the Mawlānā sees a world of beauty and perfection fashioned by the God of Mercy. He sees Mercy in life, and as such it provides the proof of the Divine Unity, of the Revelation and of life hereafter. Undoubtedly the Mawlānā is free to see in these verses the beauty of Nature. But it is a lot more moving to be able to see a world of beauty as does William Wordsworth in exulting with the wonder

filling his soul on his coming across a field dazzling with a million daffodils! There is a great beauty in a painting of Turner or of Van Gogh than in their related natural landscapes and even less so in the verses of the Quran and its reiterations of Allah's Merciful creation. Fourteen centuries of the history of Islam have not produced a single Muslim landscape painter to celebrate the beauty of Nature which so delights the imagination of Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad! In regard to the enthusiasm of Mawlānā Azad's praise of Beauty due to Allah's Raḥmat, there is actually nothing in the Quran which matches the lyric elegance of the descriptions of natural beauty in the poetry of the *Mahābhārata*, of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* and of Tulasīdāsa's *Rāmacaritamānasa.*

Zest in Life according to the Quran. Can it be that living in the XX century, in a country where English had become the common language of the educated class, the Mawlānā would not have heard of the Stoics and did not get acquainted with their philosophy and their ethics? Would he not have ever heard of the Brahmanist aims of life (*puruṣārthas*): that is, of economic and material prosperity (*artha),* emotional fulfillment (*kāma*), moral rectitude (*dharma*), self-enlightenment (*mokṣa*)? Did he indeed glow in the national limelight because he saw the zest for life in such a trite statement as Allah's in

"Verily we have created man in an atmosphere."[18] **(Q. 90. 4)**

It is common knowledge, especially in the Judeo-Christian civilization, that, as the consequence of his disobedience in eating the apple from the tree of knowledge, Adam is exiled from the Garden of Eden by Yahweh who curses him to earn his living by working. Work as a punishment, as a suffering, as a curse, is specific to the Bible, which is the common source of the three revealed religions. Saint Paul further anchored this harsh Biblical view of "work" by his harsher emphasis that "he who works eats, he who does not work, does not eat". In a trenchant negation of this work rule, the moral rule of the Brahmanist ethos consists of affirming that whoever is born is entitled to live well. It is a defining moral attribute of the Indian civilization that none of the

[18] BCQ gives this version: "Surely we have created man to face trials." Abdulah Yusuf Ali's version: "Verily, We have created man into toil and struggle." Régis Blachère's version: "en vérité, Nous avons crée l'homme misérable." Throughout this essay all the quotes are taken from M. Marmaduke Picthall's Bilingual Edition of the Quran.

three indigenous Dharmas refer to Man earning his living as a curse or as a punishment. It is just a commonplace duty undertaken with a moral conscientiousness for the sustenance of living. Furthermore work carried out as Karma, without attachment to its fruit, is transmuted into a way leading to self-fulfillment as the end of the series of rebirths. Compared to the perfection of *jīvan mukti*, or *nirvāṇa,* in the present life, the state of the God-given ignorance of the pre-apple Adam in the Garden of Eden is an absolute *banality*.[19] Adam's emancipating himself by the sin of seeking and obtaining knowledge characterizes the essence of the revelations as an outright anti-thesis of the Indigenous Dharmas setting up the pre-eminence of Self-Knowledge (*ātma jñāna*) at the centre of Indian civilization. By owing its source to the prophetic tradition initiated by the Bible, the Quran endorses the morality of the Adam story and of his banishment decided by Yahweh. Indeed in an environment where three Dharmas publish both the *what* of the purpose of living and the *how* of realizing it in the body, during the present life, on earth, it perplexes the mind that the Indian Christian and Muslim thinkers would not have perceived the triviality of the Day of Resurrection while surrounded by a culture pervaded by the radiance of mystical perfection. In both these revealed religions the closed-mindedness of the faithful believer is due to the unequivocal fixedness of the mind that their pronouncements are perfect and they lose their spiritual authority by any admixture with an alien thought or principle. Nevertheless the persistence with which Jesus, with pathetic earnestness, pleads with his followers to believe in the Kingdom of Heaven *being within* them, failed against the popular expectation of a real, institutional Kingdom coming, as prophesied, to establish the ideal, just society. It is justice, as the supreme Good, was, as it still is, the supreme collective attainment of the perfect Jewish state, and of the entire Jewish community. The cogent difference between the Jewish ideal, enlarged and extended to the Christian and Muslim ways of life, and the human and humane finalities in each of the Dharmas stresses that in the latter the perfection is prescribed, not for the state, but for the individual. That this be so is due to the commonplace evidence of each

[19] Hannah Arendt's myopia blocked her perception of the banality of evil correlated with the Original Sin and the ensuing enormities of slaveries, of colonial genocides, of brutish hegemonic suppressions. Her associating banality with the evil of the Judeocide by the Nazis is only an affirmation of her narrow, ethnocentrism, not of fidelity to world history.

individual takes birth with a totality containing his specific *samskāras* (impressions) of accumulated *karma*. And it is this inborn totality which manifests itself throughout his existence and his search for self-fulfillment. The good fortune of Indian civilization has been due to the vision of the Ācāryas who placed the absolutes of moral life within the language of Humanity for the conveyance of the individual's searching in self-perfectibility.

The late arrival of a cosmic blessing. It is a cosmic blessing that the world, in the XX century, has shed the humiliations inherent to the catastrophes of slavery, of colonialism, of the violence resulting from the abuses of wealth and of power. Further, the consciences of those fatefully weak peoples, who suffered the brutishness of the strong, degenerate nations using Force and dehumanized Violence for the sake of domination, of profit and of glory, have acquired the means to own themselves freed from the past injustices and sufferings. Accordingly the evidence grows of the fallacy that the myths of Truth owed their origin to some undefined spot in the distant void in the keeping of the Only God. Unfortunately these fanciful suppositions that *all superlative values* owe their *only* origin in the Book of Genesis of the Bible, have been the sources of most, if not of all, the woes generated by the powers impelled by God, that is Yahweh, the originator of the three revealed dualistic dispensations, as the fertile wombs of countless misfortunes, for the Believers themselves and a lot more, indeed infinitely more, for those upon whom they undeservedly exerted their inhumane dominion. Each of these world-visions claiming to be the only Truth, has been, after the two World Wars, invalidated with the unexpected, unforetold advent of the Truth and the Pacifism of Mahatma Gandhi, in a manner which, with its silent *śakti,* was never before unfurled, as a redemption of Humanity, driven by the bankruptcy of the Western Judeo-Christian hemisphere of mass demoralization, on the verge of a global collapse of decency and of the possibility of saintly certitude.

The ontological difference between the Bhakta and the Believer. The intellectual distance between the Believer in Revelation and the Bhakta of the Dharmas can be, and is, bridged by the acceptance of secular laws arising from the common earthly beliefs of the Indian nation. It is the sky which, for the Believers in Revelations, holds the impregnable fortresses of tenets, languages, eschatological pronouncements, culminating with the faith in the certitude of the Day of Resurrection. For the Dharma followers the ends aspired for and sought are individual attainments of self-perfections explored in the space of the entire psyche, with the resources of the mind and of the

heart. The vast array of the joyfulness of striving for these ends is guided by the rules of the twin obligations of avoidance of harm to the Other and the contribution to his longing for the achievement of the transcendence of all experiences determined by dualities.

Banality at the root of that zest for life. The Buddhist also works in order to sustain himself and provide for the livelihood of his family. He conducts his mode of living in the same matter of fact way as breathing or walking as an unavoidable requirement for being alive as anybody else would do. The effortless duty of working to maintain life for oneself and for others is such that the Brahmanist, for example, does not seek to involve either Viṣṇu or Śiva in his effort to provide for his family's welfare. Mawlānā may attribute to Allah manifesting His *Raḥmat* (Grace) as an act of piety, but he or his disciple Abdul Latif must not claim the atmospheric transcendence of Allah as a right to claim the moral superiority of Islam. The devotee of an Indian Dharma does not need Allah, or any other Deity, to oversee his daily activities and in living by the exertion of his physical and intellectual resources. On the contrary, with unquestioned freedom he asserts his responsibility in providing for the welfare of his dependents as a striving for the ultimate goal of freedom (*mokṣa* or *nirvāṇa*). The Brahmanist experiences this ultimate goal as *sac-cid-ānanda* (being-thought-bliss).

The references to pairs among humans and animals, as testimonies of Allah's Mercy are offered in such verses as: "And all things We have created by pairs, that haply they may reflect." (**Q. 51. 49**)

> "Glory be to Him Who created all the sexual pairs, of that which the earth growth, and of themselves and of that which they know not!" (**Q. 36.36)**

> "The Creator of the heavens and the earth. He hath made for you pairs of yourselves, and of the cattle also pairs, whereby He multiplieth you. Naught is as His likeness, and He is the Hearer, the Seer." (**Q, 42. 11)**

It has become evident by now that all that pertains to Nature lies under the supervision and the care of Allah. With his unshared Unity, Allah creates a world in which nothing exists without His presence intervening to give substance to any initiative and its purpose. Allah acts like a puppeteer who assigns the pairs of lovers, to which the Prophet bears witness in:

> "And of His signs is this: He created for you helpmates from yourselves that ye might find rest in them, and He ordained between you love and mercy. Lo, herein indeed are portents for men of knowledge," (**Q. 30. 21**)

This is vintage evidence of the Quran not providing the least space to Man in the midst of Nature. The Quranic geography makes no room for an Arab Robinson Crusoe to live alone on an island without any loss of his humaneness. During the VI-VII centuries it would have been exhilarating to fill the vast

silent, empty space of the Arabian desert with the presence of an invisible God and of Muhammad claiming to be the sole hearer of the Voice unheard by others. The Quran offers no verse with the least inkling of such superlative nobility of the love of Abelard and Heloise, of Paul and Virginie, of Romeo and Juliet, Laila and Majnu, Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, Nala and Damayantī. On the contrary, in a revealed verse, the Holy Book provides Allah's obliging approval of Muhammad taking six-year old Aisha as his wife when he was fifty-three years old and when he already had a harem of six wives. As the leader of the first Muslim society and as a general who waged thirty-six wars, he would not, as the husband of twelve wives, have understood Napoleon's love for Joséphine and his crowning her as an Empress!

Allah as the guarantor of the useful. The Mawlānā opines that Nature at best enables the survival of the fittest. But the Quran asserts that Allah sees to it that, more than their physical merits, it is the usefulness of things which needs preserving. That is why

> "He sendeth down water from the sky, so that valleys flow according to their measure, and the flood beareth (on its surface) swelling foam – from that which they smelt in the fire in order to make ornaments and tools riseth a foam like unto it – thus Allah coineth (the similitude of) the true and the false. Then, as for the foam, it passeth away as scum upon the banks, while, as for that which is of use to mankind, it remaineth in the earth. Thus Allah coineth the similitudes.(**Q. 13. 17**)

It is a strange verse comparing the foam floating on the surface of a flooded valley with the 'foam' produced by the jeweler heating precious metals and giving to such labored similitudes a spot in a major scripture. Allah has an active part in the rain drop falling from the cloud. But, steeled with loathing, He is implacably insensitive to the virtuous Kaffir to whom he directs an inevitable doom. Allah's doom is ever ready to strike the Kaffir for being Kaffir, irrespective of his leading a perfectly innocent mode of living. For Allah, as Jehovah, "difference" is immediately damned as "Evil". Innocent or otherwise the Non-Believer must be inflicted the deadly divine doom. Allah's beneficence never extends to the DisBeliever. On the contrary, He confers upon the Believer the innocence of the proxy who administers upon the innocent Other the condign hostility barbed with torment and murder. The revealed verse **Q. 17** is the eternally valid certificate which bestows innocence and due reward to the Believer who, in the right circumstances, puts into practice the recommendations of Allah. No

Islamic space must be sullied by the presence of a Kaffir.

Truth and Falsehood in the Quran. The least that can, or must, be expected of a scripture which prescribes the Straight Path at its very beginning is the preference for Truth (*Ḥaq*) against Falsehood (*Bāṭil*). Mawlānā Azad says that the root word *Ḥaqaq* means durability, or stability. Hence *Ḥaq* is lasting. *Bāṭil* does not last. In a conflict between the two, *Ḥaq* always wins. The Quran pronounces the *Qaḍā bil Ḥaq,* the decree of Truth.[20]

> ʻAnd say: Truth hath come and falsehood hath vanished away. Lo! falsehood is ever to vanish. ((**Q. 17. 81**)

There is little, if any, evidence of Mahatma Gandhi having ever referred to the Quranic decree of Truth in the support of his Satyagraha movement, despite the close collaboration with the Mawlānā in the struggle for Independence. Nor is there any major assistance to the Gandhian Satyagraha by the Muslim leadership of which Mawlānā Azad was the most visible, and most prominent, by means of the convergence of the *Qaḍā bil Ḥaq* with the *satyagraha* popularized by the Mahatma. There is further no evidence if the *Qaḍa-bil-Haq* was ever associated with the Gandhian *Ahiṁsā* to win over the majority of the Indian Muslims to the One-Kaum doctrine. In fact the very spirit of *ahiṁsā*, in its authentic sense, stands for the avoidance of harm to any living being, in thought, in speech, in action. The outbreak of raw violence of the Muslim mobs rushing out of the Friday noon *namaz* on 15 September 1946 was a vehement inauguration of the *jihad* (Direct Action) proclaimed by Jinnah, in a monumental Islamic repudiation of the *ahiṁsā* which is one of the two absolute values of Indian civilization, the other being Truth, both of which are consecrated as the leitmotivs of the supreme masterwork on Dharma, the *Mahābhārata.*

What is Truth? More importantly, what the Muslim means by Truth is singularly dissimilar from what the *Mahābhārata* pronounces as *Satyam*. Even it be historically evident that Truth does not always last, for otherwise it would not be possible to understand the meaning of the thousands of Brahmanist, Buddhist and Jaina temples having been destroyed, in devout propitiation of Allah. Nevertheless, it maintains its perennial relevance, in its *Mahābhārata*-laden meaning, fortunately, for

---

[20] BCQ, p. 53

the good of Humanity, in the heart of the Indian civilization. It is a sign which will outlive the rationale and the existence of the United Nations as the sublime Truth proclaimed by the *Mahābhārata* and enshrined as the national emblem of India, as *satyam eva jayate*. It is problematic if the Indian Muslim interprets the *satyam*, the presiding definition of the supreme, eternal value of the State, as *Ḥaq*, according to the Quran and the Sharia.

Mawlānā Azad insists on the Islamic tradition attributing the ever true, everlasting *Al-Ḥaq* not only to God, but to the revealed word of God, that is, the Revelation as well. He finds validation of his conviction in the Quranic verse **23. 71**:

> "And if Truth had followed their desires, verily the heavens and the earth and whosoever is therein had been corrupted. Nay, We have brought them their Reminder, but from their Reminder they now turn away."

However Mawlānā Azad brings forth the matter of the lapse of time which can enable the rehabilitation of an evil deed. He argues in favour of the Quran recognizing the possibility of the act of *Bātil* to avoid punishment if, in due time, the sinner or malefactor repents and takes to a virtuous living. He attributes this to the effective influence of Allah's *Rahmat* (graciousness):

> "If Allah were to hasten on for men the ill (that they have earned) as they would hasten on the good, their respite would already have expired. But We suffer those who look not for the meeting with Us to wander blindly on in their contumacy." (**Q. 10. 11**)

The verse justifies the interpretation of the Mawlānā. Even according to the cluster of Anglo-American jurisprudences, to which the Indian Constitution of 1950 belongs, it is common practice that a long time elapses between the commission of a crime and its corresponding punishment. There may not necessarily be a symmetry in the case of a beneficial action which is duly recognized and rewarded without undue delay. The only reason for the prudence related to the *Bāṭil* **(**Falsehood) stems from its dependence upon the Quran being a set of laws designed for the correct following of the Straight Path. On the other hand, the ethos of each of the Indian Dharmas offers a different perspective in regard to crime and punishment. The *Mahābhārata* lays an immense emphasis on *Truth* as the superlative affirmation of the Dharma, as well as *Ahiṁsā* being repeatedly spelled out as a similarly superlative Dharma. However the Epic allows four situations where an Untruth would not entail being held as a sin.[21] Mawlānā Azad sees Allah's *Raḥmat* (Graciousness) in the

[21] These are: telling a lie to save a life or to protect the lives of others and the means on which they depend for their living, to assure the triumph of a good cause, to tell

tolerance of the malefactor who has not yet been punished and who may have time to redeem himself and avoid retribution. The *Mahābhārata* humanely treats the question of *Bāṭil* (Falsehood) on a straightforward, practical human level, without any reference to any Deity or even to examples of mythic heroes. The offender may indeed be convinced that he has redeemed himself in the eyes of Allah and of the community of believers. But a true redemption requires the offender being raised to a higher level of morality or spirituality. That is what the Dharmas advocate with the proviso that the offending deed will effect its consequence in some mysterious way, without compromising the certainty of the offender's progress towards the final beatitude. The Law of Karma leaves God out of the economy of sinning and of being redeemed, for the offender was, and is, always the individual holder of God (Īśvara) as the *antaryāmī.*

Misfortune is no reason to forsake the loyalty to Dharma. Relative to this context, the *Mahābhārata* offers the spectacular example of the immense suffering of the five Pāṇḍava Brothers despite their having led a flawless life according to the established precepts of Dharma. On the occasion of the surprise visit of the Ṛṣi Mārkaṇḍeya, during their exile in the forest, Yudhiṣṭhira, his brothers, and Draupadī, were living on roots and leaves, with Draupadī herself, daughter of a King and wife of a King, having to sleep on the ground. In contrast Rājā Duryodhana, the cause and initiator of their misery, was enjoying the delights of holding power and wealth, despite all his evil deeds. The malevolence of their fate riled the Pāṇḍava Brothers: they exposed to the Ṛṣi a pitiable tale of the reversal of their fortune as an absurdity. In reply, the learned Ṛṣi related to them the story of Rāma, the purest exemplar of faithfulness to the rules of Dharma, who nevertheless had to face the loss of his beloved wife, and to remain fourteen years as an exile in the forest, without at any moment failing to his truthful loyalty to Dharma. The Ṛṣi concluded the lesson by advising the Pāṇḍavas that they must not depart from the way of Dharma even in the midst of the direst unfairness of their Fate. The mariner holds on to the right vision of the Pole Star in the midst of the storm swirling the waves around his ship.

There is nothing in the Quran which extols the right norm of moral conduct and the right virtue to be upheld by a virtuous person struck, absurdly, by misfortune or by injustice, or by the exertion of crookedness and immorality allied to power. Indeed, as the German Philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) unambiguously declared that he could not find a single idea in the whole of the Quran. The histories of the societies with their respective modes of living according to the precepts of the Revelations are riddled with stories of innocent victims executed, or tortured to death with extreme cruelty, of martyrs

---

a lie in a joke, to tell a lie in wedlock.

who committed the folly of doggedly remaining faithful to their vows and to their beliefs. Submitting to the decrees of Allah, Indian barbaric Believers sought fame and satisfaction in a materialistic paradise by destroying such a thriving peaceful and humane community as the Indian Buddhists among whom no one ever hurt one hair on the head of a Muslim. Would Mawlānā Azad have never heard of Nalanda? If he did not, how could he *not* have known about it? Was he really not aware of the fact that the Qawat-ul-Islam, the first Masjid in Delhi, was built with the stones and bricks from Hindu, Buddhist and Jaina Temples broken by his co-Believers? Had he never really never known of the ravages of the Hindu, Buddhist and Jaina universities and their disappearance due to the Islamic zeal of removing the evil monuments of high learning of the evil Kaffirs?

The puzzling silence of Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad. If he knew, why would he have remained silent over such a Muslim iconoclastic monstrosity, if indeed he believed in Kaffir-Muslim concord in an independent India? And why did he avoid animadverting the iconoclasm integral to Muslim piety, when the evidence of its reality was, as it still is, so abundantly displayed all over the Indian territory? How did he feel comfortable with the ideology of the Congress Party co-habiting with his silence over the history of so much past Islamic hostility to the indigenous civilization? And why did no one ask him such questions, for, after all, the violence of the realization of Partition was one more chapter in the unending history of Muslim antagonism towards the native Indian civilization?

War concomitant with Greek culture and with Islam and the spectacular rarity of the Gandhian pacifism. The Greeks recognized as a matter of fact that, according to their tradition, Politics is cognate with War. The morality of war was imprinted in Greek culture with the adage of "Might is Right". The two World Wars of the XX century were fought by the Europeans and by America on the self-righteous ideology of "Might is Right". It is against this well-cultivated and highly honored, invincible adage, characteristic of the entire Western Civilization that the pacifism of Mahatma Gandhi against the Might of the British Empire must be wisely and justly contemplated and gauged with rigorous historical justice, as a cosmic event, such as occurs once in several millennia!

Beginning with the life story of the Prophet as a Conqueror, it is fair to argue that the history of Islam is, alone among the three Revelations, connatural with the slaughterous violence of its intolerance and bellicosity. More than its religiosity these features have been propounded in the formation of a civilization and of an empire now constituted of fifty-seven separate majority

Muslim nations. Submission to Allah's law has been the driving force to the generation of the Islamic civilization hallowed as the *ne plus ultra* of religion (*dīn*). Hence Islam, since its very first proclamation, instilled into the Umma the enthusiasm of the conquering élan and the spiritedness for war which must remain permanently active in view of the realization of the *Dar-ul-Islam.* Thus enthused, submission becomes cognate with the passion for this reduction of the world as the mandate of Allah, as the apotheosis of the ideal being dutifully cultivated in the tens of thousands of madrassas.

