

A BRAHMAN

Public Memorandum.

A Note on Caste, Page 8.

The Basava - Lingayets, Page 19.

A Note on Controversy, Page 22.

2ND EDITION.

123.2' N20

N20

824

U. P. R.



A

Public Memorandum

On

Brahmanism Vs. Lingayetism

being

AN INTRODUCTION

to

His Future Work of "the Public Manifesto"

by

U. P. Krishnama  Mares City,

Editor, "The Orthodox Dynamo" 45923

and "The Wisdom of the East",

Author, "The Philosophy of Marriage",

"The Tribunal of Science",

etc., etc., etc.

PRINTED AT THE SACHIDHANANDHA PRESS, MADRAS

Edition |

1919.

IN
MEMORY
of
All Lovers of Truth
This Essay
is
sincerely inscribed
by
The Author.

THE PREFACE.

This publication is justified by the great interest and the impatient demand of the public of Bangalore to know the origin, growth and the peculiarity of the sect called Lingayets. It is thought that such demand as the above will be for the time being set at rest by this epitome in view of the ensuing historical manifesto. This book is therefore purported to be an outline of that future work of not less than 200 pages.

The coupon attached here will entitle the purchaser of this memorandum to obtain one copy of the manifesto gratis; while one unable to produce a coupon must pay its cost at R. 1 per 100 pages.

Thanks are due to those who with money and labour have helped the author in his attempts.

U. P. K.

Contents.

- I. (1) The Story of the Author's Challenge (Prologue).
(2) Declarations.
(3) Definitions.
 - II. (4) The Traditionary Origin of Castes.
(5) A Historical Survey of Castes.
(6) Classes recruited from Castes.
(7) The Position of Basava - Lingayets.
 - III. (8) The Challenge file.
(9) An abstract.
 - IV. (10) The traditionary History of Basava-Lingayets.
(11) A historical account, the Story of Basava.
(12) The Origin of Basava - Lingayetism.
(13) The Work of Basava - Lingayetism.
(14) The Conclusion.
 - V. (15) The Epilogue, Controversy modern.
(16) Controversy, ancient.
(17) Our present Plan.
 - VI. (18) The Index of references in the Manifesto.
-

Chapter I. The Prologue.

(1) The Story of the Author's Challenge. On arrival in Bangalore (4th June 1919) he found that anxiously waiting to be led, the hearts of men and women, Brahmins and their followers constituting the major part of the population of the city were afflicted by the unprecedented processions of Murghi Matt Swamigal with accompaniments of insignia (manacing to Brahman feelings), cries of Jagadguru and recitals of Vedas in public streets, (which function as a right have seldom belonged to them). One who upto now never employed his mind on enquiries about Lingayets and who now visited Bangalore as usual to deliver his religious lectures, the author thought that something must be done to champion the cause of the afflicted that their rights and those of Lingayets may be proved at a well-represented public controversy.

With this object in view, a registered letter was addressed to the Murghi Swami on the 6th June 1919 inviting him to a public controversy. No reply being received another address was made to him on the 16th June 1919. An appeal was also sent on the same date to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore for arranging this controversy, as has long been the vogue of Indian Kings.

Again silence hid the Swami's reply.

As has been usual with controversialists in such cases as this, the author issued a public notice. There was then a stir in the opponents' Camp. But instead of the Swami or his representative sending a reply to him, one who called himself Sirshi Gurusanta Sastri published some days after his notice a public reply, without sending the same to him according to rules of etiquette. Before he despatched his rejoinder, another bomb had come from one calling himself Bullappa M. I. C. (London). He made replies to these literary specimens.

This was not all. Even after the author's last notice that he must not go on answering the trifles of men like the above who did not know even etiquette, the former professor of Lingayets broke a few days' silence by another stormy public notice and a private insulting registered letter. This was also replied.

The public can easily understand their insolence and my forbearance from the file printed here as Chapter III.

Silence is no test of truth, when a challenge waits. Abuse is no argument. Tricks but weaken one's cause in a controversy.

(2) Declarations.

That Truth may prosper and the mission of right-minded historians may thrive, before God and Justice, the author declares:—

- i. Lingayets belonging to Basava parampara and sampradaya are avaidikas.
- ii. They do not constitute a regular caste, but a mixture of recruits from castes. They make a class merely held together by common tradition and common worship.
- iii. The only Brahmin element may be found in Aradhyas among Lingayets; but these also have forsaken the traditionary Brahmin karmas.
- iv. Linga - worshippers not belonging to Basava Sampradaya are different from the Lingayets of this Memorandum theologically and ethnologically. They are vaidikas and can be recognised among orthodox castes.
- v. The title of Jagadguru, if it has significance, cannot belong to any but Sri Sankaracharya who established the 6 vaidika religions and by right of succession to those who occupy his seat.

The materials gathered upto now prove only these and none else.

(3) Definitions.

i. Vaidikam consists in the following qualifications of a claimant:—

(a) Faith in the Vedas, Smritis etc.

(b) Faith in their traditionary interpretations of commentators like Sri Sankaracharya, Sri Ramanujacharya, Sri Madhwacharya.

(c) The practice of Vedic rites like upanayana.

ii. Avaidikam connotes a contradictory attitude to vaidikam.

iii. A caste is a collection of people not merely held together by common tradition and common worship but immemorially guarded from admixture of blood by prohibition of intermarriage and interdining. Different traditions and different worships cannot be incongruous with caste conception. The Brahman caste has in this way many sub-castes.

iv. A class is a mere congery of people without the special feature of caste.

v. Rights are privileges confirmed by legal decisions or special grants; and mamools are those permitted by ancient usage.

vi. Parampara means the line of spritual descent and sampradaya a school of tenets.

Chapter II. Castes of India.

(4) The traditionary Origin.

Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras who constitute the Hindu population of India are the descendants of the time-immemorial castes of the orthodox followers of Vedic religion. While in North India sects live who distinctly style themselves as belonging to one or another of four castes, there are no such well defined distinctions popularly understood in South India. Though some communities (like Komattees) often remember themselves as Vaisyas, only one line of demarkation is popularly accepted, i-e., that between the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin. Although some sects long classed among non-Brahmins now enthusiastically put forth their claims rightly or wrongly as Vaisyas, Kshatriyas and even Brahmins, there cannot be any doubt that the various sections of the non-Brahmin world must be included in the pale of the four castes of India.

The four castes are according to Aryan scriptures traced to a divine origin and they continue by the fiat of God. This evidently means to us that long long ago a *natural* process of differentiation of thought and sympathy throwing men into groups was discovered by sages who knowing the purpose of God in regard to the evolution of life ordered them into castes and guarded them by rules forbidding wrong racial adulteration.

(5) A Historical Survey. The castes thus ordained by God and guarded by sages remained in India in very remote ages. Manu describes them. The Ramayana mentions them. The Mahabharata is full of references to them. The Great met the powerful castes of the Punjab. Their existence.

Castes, it is said, had been destroyed by the influence of Buddhism in Sri Sankara's days. On this supposition sometimes a question may naturally arise, how the famous Acharya restored the castes without engendering admixture of blood? The supposition supposes much that is not true. When Sri Sankara restored the religion of the Vedas, the distinctions of castes had not totally vanished; but men had preserved them sufficiently, as converts to a new religion always do. And even of those who were no converts to Buddhism, there were a sufficient population to constitute a basis for Sri Sankara's operations. That divine commander only blew the bugle; when even the sleeping souls were roused to run into their ranks.

There can therefore be no valid objection to the present-day castes of India being the rightful representatives of the ancient castes of shastras.

The castes may be compared to a big emporium that has stood for ages. From here, it may be, ambitious men sometimes make their strange mixtures.

(6) Classes recruited from Castes. In recent centuries reformers from time to time have come forward surcharged with mad dreams of improving the people of India by destroying castes. Some instances are Raja Ram Mohan Ray and Dayanand Saraswati. By their wrong, though probably honest attempts to efface caste system, they formed classes recruited from the "emporium of castes". Such classes as arose in this manner are Brahmos, Arya Samajis, Radhasamis and others. They may be *in a way* compared with the various sects of dissenting protestants of Christian churches; *in a way only*.

(7) The Position of Basava-Lingayets. In view of the facts the author has gathered, the Lingayets whom this memorandum meditates can be classed among the protestant creations described in the previous section. More than two dozen tribes seem to have fed this strange medley of Linga-worshippers; nor is their Lingayetism of Basavi recommendations more Vedic than Brahmo Samaj or Samaj, but probably less than the latter.

Chapter III.

The Challenge Correspondence.

(8) To understand the cause of the present publication and to serve the world with practical examples and object lessons of literary morality and controversial etiquette, it is necessary to write in extenso the whole correspondence of the challenge mentioned above. But as the insertion of the complete file will mar the sense of proportion in the size of this essay, it will be printed as an appendix ; only its prominent parts appear here.

(i) The author's first letter to Murghi Swami,

SIR,

I hear people say that some years ago, you called yourself as opposed to Smartha, Vaishnava, and Madhva sampradayams and that, even now, you hold to the same position.

If that be so, I, representing also the wishes of my hundreds of readers, challenge you to prove your position in a public controversy.

I am herewith sending a copy of my Poona challenge which will inform you about some of the statements in challenge and also the principles of controversy. On your reply, I shall send the details of controversy.

I hope that you will kindly accept the challenge and reply me within a week. In case I be not replied, this letter with a note of your silence which must mean either your inability or your tacit confession of the truth on my side, will be published in leading news-papers.

I beg leave to remain,
A devotee to the cause of Truth,
yours sincerely,

U. P. Krishnamachar
(of Benares),

Tulsi Thottam, }
Madras, 6-6-19. }

(i-a)

A Public Challenge.

[Enclosure]

In view of the great confusion of the modern world of thought where of old an intellectual discipline had reigned commanding practice by principle and for the sake of the Holy-name of God and the fellowship of man—

I challenge the dissenting public of Poona city as to the following institutions of the orthodox religion of the Hindus.