The consequent historical regression due to the Muslim submitting for the realization of the *Dar-ul-Islam* as Allah's mandate. That is why the Muslim does not feel any discomfort over the disappearance of the many cultures and civilizations which it has wiped out and replaced with nothing. In no replacement has Islam given anything to elevate the worth of living by men and women living in a different cultural environment. India today has adopted a way of living borrowed from the Western, predominantly from the British culture, the laws, the political structure of a democratic mode of government, the language, the medical science and the institution of the hospital, the sartorial style of the upper class city inhabitants, the technologies, the structures of public education, and their accompanying mode of thought in the conduct of the free nation, the advantage of being socially well ordered according to the 1950 Constitution which has borrowed its essentials from the British India Act of 1937. India consequently offers the nonpareil example of a civilization which has, after Independence, borrowed or taken literally nothing from the Indian Islam itself despite a hegemony and an unbroken geographical connection stretched across nearly one millennium. [22]

Islam, the religion given by a Conqueror. A cursory look at a world map enlightens the mind into being convinced of how, and to what extent, the world has suffered the consequence of a prodigious regression of History with the obliteration of all the civilizations which have been replaced by Islam without its offering any compensating cultural benefaction. In certain aspects Muslims

[22] Conversely the British borrowed nothing from the Indians, with the sole exception of the "curry". Nor did the French borrow anything from their Buddhist colonies in South Asia. But, most probably because they did not own any square centimeter of land in Asia, the Germans felt free, from any sentiment of racial superiority, to borrow from the Indians. The notably important philosophers – Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche – enthusiastically enlarged the scope of their metaphysical enthusiasms by borrowing from the magnificence of Buddhist and Vedānta metaphysics. The British Universities, of Oxford and Cambridge particularly, chose instead to support the imperial exploitation of the sub-continent, in conjunction with the Atlantic slave trade. They also trained carefully selected brilliantly intelligent Indians for mercenary service in the imperial administration of the brutish rule of the Raj.

may claim their religion to be preferable to Christianity, with their faith being directly drawn from the very words spoken by Allah, without its being mediated by an ecclesiastical bureaucracy like the Vatican for the Christians. Muslims are not burdened by the Original Sin and of its dire consequences in the History of Christianity. Nor does Christian dogma have a humane view of poverty which has been taught by the Church, during eighteen centuries, as a mode of living bestowed by God owning his mystery and wisdom. The Muslim feels that the *zakat*, the tax payment, as one of the five obligatory religious duties, represents a compassionate view of the poor which is "better" than the Christian Theology claiming that poverty is a product of God's mysterious wisdom to which the pauper must bend without any loss of his piety. With the religious obligation of the tax payment the Muslim has a reason to feel superior to the Christian indifference toward those crippled by poverty. Further the Christian's indifference to the crushing poverty of the countless millions of Christendom was socially protected by the extremely harsh penal laws for the slightest criminal offenses committed by the poor. In England, for example, poaching a rabbit on the squire's land earned the poacher a capital punishment, if he happened to be caught. Before the advent of the XX century, England, on one occasion, hanged a girl of eleven years for the crime of having stolen a shirt. Of the hundreds of convicts whom England sent to colonize Australia, only three had committed blood crimes. It is for the reader to exercise his or her judgement over the penal law related to theft in Christianity and the application of the Law of Talion to theft by the Islamic jurisprudence. But it is a relief to be acquainted with the Dharma Śāstras which do not have such harsh treatments for the poor, for the simple reason that even the lowest caste had an occupation which sustained his mode of existence.[23] Otherwise it would be impossible to grasp the significant fact of Indian material prosperity which attracted so many invaders eager to rush into the sub-continent for the purpose of looting. Beside for the follower of the Dharmas, the social condition of the individual was believed, as a matter of fact, to be the *samskāra* resulting from the past actions. He or she is responsible for the outcome of his or her own actions and thoughts.

The corruption of Mankind when was is prescribed as a religion. Muhammad is the only man who designed and gave a religion as a military program for the conquest of the whole world and of all Humanity by the means of an unabashed violence and a limitless intolerance of any idea or action different from the articles of his dispensation. Islam became established as a God given mass hatred of the whole of Humanity with the exception of the Umma. Islam realized the cosmic paradox of a Religion and its corresponding culture as a civilizational damnation for all the other cultures, with the

[23] The enormous mass of beggar paupers as a disgraceful extraneous caste in the Indian society was the direct product as a new ugly caste consciously created by British famishing rule. Foreign travellers in India during the medieval periods did not notice beggary in India. It was Indian prosperity which attracted all the invaders and looters.

exception of those which have their roots and their undying inspiration from the Old Testament. The only opening left to Humanity for a refuge from the overwhelming influence of the Evil compounded with divinely ordered violence. For indeed it is not worth the fribbling consolation of life in an Umma-World as the ambience willed by the Holy Book.

The low level of the affirmation of individual freedom in the Straight Path and the Believer's innocence in hating the Other for being Other. The Mawlānā claims that Allah makes allowance for the individual Believer having the scope for acting according to his own judgement without contravening the spirit of the verse related to his decision. He sees Allah's tolerance in

> 'The sentence that cometh from Me cannot be changed, and I am in no wise a tyrant unto the slaves.'' (**Q. 50. 29**).

He attributes to this verse a congruence with the functioning of Nature which, for everything, fixes a period of rise, and a period of decline, slow and steady either way. "The process of steady movement is evidently intended, in its application to human life, to help man and reflect at every stage and adjust himself with the laws operating in the process. The provision of this opportunity for correction is a provision of *Rahmat,* or the Grace of God."[24]

It is indeed an unconvincing argument in favor of a Muslim "tolerance" which, compared to what tolerance has been in the history of India, is at best the forced vanity of pretending that tolerance has a place in the revelation delivered to Muhammad. Neither in the Revelation representing the doctrine of Islam as a totalitarian ideology, nor in its History during its past fourteen centuries, does one find any tolerance towards all the cultures which it has replaced without putting any worthy equivalent compensation in their space.

The absurdity of Mawlānā Azad seeing tolerance in Islam. It is enormously distressing that Mawlānā Azad would feel the stress of laboring the fiction, with reference to the above quotations, that tolerance does indeed have a reference in Islam by referring to a solitary Quranic verse, while he chooses to be totally indifferent to the myriad fragments of temples and monuments strewn all over the Indian territory as signs of the iconoclasm which is so vehemently advocated by the Revelation as the essence of Muslim dutiful religious zeal. In any

---

[24] BCQ, p. 54

allusion to tolerance nothing exceeds more, in banality, than the fact of Islam being antipodal to the magnificence of the Dharmas. And the banality consists of recognizing that Islam asserts the contrary of the Dharmas which particularly emphasize the experience of the mystical self-realization and the metaphysical basis of tolerance as the naturally spontaneous, effortless expression of peacefulness as a universalist preoccupation. It is pathetic to bring a forgettable revealed verse as an evidence of tolerance, in the context of Indian history, in laboring the proof of a virtue which never existed in the entire history of Islam, more distinctively in the particular Islam of India.

The non-existence of Man's individual responsibility in Islam. However much does Mawlānā Azad struggle to establish some free, independent space to the individual Believer, he does not succeed in liberating him from the watchful eye of Allah. The Mawlānā remains stubbornly faithful to the Revelation as an absolute norm which does not allow or enable the fullest responsibility to the Individual's untrammeled singular interpretation of the divine law. The revealed law is designed for the Umma from which any departure is held to be a criminal offence. In case of a willing departure, the consequent harsh constraint, exerted by the will of the Orthodox authority, claims the beneficence of forcing the defaulter to fall in line with the divine dictated prescriptions. There must be no bend, no curve in the Straight Path. It is pertinent to observe that neither the Muslim scholars who joined the Congress Party, nor those who advocated separation in Partition, used slogans or political statements borrowed from the verses of the Quran to vitalize the reason justifying the movement for Independence. Not even did the Muslim League ideologues do likewise, that is, relying upon verses of the Quran to substantiate the two-nation argument, though the slogan of "Islam being in Danger" was sufficiently effective in the political climate of the sub-continent, not against British harsh rule, but against the assumed domination by the post-Independence Hindu community.[25] During

[25] The reader may be reminded that the Muslim League was campaigning with the help of Quranic hatred of the Kaffir to rally the Indian Muslims against the Hindus, not against the British who encouraged and helped the Jinnah-led Muslim Kaum in its opposition to the parties struggling for Independence. Pakistanis now like to refer to their 'independence' for which not a single Muslim League member spent a single day

fourteen centuries Muslims have proved the authenticity of Allah's Grace in the deprivations wrought by the Believers upon the Kaffirs. In reality the constraints of in any allusion to tolerance Islamic intolerance persisted even during the times when the Believers were active in the struggle for pushing the frontiers of the *Dar-ul-Islam* to the detriment of Christian co-believers. In truth one must never forget that Islam is the only religion which attributes Hatred of the Other as the Essence of Allah Being, of His will, of His Sovereignty (*Rububīyat*) and of His Measure (*Taqdīr*), of all that occurs and is present on Earth. Nothing exists outside the purview of Allah. Man is not independent. All this thoughts, all his instincts and desires, are dependent on Allah's in any allusion to tolerance Sovereignty and his Measure.

Disbelief accompanies the Maulana's consideration of such contrived, though relevant, arguments, with the authority of

> **Q. 35.45**: "If Allah took mankind to task for that which they earn, He would not leave a living creature on the surface of the earth; but he reprieveth them unto an appointed term, and when their term cometh - then verily (they will know that Allah is ever Seer of His Slaves."

In order to argue that the process applies well to the upward progress towards perfection and the downward movement in life which is propitious for improvement: Allah in his infinite grace confirms with these words:

> **Q. 17. 20**: "Each do we supply, both these and those, from the bounty of thy Lord. And the bounty of thy Lord can never be walled up."

In Brahmanism it is the Supreme Being who is ALL, who dwells, as the *antaryāmī,* within the individual, whether he be rich or poor, short or tall, sinner or virtuous, man or woman, at all times in the three states of waking, sleeping, dreaming. The Brahmanist sees the Mawlānā and Jinnah as having each the same essence as the essence of Hari or Hara. This is not fiction. The history of the Dharmas abounds with glorious examples of men and women who have left enduring legacies of the manifestations of the *antaryamī* unveiled in their writings, their teachings, in their daily modes of living. The references marshalled by

---

in a British jail. Their claim is not homogeneous with the corresponding claim made by the Hindus and their allies, particularly the Sikhs.

the Mawlānā buttressed the evidence of the singular Believer's life being the purview and the will of Allah exerting his guidance and influence from distant Paradise. The model which illustrates, as a metaphor, the relation between Allah and the Believer would be the technician behind a computerized console controlling the operation of a distant satellite. It must be this companionship, felt more intensely on account of the infinite distance, which fosters the enthusiasm of the Believer to seek praying, with the thrill of being in the company of their God. It is the same sentiment which would break out, transfigured, by a Friday noon *namaz*, into a raw explosion of hateful assaults on pagan Kaffirs. It is the feeling of every thought, every speech, every action, being suffused with the radiance of the divine word which drives the iconoclastic fervor of the Believer, especially as Allah confers upon him innocence, transfiguring him as the proxy for doing His work, with the assurance of:

> **Q. 8.17**: "Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them. And thou (Muhammad) threwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that he might test the believers by a fair test from Him. Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower."

All the mayhem exerted by the Partition as a Divine merry-making would have been indulged in by Believers heartened by the eloquence of Mullahs galvanizing the faith of the innocent proxies! Hindsight fails to explain the enormity of the silence, during those fateful months, of the learned Mawlānā and their eminent secular co-believers. As such Partition was not a scandal. It was the betrayal of the intellectuals which was the scandal, characterized by the undying hatred which it has bequeathed.[26] It had the consequence similar to what occurred in the first decade of the XX century when the intellectuals failed to avert the harrowing catastrophe of the First World War and its dehumanizing sequel of changing the world into a remorseless Wasteland. And that

---

[26] But who were the intellectuals, especially among the Muslim Kaum? It is significant, and appropriate, that the Fathers of both the Pakistan and the Bangladesh nations happen to be sterile individuals as sources fatefully assumed to animate, till the Last Day, the heritage of the moral or spiritual direction of the people. Besides it could not be otherwise, for it is the Imamate that stands guard over the predominance of the Revelation in the right marching along the Straight Path.

absence of the Intellectuals lasted undisturbed while Europe irreverently descended, with the fervor of an ultimate decadence, into the maelstrom of the Second World War.

The rescue of the Moon from the clutch of Rahu. Who knows? For most likely a sympathetic mysterious hand did actually move the minds of those who succeeded in splitting the Muslim Kaum into three fragments and thereby enabled the liberation of the bruised civilization of the Three Dharmas from the deadening influence of an undivided Islamic community driven by a mind-restricting, intolerant belief. Partition was endured as an odious calamity: how could it have been otherwise with the Islamic horde of goons comporting themselves as worthy faithful proxies of Allah? Yet hindsight brings the recognition of the Indian Moon having been freed from the jaws of the iconoclastic Rāhu. In the long run the break-up of the Muslim Kaum into three fragments will make it easier for the Indian civilization to proceed with the repairs of the damages inflicted by God's willing Believers during the centuries of their hegemony.

Mawlānā Azad pursues further the idea of the individual Believer's predicament under the vigilance of Allah: the errant can always make amends and continue on his march upward. The Mawlānā draws such a conclusion from this verse:

> **Q. 16. 61**: "If Allah were to take mankind to task for their wrong-doing, He would not leave hereon a living creature, but He reprieveth them to an appointed term, and when their term cometh they cannot put (it) off an hour nor (yet) advance it."

Mawlānā Azad sees in **Q. 16.61** the individual being at every moment of his life under the vigilance of Allah, whether he is failing or is striving to live according to His prescriptions in order to avoid any repetition of an earlier mishap. Yet, in the Verse immediately following, Allah unambiguously declares his threat against any divergence from, or conscious contradiction to, His edict:

> **Q.16.62**: "By Allah, We verily sent messengers unto the nations before thee, but the devil made their deeds fair-seeming unto them. So he is their patron this day, and theirs will be a painful doom".

This verse condemns the Jews and the Christians, as well as any

Muslim who decides to walk along a lane more convenient than a certain segment of the Straight Path. Of this abhorrent animadversion of the Jews and the Christians, which will last till the Day of the Resurrection, disturbs the justice-centered imagination by its uninhibited declaration of the vintage hatred lying as a deadly poison at the heart of Islam. The mind is awed by the thought that, for the last fourteen centuries, five times every day, Muslims have been saying their obligatory prayer which refers contemptuously to the Jews and the Christians. The doom promised as the fate of the Jews and the Christians remains permanently vital as the source feeding the Believers' adhesion to their faith. The sentiment borne by **Q. 16. 62** pervades the Fatiha, the obligatory prayer which the faithful have been reciting five times every day for the past fourteen centuries. [27]

Hatred of the other at the heart of the Believer's submission. The Mawlānā does not feel the slightest disinclination towards the voluntary submission, every second of his waking existence, to the dictates of Allah. It does not occur to him that at least during a single moment of his earthly existence, he could take the risk of entertaining one single desire to escape from Allah's *Taqdīr* and claim the independence of thinking and feeling for and by himself. The inspiration does not well up within his mind the possibility that an original thought of his could be valid and be beneficial, both for him and for the Other, without its being sanctioned and approved by Allah. For only then, with such an independence and resolve, can he be authentically moral by acting with the unqualified freedom of implementing his own, original thought. In reality, it is rational to argue that Islamic culture provides divinely measured space for the live maintenance of hatred of the Other as a necessary, fundamental component of its durability. The Muslim must feel exhilarated to be endowed with Divine sanction conferring

[27] According to the Brahmanist story of the Creation of the World by the Gods and the Demons churning the cosmic ocean of milk, Śiva, for the protection of Humanity, exerted his compassion by holding in his throat the cosmic poison which came out of the churning of the ocean. But it seems some of it must have been spilled over into the heart of Muhammad, the Conqueror who devised a religion and defined all non-Muslims as undeserving of living.

upon him the freedom to hate - innocently!

Undoubtedly the Mawlānā may think and feel himself to be strong and right in the security of all the hours of his waking life being under the supervision and direction of Allah. Such a sentiment bestows confidence, self-righteousness, spontaneity of being worthy to claim superiority over the adherent to any other religiosity. In India the Mawlānā would have felt superior to all Hindus; most probably he would have agreed with Mawlānā Mohammad Ali who publicly said that the worst Mussalman was better than Mahatma Gandhi.[28] There is no evidence of any Hindu intellectual realizing that Mawlānā Mohammad Ali was right in his faithfulness to his *dīn* in his evaluation of the worth of the Mahatma. For Mohammad Ali was faithfully praising his *dīn* for being the sole religion to claim hatred of the Other, whoever or whatever, the latter may be, at all time, inferior, worthless and evil, due to his being different.

With the totality of heart and soul approval and with unconditional submission to Allah, Mawlānā Azad sees in all the aspects and moments of one's existence the measure provided by Allah. He obtains comfort with his predilection for

> **Q. 21. 109**: "But if they are averse, then say: I have warned you all alike, although I know not whether nigh or far is that which ye are promised".

Mawlānā Azad is fascinated by the idea which occurs in almost all the major world religions, that is, one day of God is equivalent to a hundred earthly years. When, it seems, some Arabs taunted the Prophet with the argument that they ought to be punished immediately if they were committing evil deeds, they were not aware of Allah's graciousness of giving them a time lag for them to have the opportunity to redeem themselves. The banality of the time lag between an evil deed and its aftermath does not escape the surveillance of Allah who assures

---

[28] When the Mahatma was asked what he felt about the Mawlānā Mohammad Ali's remark, he replied that he respected the Mawlānā who was only expressing his faith in God as a true Believer.

the Messenger: **Q.27. 71-75**: "And they say: When (will) this promise (be fulfilled) if ye are truthful? Say: It may be that a part of that which ye would hasten on is close behind you. Lo! thy Lord is full of bounty for mankind, but most of them do not give thanks. Lo! thy Lord knoweth surely all that their bosoms hide, and all that they proclaim. And there is nothing hidden in the heaven or the earth but it is in a clear Record."

The effectiveness of prayers. Close to two and half billions of Jews, Christians and Muslims pray to the same God, moved by the belief that their prayers do have a physical effect conforming to their expectation. Such a belief assumes the effectiveness of the sympathetic response of the Almighty as a reality in their daily life. Nevertheless during the last twenty-one centuries of the Judeo-Christian religions prevailing, there has not been any recorded evidence of a historical event testifying to being a product of the collective prayers of the billions of the faithful. No voice thundered from Heaven in defense of the Jews victimized by the Nazis during their fifteen year rule.

Indeed Christian Frenchmen fought against Christian Germans in the trenches during the brutish mutual killing lasting for more than the four years of 1914-18, filled with a mutual dehumanizing ferocity. The heavens did not split under the weight of Yahweh's silence when the Judeocide was being scientifically, with moral quietude, perpetrated, despite the Jews never abandoning their faith and their prayerful hope for deliverance from evil carried out on a mammoth scale. Throughout the whole span of world history military victories have been won by the advantage of the superiority of the military weaponry. Unerringly the claim, that victory was won with God helping, has always been grafted upon the record of the battle by the fortunate or cunning victor. On the other hand defeat has never generated any loss of faith among Muslims and Christians. In the XX century Muslims have remained faithful to Allah in spite of their experiencing failures and defeats inflicted upon them by Christian armies, and subsequently by the Israeli forces. They are all wounded and killed as respondents to the supremacy of Jehovah who gave the first commandment: “Thou shalt not kill”. New York Cardinal Spellman wearing a GI attire visited the American troops fighting a most brutal war against the Vietnamese, none of whom had hurt a single hair on the head of a single American citizen as a *casus belli*. But American Catholics did not lose or weaken their faith in Christ

after the defeat inflicted by the Vietnamese Communists upon the Americans in 1975. Yet men and women in all cultures would propitiate the celestial powers for boons when they are smitten by collective misfortunes for reasons which reason cannot comprehend. So we let Mawlānā Azad believe that Allah, who knows all and everything down to the least detail in the life of His humblest slave, also strengthens the latter's submission to Him with His invasive knowing of all the secrets hidden in his heart. Fortunately, despite all the ravaging conducted by the Faithful with Islamic enthusiasm, those who, on the other side of the divide, hold fast in their faith in the Law of Karma, have also the certitude that, as the Fourth State,[29] the Absolute Brahman dwells naturally, as a matter of fact, in the iconoclasts too. Long, very long before Pascal came up with his bet against the Atheist, according to which the latter loses nothing in denying the existence of God, for he benefits from the love of God who does exist! The victimized follower of the Dharmas has no choice but to believe, and act accordingly, that the ravaging Believer nevertheless, as the owner of the Fourth State, the Turīya, is, against his unknowing of it, co-substantial with the essence of Brahman, or of Buddha-Nature, independently of, and more, in spite of, the revelations of Allah and His choleric injunctions against the non-Believer.

The relationship between death and ontological fulfillment. In the ontological environment of the Dharmas the loyal devotees maintain the stoic firmness that they are responsible for their deeds the results of which remain as theirs, without ever altering the essence of the ONE, or the Plenitude, present in them. In a contrast with the votary of the One, according to the Dharmas, the consolation of the Believer in Revelation, who loses a child, is drawn from the belief in the Day of Resurrection and in the mysterious way of God acting. To the adherents of the Dharmas the parent who loses a child, knows it is due to the inexorable Law of Karma working correctly, with the belief that the departed still lives 'elsewhere', while the grief and the sorrow afflicting the bereaving relatives and friends are due to the unbearable heaviness of separation.

---

[29] The Fourth State (*caturthi*), or Turīya, which is the transcendent substratum of the Waking, Dreaming, Sleeping states.

The assurance lives on with the conviction that in the end the living and the dead all reach the ontological finality of oneness with the ALL. Even when there be no material evidence of the departed in a subsequent life, the assumption, that this be so, is sufficient for the bereaved parent to live stoically through his suffering from the absence of a departed child. For there is always, within the depths of one's consciousness, the resources to sustain the remainder of one's allotted existence, as the space for the striving for the ontological experience of self-enlightenment. In the economy of the One, there is no use of Hope, which is an attachment to futurity. Hope is a clinging, a bondage, a longing for a sensuous delight. With the loyalty to the Dharma providing stoic resilience, life goes on as the possibility of the finality of *ātman-brahman aikyam* breaking through at any moment. Dharma bears the beneficence of unfailingly activating individual piety to undertake the endeavor for the beatitude of the ultimate finality of human existence.

The absence of the Turīya in Islamic psychology. It teases the mind that the Mawlānā would not have ever experienced the slightest curiosity to examine the absence of the psychological reality of the Turīya as the fundamental hidden source and repository of the distinct, mutually exclusive states of waking, of sleeping, of dreaming. In his indifference to the meaning and to the psychic reality of the Turīya, designated also as the Fourth State, Mawlānā Azad provides a spectacular example of the Muslim's unwillingness, or inability, or fear, or deliberately thick indifference, to confront the reality and the meaning of the Fourth Psychic State, so clearly enunciated in the Māṇḍūkya Upaṇiṣad. The defense of the Mawlānā's apathy may lie in the similarity of the ignorance on the part of the Indian Christians too failing to be aware of the eminence of the Turīya in the mysticisms of the Indian Dharmas.[30] The reality of the Turīya is specific to the psychology undergirding the three Dharmas. It is an infinite wonder that the ethos

[30] Indian Christianity failed to notice the pioneering of a mystical Christianity initiated during the 1950s by the Benedictine monk Monchanin who wrote of his experiences in his book *ERMITES DU SACCIDĀNANDA*. Fr. Monchanin's idea of a mystical Christianity based on the Holy Spirit got suppressed by the intolerant authority of the Catholic Archbishop of Madras.

and the know-how of its realization, borne wherever Buddhism has established itself, the discovery of the Turīya has been the ineffable gift of India to Mankind. And it does not matter even if most Indians are not aware of it. In regard to the Turīya, the Brahmanist is, to a great extent, scarcely different from the Arab going to Samarkand to seek for the treasure seen in a dream, when he ought to look for it at the far corner of his backyard where it has been lying unseen all the time!

The dominance of the Socratic rationality. However it is germane to the theme, to the spirit, to the purpose of this essay, to aver that the vulgar perception of the Mind-Body structure, adopted from the Socratic rationality has permeated, due to the British conquest, the mental foundation undergirding the European-British system of Indian education. The Western anthropology of the human being, composed of the mind-body structure, is different from the more complex, and metaphysically edifying, fundamental Indian anthropology specified by the Sāṅkhya Darśana. According to the Sāṅkhya, in contrast with the monovalent *mind* of the Greek Man, the psychic structure of the Indian Man, composed of the *ahaṁkāra, manas, buddhi, mahat,* offers a vaster "vertical" psychological scope which enables thought to range through all dualities and ending with the mystical self-realization. The lesser, constricted mind-body duality of the Western psychology cannot, and does not, generate the thought which dispenses the awareness and the desirability of acquiring the final non-dual knowledge. In particular, the notion of the *ahaṁkāra,* which is often translated as the 'Ego', actually stands for the faculty which constantly generates the illusion of a unitive singularity, when in fact it is a faculty which ceaselessly generates the notion of a solid, lasting unit symbolized as the personal pronoun 'I'. It is at the root of this false unitiveness which Gautama Buddha laid the axe of the denunciation of the *ātman* (Self) as a solid, unchanging psychological reality. The *ahaṁkāra is a dynamic process which contantly generates the feeling, but in reality the falsehood, of a stable, unchanging psychic entity.* The hierarchical combination of the *manas,* the *buddhi* and the *mahat* as the psyche, provides the substance and the reason for the thinking, the reflection, the contemplation prescribed by the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. They constitute one of the two common ingredients of the mysticisms of the Dharmas. The other ingredient is the Law of Karma. None of the three Revealed Dharmas prescribe a

practical method of psychological process stretched across the stages of thinking, reflecting, contemplating. Most Brahmanists today are scarcely aware of the immense, un paralleled contribution to the elevation and security of permanence in the spiritual contribution which Patañjali has bequeathed to India and to Humanity.