The grounds of debate are Science, History, Common-sense, Utility, Logic.

STATEMENTS:—

(1) Early marriage (Kanya - dan) is the best of all the systems practised by the human race.

(2) Caste-system (Varna dharma) is the best one of social polity in point of view of racial evolution.

(3) The system of four stages of life (Asrama dharma) is the best one in point of view of individual evolution.

(4) Idol-worship, Yatra and Upasana constitute the best system for the spiritual awakening of the individual and society.

(5) I oppose the present-day system of woman-education, which ignores the Eastern-ideals.

(6) I oppose the reform of inter-marriage.

(7) I oppose the reform of widow-marriage.

N. B. The time or turns of any speaker will not be limited. Gentlemen of private views are not invited. The time to commence the controversy will be intimated privately and by public announcements. The controversy will be public.

Success will be declared not by votes or umpires (a useless system) but by the questions which prevail. Silence is mute inability or sufficient confession of error or doubt.

(iii) **A Public Notice.** [No. 1.]

TO THE PUBLIC OF BANGALORE.

Gentlemen,

Hearing that Murghi Rajendra Swami of Murghi Mutt of Chitaldroog now camping in Bangalore, on tour for the first time in the annals of his mutt, gave publicity to views opposed to the three Sampradayams of the Brahmins. I addressed him a registered letter on the 6th instant containing matter challenging him to a public controversy. A week's time was given him for reply with notice that if not replied I should bring the news to public judgment.

Not favoured with any reply, I addressed him another registered letter on the 16th instant in which I informed him that I was compelled by his silence to send a report of this unpleasant correspondence to be published in leading newspapers. I also stated that besides ordering for 2,000 handbills for distribution in Bangalore, I addressed His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore to implore His Highness to call upon the Swami who claims State Honours to mind a primary duty of Jagad Gurus, to accept the challenge in question. In this notice the Swami was further favoured with the extension of a day for his reply.

Originally the title "Jagad Guru" seems to have been conferred upon Sri Sankaracharya who deserved it by right of his acts. His followers to-day have inherited that title by right of succession. And now the question of that title about a particular Swami must therefore be decided by reference to his descent or his individual acts. I can understand that the followers of the three Acharyas (who made splendid and perfect Digvijayams in their days) may publish themselves under this title by right of succession; while the followers of Sri Sankaracharya hold it undisputedly. About Murghi Swamigal, I feel very doubtful. Surely the right of succession he has not. Who was his original Guru? and what kind of Digvijayam did that Guru make? Will he defend his title otherwise, i.e., by his individual acts? The story of my challenge can challenge his claims to that

He who is afraid of running his self-assumed position to a public test, who is not courageous to accept a public challenge, therefore probably also not confident of his own claims, is one to whom Digvijayam is an empty dream, and Jagad Guru, a crown too heavy.

I appeal to the public to form Right Judgment and not to be deluded by the tom-fooleries of the day.

With pleasure I may again inform the Murghi Swami-gal through this public notice that if he send his acceptance of my challenge by a letter it will not be too late; and hoping that he will not fail to avail himself of this opportunity to prove to the public his religious claims, it is being arranged that His Holiness Frativadi Bhayankara Swami Ananthacharya may stay in Bangalore a week for *vaidic vada*.

B, City, 23rd June 1919.

I am etc.

(iii-b) REPLY TO THE NOTICE OF MR. KRISHNA MACHAR
about

His Holiness of Murgi Mutt.

You have notified that, since the teachings of His Holiness of Murgi Mutt are adverse to those of the three Brāhmin systems and since His Holiness's claims to be called Jagadguru are dubious, you invite him for a public debate. I can reply to all your queries and remove the doubts which have taken possession of you. But, the fact that you require Anantacharya to debate with His Holiness, shows that you have no grit in yourself. Since Anantacharya is not an equal to His Holiness, if you bring the holy Swamis of Sringeri and other Mutts, and intimate the names of people who are your followers, arrangements will be made to convene a meeting and to reserve seats for them.

You have said that you have prayed His Highness the Maharaja to bring about this debate with His Holiness. If you are able to bring about the meeting under the auspices of His Highness and if all Jagadgurus are assembled, we

shall be able to see which of them deserve and do honour to their titles. Or, if you are not able to arrange that you may bring His Holiness of Sringeri and others to a meeting which we shall arrange, and then we shall see who is worthy and who is not.

His Holiness of Murgi Mutt has been travelling in various provinces of the country, and nowhere has his title been questioned. Now that you have presumed to question it shows that, though you have not the least bit of learning, you have a great deal of audacity.

If you fail to bring about the meeting in either of the two ways mentioned above, you are only a braggart and nothing more, and it shows that you have no following. If you don't bring about the meeting, it will also show that something is wrong with your brain. If so, the charity of Government has ready a number of Asylums.

Nothing is to be gained by mere waste of words. Their Highnesses have declared that they look forward to the growth of friendly relations among the many communities of Their Highnesses' subjects and, you, who come forward at this time like a snake, are liable for breach of peace. I, therefore, hope Government will soon put you under a suitable treatment.

5, Mysore Road, B. City }
6th July 1919. }

G. N. BULLAPPA,
M. I. C. (LONDON).

(v) An open letter to Mr. Bullappa, M. I. C., (London)

5, Mysore Road, Bangalore City. [No. 3.]

Gentleman of "Grit".

Just now I read through your letter and searched in vain for any good parts in it to answer. I may inform you at the outset that you, not I, 'waste words'. In my public notice I did not write a single sentence without argument, nor uttered a single word amiss. Yet you say, nothing is to be gained by mere waste of words.

Who wastes? Without writing your replies directly to the questions of my public notice (and you say you can reply

all my queries and remove the doubts which have taken possession of me), without exhibiting your fathomless learning (for you remark that I have not the least bit of it) you simply shower from your infinite armoury of calumniating words. You will call me 'a braggart,' you will detect like a true doctor 'something wrong with my brain'. You will recommend me heartily to the charity of Government for a place in 'a number of Asylums'. And I should even become a 'snake' in your sight. Indeed your learning is praiseworthy and none would envy you too much! Who wastes words? Yours is a game at which both the parties can play. But my elders have taught me self-reverence and self-knowledge.

Your final recommendation with good hope that the Government will soon put me 'under a suitable treatment' is indeed a testimony to your real abilities. 'Breach of Peace' you talk of. Will you for a moment think who is the real cause of the breach? Unusual processions, menacing exhibitions of insignia which wound the feelings of a large population, non-Brahmin Veda Parayanams in Brahmin Streets, parading of titles long possessed and enjoyed by Brahmin Gurus, these and many more of your camp are the real causes of 'the breach of peace'. Their Highnesses who 'have declared that they look forward to the growth of friendly relations among the many communities of their Highnesses' subjects' will not fail to see the situation and put you under proper orders.

Since throughout your letter you assume the attitude of Murghi Swami's deputy, I answer you at length. It seems that your Swamigal is ready to accept the challenge. But you require a proper man to match him! H. H. Swami Ananthacharya of Prativadi Bhayankar Mutt, Kanchi, is not equal to your Guruji. But why? Being a man of learning (for I have not the least bit of it) you must not refuse to be reasonable. From what point of view is your so-called Jagad-Guru superior to this Swami—wealth, paraphernalia, following, titles, work done, or learning? I think, friend, you have been hasty; or probably, he being very near and therefore available, you are afraid. As if your Swamigal were willing to accept the challenge, you dictate to me an

impossible condition, a prohibitive demand: You expect that their Holinesses of the various Brahmin Mutts of India will consider your Swamigal their equal and consent to have a face-to-face controversy with him; or knowing they will not, you play that you may shirk off the responsibility that comes on you. Oh! you demand a meeting of the Gods to exhibit your tremendous learning!

Look here, Sir, for Justice's sake and Truth's sake, if the parties now concerned are sincere, we shall meet. Either a body of well-elected Pundits on either side or (learned) yourself and (unlearned) myself at a public place can meet and publish to the world whether you have infinite learning or I 'have not the least bit of it'. whether your claims are true or mine! I hope that, before you reply me, you will read my first letter and its enclosure to your Swamigal. On your reply we shall settle the other terms of controversy.

A word before I leave you, Sir. Is the Canarese back of your letter the exact translation of your English on its face? You have like a snake glided there in statements not contained in your English. I am much gratified to learn that the communications to your Swamigal of our Gracious Emperor and other State Dignitaries contain your Swamigal's title as Jagad Guru. But I should ask you whether that title was conferred upon your Swami or simply noted in the address. Tricks like these are many!

I am surprised to see the second edition of your letter, which you published yesterday; wherein you omit or change some vilificatory statements. Be not afraid.

(B. City, 7th July 1919.)

I remain, etc.

(vi) To the Public of Bangalore.

[No. 4.]

Gentlemen,

I have made it well known that from the beginning of my correspondence with the Swamigal of Murgbi Mutt I am desiring to bring about a Public controversy. Hoping that its results will be far-reaching and settle once for all

certain caste disputes, I am even informing the public that this meeting, which I wish to be arranged, may be put upon a large scale by inviting the best pandits of both the parties and such modern scholars as may be able to set forth the researches of the day in respect to History and Faith.

But I see my opponents assume a peculiar attitude. They issue uncalled-for notices and open letters indulging in mere vilifications. Since I think such a kind of pamphleteering will never end literary or theological disputations and since I hold to the superior efficacy of public controversy, I am afraid that any amount of my energy-waste will not bear the desired fruit.

Therefore I hereby notify to those who are friends of Justice and seekers of Truth, that I, from this day, do not undertake to answer the penny-a-line pieces that they may leave to the wind to carry—without even the courtesy of sending them to me directly. My silence may not be misconstrued to mean my indifference or inability to meet such trashes; it ought to show the contempt with which I treat them.

Grant me leave, Gentlemen, to engage myself in the more useful work of Manifesto &c., than in sweeping the rubbish off my feet!

B, City, 10th July 1919.

Yours etc.