The obligation to popularize the importance of mysticism in ordinary mode of living. One would have to explore the subtleties of the experiences of Western mystics, in particular, the monistic mysticism of Meister Eckhart, in order to see the cognate similarity of a religious experience which, in the Judeo-Christian environment, has been, most ironically, pushed aside for the reason of its being adjudged to be at variance with the original heresy which has permanently established itself as the official orthodoxy since its adoption in 323 A.D. as the state ideology by Emperor Constantine. Before Constantine, there had been, during three centuries, the Religion of Jesus. It is an enormous tragedy that Jesus's proclamation of the Kingdom of Heaven being present within the individual believer got replaced by Saint Paul's success in substantiating the centrality of the doctrine of the Day of Resurrection in Christian belief. Muhammad adopted the revelations of the Jews and of the Christians of his day to emphasize the fear-laden submission to the belief in the Final Day. This belief deserves to be attributed the special significance of the greater popularity of its inferiority triumphing, by the use of brute force, over the more enlightening finalities of human life as taught by the oriental teachings. In particular, while yielding to the temporary needs of the imageries of heaven and hell, the Dharmas proclaim the authenticity of the preeminence of Humanity happening on earth, in the human body. Such a hallowed perspective of the perfection of life ultimately does not need the fiction of the allurements of Heaven, nor do they need the fears of Hell-Fire as goads in the search for Goodness. Ordinary experience becomes full like an egg with Truth when the Supreme Reality inhabits the body as the *antaryāmī*. There can never be a genuine dialogue with a Muslim who maintains that Islamic revelation is the sole irrefragable Truth propounded by Allah residing in the distant beyond. Closed to other forms of Truth and of Goodness, the Muslim mind believes that the best of all possible civilizations be realized, by the force of sword

writing, during the past fourteen centuries, Thus can the supremacy of Islam be manifested as absolute purity requiring iconoclasm and genocidal warfare against the present and future existence of extant non-Islamic cultures.

The treatment of Evil according to the Quran. The Holy Book establishes a radical difference between Goodness and Evil, as Light is to Darkness. It does not celebrate the contemplative self-absorption of the Christian during the moment of the angelus. Nor does it provide room for the ethereal experience of the Brahmanist in the quiescence of the *sandhyā,* when all Nature seems to be absorbed in a meditative mood. Instead, without recognizing the merit of the twilight, Allah extends His vigilance to both the commitment of the evil act and to the performance of a good deed. In a diametrical contrast Brahman, as the ONE, and as signifying the transcendental self-enlightenment homogeneous to It, exists untouched by Goodness and Evil which characterize civic actions in social intercourse. Brahman does not reward. It does not punish. It is not a savior. It just is. It is transcendent in regard to Goodness too, in reality more so, paradoxically, in regard to Goodness. Existentially the Brahmanist appeals to his Iṣṭa Devatā to help him out of his suffering. The favourite Deity (Iṣṭa Devatā) is the Saviour. Brahman can, however, be 'used' in the Individual's contemplation of Its being his self. Punishment is the result of the wrong Karma indulged in by the Individual, driven by some infirmity like anger, hatred, jealousy, bewilderment, vindictiveness, slander. Suffering results from the deed happening under the responsibility of the erring individual. God as the *antaryāmī* (in-dweller) is not affected by either the good or the evil act of the individual devotee (*bhakta*). It waits to break through the life of the seeker who chips off the mass which keeps it hidden. This is the moment when the Turīya breaks through the Waking Personality.

Mawlānā Azad explains the role of Allah in the life of the singular Believer: he argues that "the point to note is not what time an evil action takes to produce its result, but what type of people really triumph in the end. The

Quran asserts that it is the righteous who will succeed in the end."[31]

To support which he quotes:

Q. 6. 135. "Say (O Muhammad): O my people! Work according to your power. Lo! loo am working. Thus they will come to know for which of us will be the happy sequel. Lo! the wrong doers will not be successful."

Q. 6. 21: "Who doth greater wrong than he who inventeth a lie against Allah or denieth his revelations? Lo! the wrong doers will not be successful. "

Q. 9. 37: "..... Allah guideth not the disbelieving folk.

Q. 10. 81: .....Lo! Allah upholdeth not the work of mischief-makers.

With the support of the fore-going verses, the Mawlānā argues that the causality which binds an action to its outcome does not exclude the working of Allah's Grace (*Rahmat*) allowing the miscreant to seek opportunities of correction. It is only when these are neglected or spurned, that the law takes its inevitable course. The Quranic word used for the opportunities of improvement is *Tamattu*. The apposite verse confirms this divine concession:

Q.21. 44: "Nay, but we gave these and their fathers ease until life grew long for them."

But the preceding verse runs as follows:

Q. 21. 45:"Or have they gods who can shield them from us? They cannot help themselves nor can they be defended from us."

The preposterous Quranic dogmatic denial of *all* other moral or religious dispensations is, to say the least, rash and misleading, for all of the Time before the birth of Muhammad, men and women have lived full lives directed by the noblest principles of morality and spirituality. The scriptures and the traditions, which generated all those wealths of spiritualities, and the traditions which they inspired, are still ardently relevant in the present century. And they belie the exclusive Quranic claim to be the only reliable effective guide to right living. In reality the lamp of Humanity will fortunately continue to burn as long as these non-Quranic ways of being shall lead with their kindly light. The totality of the Quranic verses and of the Hadiths do not, and never did, supersede the sublime proclamation of *loving the neighbor as oneself,* in all circumstances, as Jesus's supreme gift of Goodness to Humanity for all time, for all men and women. In reality, the Humanity of the universal

[31] BCQ, pp 558

love proclaimed by Jesus recalls the existence of the Plenitude which Brahmanism had been emphasizing during the several preceding centuries. Nor is there in the Quran any verse which surpasses, in wisdom, in moral appeal, the reverence due to all sentient beings for being spiritually homogeneous with the One, for offering the jubilant hospitality to the Supreme Being as the *antaryāmī*. Allah is superseded by the Bodhi-sattva, who keeps taking rebirths till the last blade of grass is saved from suffering. Besides Allah does never offer the faithful Believer the serene, sublime fulfillment of *jīvan mukti*. As the Only God He asks only for the Believer's submission.

The question of Evil. The difference between the notion of Evil and its treatment in Islam and in Brahmanism illustrates to what extent the revelation of Allah happens not to measure up to the infinitely more elevated *modus vivendi* based on the pronouncement of *aham brahmo'smi* having its promulgation in the Upaniṣads. The world view of Islam, as are also those of Judaism and of Christianity, consists of the dogma of existence extending from birth to death as the only one: on the Final Day the buried corpse will rise from the tomb as the pre-existing full-fledged body in order to submit to the judgement presided over by God. In the Christian view the presiding judge will be Jesus, though Jesus himself never said the least word about either the Day of Resurrection, or His presiding over on that day as the cosmic judge. For the Muslim the judge will be Allah Himself. It will be Jehovah or Yahweh for the Jews. The Brahmanist view states that, on leaving the body at death, the 'soul' is reborn into a new body: death is only a change, like the change of a garment, or like the snake shedding its skin and replacing it with another, or like the air which is soiled by the dust raised by a brief gust of wind and recovers its purity afterwards. For the Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian death is final, absolutely, but is a waiting for the body to rise from the grave when the Day of Resurrection arrives at the appointed time in the Greek Calends. On that day, if the resurrected body is duly elected, it enters Heaven where it enjoys heavenly delights or as an eternal sufferer of hell-torment. The Brahmanist views death as a change for the better, or for the worse, depending on the totality of the previously accumulated Karma. This cosmic drama - which Jesus never preached - has lent itself to the

magnificent fresco painted by Michelangelo in the Sixteen Chapel, in Rome. But as a historical event, the responsible theologians who authored this beautiful, spectacularly cosmic dramatic event, would have been most probably aware of their having concocted a powerful myth which is rendered alive as historic certitude at the conclusion of the Catholic Sunday Mass.

The question of spiritual certitude. In the indigenous Indian *Weltanschauung* the real opposite of life is not death. But it is the finality of self-fulfillment as the experience of Existence-Knowledge-Bliss (*saccidānanda*), as an identity with the Ultimate Supreme Reality. It is separation which generates grief, sorrow, lamentation; it is the sadness of the absence of the beloved relative or friend. The Indian mind never was preoccupied with the representation of the tragic. None of the classic fine arts of India has ever dedicated itself to the representation of Death as a worthy subject for aesthetic uplift. The abundance of the production of soul-elevating Requiems in Western Music cogently illustrates one ostentatious difference between the Christian faith and the Indian Dharmas, in regard to which comparison becomes a futile exercise. Each aesthetic affirmation has its specific merit and exhibits its appropriate deserving of admiration.

The certitude of finality of life in Islam. It is astonishing that Muslim mathematicians, doctors, engineers, nuclear physicists, for example, would endorse, without the slightest compunction or spirit of rational criticism, the strict causality of the evil deed and its punishment during the same *one* life, which the Quran proclaims as a certitude. For in what time, in what country, in which culture, have not evil men and women gone through their lives unpunished, if not at times, have even lived the entire course of their existence while being openly honored and respected by their supporting crowd? In a disconcerting contrary occurrence, is not the absurdity universally known of innocent, virtuous men and women being tragically victimized by men or women holding unchecked power over their fate? The examples discussed earlier of the stories of the exiled Pāṇḍavas or of Rāma, who experience immense suffering despite their living according to the strictest demands of an eminent virtuousness, represent, in Indian literature, the absurd

coincidence of high morality with undeserved adversity, the like of which does indeed occur in all well-organized societies. The crucifying of Jesus, is undoubtedly the unsurpassed example of the moral absurdity of an extreme cruelty being visited upon perfect virtue. In truth Jesus perfectly represents the advice which Ṛṣi Mārkaṇḍeya prescribes to the Pāṇḍavas: misfortune must not in any way authorize any exception to faithfulness to the imperatives of Dharma. In both cultural contexts, it is the extreme humiliation and suffering which, endured with the invincibility of innocence, establish the archetypal norm for lesser mortals to strive to emulate. It is the significant deficiency of Islam that it does not provide any incident or thought, either in the Hadiths or in the Sirah of Muhammad, as a model of toughing out an extreme gratuitous series of physical pain and humiliation, with stoic fidelity to a sublime morality in the midst of the basest misfortunes. On the contrary, throughout his career as a conquering leader, Muhammad was a fierce, uncompromising enthusiast in the execution of the *lex talionis*. On the cross, exhausted, thirsty, agonizing Jesus asks his Father to forgive all those who had tormented him. Such was the lesson which Jesus taught to mankind. It is unfortunately a moral deformation that the Christian theology transformed the meta-historic example of heroic virtue into the ritual of absolution from the Original Sin bequeathed by Adam's disobedience of Jehovah's order not to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge. The perversion of Jesus setting the norm of suffering, without any diminution of his fidelity to the sublime virtue of forgiving, while dying on the cross, was *historically* realized, with a centuries-long inversion of that moral paradigm, by Christians creating misfortunes for their slaves and their colonized peoples who perhaps did not know the tragic context of the ideal art or duty of forgiving, but of a certainty were forced to labor for the fortunes of the providers of their misfortunes.

The absurdity of Goodness failing and Evil prevailing. Indeed in all recorded times mankind has witnessed the absurdity of goodness coinciding with suffering, of evil-doers experiencing the ease of uninhibited enjoyment. World history abounds with stories of Autocrats, Dictators, Caliphs, Slave Traders, passing through their careers, unmoved by the tribulations of their subjects, and living unmolested till their death. There is no evidence of the Mawlānā's acquaintance with the Old Testament story of Job who goes through a lasting undeserving

anguish despite not giving up his faith in Yahweh.

The causal link between Evil and Repentance in Islam. The Quranic explanation of the causality regulating the link between an evil action and a correlated repentance may satisfy the moral questioning of most Muslim men and women. But quite often history bears the testimony of the frequent banality of truthfulness and goodness being disgraced by perfidy, iniquity, criminal malfeasance of all sorts. As bewildering outcomes of virtues such unanticipated reversals do happen all the time, in all places, in all societies, with the fullest immunity. Accordingly this fateful irony recalls the use of the guillotine, during the Terror phase of the French Revolution, or the firing squads marshalled by the Iranian Revolution led by Ayatollah Ruholla Khomeny, when not a few honest, innocent, morally upright and intellectually accomplished men and women all of a sudden found themselves helplessly facing the guilt of being on the other side of the political fence. Despite the liquidation of tens of thousands of men and women, and the presence of the many gulags, Stalin died peacefully in his bed surrounded by his trusted doctors and mourned by most of the population. Winston Churchill died highly decorated; he was hailed as a great Englishman because he knew how to serve the Empire with relentless, extreme barbaric severity in the administration of the peoples trapped in the coils of arbitrary British Law. His engineering the Bengal Genocide in 1943-44, euphemistically disguised under Martial Law as the Bengal Famine, was methodically carried out without anyone in Great Britain, from the King to the humblest milkman, feeling the slightest disturbance of conscience. In an abundant similitude of destruction perpetrated with acquiescence to the Law, in the guise of Divine Revelation, Islam does not symmetrically have a credible justification for such enormous, but frequent, occurrences of Evil triumphing. Islam does not explain the occurrence of evil which it itself sponsors freely in the exhibition of Allah's Sovereignty (*Rububītat*) and His Measure (*Taqdīr*) of all that occurs in the world, from the White Whale hunted by Ahab, according to Herman Melville, to the tiny naturally blind worm softly wriggling in a soft humid sod.

Evil does not always triumph. But, according to the Dharmas, Evil

does never triumph: the real justice is administered by the Law of Karma operating as effortlessly as does the impermanent flow of existence. More: the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* insist upon the resolve that, amidst the throes of sadness and dejection resulting from Evil overwhelming his faultless virtuous conduct, the moral individual must not yield and must stoically persist in his fidelity to the principles of Dharma. Such a lesson was given by the Ṛṣi Mārkaṇḍeya to the Pāṇḍava Brothers and Draupadī when he met them in the forest. It is inspiring to remember the nobility of the Ṛṣi's recommendation: it is a distinguishing feature of the Brahmanist Dharma, the like of which is to be found neither in any Hadith nor in the Quran.

Human destiny in Islam and in the Dharmas. Indeed, with the approval of the Mawlānā, Allah provides an infinite loophole to the Evil-Doer, as his *Rahmat* (Grace), in the promise of the Day of Resurrection at the conclusion of the linear Time, in the distant future: the Evil-Doer may, with a cynical sense of immunity indulge in his ways without feeling the constraint of the thought of a far-away penitence. On the other hand it pertains to the radiant testimonial of the native Dharmas that they open out the three ways to the ultimate destiny of Man.[32] They indicate the practical mystical way of knowledge which leads to the felicity of the ontological self-fulfillment of the individual as a private experience on earth, in the body, as *saccidānanda* (the bliss of Being and of Thought). The way of self-perfectibility goes through the due exhaustion of all the moral obstacles which may have been earned in the preceding tribulations. The finality of the experience consists of its being personal, suffusing the psychic space within the body, without any reference to or need of, the Euclidean space of Heaven. In truth the desire of a permanent dwelling in Heaven constitutes a major impediment to the striving along the path leading to the ontological self-perfection. With its dualistic substance characterized by the assumption of Man-Here and Allah-There, the Quran provides the Euclidean Space and the Ptolemaic Time as the moral stage for the Believer's theatre. The monistic Dharmas proffer seductions and ways to explore the psychic

[32] The ways (mārga) of Karma (action), Love (bhakti), of Knowledge (jñāna)

time as the coincident psychic space for the unfettered striving for the attainment of either *jīvan-mukti*, or *nirvāṇa*, or *kaivalya*. These finalities are for the brave explorers. Heaven is for the timid who stays on the shore waiting for a coconut to fall: he chooses not to venture out to seek the gems and precious stones concealed within the vast unexplored territory.

The foundation of the exclusivist mentality of the Muslim and its historical repercussion. A verse like **Quran 9.37** above asserts the exclusive concern of Allah for the Believers. Such a statement does not bear even the semblance of being universalist: it consolidates the exclusivist mentality of the Believer. The resultant faith, from which the Believer cannot, under the threat of being killed, secede, has, throughout the history of Islam, guarded the believer within the shell of the revealed text. With the timeless words having Allah Himself as the author, the possession of the word heightens the dignity of the Believer with the sentiment of being above the adherents of all extant faiths, or of any new possible future revelations. Thus is born the fanaticism of the believer who sets the vertical fixedness of Faith in Allah and the absence of any curiosity to be horizontally acquainted with the contents of the belief of the coeval Other. The security of his believing to be the beneficiary of the only Truth for the only Straight Path to Heaven explains, since the last quarter of the XX century, the conflictual exclusiveness of the Muslim migrant within a non-Muslim society. It baffles the secular, liberal European hosts that the Muslim migrant would generate social and political stresses affecting their traditional identity, while his mobility does not direct itself to the wealthy societies *within* the Umma. In Europe the stresses and the conflicts which Muslim migrants have initiated within their host societies stem from the closed-mindedness due to the belief which does not allow any mental space for accommodating ideas pertaining to a different faith. The co-existence of alien rules and principles with the revelations of Allah would destabilize the Believer and cause him to lose his identity the preservation of which becomes the source of the tensions which he generates in the midst of the secular, liberal societies of Western Europe. The Brahmanist or the Buddhist who migrate to Europe do not feel threatened with the loss of their

identity for they can, as a matter of fact, maintain their sentimental stability and their spiritual autonomy by the preservation of the substance of their respective ancestral belief endowed with its own finality. For the Muslim the conflict arises from the irony of his sharing, with the Christian neighbor, the same belief in the finality of the Day of the Resurrection.

The reason underlying the outsider status of the Indian Muslim. Hence it is no wonder that after more than a thousand years of coexistence with Brahmanist-Buddhist-Jaina Kaffirs, the Muslims have maintained, as Mawlānā Azad so convincingly demonstrates, the exclusivist-outsider dimension of the Indian Muslim's faith. Due to the exclusive mentality and the spirit of the hateful condescension generated by the simplicity of the faith which fills the totality of the individual believer with Allah's presence (*Rububīyat*), the Muslim disdainfully chooses to ignore what the Other thinks or feels. Concurrently the choleric verses - as discussed in Chapter Three - in addition to the absence of any philosophical pith or metaphysical purport would, in fact do, discourage any Kaffir from any obligation to know and understand the galvanic contempt of the Muslim. That is why the mutual ignorance, consisting of self-conscious contentment with exclusiveness on the part of the Believer, distinct from the alienated indifference on the part of the Kaffir, has plagued the history of the Indian sub-continent.[33] The Muslim hordes who came to India did not bring any literature, or any refined stock of fine arts, or a sophisticated political culture based on well-tried laws established on tried humane historical experience. They came to set up their faith, with the unquestioned pride of spreading it as a divine dispensation by using the means of a brute power as the justifiable expression of the Revelation. They brought intolerance as a normal way of living and iconoclasm as a sacred duty. Their sense of

[33] During the mid-1950s, the course on the Study of Comparative Religion offered by the Department of Philosophy of the Banaras Hindu University did not have any reference to Islam. The standard opinion of the teaching staff, without any exception, held the view that there was nothing philosophical worth studying in the Quran. Even if this be true, nevertheless the earlier occurrence of the Partition did not generate any concern or reason, among the Professors of Philosophy, to seek for the intellectual or other justification for the Two Nation Theory dear to the majority of the Muslims.

being self-contained, within the shell of a faith in a sealed revelation, warranted their depredation of the Kaffir land as a homage and fidelity to Allah. With the revelation of Allah Himself fighting the wars of the Muslims, violence and killing do not represent an evil in the Believer's sensibility. This feature of the Islamic faith lies at the antipode of the *Mahābhārata* repeatedly declaring that absolute non-violence is the supreme moral rule (*ahiṁsā paramo dharma*).

The Muslim's aversion for cultural synthesis and the rise of the Tabligi movement. For more than a millennium the Indian Muslims have maintained a cohesion distinguished by their collective lack of curiosity in the cultural ways and fundamentals of those cultures with which they choose to invade or where they find it convenient to migrate. All great historical moments of cultural splendor have come out of the synthesis resulting from the thriving blend of two different civilizations coming together. The significant examples are: Periclean Greece, the Greco-Buddhist Gāndhāra, the Tang Dynasty, the Europe of the Enlightenment, the short period of the Early Mughal dynasty. The brief history of the Mughals was in truth artificially hyperbolized by British nationalist historians and propagandists as an embellishment of the Jewel of the Empire. This latest example did not leave any lasting impression on the successive educated Indian Muslims. Partition proved to be the application of the Islamic will to extinguish all signs of cultural contamination and to revert to a religious purity expunged from an admixture with pagan defilement. It is enlightening that, faithful to their two-Kaum ideology, neither Pakistanis nor Bangladeshis look up to the Mughal history as an inspiration to their specific national construction. It is not an accident, but a cultural logic, that the Tabligi movement would have arisen within the particular environment in North India churned by the vibrant influence of the indigenous spiritual traditions, in particular the Brahmanist, where a lot of forced conversions had occurred during the time of Muslim hegemony. It was quite natural that the converted masses would have maintained habits, tastes, sympathies, as persisting elements of their previous culture which they had been forced to leave, in order to escape the burden of the *jaziya* and other constraints. These remnants of the indigenous cultures within the masses

of converts became viewed as *impurities* by the conservative Mullah elite as a corruption of the perfection of Islam. The Tabligi movement arose as the response directed to the purification of the faith from its contaminating accretions still adhering from the earlier socio-cultural practices and mores of the Disbelievers. The impurities would have been viewed with particular resentment because they originated from a dispensation abominated by the Quran as a contemptible paganism, unrelated to any of the three revelations. Within the Brahmanist community, the Ārya Samāj claimed to be a simplified return to the ancient Vedic culture before it got clouded with excessive rituals and particularly with a fossilized *varṇāśarama*. In particular the Ārya Samāj gave great importance to the education of women and to the learning of the English language and accordingly founded the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic School system to promote its reformed social activism within the Brahmanist environment.