(9) An abstract. In the notices of the opponents who were not invited by the author nor as far as he can read from their writings represented the cause of the Swamigal, no attempts are made to answer the points raised by him, except the quixotic attempt of Mr. Sirsi Gurusanta * who quibbling over the name of Visistadwaitam tries to make of it a spectrum analysis of different siddhantas. A chameleon may become as many different creatures as the colours it changes rather than Visistadvaitam become as many systems of philosophy as the gods its advocates worship. ^{One} more attempt or trick is played by this same professor in his

* See the Complete file.

balderdash probably giving us to understand that Lingayets are Brahmans by the babble of lingi - alingism. While Mr. Bullappa's pretensions to learning far superior to the author's are prima facie absurd, Mr. Gurushanta's rigmarole is more ably put, but not too well to be detected.

The points raised by the author and unanswered by his opponents are :

- (a) Varnasrama.
- (b) Early Marriage.
- (c) Widow-marriage and inter - marriage.
- (d) The Jagadgurutvam of Jangama Swamis.
- (e) The Brahman claims of the Lingayets.
- (f) Their Nandi Dwaja, Vyasa-hasta, etc.
- (g) Their mixed origin, as a class.

Though the correspondence from their side proceeded-uncalled for and without authority from their so-called Jagad-guru, the author cared to reply them out of pity for their self - assumed position in this controversy he wished to arrange. But seeing their undesirable, abusive, inelegant style and want of substance, he put a stop to further public correspondence from his side by issuing his last public notice.

If Truth there is, put it on the stage; let it dance its worth; do not try to hide it in a bush ; it can come to an Exhibition before the Light of Day. Truth's eye can stare the Sun in his face !

Chapter IV.

The History of the Lingayets.

(10) Traditionary Origins. The authors of the Vaidika religions of India (i-e those based upon the authority of the Vedas) have a common tendency to trace the origins of their systems to the very fountain head of Hindu scriptures. It is not unreasonable then that they claim to be mere revivers of their systems which (according to their views) are as eternal as the Vedas forming their basis. Thus Adwaitam was only revived by Sri Sankaracharya; Visistadwaitam and Dwaitam are eternally more ancient than the days of Sri Ramanuja and Sri Madwa respectively.

As regards Vira Saivism, the same claims are put forward. If one will impartially study Hindu scriptures, Sanskrit as well as Tamil, one cannot reasonably deny the above claims of Vira Saiva religion.

In fact these religions have always existed and are comparable to mighty channels which can be now and then flooded by tributaries. Acharyas and commentators came like these tributaries and from their divine and infinite source fed the rivers of faith.

But the view we take about the nascent religions of Hindu dissenters is that they can never put forth similar claims more than a congery of Hindu converts gathered from all sources and believing Scriptures whenever suitable to their whims. The pretension of the Lingayets that their religion is more ancient than Basava depend on a mere ray of resemblance with the very ancient Vedic religion of Siva or Rudra which even to-day prevails in several parts of India among peoples perfectly Vaidic, believing Vedas and Shastras, with reverence to Brahmans and Brahman acharyas; and it appears to be as ridiculous and repulsive as the pretension of Aryasamaj that it is more ancient than the time of Swami Dayanand, who whenever necessary

discarded several sacred books of the Hindus and ridiculed the orthodox acharyas like Sri Ramanuja. A sect with a literature not older than 5 centuries who originally rejected caste and even the Vedic authority and refused to accept the immemorial Vedic rites like upanayana cannot, notwithstanding their religious professions today, constitute an orthodox society within the pale of four castes which history has held up as always allied with the Vedas and Vedic ceremonies. In spite of its resemblance to Saiva or Sakti Visistadwaitam, the strange Lingayetism under review can but be a little more ancient than Basava, not older than Ekant Ramayya. Even as Rome was founded by two brothers, the Lingayetism was wrought into shape by the Merlin of Bagwadi and his miraculous nephew out of the mist of Ekant Ramayya and the 500 Swamis of Aihole.

(11) A Historical Account, the Story of Basava.

Basava (about 1160 A. D.) was an Aradhya Brahmin. As Mohammed ran from Mecca to Medina, he went from Bagwadi (his home) to Kalyan consequent upon his *un-Brahminical* acts. During his renegade life he was probably initiated into Vira - Saivism which he used to ventilate his spite against Brahmins.

(12) The Origin of Basava-Lingayetism. Thus out of

spite to Brahmans a new religion arose, having only a semblance of an ancient Aryan faith. Basava - Lingayetism was the result of anti-brahmanism.

Fortune favoured Basava. His beautiful sister was a timely cause of his prosperity. For now there was a usurper jain king, (Bijjala), whose minister made the sparkling beauty's brother his son - in - law. This event brought the king in sight of the Moon of beauty. He was enamoured and married her. The charmed king let the queen's brother grow in power. Basava was soon his prime-minister and used his influence freely. His new religion thus acquired a sufficient population. It is not improbable that some of his caste men joined him who now represent the Brahman element among the Lingayets.