The organic relationship of state purity with violence. However the Tabligi movement for the restoration of the original purity of Islam was directed *against* the different, alien Brahmanist culture. By such an action, which has recruited the scores of millions of Believers under its banner, the Tabligi version of Islam has successfully scuttled what a unique burgeoning synthesis could have emerged, with Islam developing a *modus vivendi* specific to India and a model for the enhancement of the cultures in all those regions where the Muslims have entrenched their hegemony. Instead of generating creative syntheses, the Islamic hegemonies have *actually obliterated the cultures over which they prevailed, thereby bringing about an immense cultural loss to the whole world.* The demographic growth of the Tabligi brand of Islam provides proof of the triumph of inferior cultural determinations succeeding by means of the strength of an infra-mindfulness, which dispenses with the obligation to cultivate personal independent initiatives, in conjunction with the submission to what the Quran stipulates. The Tabligi advocates a purity of religiosity which, in the absence of the art of persuasion, fosters violence as the *modus operandi* of its legitimacy. Despite their professed peacefulness they do, in reality, espouse and support the Wahhabi version of their faith. The Tabligi

offers to a world which, subsequent to the World War II, has become an armed camp, one more ideology for nurturing the readiness for violence in the name of the One True God. Consonant with the Tabligi contribution is the Verse **8.17** of the Quran[34] which validates the justification of *jihadic* violence in the proxies' innocent defense of the purity of the Islamic faith.

The similarity of the historic role of the Indian Christianity with Islam. On the other hand, as a revealed dispensation, Indian Christianity too failed to bring forth a theological synthesis specific to India which could have influenced the development of the faith in the Middle East and subsequently in Europe. It is thought provoking that during the first three centuries the Christianity of Jesus spread uncorrupted by the intrusion of politics and its Machiavellian component resulting from Emperor Constantine adopting the new religion, based on the Nicean Creed, as the state ideology. Little is known of the Indian Christianity of those first three or four centuries before the faith settled in Europe. What is left unsaid in India, perhaps out of fear of its impact on the imperatives of electoral politics, is the common factor of both the Christian and Islamic faiths failing to win the adhesion of the scholarly section of the Brāhmaṇa caste. As a result, they could not devise original, specific syntheses, such as occurred with the scholars of classic Brahmanism interacting with their peers in the Buddhist dispensation, especially in its Yogācāra version, to engender the magnificent synthesis of the Advaita Vedānta. *Besides it is on account of the low level of philosophical thought or speculation in the Quran and in the Hadiths, that the Muslims could not even visualize or imagine a synthesis with either the immensely sophisticated meta-psychic thought systems of the Buddhists or of the Brahmanists in India.* Nor can they, since the last decades of the XX century, work out a cultural synthesis with Europe boasting of a virile metaphysical tradition as a dominant feature of its history. It is easy to understand the absence

[34] "Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them. And thou (Muhammad) threwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that he might test the believers by a fair test from Him. Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower."

of a cultural synthesis between Brahmanism and Islam: any possible synthesis would have required a synthetic blending of Thought and of the Arts. Islam is structurally a legalistic dispensation, with little, if any, philosophical content. Moreover, any synthesis in the arts was not feasible with Islamic fidelity to the primitive Mosaic commandment hostile to the fine arts of representation. Qawalli is the only example of a synthesis of the native Hindu Bhajan style of singing with Islamic themes. Muslim classical singers became prominent by a trained continuation of the Indian Classical music having its origin in the recitation of the Sāma Veda and it has continued without corruption by Hindu pre-eminent masters converting to Islam. But they retained the original Hindu mode of vocal music which has been well preserved by successive Islamic singers in strict faithful adherence to the traditional structure of the *rāga*.

Islam does not have the property for synthesis with any different culture endowed with a cogent philosophical determinant. On the contrary, the pale democracies of the few Muslim countries of the Umma acknowledge the weakness and the insufficiency of the revealed Sharia substantiating the necessity of the satisfaction of their political needs by borrowing from the constitutions of the Western democracies. To these fundamental rules and principles, borrowed from mainly the Anglo-American political dispensations, the few Muslim ersatz democracies add a few rules reminiscent of certain revelations of the Quran and of examples borrowed from the Hadiths, such as the death penalty for the crime of blasphemy. But these adaptations and borrowings from Islam do not constitute evidence of beneficent, creatively inspired cultural syntheses. On the contrary, the Muslims manifest hostility based on insignificant, immaterial differences against their minorities, such as the distinctive illiberal law regulating non-Islamic marriage.[35] The difference between the cultural sensibilities of the Muslim and of the Hindu in his minority status is magnified by the

[35] It took Pakistan 74 years to enact a law recognizing the validity of the Hindu marriage. Even then it contains a sub-clause whereby the marriage loses its legal worth, if one of the two partners converts to Islam.

emphasis of Islamic Sunni theocratic identity as the prevailing social norm. As a result of such an exclusivist attitude, evident for example in Pakistan, Islamic majority toughens its will by asserting power in opposition to the legally-imposed socio-political inferiority of the minorities. Before the Partition it was a deeply entrenched, widely spread sentiment among the Indian public that the only difference between the Muslim and the Hindu consisted in one going to pray at the Masjid and the other at the Mandir, and everything else pertained to a commonly shared *homogeneous* social reality. That sentiment of easy, stress-free co-habitation proved to be a bubble which a choleric verse or two could so easily prick to set forth an explosion of anti-Kaffir hatred hitherto kept in store. In Europe it is sufficient for the Muslims to use *hallal* and the *burqa* - as weapons unsuspected by the culturally sophisticated host citizen - to seriously challenge the well-established liberal jurisprudence, the secular power and the political sagacity of the well-established Judeo-Christian civilization. The Goths who came down from northern Europe to sack Rome came with weapons and earned the negative reputation in the reports of most historians, though they brought certain forms of art to the Romans and the Spaniards.[36] The Muslim replaces the culture which he invades or conquers with putting practically nothing in the cultural desert which he establishes by the sweeping use of the sword.

The dysfunction due to the exclusivist mentality of Muslim migrants in secular Europe. Furthermore the Muslim's resolute maintenance of his rock-hard exclusiveness, in the midst of the humanistic, secular cultures of Western Europe, displays the absurdity of Islam imposing a distinctiveness hostile to the Judeo-Christian civilization, notwithstanding the Quran acknowledging its co-essentiality with the Jewish and the Christian revelations. Since the 1970s the Muslims in Europe have been active in straining themselves to reproduce the success they achieved against the Indian civilization of

[36] The writer and film-maker Waldemar Januszczak rehabilitates the impact of the "Barbarians" on the cultures of early Medieval Christian & Islamic cultures, in a 2-disc published by the BBC with the title *The Dark Ages*: An Age of Light.

Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism. In other words, they brazenly unveil, in the midst of a great civilization, the effortless use of the cunning, and the unyielding force of an inferior religiosity, with the disconcerting, but adroit enforcement of *hallal* and *burqa*, as a *jihadic* judo in turning the noble, secular laws of the host country against itself. Consequently, with relentless efficiency, they are intent on weakening and scuttling the host's way of life which has been refined by an inspiring vision of the world nurtured during centuries of selfless sacrifice and of persevering heroism. The aggressiveness of the Muslim migrant minority has contributed one additional malady to Europe by extending Middle Eastern antisemitism to a European Union which has gone through the trauma of the collective shame of the Judeocide perpetrated during the World War II by Nazi Germany and its allies.

The definition of Truth for the individual and for nations according to the Quran. According to Mawlānā Azad the dominant principle which assures the stability of the individual and the durability of nations consists of the law of Truth or of survival. The divine law of *Raḥmat* (Grace) presides over those who "live or survive and who subserve or advance the cause of life. For otherwise, human wickedness will have no check placed thereon."[37]

It is a strange argument, the reason of which is difficult to grasp, when he writes of the law of 'Truth' applicable to individuals as well as to nations: that is, the domination of one by the other being alleviated by divine intervention. He insinuates that it is due to Allah that nations perish as the result of God's grace acting as a restraint in order to save the victims, for otherwise the earth would be corrupted. This is a tall statement which substantially contradicts the evidence of history. Nearly five centuries of Ottoman Muslim rule gave little, if anything, to the peoples of the Balkans. The Mawlānā winks at the fact that the Arab Muslims were colonized by the Ottomans for nearly six centuries. It is worse, a lot worse: Muslims with their intolerance and their iconoclasm prevailed to obliterate the peaceful and more humane cultures of the Buddhists in Indonesia, in Afghanistan, in India, in Gandhāra and in

---

[37] BCQ, p. 58.

Central Asia. If Allah is responsible for these triumphs of his Believers, then Allah has acted against a large fraction of Humanity in the midst of which excelled, Goodness, Truth and, in addition, the Peace favorable to the production of an abundance of Beauty. The disappearance of the Buddhisms, which fell to the less civilized Muslim armies, has been a monstrous regression with peace being replaced by violence and intolerance, with beauty and high learning replaced only by the memories of their vanished splendor. And it is an immensely strange component of the Muslim mentality that they never evince the slightest remorse or regret for their using fire and sword to obliterate so many manifestations of sophisticated humane civilizations. All those apocalyptic genocides, all those cultural diminutions, happened because *Allah failed to infuse His Believers with the knowledge and the art of persuasion.* For the Muslim does not persuade. He is satisfied in winning the argument by murdering the opponent. The relevant rationale derives from the obscure verse:

> **Q.2. 251**: So they routed them by Allah's leave and David slew Goliath; and Allah gave him the kingdom and wisdom, and taught him of that of which He willeth. And if Allah had not repelled some men by others the earth would have been corrupted. But Allah is a Lord of kindness to (his) creatures."

What a strange affirmation of God in the affairs of Man! The revealed notion of God intervening to give victory to one contestant against another in the social and political contests of rivals was dramatically superseded by Napoleon at the ceremony consecrating him as the Emperor of the French in 1805. Brushing aside an age-old tradition, at the right moment, he took the crown from the hands of Pope Pius VII and placed it himself on his head and followed his dramatic, historical gesture by crowning his wife Joséphine as the Empress, while the Pope looked on silently at the astounding denial of his sacred authority. At the victory of Iéna in 1804, which put an end to the Holy Roman Empire, which had been inaugurated on the Day of Christmas, in the year 800, Napoleon did something spectacularly unique in history. He had achieved such an event as would have been dreamt of by nobody else. His coronation gesture was a due homage to the norm setting glory achieved by the *non pareil* intelligence and the achieving will of Man. Indeed there was nothing pertaining to God in his planning the strategy

and execution of his army's maneuvers in the extinction of the thousand and four years old Holy Roman Empire which the Papacy in Rome had fostered to counter the influence and the rival power of Byzantium with Constantinople as its capital.

The alliance of the God of revelations with powers of oppression. One would expect Allah to be concerned with the spiritual finality of his Believer on Earth, rather than with intervening in the banality of liberating weak sufferers from oppression. History has recorded a whole spectrum of revolutions, of changes of politically repressive regimes, carried out with the energies and sacrifices of men and woman relying on their own personal moral and physical resources, and often with the express repudiation of established religiosities. More: History also records both the Catholic and the Protestant Churches collaborating - as they did during the twelve years of the Nazi regime of Germany, and again in Chile in 1973 - with oppressive power against the weaker social victims of injustice. The civil wars among Christians subsequent to the rise of Martin Luther provide examples which make it impossible, if not downright immoral and indecent, to introduce the same God in the shenanigans of conflicting forces led by men and women on opposite sides of the same battlefield. In all these cases God was never concerned with the spiritual fulfillment of the individual or of the believing collectivities. History belies the claim of the Verse:

> said: **Q. 22.40**: "Those who have been driven from their homes unjustly because they Our Lord is Allah - For had it not been for Allah's repelling some men by means of others, cloisters and churches and oratories and mosques, wherein the name of Allah is oft mentioned, would have assuredly been pulled down. Verily Allah helpeth him who helpeth Him. Lo! Allah is strong, Almighty."

During the French Revolution of 1789 and after, many churches and monasteries were vandalized by the enraged proletarian rabble venting their anger against the collaboration of the Catholic Church with the oppressive policies of the Ancien Régime. In an earlier period the Protestants came down and ravaged Rome, all in the name of the same God. And Muslims practiced their belief in the performance of their sacred duties by the lusty destruction of countless temples and all the centers of high learning of the Brahmanists and of the Buddhists. Allah's *Raḥmat* (grace) manifested in the protection of cloisters, churches, oratories and mosques, has been enacted in India by its absolute reversal

at the expense of the Kaffirs' institutions by His Believers acting as His proxies. It is a melancholy fact of the Indian History of Islamic iconoclasm which awaits a coherent study and publication by responsible and judicious historians. It would be an immense contribution to social harmony if such an enterprise were ever to be carried out by Muslim intellectuals and academics and own, in a spirit of reconciliation, the damage they wreaked resulting in the colossal diminution of the culture of the sub-continent.

The Muslim claim to glory for victory and domination in the ravaging of Indian civilization. Moreover Indian Muslims do, most of the time, remain silent on the disappearance or near disappearance of the Jewish minorities in all the North African and Middle Eastern Muslim countries. In most of these countries the Jews had been living prosperously for more than a thousand years. History moves backward in Iraq, for example, where many among the Christian community have been forced to emigrate. Muslims evince spontaneous indignation at the slightest disregard shown towards them and to their obdurate refusal to seek peaceful harmony with their host societies. But, as a majority, they do never show any inclination to own the pain they do not hesitate to cause to the Other for no other offence than to be harmlessly different. Anything different from the Islamic way of thinking or of living gets almost instinctively opposed as being unworthy of sympathetic consideration.

In all majority Muslim countries the minorities are effectively qualified by their respective constitutional law as second class citizens. The Mawlānā's argument that, according to the Quranic verse quoted above, whereby Allah comes to the support and relief of those, who are persecuted by Others, is concretely applied, *in reverse*, by the harsh discrimination applied against the non-Muslim in the so-called Islamic democracies. True to its name as a Pure Nation, Pakistan has deemed it necessary to reduce to near extinction its non-Believing minorities and to enact a constitution which unambiguously classifies its minorities as second class citizens. All these cases of the sufferings of the Disbelieving minorities in Muslim countries actually controvert the Quranic verses which spell out Allah acting in the defense and the

protection of those Believers who are oppressed: *the verse simply does not apply to the victims of Muslim oppression.* The *Raḥmat* of Allah is *not* universal. It is merely Islamic. It is valid only for the *internal social condition of the majority in a majority Islamic society.* Despite its geographic spread, Islam is *not,* and never has been, a *universalist* ideology. It is just an Islamic culture. The justifying evidence of the civilizational limitation lies in the proud evocation of the fact that Allah suspends His graciousness when Muslims decide to kill Muslims, as has occurred so many times in the history of Islam. And Muslims maintain this particular cultural attribute in the first quarter of the XXI century.

The gradual mode of acting of the Grace (Raḥmat) of Allah and its relation to the Partition. The Mawlānā puts significant emphasis upon the gradual expenditure of Allah's Grace: He leaves the offender room to realize his wrong and to come round by voluntary means of self-correction and by abiding by the imperatives of the Straight Path. In approval of this particular manifestation of Grace affecting nations, the relevant Verse

Q. 7. 168: "And we have sundered them in the earth as (separate) nations. Some of them are righteous, and some far from that. And We have tried them with good things and evil things that haply they might return."

is backed by

Q. 9. 126: "And whenever a surah is revealed, they look one at another (as who should say): Doth anybody see you? Then they turn away. Allah turneth away their hearts because they are a folk who understand not."

which prescribes a reasonable time limit for the offender to take the course approved by Allah. Indeed Allah sternly warns that the limit will not be extended. He does indeed clarify the extent to which His Grace will cease to operate in the Verse:

Q. 7. 34: "And every nation hath its term, and when its term cometh, they cannot put it off an hour nor yet advance (it)."

Thus do individuals and nations come under the purview of Allah and of his *Raḥmat*. It must have been verses like the above that the Muslim clerics would have used to fire up the Muslim masses who were made to believe that, in an independent India, they would be ill-treated by the majority Hindus. It teases the mind that the A. B. Vajpayee-led Bharatiya Janta Party government would have sponsored, at the expense

of the national economy, the establishment of Madrassas, as appeasement of the Muslim minority. The more than 35,000 madrassas in Pakistan train their alumni to learn these verses by heart. The large number of the fanatics who are rationally cultivated will maintain till the Day of Resurrection this supervision of Allah over the Kaffir Nation of India in its relationship, its attitude, its socio-political treatment of the Indian Muslims according to their interpretation of the verses dear to Mawlānā Azad. It is no wonder that Indian Muslims maintain a studied silence over the ethnic cleansing of Kaffir minorities and individuals in Pakistan and in Bangladesh, as well as over the separatist movement of their co-believers in Kashmir. Allah's *Raḥmat* is on their side as it works silently, on the margin of the 1950 Constitution, to stand guard over their destiny. The Mullahs must be seeing to it that the madrassas last, in order to maintain appropriate Muslim vigilance with the authority of Verse

Q. 15. 4-5: " And We destroyed no township but there was a known decree for it. No nation can outstrip its term nor can they lag behind."

Which bears maximal importance as a reference to refute all those who parrot the perverse fiction that Islam is a religion of peace. *The Quran is the only divine revelation which takes pride in celebrating God (Allah) as a willing destroyer of anything or anyone that lies outside the pale of its decrees.* One can see how the above verses could sustain the rationale for Partition. By means of the brilliantly executed emotional arousing of the masses, the anglicized educated Muslim middle class prevailed in inverting History by presenting the Muslims as prospective victims of the majority Hindus in an undivided independent India. Concocted by middle class Muslim leaders it was a monumental hoax which won the adhesion of the majority of the Muslim community. *The simple fact was that for centuries it was the fate of the Hindu majority to have been victimized by the intolerant doctrine and the violent practice of a Muslim hegemony animated by a culture far inferior to the ten millennia old native civilization.* It still amazes that the Hindu leadership could not find the proper argument to debunk this perverse inversion of history throughout the thousand years of Indian Islam. If the Mawlānā had any inkling of the falsehood of the Muslim League propaganda of Hindu domination of the Muslims in an undivided India, he did not succeed to make his voice heard even when the Congress

Party elected him as its President on more than one occasion. He chose to remain silent even when he was denounced by the leaders of the Muslim League as a traitor to the Islamic cause. Nor did he, with the authority of his acknowledged Islamic scholarship and learning, rebut the claim of Jinnah claiming to be the leader of the entire Indian Muslim population. With all his scholarly authority in Islamic studies he proved to be helpless in the face of M. A. Jinnah who, despite his ignorance of Indian History and of Islam, claimed to be the sole leader of all the Muslims of India. Muslim hatred of the Kaffir proved to be invincible in that national struggle against a British power which was sympathetic to the Muslim demand for the partition.[38] It never occurred to the Mawlānā to seize the opportunity to tell his community that it was Muslim hegemony which had oppressed and ravaged the pre-Islamic civilization of the sub-continent. Neither he, nor any of the nationalist Muslim leaders could marshal the courage to tell *that* truth, *that* way of the Revelation exhorting iconoclastic passion in the submission to Allah's injunctions.

The success of the Indian Muslims in the inversion of their history. The verses of **Quran 15. 4-5** (quoted above) bear an uncanny relevance in their providing congruity with the implementation of the Partition urged by the powerful incentive of innocently perpetrated hatred decreed by Allah as a mode of right action. The consequent easy success of the emotional arousing of the masses was carried out by means of the brash presentation of an inversion of Indian History. It was a monumental example of a mass explosion generated by the thinking and instigation of the responsible educated Muslim elite. The stratagem consisted of postulating, as a Truth endorsed in Heaven, that the Hindus would act as oppressors of Muslims in an Independent India. The break-up of the nation was put into practice according to the belief of Allah intervening, with the aid of His proxies, to burn, rape, kill, uproot and displace. The revealed verses proved to be congenial to the killing of the

[38] Throughout this essay the references to Partition do not weaken or refute the fundamental conviction that the trisection of the iconoclastic, intolerant Muslim Kaum has been a fateful beneficence for the *sanātana dharma.*

Kaffirs and in implementing Allah's will to *'destroy townships'* and prevent Harbi Hindustan from *'outstripping its term'* and from *'lagging behind'* to hide in the safety of its self-protection!

The ineffectiveness of the Mahatma's "Allah Īśvar terā nām" and the intellectual unresponsiveness to the Fascism of the Muslim League. That is why Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad never involved the Quran in the approval of the *'Allah-Īśvar tera nām'* ideology. He may have been a loyal supporter of the Congress Party. Like Ekalavya who had acquired the desired knowledge but could not use it,[39] the Mawlānā did not exert the weight of his scholarship in the Islamic scriptures, in alliance with the nationalist politics of the Deoband School of Islamic Theology, to confront Jinnah who cunningly used Islam as the ideology of the Two Nation Doctrine and as the reason for the mayhem of separation.

Hindsight benumbs the imagination having to contemplate that, despite his utter ignorance of the history of India and of its composite culture, and of the violence of Islamic history in particular, Jinnah could prevail over the minds and hearts of the vast majority of the Muslims against the prestige of the Mawlānā and of the Deobandi theologians. The only rational explanation of the success of Jinnah consists of the ease with which it was possible for him to set ablaze the Muslim Kaum's latent hatred of the Hindu Kaffirs enjoined by Allah. He could predominate by the uncanny use of brute violence being co-essential with the very substance of Islam as a revealed totalitarian political doctrine cloaked by Muhammad with the plain five-obligation religiosity. Jinnah understood that no religious or philosophical

---

[39] Ekalavya was a Shudra boy who, in hiding had placed an image of Droṇa, as a surrogate Guru and practiced the art of archery in imitation of the instruction the latter was giving to Arjuna and his brothers, as well as to the Kaurava cousins. He succeeded to have mastered that military art to the extent of being a capable rival of Arjuna, the favourite disciple of Droṇa. When Droṇa discovered the young Ekalavya and learned how he had been practicing in hiding while revering him represented as the idol, the Guru said that he was entitled to ask for his *dakṣiṇā*. Ekalavya agreed and Droṇa asked for his right thumb. Faithful to his word Ekalavya cut off his thumb and gave it to Droṇa, thus removing the possibility of a threat to Arjuna on the battlefield.

language could persuade the Kaum to follow him. He had the uncanny perception that only violence would provide the necessary motivation of the lumpen Muslim proletariat. They followed him, in a manner similar to the popular following of the masses supporting the politics of Mussolini in the early 1920s and of Hitler in the mid 1930s. Nobody, either in India or in Europe, was aware of this fascist modality in the politics of Jinnah.

In truth as essential constituents of primordial violence, the Quran and the Hadiths do not provide any suggestion of an ethos, in relation to the Kaffir, of brotherhood, of quietude, of understanding, of creative mutual sharing, as resources and possibilities for peaceful collaboration. Muhammad threatened the Jews to leave or else submit to annihilation, although they had been living in Medina for the previous five hundred years. He forcibly exiled then to Syria and allowed them to take only as much of their belongings as could be carried by a camel. Fourteen centuries later Jinnah lit the explosion which set into motion the displacement of about fifteen million men, women and children refugees on both sides of the Muslim-Kaffir divide. Essentially the Islam of Muhammad and the Islam of Jinnah manifest their undying similitude.

During the two decades before 1947 India was entangled in the maelstrom of the confluence of the mutually hostile policies of the Hindus, the Muslims and the British. It was a Satanic sub-continental plight which Fate, the *Taqdīr* of Allah, used, as an expression of His *Rububīyat,* to tilt the balance in favour of the Brute Force of the Muslim League prevailing. However, after seventy-five years, Time silently dissipates the fog shrouding the chaos of Partition. It unveils the reality of the sub-continent having been broken into three fragments - the Pure, the Indian, the Bengali - with the blessing that India enjoys the lightness of having in her midst a lot less of that irreducible Dajjalic hatred dispensed by the best of all possible revelations! It teases the mind, with hindsight, that the learned Mawlānā, the President of the Congress Party, did not instruct his Hindu colleagues to grasp the reality of Dajjal, the Islamic Anti-Christ manifesting himself in the havoc of trisecting the sub-continent.

The meaning of Allah's love. According to Maulana Azad the Quran draws attention to the divine attributes, in particular, that of the *Raḥmat* (Grace) which permeates every other attribute and gives it its

independent meaning. He refers to the Prophet calling upon the faithful to develop in themselves the attributes of Allah. According to this appeal of the Prophet, in order to stress the love which Allah has of Man, Maulana Azad singles out this verse:

> **Q. 2. 165**: Yet of mankind there are some who take unto themselves (objects of worship which they set as) rivals to Allah, loving them with a love (like that which is the due) of Allah (only). Those who believe are stauncher in their love for Allah - Oh, that those who do evil had but known, (on the day) when they behold the doom, that power belongeth wholly to Allah, and that Allah is severe in his punishment!''

This verse provides a defining encouragement to the Believer to demean the form of worship of devotees or followers of other faiths. It is as far as many light years of miles, as there can be grains in the sands of Arabia, from Śrī Kṛṣṇa's sublime stanza stating His love for His devotee:

> "Whosoever offers to Me with devotion, a leaf, a flower, a fruit, or water that offering of love, of the pure of heart I accept".[40]

The verse above which mentions Allah's love for the Believer does simultaneously remind him of the doom which awaits the devotees of the three indigenous Dharmas. Allah does not have any divine love for Man, as does Christ in the Triune God of the Christians. Nor does Mawlānā Azad measure the transcendental sentiment which, surpassing *love* in all the ways of its interpretation, consists of the Brahmanist's confidence and the knowing of his *iṣṭa devatā* being present in him as *antaryāmī.*

It has become a banal knowledge that the many active Jihadi groups do not today spare even the Jews and the Christians to the same extent as they victimize the Disbelievers among the majority Indians. The love of Allah is limited to the Believers. Allah does not in the least reflect any of the fundamental sweetness, goodness, charity and loyalty which lie at the heart of the teachings of Jesus. Indeed what the Quran attributes to Allah as love is limited, not to Jews and Christians as Believers, but only to the Muslim Believers. It is not a universal love, embracing all forms of moving and unmoving forms of life, as obtains particularly in Brahmanism, in Buddhism and above all in Jainism. Nor does it have

---

[40] Bhagavad Gītā. 9. 26: *patram puṣpam phalam toyam yo me bhaktyā prayacchati/ tadaham bhaktyupahṛtam aśnāmi prayatātmanaḥ//*

the universality of the Nicean Creed according to which the Holy Trinity is honored as a loving Divinity. The love of Allah and Muhammad extends to the community of His believers, not to all human beings as Jesus advocates, nor to all sentient beings as Buddha and Mahāvīra proclaim and teach.

Mawlānā Azad persuades his reader with the reference to Muhammad transmitting the desire of Allah in **Q. 3. 31-32**: "Say, (O Muhammad, to mankind): If ye love Allah, follow me; Allah will love you and forgive you your sins. Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. Say: Obey Allah and the Messenger. But if they turn away, lo! Allah loveth not the disbelievers (in his guidance:)."

There cannot be a more unambiguous exposition of Allah's favor: the Quran marks the territory of God's preference. Indeed, as regards those who choose to live beyond the sphere allotted to the believers here is what they should expect their fate to be:

> **Q. 2. 161-162**: "Lo! those who disbelieve, and die when they are disbelievers; on them is the curse of Allah and of angels and of men combined. They ever dwell therein. The doom will not be lightened for them, neither will they be reprieved."

The Indian Constitution and its guarantee of the equality of the Indian religions. It is upon a religion which spells so much hatred for the non-Believers, that the Indian Constitution of 1950 confers equality with the other dispensations present in the post-partition territory. The equality is further buttressed with the right of the Muslim to convert followers pertaining to the native Dharmas. But the glaring fact is that the Brahmanist, whose Dharma prescribes *tat tvam asi* (thou are that), does not foster conversion for the reason that all life is essentially homogeneous with *tat* or Brahman.[41] His Dharma is the antipode of Islam which, alone among all religions, enjoins hatred of the Other. It must have been due to their complete ignorance of the Quran that the members of the Constituent Assembly and the writers of the Constitution failed, or were afraid, to attach pertinent qualifiers to the clauses related to the equality of religions and to the right of Christians and Muslims to practice their artifice in the conversion of unwary ''Pagans''. They should have been aware that Hindus, Buddhists and Jainas are, as a rule, contemptuously regarded as “Pagans”. That is, as

[41] In addition to the immanence of the Supreme Being, the ONE, in all beings, the *varṇāśrama* based society did not promote conversion.

morally and spiritually inferior, Pagans are "natural" beings, in comparison with, for example, Christians, who acquire the "supernatural" essence by means of the rite of baptism. The Christian is a Person. The unchristened Hindu is not a Person.[42] He is natural. He has the status of an animal. He does not go to Paradise, the celestial reservation for Christians. According to this official, orthodox view maintained by Christian Theologies, all Hindus end up in Hell! Additionally it may be argued that the Slavers would have experienced no scruple in their trade by viewing the captured or bought unchristened Africans as natural as beasts of burden and their use for the hard labor in the production of American wealth was merely natural and could be carried out as sinless enterprises.

The authors of the 1950 Indian Constitution should have been aware that Indian Christianity itself it not equal to the European Christianity: its inequality was signified by the fact that, till 1947, India had never had a single Cardinal. Indian Christianity obtained its first Cardinal *after* India became independent in 1947, illustrating the status of the Church in Rome as the most potent political institution. Both Christianity and Islam, as dualistic religions barbed with immense political power, are radically different, in their dualistic theologies, in their moral discourses, in the prescribed human finalities, from the corresponding morality and spirituality of each of the native monistic doctrines. There is no equality in the stark difference between Man and God in the revealed religions and Man being co-essential with the Supreme Being as the *antaryāmī*. To attribute the notion of the immanent *antaryāmī* to Allah would be a blasphemy which is punished according to Islamic jurisprudence with a

[42] During my student days at the Banaras Hindu University, in the late 1950s, I had, on one occasion, a conversation with the Belgian Jesuit, Fr. Camille Boulqe who, speaking in French, said: "Certainly Mahatma Gandhi is a good man, he is highly moral and is respected. But I have no doubt in my mind that he will go to hell!" Fr. Boulqe was a specialist teaching Hindi Literature in a Christian College in Allahabad. His opinion had the same intellectual meaning as Mawlānā Muhammad Ali who, in the 1930s, declared that the worst Mussalman was better than Mahatma Gandhi. In reality, Mawlānā Muhammad Ali was right, in his fidelity to the Quran, and to Islamic jurisprudence.

death sentence.

The ignorance in the Indian Constitution of the effect of conversion. Above all, the immense prejudice committed to the Indian polity by the constitutional provision of equality of the religions active in India consists of this: the absence of the recognition of the abundant evidence, in Europe and more so in India itself, *of the convert hating the tradition*, *the community*, *the family*, from which he has been converted. The majority of the Indian Muslims, who followed Jinnah in implementing the *Jihad*, euphemistically labelled as the *Direct Action* on 15 September 1946, and a year later wrought havoc in the implementation of Partition, were converted Hindus and sons and daughters, grandsons and grand-daughters of converted Hindus. Jinnah brazenly told a historical truth when he haughtily declared that Muslims cannot live together with Hindus. During the talks in September 1946, Jinnah had no answer to the Mahatma saying: "It is the first time in History that a community of converts would consider itself to be a different nation!"

The *modus operandi* of the Missionaries in India. Most likely the Mahatma was not aware that, in Europe, the worst anti-Semites were converted Jews and the sons and daughters of converted Jews. He did not know that in Mauritius the enemies of the Hindu community of indentured workers were not the "Whites", the early aristocratic French settlers, but the Creole elite composed mostly of Hindus converted to the Anglican and Roman Catholic faiths, followed by material help to their being educated and/or tempted with easy placements in civil service jobs, especially during the years of the Great Depression, when academically endowed Hindus easily got jobs on condition of being baptized! These converts were the haters who held the unconverted majority of Hindus in utter contempt. It was such in relation to such sociological aberrations generated by conversions that Swami Vivekananda invented the word "Churchianity" to qualify the religion of the Christian missionaries in relation to their use of crass, materialistic enticements for winning 'souls' passed off as converting practices. The Enlightened Swami particularly berated the crude incentives brazenly proffered on a large scale by the missionaries, with the support of the British authorities. In a display of his magnanimous spiritual eminence Swami Vivekananda advised the Indians to read Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ* to discover the reality of the genuine merits and virtues which should qualify the authentic Christian in comparison

which what the missionaries were offering to the uninformed, mostly uneducated Indians. The Swami's tolerance thereby tried to persuade the misguided Hindus to know on the basis of what virtues, of their own, did the missionaries themselves assume the moral authority to convert the mostly ignorant Indian who had already been impoverished by the Christian power. The ignorance of the mechanics of conversion is evident in the absence of a single Brahmanist voice having ever questioned the absurdity of why a Bihari Indian semi-illiterate villager should, in order to be elevated as a Christian, be instructed to believe that he is, or was, born with the Original Sin, just because, in a distant land, in a distant time, an adolescent Semite ate an apple, in order to acquire knowledge as a means to liberate himself from ignorant servitude.

The misleading postulate of the equality of the religions obtaining in India. It bewilders the mind that during more than two years of debate, the authors of the Constitution would not have felt any compunction regarding their not having had the right perception of what equality of religions would mean as a disserving constraint on the non-converting majority. With hindsight this ignorance of a menace to the spiritual vitality of the nation acquires with time a magnitude which, to say the least, defies comprehension. Nevertheless let it be said, that the Indian State has lasted as a decently stable and harmonious polity for the past seventy-five years due to the Constitution having served as its guarantor. Concurrently the gratitude for the steady relevance of the Constitution calls for the recognition that faith, in its merit and in its wisdom, dwells in the heart of the Brahmanist humanity bearing the responsibility and the duty redounding to it, as the Keeper of the moral exaltation of an Ācāryan heritage.

The universalist particularity of the Brahmanist humanity. Of all the major religiosities active in India, only Brahmanism is the only authentically universalist dispensation with the further distinction of its being supremely humane. To crown it all, Brahmanism is written in scriptures which legislate a civil code without leaving out a single form of life beyond the pale of the Immanent One. If it is possible, and historically true, that there can be a genuine spirituality which allocates a value homogeneous to all men and women, without any distinction, even if they do not believe it or be aware of it, the preeminence of such a supreme benefaction should be attributed to the three Dharmas. A particular emphasis is due in favor of Buddhism for the lofty simplicity

of its doctrines and for its having been peacefully, with unqualified voluntary enthusiasm, accepted as a way of life across most of East and South Asia. The "that", the *tat* of the *tat tvam asi* of the Upaniṣad, signifying the respective finality of each Dharma, dwells all the time "within" the depths of the sub-consciousness; it is not an external reality available and waiting to be possessed. It is the ever present ultimate reality hidden under the mass of words stored in the memory, of language, of dualistic reasoning.

The magnanimity of the Dharmas. Taoism is the only other dispensation which matches the universality of the Dharmas, with its particular homogeneity with Brahmanist mysticism. None of the revealed religions does so: neither in their doctrines, nor in their theologies, nor in their histories, nor in their beliefs, do they lay claim to the reality of salvation in Heaven being equal to *mokṣa, or nirvāṇa, or kaivalya* realizable on Earth, in the body, as a concretely singular, private experience. Besides the Heaven of the revealed religions is not the same as the Vaikuṇṭha of Brahmanism. Felicitously Gautama Buddha rejected the belief in a Supreme Deity as an object of thought; as such the mental imagery acts of an attachment, as an impediment to the contemplation essential for the transfiguring of oneself as a nirvanized Arhat. There can be no doubt that it is the absence of an Indian divinity in Buddhism which has made its acceptance possible in the other cultures beyond the frontiers of India. The Emperor Aśoka had the sagacity to promote the spreading of the pacifism of the godless Buddhism, instead of Brahmanism decked with the presentations of its thousands of deities and of hundreds of pilgrimage centers (*tīrthas*).

None of the revealed religions comes up to the level of the glorification of the *ne plus ultra* of human experience described by the Dharma literatures as the summit of humanity, higher than whatever rejoicing the Biblical Heaven can promise as a seduction conveyed by the poetic imagery of the pronouncements of Yahweh, or of The Father of the Holy Trinity, or of Allah in the Quran. In this matter of the equality regarding the various religiosities of India, the Constitution has fatefully erred due to the authors not having had the determinative cognizance of the various theological specificities and their conflictual applications on the ground, as well as of the modalities of their

respective histories.

The art of giving the Devil his due! It is just a simple matter of giving the Devil his due! But, for the Indian Muslim, the Devil happens to own the three faces of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism. The writers of the 1950 Constitution failed to grasp this elementary fact: the finalities of the revealed religions are *meta-physical*. They are rooted in the vision of an ersatz-ontological experience of an *external* pseudo-transcendence lodged in Heaven, which is conceived as a tri-dimensional *Euclidean* space 'out-there in the beyond above' filled with provisions of sensuous delights! Compared to this materialistic view, Śaṅkarācārya's soul-elevating pronouncement of *mokṣa* is a Himalayan peak of spiritual recommendation. It is determined by the naturally indispensable heroic striving for the attainment of self-fulfillment. It soars above all the literatures of Heaven. It is predicated with the adoption of a whole-hearted, un wavering commitment to a dispassionate detachment from all forms of alluring worldliness defined as: *iha amutra karma phala bhoga virāgaḥ* (the non-attachment here (in this world) and hereafter (in the next world, in Heaven) to the enjoyment of the fruit of karma).[43] There can be nothing higher in the domain of mystical spirituality, uniquely characteristic of humaneness, than the generation of perfection as the fullness of what the individual Man is, on the surface of the Earth. For, notwithstanding the opinions of Pope Benedict XVI, of Allah, and of all poets and dreamers of Heaven in all cultures, there is nothing more in the Void than the void, with the word 'heaven' signifying no-thing. Besides the Space which holds the stars and the galaxies, including the Biblical Heaven, is *homogeneous* with the space of the Body which naturally includes the immeasurable *private mental space* of the Individual.

Meta-psychic self-fulfillment as ultimate reality taught by the Dharmas. The finalities of the Dharmas are realizations of a *meta-psychic* ontological experience '*within*' the depth of personal consciousness, *within* the *psychic* space *as* the *antaryāmī* of the One. That being so, there cannot be, and there has never been, any equality

[43] *Brahma Sūtras*, commentary of *Sūtra* 1, by Śaṅkara.

among the religions which obtain in India. There is indisputably a hierarchy within the six main Indian religions with the traditional Dharmas being infinitely 'higher' than the others. Orthodox Christian Theology proclaims that no salvation is possible outside the Church. More rigidly so does the Quran proclaim the uniqueness of Allah's revelation superseding the previous revelations. It castigates the Jews and the Christians for their estrangement from Allah's earlier Jehovah-bestowed dispensations. Islam berates all other tenets as errors, as abominations deserving the doom inflicted by Allah. Moreover the Holy Book enjoins upon all Believers to wage war against the Dar-ul-Harb.

In regard to the defense of authentic spirituality uncontaminated by Politics of greed and of power, and by War contingent upon the rivalries of Kings, this essay does not serve as an apology for any type of fundamentalist argument. It states a fact of History based on the Scriptures. It is as valid as imagining that a Muslim Inuit living in the neighborhood of the North Pole would find it harder to obey Allah in practicing the month of Ramadan than does the Arab in Mecca.

Extending the love of Allah to His creatures. According to the Gospels Jesus prescribes the universal love of the neighbor to the same extent as one loves oneself and as much as He himself loved the one listening to him. Mawlānā Azad would like to represent Allah being equal to Jesus in the virtue of universal love. He refers to this verse:

> **Q. 2. 177**: "It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces to the East and the West; but righteous is he who believeth in Allah and the Last Day and the angels and the Scripture and the Prophets; and giveth his wealth, for love of Him, to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and to those who to ask, and to set slaves free; and observeth proper worship and payeth the poor due. And those who keep their treaty when they make one, and the patient in tribulation and adversity and time of stress. Such are they who are sincere. Such are the Godfearing."
>
> **Q. 76. 8-10**: "And feed with food the needy wretch, the orphan and the prisoner, for love of Him, (Saying): We feed you for the sake of Allah only. We wish for no reward nor thanks from you; Lo! we fear from our Lord a day of frowning and of fate."

The high art of giving. All the major religious traditions stress strong reprobation of indifference to poverty and of hard-heartedness in not alleviating the witnessed sufferings caused by sickness, old age, oppression and hunger. The imagery of Hell, a common feature of most religious scriptures, testify to the universal condemnation of the individual who remains impassive in the face of those who happen to be

mired in psychological and material insufficiencies. But the moral impulses, like those signified by the verses quoted above, happen to be motivated, not by a categorical imperative generated by conscience but by fear of provoking the ire of the Almighty God. They fail to convince as being the best of what Charity can achieve. According to the Dharmas the ethos of giving, of helping, of feeling empathy, is uni-directional, with the giving as its own finality. The act of giving must not be qualified by fear of any of the supreme Deities in the world view of the Brahmanist. *The act of giving must be effortless, carried out with unqualified spontaneity, with complete freedom. The gift is its own finality. It does not expect anything in return. The receiver is neither expected not entitled to return the favor.* The subtlety of the ethics of giving entails at the same time that the receiver of benefaction must not be ungrateful: ingratitude is a weighty sin.[44]

The art of compassion. Since more than a thousand years before the birth of Muhammad, Buddhism and Jainism have been teaching and institutionalizing ways of compassion with a prodigious emphasis unequalled by any previous or subsequent dispensation. There is no evidence in the thought of the Mawlānā of any sign of his having ever been moved by the limitless compassion of the Jaina towards even the lowliest living creature. Educated westerners feel overwhelmed when they witness a Jaina monk holding a delicate chowrie which he uses to displace a possible miniscule insect from a seat before he occupies it. Such a scrupulous respect for life, which can only have been initiated and practiced for more than twenty-five centuries, can only have arisen on the soil which made the way of the Jaina ethos possible, without the help and benediction of a celestial divinity. The Jaina reverence for Life, in all its expressions, without any exception, symbolizes the pinnacle of the Dharma spirituality of India, of tolerance and of compassion for all forms of life. Compared to its Himalayan height all other ethical teachings are mere wrinkles on the vast lowland.

Critique of the presence of Allah's mercy in the Believer. Unabashed the Mawlānā would make one believe that "great is the stress laid on the presence in man of the quality of *Raḥmat* (Mercy)". Indeed on no other attribute of God does the Quran lay as much stress as it does on the attribute of Mercy. The references to it occur in more than 300

[44] The *Mahābhārata* considers "ingratitude to be a sin as unforgivable as are the killing of the Guru, the killing of a woman, the killing of a foetus.

places in the Quran; and if we include other attributes which in one form or another are concomitants of it, such as providence, benevolence, forbearance, and forgiveness, the number enlarges, so much so, that the Quran from cover to cover assumes the role of but a single unified message of divine mercy. Indeed, the life and teaching of the Prophet of Islam may be expressed in a phrase: "worship of One God and love of His creation."[45] But the Quran appealing to the Believer to wage war against the *Dar-ul-Harb* until the whole world becomes a *Dar-ul-Islam* negates most, if not all, of the claims that the distinguishing attribute of Allah is mercy. To begin with, Muhammad's unforgiving and harsh treatment of the enemies who were most of the time Jews and Christians does not represent, in any manner of obliging casuistry, any semblance of mercy. The heavy history of the iconoclastic ravages in the name of Allah further belie the Mawlānā's sentimentally adverting Mercy as the distinguishing trait of Allah.

The Mawlānā refers to a Hadith which states that the mercy of God is for those who show mercy to God's creatures. He argues in favor of the Hadith reflecting Jesus Christ's saying: "Show kindness to those who live on earth, so that he who is in Heaven may show kindness to you".

> In the same vein the Prophet of Islam says: "Graciously kind is God, the Holy, the High. Show kindness to those on earth so that Divine grace may descend upon you from above."

The Mawlānā epitomizes the Islamic notion of Grace, by his saying: "The fact is that the basis of devotion to God, according to the Quran, rests on the idea that the aim of human life is to reflect in one's own thought and activity the attributes of God. The quality which distinguishes man from the mere animal and which gives him his pre-eminent station in the scale of life is his humanity,

---

[45] BCQ, p. 64. While quoting the Mawlānā's enthusiastic celebration of the Quran, I was involuntarily reminded of the American Jesuit priest, Fr. Ward Michael Bond who was reading the Quran on the opposite side of the table where I was reading an article, in the small library of the Centre for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University. That was in the fall of 1967. Fr. Bond was posted in Chile and had taken a six-month leave for a refresher course at the Centre. Suddenly he closed the Quran with a sharp gesture and exclaimed: "Esta fuego! Esta fuego!" ('It's fire! It's fire!'). He whistled and shook his head, when I told him the three Muslim scholars at the Centre were there for doctoral work in non-Islamic religions and they believed the Quran was the most saintly of all books. After my remark, Fr. Bond laughed.

which the Quran styles as the spirit of God."

And this is the verse on which he makes such a portentous claim:

> **Q. 32. 8-9**: "Then He made his seed from a draught of despised fluid; Then He fashioned him and breathed into him of his spirit; and appointed for you hearing and sight and hearts. Small thanks give ye!"[46]

There can be no humanity in the Believer who kills with the assurance of his being innocent for being the proxy of Allah who is doing the killing*:* **Q. 8. 17***:* Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them. And thou Muhammad) thrwest not when thou didst throw, but Allah threw, that H might test the believers by a fair test from him. Lo ! Allah is Hearer, Knower,

Nor can there be any semblance of Humanity suffusing the soul of Muhammad who waged thirty-six wars. Moreover in relation to the above mentioned verses of the Holy Book, the association of Mercy with both Allah and His Messenger is a cynical affirmation of moral insensitivity, when one compares the Quranic view of the merciful Muslim with the Bodhisattva who dedicates himself to the salvation of all suffering sentient beings.

The Quranic explanation of the creation of Man does certainly present a more humane creation than Adam's as described in the Book of Genesis of the Bible. It is even a more respectable description of the nature of Man than Aristotle defining Man as a rational animal. But the Quran does not, and cannot, postulate a better, or higher, or more spiritual personalism than the Brahmanist's celebration of Man as the dwelling place of the Supreme Being as *antaryāmī*. In the catalogue of humanities there cannot be any higher than the native Indian humanity defined as the space for the realization of such absolutes as *mokṣa, as nirvāṇa or as ṣūnyatā, and as kaivalya*. The concept and the realization of the *antaryāmī* is anathema for the submitting Believer. The large tradition of mysticism in the Christian tradition may enable the pious Christian to understand and welcome the Brahmanist claim and experience of self-fulfillment as the immediate knowing of the *antaryāmī*. Nevertheless there is nothing in the history of Christianity which enables the faithful congregation to admit the cogency of the specific, unrivalled notion of the "formless" (*nirākā*ra) Ultimate Reality or Supreme Being. The *nirākāra* Supreme Being is specific to

---

[46] BCQ, pp. 64-65

Brahmanism: it represents one of the Himalayan peaks of native Indian thought.