Suspected of regicide, Basava was persecuted by Bijjala's son. Consequently he threw himself into a well. After him his mission was taken up by his nephew, Channa Basava, born of his *virgin* sister.

The Basava - Lingayetism owed its origin to Ramayya and its popularity to Channa Basava far more than to Basava himself. But strangely enough Basava's name came to be upper-most.

(13) The work of Basava - Lingayetism. The anti-Brahman Wheel which was set in motion by Basava progressed in its march unimpeded through centuries until enmity and spite which gave it its motion grew to crush under its weight even the rights of Brahmans. The strange shape which thrived by the side of the Brahman began to devour him. The Brahman awoke and even to-day fights to keep his evil away! He tried to get and got judgments of law courts for the protection of his rights.

(14) Conclusion. The author of this memorandum being a Brahman and feeling for the cause of his caste attempts what in him is possible to do the duty fully devolving upon him by a public call and to establish the mutual rights of his people and the Lingayets by the most fair means of an open controversy. With a good heart he sent a challenge to one of their gurus. But the guru answered him by silence. The author then took up the matter earnestly and through a number of notices and replies pushed it to this memorandum. If silence still meet him, his next step will be the publication of a Public Manifesto, as described in the preface here.

He waits to learn all that his opponents can say for their cause; for his vow is to speak impartially and truly. If waiting will be useless, he will surely publish the experience of his quest of "the Desert - Lamp", a *Brahminical-and-Basava-Lingayetism* !

Chapter V. The Epilogue.

(15) Controversy, the modern. It is proper to insert here a note on the author's work with regard to the challenge mentioned in the preceding sections.

Seldom meeting face-to-face, controversialists generally use today the medium of Press or private pen. The effect of such pen-war as this is mere confusion or pretension, worse confounded by wealth or influence well-or-ill-used. After some noise, the parties drop into silence, each vaunting victorious; while the faithful men are rendered weaker amid darker doubts than before. This tendency may be attributed to a wrong sense of honour as well as to a moral weakness which, before mental poverty, leads one readily to talk Billings' Gate. Albeit the progress of science by means of controversy, its barrenness or confusion or its ridiculousness is characteristic of modern discussions of religion and society.

(16) Controversy, the ancient. In ancient India and often amid orthodox pandits even today, the cause of truth and popular faith is guarded by a system of controversy which is public and personal and prefaces debates by divine vows to follow discovered truths. The stories of *digvijayams* illustrate the above view amply and well. Even kings helped the spreading of Dharma by presiding and ordering according to Manu and the vows of pandits. The king and the people who witnessed the discovery of truth through a severe controversy often followed the seach-light faithfully. While a sense of fear withheld the doubtful from the contest, the controversies of the ancient type have never been barren or bad.

(17) The Present Plan. Convinced like this, the author wishes for a controversy of this kind. Make it representative; vow and make the opponents vow to the holy cause of truth, honesty, openmindedness, faith and sincerity; recog-

nise the opinions of modern scientists and critics, of course subject to criticism.

The controversy will then be held in two sections:—

(A) The Laukic debates will include scientific and historical modern literature.

(B) The Vaidic debates will include all the ancient sacred literature acceptable in a controversy.

Read the italics on page 11 (bottom)

Though long and weary, such a controversy as is here sketched, can alone be helpful; and for more details, see the public manifesto.

(18) The Index of References in the Manifesto,

The Analysis:—

A. Judgments of law courts.

B. Puranas.

C. English works.

(a) Anthropology, & Ethnology.

(b) Theology.

(c) History.

(d) Science.

N. B. A complete index will appear in the manifesto. A & B are omitted here for want of space and their lesser importance now than that of C.

C-a:—The Mysore Gazetteer.

2. The Census of Mysore.

3. " Epigraphica Indica.

4. " Indian Antiquary.

5. " Mackenzie Mss.

6. " Castes & tribes

—Thurston. [of India.

7. —Sherring.

8. —Bhattacharya.

9. —Ramasami.

10. " People of India.

11. " Dt. Manual, Bellary.

12. " Mysore Ethnological Survey.

13. " Manual of Coorg.

14. " Creed, Customs and Lit. of Jangams.

15. " Journal of R. A. S.

C-b:—Vaishnavism, Saivism.

2. The Religion of India.

3. " Encyclopaedia of Religion.

4. " Religious Thought & Life in India.

5. " Religion of the Hindus

6. " Sketches about Hindus

7. " Mission to Mysore.

8. " Indian Theism.

9. " Vira Saivas.

10. " Saiva Siddhanta.

C-c:—The Early Hist. of Ind.

2. The Epochs of Ind. Hist.

3. " History of Ind. T.W.

4. " —W. H.

5. " —Mysore, P.K. Rao.

6. " —the Deccan, J.B.D.G.

7. " Imperial Gazetteer.

8. " Encyclopaedia Brit.

9. " Canarese Literature.