The comparison of the Islamic and the Indian cosmologies. The Mawlānā does not refer to the Brahmanist cosmology of the world being the outcome of the churning of the cosmic ocean of milk, out of which all things come into existence in their fullest maturity. The native Indian cosmology bears no relation to the *Origin of the Species* of Charles Darwin (1809-82). In fact the theory of the evolution of Man from the Ape has not in the least been a matter of discussion or concern among the followers of the three indigenous Dharmas. In particular the Brahmanist cosmology of Creation being produced by the Gods and the Demons churning the Ocean of Milk presents the existence of the fully grown human being, together with the co-existence of Goodness and Evil being concomitant with the churning. All that exists has come from the Ocean of Milk, in contrast with the Old Testament proposition of Chaos preceding the creation of the World. Without contradicting the ethereal concept of the World being issued from the churning of the Ocean of Milk, according to the popular Brahmanist myth, the mystical proclamation of the *Mahābhārata* provides the elevated thought of there having been no time when the ONE was not, and there will never be a time when IT will not be.[47]

Man's body in Islam and in Bahmanism. Far nobler is the Brahmanist view of the human body made up of the five Elements, in contrast to the 'despised fluid' dear to the Quran and to Allah. The Brahmanist tradition honors the substance of the body with incineration when it dies and the ashes scattered into running water, often in a river, or cast into the sea, thereby returning the body to its original sources. Such a treatment of the body bespeaks the high level of sophistication of Brahmanist thought which, together with the subsequent two Dharmas, celebrates the matter of the body as a karma-designed abode holding the essence of the Absolute Reality.

The poetic beauty and the philosophic conception of the creation myth of the Brahmanist lore derive from the evocation of simultaneous product of the ambrosia which gives immortality and of the poison as

[47] Vide Chapter 2 of the *Bhagavad Gītā*.

the evil threat to all living beings. Fortunately, the latter instantly is awarded security and safe-keeping by the magnanimity of Lord Śiva who offers to hold the cosmic poison in his throat. And the poison was so virulent that it turned His throat blue and, consequently, Śiva became affectionately known in Brahmanist culture as *nīlakaṇṭha* Mahādeva.

In a marked difference from the revealed religions, particularly and fortunately from Islam with its obdurate, divinely ordered violence, Brahmanist cosmology does not burden the Supreme Being with the cares of overseeing Man's charity and graciousness. Nor does it aggrandize the power of Īśvara with a might equal to the absolute sovereignty of Allah extending its ubiquitous authority to the smallest flutter of a leaf on a tree or to the minutest thought of the Believer. It teases the mind that the revealed verses do not refer to Allah's *Rubūbiyat* (Sovereinty) and *Taqdīr* (Measure) in the experience of the Believer's experiences of sleeping and in dreaming. In harmony with the impermanence of Time as the stuff of existence, the Brahmanist Man is a free agent, with all his actions and intentions being regulated according to the stern Law of Karma, operating in his singular intimations. The causality of Goodness and of Evil pertains to his sole responsibility: it is this moral independence that today does, to a great measure, sustain, with spontaneous consent, the peaceful response to the imperatives of electoral representation under the jurisdiction of the 1950 Constitution.

The glorious usefulness of the Purāṇas. Brahmanist Purāṇas fulfill the beneficent purpose of offering a large array of mythic examples which conduce to the attractiveness of mystic experience. It is left to the freedom of the ordinary Brahmanist to be sufficiently attracted by the beauty of the meaningful narrations for him to integrate their elegance as adornment of his own existence. The magnificence of the divine essence is, in mystical self-fulfillment, homogeneous with humaneness, the pathos of how a supremely elevated Brahmanist spirituality could have been so ravaged and despoiled by the exclusive, harsh, fossilized legalism dispensed by the Quran and the Hadiths**.** It is disturbingly astonishing that the Indian historiography would have not yet fully brought this stupendous irony to the mind of the common people. Nor does the irony strike the imagination of the Muslims living in the countries which have borrowed certain principles of democratic rules from the West. Neither in their revealed laws, nor in their consciousness, do they have the viewpoint enabling a rational critique of their "democratic" constitutions constituting the oxymoron of their

being blended with Islamic theocratic imperatives.

The influence of the Ācāryas and the forest-dwellers. The virtues celebrated by the Dharmas are inculcated by the ancient sages, superlatively meritorious men and women, and the noble Ācāryas, who selflessly offered their own actions of benevolence, and the normative examples of the lives of mythic deities, as incentives for the willing mimesis by the seeker of mystic knowing. The unique gift of the forest-dwellers (*vānaprastha*), men and women contemplatives unconstrained by the history and the geography of the land, calls for deserving recognition. Its peacefulness, its magnanimity, its wealth of esoteric learning, its civilizing ardor, have molded the graciousness of the Indian mind to the extent, for example, of its bursting forth in the life and purpose of Mahatma Gandhi as the personalization of authentic Peace and *Ahiṁsā*. The difference was huge, between, on one side, these two values, as movers of the Brahmanist people in their epic moral response to, on the other side, the combined devilries of British power allied to middle class Muslim fanaticism. It brings forth the Mawlānā's consequential boasting of the Quran without his using a single word to explain how and why its verses got used, in favor of Allah enjoining the obliteration of the indigenous institutions of high leaning and of corresponding aesthetic masterworks.

The difference between the avatāra of Viṣṇu in Brahmanism and of Jehovah in the Revelations. In an infinite contrast buttressed with providential influence, the Brahmanist way of life, inspired by the allurement of mystical finality, has been the gift, to India and to all Humanity, with the certitude of the descent of God, as the favored deity (*iṣṭa devatā*), into the seeker as the homogeneous in-dweller, as the transcendental essence of the singular devotee. This descent takes place in the psyche of the individual, it is not a historical event embracing a race (as Jesus among the Jews) or a community or nation (as Allah's revelation for the Kaum). Independently of history and of geography, the descent is experienced by the devotee as the end of his striving and attainment of self-fulfillment. Based on the individual's personal appropriation of the transcendental ontological benefaction as the *antaryāmī*, the specific Indian tradition does today maintain the pursuit of the variety of vaulting mystical passions stimulated by the Indian Dharmas. In contrast to-day an impressive literature has emerged in Western Europe in relation to the disaffection raging within the Christian fold despite the dogmatic claim of the uniqueness of the opportunity for universal salvation resulting from the original Word becoming Flesh in

History. The disenchantment within the Christian Ecclesia is certainly due to the historicity of the divinity attributed to Jesus Christ. It turns out that the historicizing of the advent of Jesus must have, after two thousand years, finally sated the traditional fervor and initiated an indifference as one more item in the upsurge of confusion as to what is Truth in the estimation of ecclesiastical authority. On the other hand there is the transcendental mystery of the Universal One choosing to spread Its radiance by settling Its soul in the fertile soil of the Land of Bharata as the in-dweller of every soul. It is the absence of the Holy Spirit in the soul of every faithful Christian which has given rise to a universal sense of spiritual barrenness.

The difference between the general alienation within the Church and the popularity of namaz in Islam. The consumerist culture of the Western Humanity is enhanced with a host of opportunities for the moral and aesthetic satisfactions with the use of secular boons proceeding from the works of men and women in the sciences, in the fine arts, in the industries, in high secular learning. Shared by much of the rest of the world, the material benefits have arisen from the secular intelligence and competence at levels higher than what is available in the management of the ecclesiastical bureaucracies. Set against the supremacy of the culturally ennobling advantages, the Christian now increasingly finds little attraction of whatever the Church proposes as singularly elevating and challenging. On the other hand, the Muslim does not feel constricted in relation to the desirability of participating in the fine arts or in high philosophical learning. He is satisfied with the ease of the revelation having been hostile to the fine arts, particularly the arts of representation, and of any learning or knowledge which would challenge the absolutist contents of the Quran which claims to hold all that needs to be known and all that it reveals is the perfect, eternal Truth. The Believer is contented with the Quran representing the definitive excellence of all that needs knowing, and he is further encouraged to dwell in this scarcity of fine arts, while being prudently attracted by secular knowledges, under the aegis of his submission to believe in the revelation. The individual Muslim is afraid to yield to the attractiveness of secular profane learning and its ancillary benefits. He denies to himself the private possession of his autonomous responsibility and his independent social conduct, out of fear of being assailed as an apostate.

The joy bestowed by the ONE. Unburdened by the negative idea of apostasy, and favored with the well-entrenched belief in the all-pervasive ONE, the Brahmanist does heartily maintain his religious fidelity, for example, to the attractiveness of music and other fine arts

associated with the rituals and, in particular, with the joyfulness of companionship with the favorite deity represented by the Idol. Westerners who visit India are immensely surprised to see the Brahmanist temples being always crammed with unregimented crowds eager to have the *darśana* (the seeing) of the divinity in the worshipped image.

The difference between Allah and the *iṣṭa devatā* in Brahmanism. The Muslim submits to the decrees of Allah, believed to be an able-bodied Arab personality who lives in the far depth of the Cosmos and, by means of his *Rubūbiyat* and *Taqdīr,* fashions the particulars of the Believer's following the Straight Path. And Allah communicated His laws and rules in the Arabic language to Muhammad. The Brahmanist uses his own reason and sensibility to enact the mimesis of the perfections illustrated in the lives of the mythic heroes brought to life in his imagination as delightful stirrings inspiring the best possible way to sit, to walk, to speak.[48]

However, the manner, in which the Mawlānā explains and lauds the virtue of graciousness, according to both the Prophet and Jesus Christ, disconcerts the non-Islamic giver's mind by its being a bargain struck as a commercial transaction. Perhaps this could have been an unreflecting theological habit on his part, because Muhammad, having begun his career as a businessman, visualized the morality of practicing graciousness towards the neighbor *in order* to be worthy of God's grace *in return*. The gracious act is not such a gift as that which, in the economy of Brahmanism, is offered without the recipient's obligation to return the indebtedness, nor is it offered with the giver expecting any reciprocity on the part of the recipient. The Muslim's art of giving is motivated by the expectation of Allah's grace as a reward.

Carried out with the desire to acquire Allah's obliging graciousness the benevolent act of the Muslim has no common element with the ethereal *niṣkāma karma* of the Brahmanist, or of the Buddhist, or of the Jaina. Caraka, the founder of Indian Medicine, defines action or karma as a categorical, unconditional act: *kartavya eva karma, na anyad adhiṣye. (i.e. karma is the categorical obligation to do what has to be done, without any external constraint*). In these six words Caraka gives the supreme definition of Karma as a categorical obligation to do what

[48] In reference to *Bhagavad Gītā,* 2. 54, where Arjuna asks Kṛṣṇa how the perfect Man sits, walks, speaks.

must be done, without the obligation being directed or imposed by any external agency. It means that the Karmika act is itself the obligation of its unqualified fullness.[49]

The moral action in Brahmanism as a measure of action according to Islam. The moral action of the Muslim is equivalent to a merchant's business *quid pro quo.* Whether it is acted out in the Muslim or in the Christian way, grace is an act of conformity with an *external, material* goal, with a desire to please God, and to earn His grace in return. The Brahmanist offers the instruction required for the experience of the ultimate bliss as a spontaneity which does not seek a reward: the instruction for the crossing over the ocean of transmigration is a gift which asks for nothing in return, for it acts more as a spontaneous, effortless obligation, as the midwife who ushers a life to the world without claiming or exerting any right over the mother or over the infant. The Brahmanist tradition celebrates the lofty tradition according to which it is the Guru who is drawn to instruct the *śiṣya,* instead of the latter seeking the preceptor as the guide steering his striving for self-enlightenment. In practice, it is the Guru who, as the supreme authority over the disciple's *sādhanā,* is revered as a deity. In the scale of veneration in the context of the right spiritual exercise, it does not offend anyone if the faithful disciple evinces greater reverence for his Guru than for the Lord Divine. Only in an Indian dispensation is it indeed a blessing for Humanity that the seeker's ascetic practice responding to the call of mystical fulfillment can be undertaken without the obligation of an obedience to a peerless God, such as Jehovah, the Hebrew God of the Old Testament. Buddhism is the supreme example of a dynamic, universalist spirituality which satisfies all the questions and demands related to the good life without the belief and the support of any deity. It is the *modus operandi* of the striving for the ultimate self-knowing which commands due veneration just because it unveils the substance of the divine presence as the in-dweller. Hence the guide, or the Guru, who leads the experiencing of the mystical progress, deserves, from the disciple, the highest attentiveness and courtesy out of unquestioned gratitude.

The particularity of Buddhism. The august spirituality of the Buddhists testifies to the possibility, if not even more confidently, to the certitude of self-perfecting without the support of a belief in a heavenly

[49] It is absolutely a matter for wonder that all the literature on Hinduism (Brahmanism) do not refer to the brevity of Caraka's definition of Karma in his Samhitā.

Almighty. At the beginning of the XXI century, in the midst of the spiritual estrangement from his Church, the Western Man, anchored in the ease of wealth and of materialistic possibilities, is not moved by the joyfulness of exploring within himself the self-perfection indicated by Buddha's Godless transcendental Middle Way (*madhyama pratipad*). This is because the walls enclosing the Western Man's sensitivities and exclusive propensities can be so impassable. Theology was conceived, designed and taught for the *ecclesia,* the totality of the believers, the Church, not for the singular adherent to the faith. The follower of the Dharmas does not belong to a collectivity: he follows his particular path towards the ultimate perfection of his humanity as a personal experience. The advent of the Individual freeing himself in the XVI century brought for the glories of the Enlightenment: it signified to a large extent the breaking up of the Ecclesia and the triumph of the categories of Good and Evil in relation to the materiality of the body, not to the Ecclesiastic Establishment. The monumental difference between the individuality of the Judeo-Christian and the solitude of the *sādhaka*_consists of the former not having the equivalent of the availability of a guide to show the way to individual mystical plenitude.

An examination of Grace in reference to Buddhism and of its destruction by iconoclastic Islam. Neither the Grace of Allah, nor even Christ's sublime forgiveness of the enemy, reach up to the compassion of Gautama Buddha, *the first promulgator of universal salvation.* According to the legend, Gautama was living in Heaven, in his previous birth, as the Prince Vesantara and from there contemplates the suffering of all sentient beings. Out of his humaneness and sympathy felt for the suffering of all living beings, he decides to come down to Earth to dedicate himself to the task of ending of their suffering. And he is born as a prince called Siddhartha. He lives in luxury, gets married, but leaves his princely life, his wife and his baby son, goes to the forest and after six years of meditation, comes out as the Buddha *(the Awakened One)* and preaches the Four Noble Truths which, by following the Noble Eight-fold Path, leads to Nirvāṇa. He gave to the world the truth of the Middle Way (*madhyama pratipad*) which leads to the end of Suffering. Available to any sentient being the Middle Way does not prescribe any qualifying condition for the individual's free pursuit of a mode of living which, by means of the eight-fold path, leads to a destination well

beyond all aspects of mental and physical suffering.

The beneficent universalism of Buddhism. It is only in a dispensation like Buddhism that the Grace of universal salvation is sought for all beings, as compassion awarded without any relation to reward or recognition. Nirvāṇa or the attainment of the Arhat (*Worthy*) status is not tainted with any thirst for Earthly recognition or for any Heavenly delight. Being beyond language, beyond history, beyond geography, the Middle Path is the genuine, unqualified, Grace which demands no approval by any divinity, for there is none - out there! The Buddhist graciousness is heroic, it does effect, as a banality, the realization of graciousness, not as an effort so much, but as an effortless gift which requires no celestial approval or blessing, or honour or recognition from earthly equals or superiors. *That such a Way of graciousness would have suffered the catastrophic destruction of the Nalanda Centre of Buddhist Studies, together with the massacre of thousands of defenseless monks, learners and students, and the burning of the three Libraries of manuscripts, must be recognized as a monumental repudiation of the reality of Allah's grace in the history of India.*

The unpublished history of Muslim iconoclasm. Not only did Muhammad Bakhtiyar, the general of Sultan Qutb-ud-Din obliterate Nalanda because it did not contain a copy of the Quran, but the Muslims destroyed all the extant Universities and Centres of Learning. Throughout their eight centuries of their hegemony the Indian Muslims did not build a single school, let alone a university. They finally acquired a high school, which later was transformed into the Aligarh Muslim University, as a benefaction bestowed by the British authorities. Nevertheless the diminution of Indian civilization by Muslim power remains an indelible fact which no amount of hair splitting argument in favor of whatever contribution they may claim to have made. The Taj Mahal is not a compensation of a single center of learning disappearing by reason of the Muslims submitting to the laws and rules revealed by Allah.

At best such a barbaric iconoclasm, practiced so often, as sacred Quranic duty, qualifies as a glorified constituent of the Believer's *Imān*

(faith). Displaying a superficial interpretation of the ethics of Jesus, Mawlānā Azad finds it easy to associate the *Raḥmat* of Allah with the Grace exalted by the spirit of the Beatitudes of the Gospel. He abstains from referring to the fossilized Indian Christianity, in conjunction with the missionaries sponsored by the London Missionary Society. Concurrently he prudently remains silent over all the genocidal famines engineered by the looting and the taxing perpetrated by the votaries of Anglican Christianity, in loyal service to the King or Queen, Defender of the Faith. There is no oral or written history of oppression practiced by Buddhists in more than twenty-five centuries. On the contrary in the lands where it spread and was adopted by the different peoples endowed with their specific cultures and ways of life, it gave rise to a variety of synthetic adaptations represented by their particular literatures, arts, ceremonials, without in any way disturbing the previously existing cultural formations. That is how all of Asia came to own and develop its different Buddhisms. The iconography of the Buddha figure illustrates the cultural independence of the Buddhism flourishing in every specific country endowed with its particular cultural tradition.

Forgiveness in Islam in a contrast with the new moral doctrine of Jesus. Mawlānā Azad is defensive in regard to Jesus preaching against the law of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and advocating the higher alternative of enhancing the merit of the virtue of resistance to evil. It must have shocked the Jews of his time when Jesus preached the eminently surprising worthiness of turning the right cheek when the other is slapped. Furthermore Jesus went against the long standing Jewish tradition with the novelty of loving the neighbor as the brother, which is easy to be endorsed by anyone. But his proposition of loving the enemy, of blessing those who curse, of doing good to those who hurt, of praying for those who spitefully abuse and persecute, was in reality turning upside down the prevailing moral tradition (**Matthew, 5. 38-40**). Jesus was in truth preaching an ethos of peace and of loving-kindness in an environment pregnant with the Jewish law of talion. The Quran actually hardens the *lex talionis* with an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, an ear for an ear, a nose for a nose, a wound for a wound. With the new revelation given to Muhammad, the terrible law was further

exacerbated by an Arab society of mostly merchants fostering and resisting the frequent occurrences of razzias, in which no quarters were given or received.

In the Quran the injunctions which the Mawlānā quotes as Allah's claiming equivalence with the precepts of Jesus are:

Q. 3. 134: "Those who spend (of that which Allah hath given them) in ease and in adversity, those who control their wrath and are forgiving toward mankind; Allah loveth the good."

Q. 41. 34-35: "The good deed and the evil deed are not alike. Repel the evil deed with one which is better, then lo! he, between whom and thee there was enmity (will become) as though he was a bosom friend. But none is granted it save the owner of great happiness."

However, in the mercantile environment in which Muhammad had been brought up, he must have come across the profound difference between the *lex talionis* of the Jews and Jesus advocating forgiveness of the enemy. Since he institutionalized the Jewish law of the eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, in the Islamic penal code, the Prophet would have deemed it necessary to make a reference to the original, elevated thought which Jesus, unexpectedly, introduced in a culture dominated by the traditional Rabbis. Hence the involved, timid references in the Quranic revelations mentioned above. They do not exhort forgiveness with the commanding power of a categorical absoluteness which transcends all possible circumstantial mitigations of the effects of an offense. The forgiveness of the enemy arose from the humanity of Jesus, which was a novel, revolutionary ideal proclaimed in an inimical environment. He claimed it did come to him from his Father in Heaven. The only other authentic similitude of the forgiveness of Jesus had earlier arisen, a century earlier, in the Mahāyāna ideal of the Bodhisattva who undertook the unencumbered task of the salvation of all sentient beings qualified as being endowed with the Buddha-essence, with the terminology of the Kingdom of Heaven being identified with the individual's self-essence (*svabhāva*). In short, Jesus was advocating the mystical finality of the experience of the Kingdom of Heaven in an environment nurtured by the legalism of the Old Testament, where the Kingdom was interpreted as literally being what the word signified, not as the mystical experience Jesus meant it to be.

The meaning of forgiveness in mystical humanity. Forgiveness

of the enemy owes its reason to the belief in the reality of the offender having, despite the offense which he has committed, the same essence as the forgiver's and the Father's. In comparison the 'forgiveness' in the Quran is only an apology for Muhammad's coy acquaintance with Jesus hurling an adamantine blow at Yahweh's talion. The Prophet used his nine swords frequently against the Jews and the Christians. He could not have had the imagination to grasp the sublime word of Jesus nailed on a wooden cross and pleading with his Father to forgive those who did not know what they were doing to him. In a just measure of the contrast, this is the law of talion as stated in the Quran: And we prescribed for them therein: The life for the life, and the eye for the eye, and the nose for the nose, and the ear for the ear, and the tooth for the tooth, and for wounds retaliation. But whoso forgoeth it (in the way of charity) it shall be expiation for him. Whoso judgeth not by that which Allah hath revealed: such are the wrong-doers. (**17. 33**)

The meaning of the Partition violence. During the murderous mayhem of the Partition of the sub-continent the world became witness to an enactment of the original Arab insensitivity to Jesus preaching the adoption of forgiveness as the response to an offence. That enormous insensitivity was evident in the free use of swords, machetes, arsons, rapes, of the wanton killing of non-Muslims in the face of the utter ineffectiveness of the *Mahatma's politics of ahiṁsā.* Hannah Arendt is certainly mistaken in arguing that Mahatma Gandhi would not have prevailed against Hitler or any like dictator. Her clichéd argument, endorsed by other western historians, philosophers and sociologists, consists of arguing that the Mahatma happened to be lucky in acting against the law abiding and moral British opponent. All of them thought and wrote under the bias that, compared to Hitler, the British rulers were all tender, innocent choir boys, forgetting that Hitler lustily supported the rudeness of British treatment of "lesser", inferior races. In reality the British were, perhaps with a slight veneer of propriety, more ruthless than the Nazis. The Nazis killed the Jews themselves. Himmler circulated a letter addressed to all the members of the SS Troupers asking them to be rational, patriotic and heroic in not being emotionally disturbed by their having to eliminate the Jews as a necessary duty. The British authorities – as well as the French in their colonies – made the Indians kill Indians. On 10 April 1919, at the Jalianwalla Bagh the unarmed victims were mowed down by Hindu and Gurkha soldiers obediently serving the sadistic British commander General Reginald

Dwyer.

The hollowness and the ineptitude of Hannah Arendt's shallow criticism of the effectiveness of Mahatma Gandhi's pacifism. From an Indian point of view, compared to Churchill who singularly engineered the Bengal genocidal famine, Hitler was a saint.[50]

Arendt did not have the sagacity to argue why not Gandhi, the person, but why "Gandhiism", did not manifest itself against Hitler by, for example, the Pope Pius XII, or the Protestant and Catholic Archbishops of Germany. In other words, while the entire structure of the Christian faiths rested on the *sacrifice of Jesus* – a feature which does not exist in any of the Indian Dharmas – no one in Christendom so much as evoked the IDEA of a high dignitary of the Church committing himself to *his self-sacrifice* as an opposition to mass violence against defenseless, innocent populations. Gandhi appeared in a tradition which has, for several millennia, prescribed and nurtured renunciation as a requisite for the pursuit of the spiritual self-fulfillment. The notion, the willingness to forego pleasures, wealth, family and social bonds, come easy to the followers of the three indigenous Dharmas. Gandhi's constant searching for the higher reaches of living, by means of straining his physique, was imitated by the *satyagrahis* who were trained to face police brutality without uttering a single word of anger. Filmed documentaries happen to be still available as testimony of this unique form of heroic, sublime political protest.

However Arendt could have sought support for her argument in referring to the example of Jinnah's determined Direct Action or *jihad* against the peacefulness adopted by the Hindu political parties. Further support to Arendt's argument may be adduced with the further example of the majority of the Muslims pouring contempt on the Mahatma's *politics of ahiṁsā* in the practice of their untrammeled violence which resulted in mass rape, arson, murderous rampage, culminating in a million dead and fifteen million men and women refugees. Hannah Arendt's argument, that the British could bend and yield to the power of *ahiṁsā*, gets debunked when the British power, victorious in Europe

[50] For a description of Churchill's responsibility in the Bengal Famine (Genocide) see Madhushree Mukherjee's Churchill's Secret War, Perseus Book Group, New York, 2010. A heavier indictment of the brutalities characteristic of British imperial rule is available in Caroline Elkins' *Legacy of Violence: A Study of the British Empire*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2022.

against the Nazis, sided with the brazenly Fascist Muslim League and the majority of the Indian Muslims, in their willing toleration, if not encouragement, of the Muslim orgies of burning, killing and destroying without restraint. Arendt was, as a Western intellectual, ignorant of the profundity of the Indian soul. In particular, she had no idea of the predominant concept of the ONE, of all that exists as a PLENITUDE which has always been and will always Be. It was manifest in her indifference to the Hindu ethos and in her sympathy for the former British conqueror. She could not evince the least reservation in denouncing the Gandhian pacifism for she ignored, or chose to ignore, the known abundance of the spoliations and brutalities inflicted by the merciless British rule. That the Indians enabled the British to leave the Empire like gentlemen was an extension of the Gandhian non-violence which was implemented without an iota of hatred. And Arendt was utterly unable to even imagine that the spirit and the essence of the Gandhian saga was the manifestation of a pacifism which has its roots in the ancient lore of the sub-continent which gave to Humanity the only universalist civilization. It was that metaphysical universalism which Mahatma Gandhi had the rare intelligence to bring forth as the virtuous power of Truth and *Ahiṁsā*, the leitmotivs of the *Mahābhārata* Epic, as beneficent forces pitted against the might of a mortiferous evil power. He had the genius to give to these two moral forces a body - His! The Gandhian incarnation of Truth and *Ahiṁsa* is of such a height, that it will require the distance of centuries for historians to be able to look back and adequately wonder that such an event had indeed happened. These two superlative categories had always dwelt in the collective psyche of the Indians as the eternal cherished values of the nonpareil universalist culture of the sub-continental people. Mahatma Gandhi was the avatar of the ancient spirituality enshrined in the Vedas and bequeathed to a people who never went beyond their homeland to harm anyone for their profit and glory. In her disdain of the Gandhian pacifism Hannah Arendt did in reality expose the moral bankruptcy of the European civilization. Further her reprobation of the Gandhian pacific use of the *Ahiṁsā* virtue, as a weapon against the brutish force of British rule, was effective in unveiling the important admission of the central fact of the Western civilization never having had *peace* as its defining cultural category. Hannah Arendt and her peers failed to refer,

in their decadent rejection of the Gandhian *ahiṁsā,* to *Force* as the characteristic definition of Western civilization. And Homer's *Iliad* is the recognized definition of the spirit of Western culture in its glorification of Force. Agamemnon, the leader of the Greek army, sacrifices his own daughter Iphigenia, in order to propitiate the Gods to raise the wind to swell the sails of the ships carrying the Greeks to cross the seas and bring down the topless towers of the Troyans. And the two leitmotivs of the *Mahābhārata* are: "Truth is the Supreme Dharma" and "*Ahiṁsā* is the Supreme Dharma".

The Quranic view of the enemy compared with the Christian meaning of forgiveness. The scholarship and knowledge of the Islamic scripture clouds the imagination of Mawlānā Azad in his laboring to marshal the Quranic way to deal with enmity with the aid of such vague responses as proposed by the verses mentioned above. The Mawlānā fails to grasp that Jesus was not only proposing forgiveness as a feel-good experience on the part of the offended. But more profoundly, within the world vision of Jesus, the act of forgiving consists of the forgiver's moral strength being exerted in the transfiguration of the offender into a person animated, in the response to his being forgiven, with noble sentiments, with his rising above the earlier evil impulses or inclinations, to the status of a newly born benefactor. In truth the act of forgiving brings about the conversion of the offender to a higher state of being. On the cross, in the darkness of his immense suffering, Jesus was actually expressing the virtue of the *Mahāpuruṣa* who, like Gautama Buddha, has the merit of instantaneously convert an evil-doer into a wholesome good-doer. Such a preeminent moral category is absent in the Quran, in the *Sahih Muslim* and in the Sirah of the Prophet.

The sublime act of Jesus on the Cross. During the four hours that Jesus lay suspended with his hands and feet nailed to the cross, Jesus nevertheless had the clear conscience of appealing for the forgiveness of his tormentors. He appealed for the meta-psychic transformation which, operated in the offender, arises from the forgiving act as a redemption of the offence. The forgiver does not mechanically turn away from the offender and from the situation in which the offense happens to have been committed. His beneficence exerts a transformative power which erases the offence and restores to the offender the integrity of his

authentic personality which had been diminished by his offending action or thought, or speech. Muhammad and, consequently, the Mawlānā, fail to grasp that the forgiving is a repair of the broken self of the offender and a grace-full act of restoring the offender to his wholeness. It is a repair which only the forgiver can bring about. Forgiveness does have the virtue to eliminate the very reason, however justified, of punishing even the worst offence. Jesus, the *Mahāpuruṣa,* in appealing for the forgiveness of the participants in his martyrdom, set the norm for all men and women, for all time. Jesus further enhances the sublime worth of the act of forgiving with the humility of not attributing to himself the source of the forgiveness, but with the prayer to his Father for accomplishing his last earthly wish. Indeed there is not in the whole history of Islam which supersedes in moral depth this cosmic-shaking gesture of Jesus on the Cross.

With his preference for the Quran's ineffectual proposition in favor of a mitigation of the law of retaliation, Mawlānā Azad demonstrates, perhaps unintentionally, how unrealistic has it been for the Quran to claim moral and spiritual preeminence in relation to the two preceding revelations: the Jewish and the Christian. It does actually represent a qualitative regression in regard to the universal brotherhood preached by Jesus. Besides Muhammad totally ignored the Christianity of the sweet Jesus of the first three centuries, before Constantine in the year 323 made the new dispensation the ideology of the State. From then on, with few exceptions down the centuries, Christians have - most unfortunately - been giving to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and giving also to Caesar what belongs to God. In Islam, with His *Rububīyat* and *Taqdī*r, Allah is both God and Caesar.

The meaning of retaliation according to the Quran. Mawlānā Azad states that security of life justifies retaliation, while providing the rider that forgiveness could be a better alternative. This becomes manifest when the retaliation is carried out with the same measure of the harm endured by the victim, though it would be better if the victim endures the offense patiently.

> **Q. 16. 126-127**: "If you punish, then punish with the like of that wherewith ye were afflicted. But if ye endure patiently, verily it is better for the patient. Endure thou patiently (O Muhammad). Thine endurance is only by (the help of) Allah.

Grieve not for them, and be not in distress because of that which they devise."

The Mawlānā extols the verses above in defense of his belief that the Quran proposes forgiveness commensurable with Jesus's revolutionary advocacy of forgiveness against the power of the Jewish Orthodoxy which has till the present upheld the *lex talionis*. There is one question, and one only, which does refute such a pallid apology proffered by the Quran as the rejoinder to the endurance of a malefaction: *what offense did the Brahmanists, the Buddhists, the Jainas commit that the 'enduring', 'patient' Muslims responded with the iconoclasms which ravaged their institutions, their temples, their universities and centers of high learning, their civilization? For what kind of Islamic achievement, beside his ravages and his lootings of the wealth of India, did Ghaznavid Mahmud receive praises and honors showered upon him by the Caliph? To what offence did Nadir Shah react into coming from so far to wreak a large scale massacre and looting? What prejudice did the Hindus cause to the Muslims for Jinnah to declare that Muslims cannot live with Hindus and accordingly, like a latter day Dajjal, unleashed his Kaum to wreak mayhem for the realization of Partition?*

The Quran and the Bible. It is always possible to press a desired interested meaning into one's belief in order to make it worthy of a favorable comparison with a more humane or more prestigious ideology. Hindu academics did indulge in such an exercise during the early decades of the XX century when, after the discovery of the original *Arthaśāstra* of Cānakya, and its hasty comparison with Machiavelli's *The Prince*, they declared that India too had a historical tradition on the same level as European history. They could not muster the right argument and the intellectual faith to claim, with prideful justification, that, universalist India had, since the earliest recorded time, a genuinely creative predilection for Myth, instead of History. In reality, instead of an equivalence with what obtains in Western culture, the Indian had always been guided by a *Weltanschauung* fixed on a higher intellectual and moral ground which the Western scholarship has not yet fully understood. It is not an exaggeration to trumpet that, in the native Indian civilization and culture, *History becomes concretely alive in the individual's bringing down, into his daily existence, the values and*

virtues of his well-chosen exalted Myth. This is a process of the individual pursuing the dynamic experience of an elevated value as his personal culture as an addition and enhancement of the collective culture, in a tradition which has eluded the attention of the academic in the Western educational and learning institutions. The myth awakens the Ontological Reality as *antaryāmī,* or *nirvāṇa,* or *kaivalya* and gives meaning to ordinary existence and thus sustains the Dharmas as constituents of existence. It is the individual's concrete experience which is *universal*, and it is profitable for the larger community or nation as *History.* There is no Ontological Reality in the life of the Individual in Christianity which got reduced, ironically, but fatefully, since the very beginning of its history, to merely attributing a moral dimension to its centralized ecclesiastical power centered in money and in political influence. In a culture which associates Goodness with the materialistic pursuits of Capitalism or Socialism, in spite of the history of their violent internecine conflicts and wars, it became inevitable that the disenchantment with the Church would have become an unavoidable trend towards an ambience of melancholy. Muslims flock to their mosques because of their enthusiasm of repeating the very words of Allah and, furthermore because they have little satisfying substance in their modes of living which are authentically Islamic. The feeling of a wanting becomes evident in their always seeking satisfaction in non-Islamic societies for the immediate enjoyment of the ease of the mind and of the body. In their own majority countries they establish a sort of ambiguous democratic pattern of government under the sovereignty of Allah and of the fundamentals of the Revelation. The Mosque provides the only opportunity for their identity constituted of their collective submission to the laws and rules prescribed by Allah. These enjoin the exhilarating, innocent conviction that hating the Other is a virtuous act, with the exhilarating feeling of freedom derived from the knowledge of acting as Allah's proxy. It must be extraordinarily exciting for the Muslim to feel the intoxicating freedom to hate the Other, gratuitously, and thereby pleasing to the Only God. The divine prescription to hate the Other must be a most powerful emotion in the ordinary mode of the Muslim's living.

The emotional elegance of a reverse Ontological Reality. The Muslim goes to the mosque which mirrors the promise of a *reverse* Ontological Reality characterized by the happiness of submission to the revealed injunctions to kill and shed the blood of the Other. It is the utmost contradiction of the *habeas corpus* of the Anglo-American jurisprudence, of which the Indian Constitution is a member. Such a

happiness, even if multiplied a million fold, is not worth an iota of the bliss of the Brahmanist's *saccidānanda,* or the Buddhist's *nirvāṇa,* or the Jaina's *kaivalya.* There cannot be any more exalted happiness than the mystical finalities of the indigenous Dharmas, with the mystical finalities being free from the limitations of the Space and the History of the Dharmas. In a legitimate association with these finalities, the mystical finality of such Christian mystics as Meister Eckhart's is on a par with the Indian mystical tradition. There is no vanity, or empty praise, in claiming the significant ontology of the mystical experiences of the Dharmas and of the Eckhartian Theology: they express genuine, concrete, abundantly recorded expositions of the variety of mystical conclusions of earthly life. They are experience which confirm the common essentiality of all races, of all cultures, in a convincing repudiation of all limitations and exclusions unnecessarily imposed by Dogmas and exclusivist Doctrines which justify hatred as faithfulness to Truth.

This essay stresses the Maulana being at pains to prove that the Quran does own religious equivalence with the Bible, the sole source of all the religious intolerances and their baneful consequences. His interpreter, Syed Abdul Latif says:

> ''There is really no difference between the teachings of the Quran and the teachings of Christ. The injunctions of both are the same. Only, the style employed in expression and the occasion for the utterance vary. Christ stressed the need for purification of the heart, and did not attempt to lay down a law, for the law of Moses was there, and he did not choose to alter it. He merely desired that this law should be applied to purify the spirit. The Quran, however, presents ethics and law simultaneously. Naturally therefore it ad had to assume a style and expression which should create no doubts as to the purposes to be served. In the first place, it calls upon man to develop the talent for forgiveness, as it regards it the basis on which all piety and righteousness should rest. In the second, it keeps open the door for retaliation in unavoidable contingencies. In the third, it is careful to make it clear that retaliation should not err on the side of excess, as that would be decided injustice." [51]

In support of this casuistic quibble to press the relative superiority of the Quran, by subjecting the ethics of Jesus to admit the obligatory implementation of the law, he refers to the verses **42. 39-43**:

> And those who, when great wrong is done to them, defend themselves the guerdon of an ill deed is an ill the like thereof. But whosoever pardoneth and

[51] BCQ, pp.71-72

> surrendeth, his wage is the affair of Allah. Lo! He loveth not wrong-doers. And whoso defendeth himself after he hath suffered wrong- for such, there is no way (of blame) against them. The way (of blame) is only against those who oppress mankind, and wrongfully rebel in the earth. For such is a painful doom. And verily whoso is patient and forgiveth – lo! that, verily, is an affair of great resolution.

The expansion of Islam unconnected with spiritual superiority. The fact of the history of the Muslims eliminating the Arab Christians and the early Christian kingdoms which had been in existence for several centuries, before the birth of Muhammad, constitutes proof of a military triumph which does not, and must not, be attributed to moral or spiritual superiority. All the conquests of Islam have been achieved with the free use of the sword, with the stern application of military force. Persuasion has never played any part in the spread of Islam. It is Buddhism which, alone among all religions, provides the unblemished example of its having been spread beyond the frontiers of India and of China by the persuasive examples of renouncing monks conveying the words of the peaceful *sūtras.* The history of Christianity is replete with its sponsors and ideologues boasting of the superiority of its spirituality by associating it with military triumphs over weak nations as evidence of the preeminence of Jehovah or of Jesus. Or, whenever and wherever Christians have praised their military triumphs as vindications of a superior civilization, they have done so actually in praise of a heresy, enforced as orthodoxy.

The hoax of Islam claiming superiority over Christianity. But in one decisive aspect the totality of all the majority Muslim countries, the Umma, cannot, by any amount of casuistry or otherwise, claim any superiority over what Châteaubriand, in his *Génie du Christianisme,* persuasively argues, in favor of the excellence of Christianity, by hailing the literatures, the arts, the sciences, the monuments, the institutions, as testimonies of its excellence and of its civilizational importance. In the domain of the Fine Arts there is not much to which the Muslims can offer to match in beautiful and soul-elevating products of human initiatives. On the contrary, by proclaiming they are the depositary of the best of all dispensations, Muslims have not hesitated in replacing the nobler cultures with their way of life by the exercise of a brute power. In fact, wherever they roamed and wherever they settled, they never could understand the contradictions facing them by different modes of

thought, nor could they evolve the art of persuasion to justify their claim of being representatives of a superior way of living. They dealt with difference of opinion or belief, neither by debate or the peaceful demonstration of the excellence of their belief, but by the ministration of the physical obliteration of the other. Historically the Muslim's coming into contact with the Kaffir would be the equivalent of the Proponent in a debate shooting the Opponent and thereby claiming he had won the argument.

The great hoax. The proclamation of Islam as a religion superseding both the Jewish and the Christian dispensations is the greatest hoax ever registered in History. And for the first time in History Islam is fated to test its claim to be the only absolute Truth, above all other truths, in its coexistence, with the unique dominant community of the Disbelievers who generated and nurtured a civilization enriched by the humanities of the three distinct Dharmas. In short: for the first time, for the enlightenment of the whole world, India offers itself as the stage where Islam meets a unified traditional *pagan* India where the hegemony of Iconoclasm, Dhimmitude, Jaziya will have little scope for their re-affirmation. In the present particular pagan Indian socio-political predicament, the Indian Muslim, alone in the entire Umma, finds himself confronting the co-existence of his closed-mindedness with the native mode of reasoning leavening the cultures animated by the three Dharmas rising at last from the depths of the alienation foisted by the Islamic and British hegemonies. India rising from the darkness of the inhumane hegemonies of Muslim and British materialisms augurs the future of Humanity experiencing a universal redemption.

CONCLUSION. The barbarism of the Judeocide perpetrated in the midst of Europe in the middle of the XX century has generated no reflection, and has exerted no real influence on the exclusivist theologies which have arisen from the limited area of the Middle East and have, with the consecration of hatred as a divine gravity, weighed heavily on the rest of Humanity. It has been the hitherto invincible force of Divine Revelations which persists as an eternal curse coterminous with the Kali Yuga. Absurdity pervades the whole world when God, that is, the Biblical God, dispenses thoughts and reasons for men and women to tear one another as such. For the wild beasts kill only when they are hungry, for so have they been born. Men and women kill one another for the sake

of the speculative abstractions which determine their respective identities.

The world Rabbinate has not manifested any reflection on the fact or just the possibility that the collective suffering of the Jews would have been a distant consequence of the Old Testament having been the source of all the religious intolerances which have pervaded the three revealed monotheistic religions. Nor has the West, with its several overseas colonialisms, made any intellectual effort to see and learn from the wisdoms and the varieties of religious tolerance of those whom they 'inferiorized' in order to rob, spoliate, and ravage while using the revealed religions and the names of their monotheistic religious particularities as shields in their armors for facilitating their conquests with a good conscience. During the academic year 1967-68, at the Center for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University, the particular batch of American research scholars were surprised to learn for the first time of the relative harmony having prevailed in each of the pluri-religious cultures of India, China and Japan.

The unique example of a more than a millennium of religious conflict that has marred the history of India has been related to the presence of Islam. The pluri-religious Chinese and Japanese societies have suffered no depredation and internecine wars as have the Indian indigenous cultures been victimized by the hammer blows struck by the Muslim iconoclasts. In particular Japan, for a good reason, today does not allow Muslim migration, nor does it permit the construction of even one mosque. It remains a quiet nation. Even if India had only Brahmanism as its sole persuasion, it would still have a multitude of divinities, which would foster an unlimited proliferation of beliefs. It is significant that peace and tolerance prevail when different communities, inspired by their specific sets of creeds, live together in peace and harmonious solidarity.

The mind is oppressed in contemplating the stolid insensitivity of Imams, Rabbis, Bishops to catastrophic violence directly resulting from the beliefs in the absolute Unity of God, as the infernal legacy of the Old Testament. Nor does this concomitance of genocidal violence with monotheistic belief engage the attention of professional historians,

especially in the Judeo-Christian West. Nor has it disturbed the collective conscience of much of the West that the history of the mutual killing of the Other in the name of God has been the fashion, as it still prevails in the XX century and well into the early decades of the XXIst, brought about by nations and societies claiming allegiance to the same revealing Deity. These studied or instinctive forms of ignorance, or the unthinking collective habits, bear the fact that every culture has a Day Side and a Night Side.[52]

An example of awareness of the Night side of the Untouchability within the Indian culture was provided in the 1930s by the solitary campaign carried out by Mahatma Gandhi in his crisscrossing the Indian sub-continent, often on foot, calling for the abolition of that social evil which affected millions of his deprived compatriots. As yet no like movement has been initiated in either of the three divine revelations in order to eliminate the murderous violence which lies at the core of each. Following Emperor Constantine adopting the religion as the state ideology, the following centuries of Christianity are known for the internecine quarrels and disputes which got settled by violence. Differences of opinion and of belief, during the life of Muhammad and immediately after his death, caused a lot of blood to flow. Three of four of the first Caliphs were murdered. These days, in different parts of Africa and of the Middle East, Muslims zealously maintain the habit of killing one another, with each warring party claiming to have Allah on its side.

Hence it is not surprising that Mawlānā Azad would write his version of Islam by using a self-serving comparison of the Quran with a vague, generic Christianity unrelated to any particular historical denomination. He lived during the same troubled period when Bhagwan Das wrote *The Essential Unity of the World Religions*, from the tolerant world view of Theosophy. At about the same time Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan wrote the still vibrant first chapter entitled *The Soul of a*

---

[52] The Day side and the Night side of a culture has been persuasively brought forth by Carl Gustav Jung in his *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, which came out in 1933, six years before the start of the World War II.

World Unborn, in his *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*. In which he argued, with the passion of an idealist, that the future will bring about a universal consensus with the recognition of mystical experience as the confirmation of the essential unity shared by all mankind. His noble vision has not yet been realized.

It is always Brahmanist thinkers who display the enthusiasm for reconciling the different world religions by stressing their fascination for the mystical core they see in the major world religions. They were unmoved by the distinction which Islamic and Christian theologians make in not recognizing any parity between the 'man-made' Oriental and the 'divine', revealed Religions. No theologian in either Judaism, or Christianity, or Islam has till today written a book or offered an oral statement to claim similitude or equivalence, at mystical levels, among the Eastern ''human'' and the Western ''divine'' religions.[53] In reality both the Islamic and the Christian Orthodoxies resolutely dismiss the validity of the mystical experience as an inauthentic expression of each of their respective faiths. In Europe the Church sponsored a crusade against the Gnostics to the extent of their extermination having been a great loss, not only to Europe, but to all mankind. Till today the Sufis in Islam practice their faith in secret, out of fear of the orthodox majorities of the Muslim nations.[54] The challenge remains for a commonly shared sentiment of practical tolerance of the divergences characterizing the major religions. It consists of the fundamental task of theologians and apologists studying the diversity of religious faiths with the obligation to learn to know what one knows, to learn to see what one sees.

Maulana Azad's comparative comment in his interpretation of the Quran leaves out any allusion to the indigenous Dharmas of India. His view of spiritual realities encompasses only the limited ground covered by the revealed faiths. He must have felt it justifiable to limit his comparisons, however one-sided they may be, and certainly are, to the two previous divine revelations which he mostly berates while stressing the assumed authoritative primacy of his own faith. He does not see the

---

[53] Fairness requires the exceptional example of Emile Gillabert's *Paroles de Jésus et Sagesses Orientales*, which explains by means of the Advaita Vedānta the Kingdom of God, the central concept in the teaching of Jesus.

[54] It is a fact that certain Sufis too approved of *jihad* as faithful observance of the Revelations of Allah.

Humanity of the India of Brahmanism, of Buddhism, of Jainism and the history and the culture which these have stimulated. His indifference, or insensitivity, to the visible accomplishments of the native Indian culture and civilization, is characteristic of the Muslim mind's natural imperviousness to any aesthetic or humane attribute pertaining to a different dispensation. In truth the Indian Muslim finds himself in the unique position of living amidst a society composed of a majority of Kaffirs who, as such, are the objects of Allah's abomination, as laid down in the Quran. Before Independence in 1947, most of the Indian Muslims who happened to be unable or unwilling to leave for either Pakistan or Bangladesh, found themselves trapped in the space from which they had sought separation out of the assumed fear of persecution by the Hindu majority. The Muslim League elite succeeded to turn the social history of India upside down, for it was the iconoclastic Mussalmans who ravaged India and culturally impoverished and diminished the civilization in which they came to write their history with the sword!