C-d:—(for the essay on caste)

1. The Evolution of sex.

C-d-continued:—

- | | |
|---|---|
| 2. „ Psychology of sex. | 11. „ Story of Creation. |
| 3. „ Race-Suicide. | 12. „ Principles of Sociology. |
| 4. „ Criminal. | 13. „ Origin of Species. |
| 5. „ Man and Woman. | 14. „ Family in its socio-
logical Spects. |
| 6. „ Theory of Heredity. | 15. „ Crowd |
| 7. „ Problem of Life and
Reproduction. | 16. „ Mendalism. |
| 8. „—Life, Growth, Death. | 17. „ Natural Selection. |
| 9. „ Riddle of the Universe | 18. „ Degeneracy. |
| 10. „ Evolution of Man. | 19. „ Tribunal of Science. |
| | 20. „ Antiquity of Man. |

Note 1. The Nagaritha Lingayets:—Of the two sections of traders and craftsmen, the L-hand or 9 phanas and the R-hand or 18 phanas, the N. Lingayets belong to the former. Having *Brahman* gurus and customs, they conform to their ideas far more than other Lingayets who hating *Brahmans* and their castes retain their wings and during the 1891 census attempted to “fly in eagle-circles up to the great Sun of Glory”!

Note 2. The Aradhyas constitute a *Brahman* Sub-Caste In Telugu districts though considered very inferior they marry with the Smartas. Probably the Aradhya Lingayets were originally taken from this caste by the influence of Basava and his nephew, also of the same derivation.

Note 3. The Lingayets are jealous worshippers of the phallic Siva exclusively, wearing the phallic emblem encased in metal or wood, and smearing the forehead with holy ash.

Woe worth the day, woe worth the hour,
When *Brahmans* and cows protec(tion)less suffer!
The Cov'nant of God, He works not to fail;
Sri Kalki's Day, the Hour we hail!

The Appendix, the Challenge File.

N. B. Parts of the file numbered and included in the book are omitted here.

(ii) *The Author's second letter to Murghi Swami dated 16th June 1919.*

Sir,

In continuation of my registered letter dated 6th June 1919, I desire to inform you that to-day I am sending a report of the whole correspondence to be published in News Papers with a note of your silence which I take to mean either your inability or your tacit confession of the truth on my side.

I am also sending a communication to my Orthodox Dynamo to inform my hundreds of readers about your meaningful silence. I have ordered for 2000 hand - bills for distribution in the City.

I may extend to you this favour, that the above arrangements may be deferred provided you telegraph to me your acceptance.

A letter has also been addressed to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, a copy of which is herewith sent for your information.

I have the honour etc.

(ii-a) *His letter to His Highness of Mysore dated 16th June 1919. [Enclosure]*

May it Please Your Highness :

I beg leave to submit herewith copies of my letters to Murghi Rajendra Swamigal of Murghi Mutt now camping in Bangalore, invoking him to a Public controversy to prove the true views of social and religious matters.

I believe Your Highness will kindly call upon him (who claims State Honours) to accept my challenge for the com-

mon cause of Truth. I believe Your Highness in the above act will bring to Public Notice the Ancient Raja Dharma. Moreover such an occasion as this which Your Highness may arrange should be a real ornament to your numerous State - activities.

An Open Controversy to extirpate error and falsehood, to establish Dharma in the light of modern Sciences is all that I pray to Your Highness to arrange for.

I hope I shall be granted my prayer, and hoping, I pray, May all the Gods and the elders heartfully bless Your Highness with long life and progeny.

I beg to remain etc.

(ii-b) *His Letter to the Public of Bangalore*

dated 1st July 1919.

[No. 2].

Gentlemen,

Rumours are afloat to mean that after my recent correspondence with the Swamigal of Murghi Mutt of Chitaldurg, now in Bangalore, and my public notice, I have assumed a cowardly attitude, I hereby beg leave to inform those who are interested in the Ancient Religion of Rishis and Acharyas that having launched myself so far in the present public contest for the holy cause of Dharma, it is impossible (I feel) in the nature of the case, to retire without impairing the cause I struggle for.

Ho, to be a martyr, if it need be, is better than wreck a Noble Cause with honour and good name!

As long as the Swamigal has not cared to reply all my letters and my public notice, no blame of cowardice or indifference can rest on me or those pandits (like H. H. Swami Anantacharya) whose assistance I have sought or may seek.

Yet I honestly think that silence on the other side should not still the activities on our side. I have therefore engaged myself in a little literary work with a view to issue a Public Manifesto. Extracts from various impartial

European critics and historians, Bombay and Madras Law Reports, and numerous documents of cases between Lingayets and other castes in Mysore and elsewhere are being prepared to discover the history of the Murghi Mutt.

I hope that by the Grace of God, the Ancient Protector of Dharma, and by the good-will of the elderly public my humble self will be soon granted the privilege of issuing a Public Manifesto which will clearly state such tested facts and indisputable arguments as will finally settle this vexed problem of castes and restore peace to Society and honour to Shastras.

Yours etc.

(iii-a) *Mr. Gurusanta's public reply dated 2nd July 1919,*
[Translated abstract].

1. Adi Murghi Swami's followers have from time to time gone out (of their Mutt) on tour to make converts and bless the world. This being known in the annals of the Mutt and among the public to urge falsely that the Swami-gal tours "for the first time in the annals of his Mutt" is to cut one's own nose in order to set a bad omen to others.