The fear of Hindus persecuting Muslims was a deliberate contradiction of the peerless tradition of tolerance as the distinguishing characteristic of the Indian way of living determined by the contents of the three indigenous Dharmas. Yet, after partition, the remaining Indian Muslims chose to maintain their obdurate exclusiveness and their feeling of the inferiority of their fatefully having to live under Kaffir authority, while their co-believers had secured their good fortune to be ruled by Islamic jurisdictions.

It is this real, but hidden, sentiment of something missing in their collective self-image which propels the Indian Muslim to shut his mind to the acknowledgement of anything worthy of admiration, let alone the adoption of a creative, working cultural synthesis. In reality there will never be a cultural synthesis, for nowhere have two distinctively different cultures ever generated a synthesis. With the symbol of their holding on to their Sharia as the indication, the Indian Muslims do not realize or feel to what extent their exclusiveness constitutes, under the secular and liberal 1950 Constitution, an impediment to the native Kaffir followers of the Dharmas seeking to repair the damages inflicted by their hegemony.

Characterized by their closed-mindedness towards any form of Beauty, of Goodness and of Truth not mentioned in their Holy Book, the Indian Muslims seek and obtain the satisfaction of living a superior life consecrated by the rules and laws dictated by Allah to Muhammad. Nothing proves the closed-minded self-satisfied psychology of the

Indian Muslims more than their adamantine indifference to the heavy destructiveness of their not being able to develop sensibilities to the Beauty, the Goodness and the Truth of the Kaffirs living in their immediate neighborhood. That destructiveness stems from Allah's injunctions of intolerant treatment of anything which lies beyond the pale of the territory marked off from the sands of Arabia. The ravaging impulse of the Islamic revelation became quickly evident in the army of Muslims rushing out from Arabia across the mostly empty space of North Africa up to the Pyrenees separating Spain from France. In contrast the more serene, mystical cultures of Brahmanism, of the supremely pacifist Buddhism and Jainism, all proclaiming individual finalities of self-fulfillment as the essence of Humanity, favored the self-satisfaction of the Kaffir to dwell in their sub-continent without any desire for a supplement to fill the void of the revelation beyond Medina. Islam proves to the whole world that it could succeed to build an empire without the necessity of an ontological fulfillment being central to life. The surrogate of the Day of Resurrection as a substitution for the Ontology of individual, personal experience of the mystical self-fulfillment is in reality the lie which subsumes all the imperatives for the passing shows of empires under the caption of glory.

It is a paradox that tolerance be a preponderant feature of the Indian Dharmas which have evolved from the learning and the search for the ultimate self-knowledge by means of *human* effort, with the monumental difference from the religious revelations descending from Heaven emphasizing their intolerances with each stressing that it is the absolute Truth dispensed by the *only Almighty God*. Religious Tolerance is the magnificent gift of the Indian *Man* to all Humanity. Intolerance is the curse and the misfortune visited on Humanity by the *God-beliefs* pertaining to the three revealed religions which have their source in the Old Testament.

India is the only land where a moral civilization arose as the fruit of human effort which, over a span of several millenia, brought up a magnificence illustrated by the abundance of its monuments and the plurality of its knowledges, with the cultures of South Asia displaying the products of the peaceful sharing of its elevated way of Being. Such a perspective brings forth the fact that the Indian Muslims do indeed shut their minds off to even the slightest acknowledgement of the merit of the Kaffir accomplishments. It is a strong imperative to bolster their identity with closed-mindedness as their naturally born endowment correlated with their submission to Allah's sovereignty. Within the economy of the sub-continental civilization the gravity of their natural

exclusivism epitomizes the unfinished tribulation which shackles the furtherance of the heritage of the Ṛṣis and the Ācāryas.

Mawlānā Abdul Kalām Azad compares the fundamentals of Islam with the fundamentals of *his* perception of Christianity and of Judaism: they are centred on *his* faith in the Unity of God initially bequeathed to Humanity by Jehovah who in the Old Testament of the Bible proclaims himself as the Only God to which Moses gives his assent. The concept of Jehovah as the sole God, with its subsequent spin off as the Nicean Creed, became known as the sole divinity on a global scale coinciding with the predominance of Europe and its variety of imperial colonialisms. Jehovah as the source of all the religious intolerances is further enhanced with a mortiferous intensity in the revelation offered to Muhammad who intensifies, to the ultimate degree of mercilessness, the law of talion as a beneficence in Islam arrogated as the seal of prophecy. The Brahmanist is always astounded that the Only God could deem it indispensable to project the presence of Hatred of the Other and the Cruelty of the *Lex Talionis* into His Creation! The Revelation pronounced by Muhammad was actually a radical regression, in its back-sliding from Jesus's revolutionary propounding the forgiveness of the enemy, the turning of the right cheek when the left cheek gets slapped and, above all, his enunciation of the mystical Kingdom being present in the individual as his private essence.

The concept of Divine Justice. The Dharmas do not postulate a Supreme Being as a cosmic Judge. With the doctrine of the Law of Karma and the practice of Yoga as the two common features of the three Dharmas, Justice as such is co-substantial with *karma phala* (the fruit of action). Undoubtedly the classic Dharma Śāstras did prescribe the rules of Nīti according to which the King would, and did, with the advice of his ministers, administer reward and punishment, without any reference to a presiding Judge in Heaven. The notion of God administering Justice lies at the heart of Judaism. The practice of the Law Court presided over by a government-appointed Judge, which has become universal, has its origin in the Biblical concept of God as Judge. The swearing on the Bible, or on the Quran, with each book representing the Transcendent God in Heaven, is a Judaic symbolism. It makes sense that the Bible and the Quran would be viewed as equivalent to God who inspired or revealed their contents. That this assumption be in reality a magnificent assumption entertained by the Jewish or Christian believer is beside the point. But, as a collective mimesis practiced by the Indians of the three Dharmas, the *Bhagavad Gītā*, with its author being Vyāsa, according to

traditional acceptance, does not in reality have the status of being the representative of the Supreme Being. But it has become, in the jurisprudence of India, the Indianized moral authority equivalent to the Bible or the Quran. In Brahmanism neither Viṣṇu nor Śiva, nor any other Divinity, is a judge. Nor is there, fortunately, a Day of Judgement at the end of the Kali Yuga.[55]

However Mawlanā Azad recuses the notion of God as Judge. According to him the Quran regards reward and punishment in the same way as they occur ordinarily in life: goodness is rewarded, evil is punished. He leaves out occurrences of Goodness not being rewarded and of Evil triumphing amidst an abundance of happiness and delight. Nevertheless the Quran recognizes this universal law: the good deserve Heaven, and Hell is for the evil-doer. Arguing in favor of Allah being endowed with such attributes as *Rubūbiyat* (Providence), *Raḥmat* (Mercy), there is no room for terror as an attribute which requires 'awe' and 'fear'. It is a concept which has been misunderstood. Still the Mawlānā attributes Justice to the Providence and the Mercy of Allah. The Mawlānā leaves out of considering the Believer's submission to the revealed verses, without the safe freedom of opting out for living a personal, independent way of life. Or, if he is aware of it, he provides the rider by arguing that, if the law of requital did not exist, there would be chaos in the world and the path to perfection would be blocked. The Mawlānā says Providence and Mercy give all that the world needs and the principle of Justice gives it balance or beauty that it needs by eliminating every ugliness lurking therein.[56] He explains the word Justice or 'Adl' which, in Arabic, means 'to make even'. It is the basis which keeps the Universe at rest.

He is at pains to make believe that Allah does not foster in the Believer's heart the fear of a cosmic terror. He is conscious of the fact that the Christian believes in the Father of the Holy Trinity as a benevolent and loving divinity who maintains a relationship of love with the faithful believer. Indeed the Mawlānā labors the point of Allah

[55] It would not be unreasonable to speculate that the frequency of witnesses turning rogue, under oath, on the witness stand, during a trial may be due to the absence of fear of God's punishment for giving false testimony.

[56] BCQ, p. 79

providing a 'balance' and 'beauty' in the world, as a refutation of the more elevated notion of a benevolent, loving Father in Heaven, according to the Christian orthodoxy. It is indeed a fastidious opinion to offer to his fellow Muslim a reason to feel superior with the belief of Allah assuring balance and beauty in the world. He skirts off the edge of History with the quiet unmitigated indifference to the iconoclastic ravages of the Beauty of monuments and of countless sculptures which adorned the native cultures. The ruins of Vijayanagar at Hampi will, till the last moment of the Last Day, remain a cry denouncing any justification of Allah's *Rubūbiyat* Providence), *Raḥmat* (Mercy), *Taqdīr* as assurances of 'balance' and 'beauty' to the world, without any revealed law of acquittal for iconoclastic depredations.

These contradictions do not offend the sensitivity of the Mawlānā. It is because the Muslim, even if he be the scholarly Mawlānā, does not think according to the Socratic rationality which the different European imperialisms and colonialisms have disseminated all over the world. In submission to abiding by the belief in the Quranic verses, he writes following what he naturally must think in correspondence with the 'psychology' underpinning the language of Allah, revealing his verses in conformity with the particularity of the Arab mentality. As a Believer he naturally obeys the 'logic' of the spirit of Allah's will which animates His words consistent with His psyche and subsequently with the psyche of the Prophet. The requirement of praying five times a day strengthens the narrowed scope of independent, personal thinking within the narrowness of the revelation. It is like the frog which believes the sky is as large as the circumference of the opening at the surface of the well. Anyone telling the frog that the sky is infinitely bigger than the circular patch which he sees, would be damned as a Disbeliever for whom Allah reserves a doom.

The Muslim insensitivity towards the harm he inflicts upon the Disbeliever has its analogous occurrence in the psychology fostered by the Christian animated by the consciousness of his baptism completing his *naturalness* at birth with the *supernatural* essence of the Holy Spirit, thus placing him as a reborn *person* above all sentient beings who have not been christened. The centuries of the practice of worshipping a

crucified cadaver held above the altar would have subtly, but effectively, conditioned the mind of the faithful believer with a disposition favorable to the reasoning immanent in the fundamentalism of the doctrine: the non-christened individual is a *natural* being, or thing, and can accordingly be treated like a *natural* beast of burden. It is this mentality which has outgrown the sentiment of the earliest days when the Faith coincided with the spirit of the 'loving-the-neighbor', of 'forgiving the enemy', 'of turning the left when the right cheek is slapped'. The Spanish Catholic conquistadors destroyed the civilizations of the Mayans and the Aztecs, and enslaved their populations and made them work in the mines for six days of the week, and on Sundays constrained them to listen to the Mass said by the priest who did not omit telling then that their Quetzalcoatl was a non-god. Even the Romans were not as harsh as those who swore by Jesus while imposing their cruelties upon the defeated Mexican populations. They could do so with a clear conscience because of their thinking according to the 'logic' and the 'rationality' appropriated from a Theology which, without any organic link with the thoughts of Plato and Socrates, used a mode of thinking whereby the Humanity of Jesus was transfigured, or rather, in truth, as the ground reality, deviated as "divine". The Indian Christians and the foreign missionaries conveying the message of Jesus, remained silent, without a single voice being raised, during all the genocidal famines perpetrated upon the Indian natives by the British in the name of the King (or Queen) endowed with the title of Defender of the Faith. John Ruskin made his voice heard when he pronounced these words: "What are we doing to those Orientals? What we are doing to the Orientals is worse than what does the Highwayman. The Highwayman says: 'Your purse or your life!' But we, as Christians, go and tell the Orientals: 'Your purse and your life!

The Indian Christians, as supporters of the British Power and as opponents of the struggle for Independence, chose to continue to sing 'long life to the Emperor' during the Sunday Mass while the mayhem of Partition raged outside. All these infernal logics pertained to their respective rationalities, far remote from the way in which Plato and Socrates envisioned the role of Man in the world.

That is why, in India, both the Muslim and the Christian histories do not offer the celebration of a transcendental ontological experience as

the finality of the Believer's existence. It makes living easy and delightful. It gives the illusion of certitude, of safety and of the comfort of believing in the fable of a distant Day of Resurrection.

Indeed the study of religions perplexes the mind when it encounters the inability of the theologians, and the whole array of intellectuals among the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims, maintaining the steadfastness of their faiths without questioning their concomitance with wars, massacres, genocides, all generated by the intolerances inherent to the revealed monotheistic exclusivist beliefs. Nothing distinguishes the Western civilization with more intense anguish than the particularity of its willful expansion with genocidal vigor as the signature of its ontological superiority reified with dehumanizing domination of the weak peoples by the use of Force, aided by their Churches celebrating the availability of the preeminence of Heavenly perfections. It is the good fortune for Humanity that the beneficence accruing with the spirited survival of the Orient bears the certitude of Humanity recovering the integrity of its humaneness which had borne the burdens of the White Man and of the Muslim for too long. For too long has the supremacy of Heaven-centered propositions fashioned the destinies of Humanity. The signs now stimulate the thought of the certitude of Humanity providing the ennobling vision of all that lives is sacred and worthy of veneration as one family, here on the Earth! In truth it is high time for the Humanity-here to be recognized with its ontological totality being All-Here. The There-Heaven is the well-established superstition celebrating a spiritual black Void with the veneer of shades of Blue. For the realization of a genuine, truthfully elevated near future India holds the promise of enabling the security of a concordant Humanity consolidated as one Family.

INDEX

Abbassid Dynasty: 66, 108, 289, 336, 358, 518
Abdel Kader: 486, 524

Abdennur Bidar: 283, 284, 285, 290, 390

Abder Rehman: 257

Ahimsā: 1, 2, 3, 97, 130, 382, 386, 486

Ahmadiya: 258, 308

Aligarh Muslim University: 564

Allen, Charles: 21, 22, 29, 46, 47, 138

Arendt, Hannah: 81, 630, 631, 650

Ambedkar, B. R.: 224

Arya Samaj: 614

Ashoka, Emperor: xxi, 122, 350, 614, 632

Attila: 149

Aurobindo: 364

Auschwitz: 182, 399 Avicenna: 67, 344

Averroes: 344

Ayodhya-Babri conundrum: 122

Azmi, Kaifi: 369

Aztecs: 528, 541

Babri Mosque: 415, 423, 424

Badr: 313

Bakhtiyar, Muhammad: 26, 27, 34, 159

Bamiyan Buddhas: 111, 135, 136, 151, 198, 199, 337. 466, 499, 564

Benedict, Pope: 134, 142, 182, 236

Benedict VI, Pope: 142, 236

Bengal Genocide: 17, 18, 134, 182, 181, 334, 336, 394, 425, 498

Bhagat Singh: 392

Bhagavad Gītā: 127, 205, 227, 269, 271, 362, 451, 452, 487

Bhagavad Purāṇa: 501

Bhagwan Dās: 231, 232

Bhakti in Brahmanism: 458

Bhū Devī: 244, 521

Bidar, Abdennour: 282, 283, 289

Big Boy: 359ho

Borobudur: 19, 503

Boulqe, Camille: 242, 629

Brexit: 352

Burchardt, Jacob: 535

Burden, White Man's: 393

Byzantium: 86, 227, 302

CAA Law: 9, 97, 200, 372, 424

Cānakya: 635

Caraka: 642

Cardinal Fernandez: 184

Case for India: vi

Cathars: 538

Charles the Hammer: 257

Chateaubriand: 547

Churchill, Winston: 100, 134, 317, 333, 336, 394, 488, 630

Claudel, Paul: 248, 350

Clovis: 56, 182

Columbus, Christopher: 175, 180, 552

Communal riot: 212

Condorcet: 297

Confucius: xxii, 315, 344

Constantine, Emperor: 70, 225,228, 312, 335, 440, 603, 615

Coomaraswamy, A. K.: 511

Copernicus, Nicolaus: 514

Countrer Reformation: 19

Curzon, Lord: 250, 251

Dajjal: 87, 205, 250, 251, 309, 312, 316, 375, 420, 626

Dalrymple, William: 335

Dar-ul-Harb: 88, 203, 278, 415, 543

Dar-ul-Islam: 14, 151, 152, 154, 192, 348, 368, 369, 370, 396, 406, 408, 413, 415, 441, 518, 532, 543

Darwin, Charles: 620

Dayanand, Swami: 437

De Gaulle, General: 91, 270

Deoband, chool: 343

Descartes, René: 157

Deussen, Paul: 445

Dharatī Mātā (Mother India): 510

Dharma, Indigenous: xix

Dhimma: xvi, 135, 219, 229, 281, 287, 372, 376, 377, 382, 395, 409, 423, 430, 441, 442, 573

Direct Action: 204, 375

Dome On The Rock: 518

Dostoîevski, 299

Druids: 538

Durant, Will: vii

Einstein, Albert: 177

Eisenhower, President: 331

Ekalavya: 625

Eliot, T.: 354

Elizabeth II, Queen: 422, 426

Ellora, 486

Fa Hsien: 67

Ferro, Marc: 357

Finalities: 67

Firdausi: 344, 428

Fossilized Christianity: 182,

183

French Revolution: 307

Gance, Abel: 164

Gandhi, Mahātma: 24, 29, 83, 87, 89, 91, 115, 123, 216, 224, 225, 231, 303, 308, 336, 351, 354, 382, 545, 640

Garam Hawa: 254, 373

Gracien, Balthasar: 522, 523

Grousset, René: 97

Gnostics: 538

Habeas Corpus: 347, 388, 397

Halaku: 66

Hampi: 393, 645

Harappa, 79, 394

Harbi Kaffirdom: 121, 231

Hasan, Mushirul: 122

Heidegger, Martin: 336

Hegel, G. F.:405

Héloise & Abelard: 207

Himmler: 5, 336

Holy Trinity: 518, 627, 632

Homer: 237, 632

Huguenots: 60

Hulagu: 302

Ibn Khaldun: 344

Iconoclastic Devastations: 344, 392, 465

Iman: 488

Ibn Arabi, 379

Inferiorisation of India: xi

Inquisition: 257

Intolerance: ix

Iqbal, Muhammad: 102, 288, 295, 404, 405, 410, 434, 445

Iśa Upnisad: 218

Islam, the Religion of Truth: iii, iv

Islamophobia: 256, 414

Jāhiliya: 404, 408

Jalianwālā Bāgha: 134, 419, 343, 422, 648

Jaziya: 287, 395

Jihad: vi, 53, 191, 216, 408, 423, 488, 491, 494

Jinnah, M. Ali: 86, 91

John XXII, Pope: 188

Kaba: 567

Kālidāsa: 347

Keay, John: 23

Khomeni, Ayatollah Ruholla: 609

Kierkegaard, Soren: 489

Kipling, Rudyard: 111

Konarak: 202

Lao Tzu: 523, 533

Lawrence of Arabia: 379, 383

Lex Talionis: 307, 591

Love: Classic examples of fateful lovers in high literature: 207, 571

Luther, Martin: 187, 190, 620

Macaulay: 7, 104

Madhyama Pratipad: xiii, xx, xxi

Mahābhārata: 1, 3, 16, 573, 574, 592

Mahāvīra: 400, 418

Mahmud of Ghazni: 67, 159, 200

Mālavīya, Madan Mohan: 15

Manicheans: 538

Mao Tse Tung: 256, 258

Martel, Charles: 257

Martin Luther King: 392

Matthai, John: 186

Mauritius: 84, 630

Māyā: xv, 24, 108, 252, 253, 273, 339, 341

Mehta, J.: 5

Michelangelo: 589

Middle Way: xx, xxii, 220, 402, 505, 538, 644

Minar-e-Pakistan: 61, 131, 371

Modi, Narendra (Prime Minister of India): 40, 131

Monchanin, Fr. Jules: 73

Montesquieu: 29, 37, 38, 229, 312

Moses, 362, 536

Mother Teresa: 185

Mountbatten, Lady: 187

Mountbatten, Lord: 352, 393, 398, 446

Muhammad: 136, 159, 178, 227, 228

Mukherjee, Madhushree: 18, 21,301, 630

Murti, Professor T.R.V. : 20, 21, 303, 351, 353

Mus, Paul: 503

Muslim League: 102, 124

Muslims, Eminent: 336

Nāgārjuna: 43

Naipaul, V. S.: 360, 363

Nālandā Centre of Buddhist Studies: 26, 160, 390, 393, 396

Naoroji, Dadabhai: 354, 356

Napoleon: 602

Nicene Creed: 468, 610, 628

Nieman, Susan: 21, 419, 526, 527, 537

Nietzsche, Friedrich: 405, 434, 560

Ocean of Milk: 620

Omar, Mullah: 112, 202, 337

One Nation Doctrine: 368it

Onfray, Michel: 451, 452

Original Sin: 426, 613

Osiris: 454

Otto, Rudolf: 507, 517

Ottoman Islam: 19, 84

Panikar, K. M.: xviii, 3

Partition: 83, 96, 99, 110, 197, 216, 356, 371, 490, 578, 596, 606

Patañjali: viii, 24, 148, 169, 223, 289, 401, 456, 463, 467, 475, 482, 503, 544, 585, 602

Patel, Vallabhai: 103

Pelliot, Paul: 514

Pétain, Marshal Henri Philippe Omer: 92

Peyrefitte, Alain: 93, 272

Picthall, M. Marmaduke: 568

Pius X II, Pope: 630, 649

Poitiers: 257

Pure State, The: 202

Quetzalcoate: 541, 542

Qutb-ud-Dere in Aybak, Sultan: 645

Radhakrishna, S: 2322, 402, 452

Rāmakrishna, Śri Paramahaṁsa: 327

Reinach, Solomon: 225

Robinson Crusoe: 198, 584

Rolland, Romain: 87, 467

Roman Catholicism: v

Rousseau, J. J.: 98, 272, 282, 351, 515

Rubinstein, Richard: 490

Rumi, Jallal-ud-Din: 379

Saint Paul: 173

Śaṅkarācārya, xxii, 24, 142

Satyagraha: 1, 62, 106, 264

Schopenhauer, Arthur: 445

Socrates: 367

Spellman, Archbishop: 599

Stockholm Syndrome: xiii, 24, 39, 45

Suzuki, Daisetz: 531

Tabligi Muslim: 614

Tagore, Rabindranath: 360, 390

Taj Mahal: 485

Taoism: xxii

Taqiyya: v, vi, 275, 277, 353

Tharoor, Shashi: 353, 355

The One: 143, 533, 536, 541, 556, 623

Theosophists: 361, 364

Thomas à Kempis: 227, 612, 630

Thomas, Apostle: 2, 71, 566

Thucydides: x x

Torquemada: 257

Toynbee, Arnold: 2, 71, 147, 178, 182, 275, 350, 353, 378

Turīya: 367, 601, 602

Two Nation Ideology, 408, 415

Unamuno, Miguel de: 510

Universities, ancient Indian: ix

Urvaśī: 511

Vājpayee, Prime Minister Atal Bihāri: 112, 119, 198, 204

Varma, Pavan: 6

Vasudhāiva kutumbaikam: xiii, 17, 303, 400

Vedānta: 24

Veil, Simon: 465

Vivekānanda, Swami: 61, 149, 219, 226, 612,630, 631

Voltaire: 523

Vote Bank: 407

Wannsee Conference: 257

Weil, Simone: 465

Wilkins, Charles: 30

Zoroastrian Persia: 302