2.....there are chiefly four Siddhantas, Dwaitam, Adwaitam, Visishtadwaitam and Sakti Visishtadwaitam. Anciently among Brahmins there have been two divisions, Lingi and Alingi. Of them, the Brahmins belonging to Dwaitam, Adwaitam, Visishtadwaitam are Alingi; and Lingi Brahmins and Alingi Brahmins have both adopted Sakthi Visishtadwaitam. Among Lingi Brahmins there are two different Acharas, the Sivacharya Mata and the Siva Aradhya Mata. These six religions are established by various Bhashyams on the Brahma Sutra, namely Uttara Mimansa. Among these Dwaitam was established by Madhwacharya, Adwaitam by Sankaracharya, Vishishtadwaitam by Ramanujacharya, Alingi Sakti Visishtadwaitam by Srikanta Desikar, Lingi Sakti Vishishtadwaitam of Sivacharya Mata by Nilakanta Sivacharya, Siva Aradhya

Mata by Sripati Pundit.....
Among the Brahmins Madhwas are Dwaitis,
 Srivaishnavas Visishtadwaitis, the descendants and rela-
 tions of Appayya Dikshitar are Alingi Sakti Visishtadwaitis,
 Gurusthaladavaru (otherwise Brahmins) famous as Veera-
 saivamata Acharyas are Lingi Sivacharya Sakti Visish-
 tadwaitis, Aradhya Brahmins are Lingi Saiva Aradhya
 Sakti Vishistadwaitis.....

.....Such being the case, U. P. Krishnamacharyar has
 published that there are only three religions among the
 brahmins and that they are not conflicting ; but only the
 views of Jagadguru Murgharajendra Swamigal, the Guru of
 Sivacharya Brahmins, are opposed to the Sampradayams of
 the three classes of brahmins. Who are those three classes
 of brahmins ? Are not the remaining classes of Brahmins
 known (to him) ? He who cries to find fault (with others)
 must clearly know himself and others.

3.....

If this is replied within a week, I shall in detail
 repudiate the other three paras.

N. B. Some sanskrit texts, mostly not pertinent, especi-
 ally one from the Mahabharata grossly contorted and
 misinterpreted are omitted, together with certain vilificatory
 words.

(iv) *The author's Public Rejoinder dated 2nd July 1919.*

[No. 2 (a)]

Gentlemen,

To-day after two o'clock I chanced to come upon a
 printed Canarese Notice, intended to be a reply to my
 Public Notice dated 23—6—19.

Before I take you over the details contained in that
 Notice, I wish to give expression to what I felt on my first
 glance at it. The ordinary rules of Etiquette should have

dictated to its author who calls himself "Sirsi Gurusanta Sastri" that he must be courteous enough to send his notice to me whom it evidently purports to attack, even as I sent my public notice to Murghi Swamigal by registered post. Like a man who does not want to undertake the responsibility of standing a Public Test, this curious author is not mindful even to give his address. It is plain from his mention of 4 paras in para 1 of his notice that probably he may not understand English and naturally enough the etiquette of controversy.

In addressing this letter to the public I have no other object in view than to discharge a duty that primarily stands against me as there may be a public opinion that I should meet the opposition from any man of the Swami's Camp. It will be plain from my previous notice that since I addressed it to Murghi Swamigal inviting him to a public controversy, I did not make it my business to answer any and every one especially through leaflets. It is an old truth that there can be no end to any kind of pen-war. I believe that proper rules of etiquette being observed an open controversy will soon discover the truth for public benefit. I wish it to be understood here that in the enclosure of my first letter to Murghi Swamigal (a copy of my Poona Challenge) I plainly stated that such a controversy alone was desired. The same was desired even in my public notice. I emphatically declare once more that I am always ready for such a trial. The writer of the leaflet, if he has any truth to state, may not shrink to risk his treasure at a public exhibition. He will not lose a shade of his honesty if he will mind to request his so-called Jagad - Guru to arrange for a public controversy. If this Swami thinks that in consideration of his high position of silver set-up, I or my party do not deserve a face-to-face controversy with him in public, he may not grudge, if he be sure of his worth, to depute his best Pandits, to champion his noble cause of Lingayetism (Brahminical) He may not feel shy, being "second to none in point of culture" * to inspire his assistants with sufficient

knowledge, that they may return to him gathering laurels in the fray. Hoping that these remarks will not fail to drive our Sastri on the right line of vanquishing error, I shall now examine the wonderful specimen of Theological Defence before me.

If I reply him within a week, he threatens me, he would publish the absurdities of the remaining three paras of my notice. A threat indeed ! If I do not reply, it means, our faithful friend will not publish my absurdities ! Yes, he hoped that by not sending me his notice by post or man and by writing that curiosity in Canarese, I would be ignorant of a kitchen feat and be silent ; then indeed he may escape from his self-imposed responsibility of answering my questions in the Canarese para 4 of my public notice, the claims of Jagad - Gurus ! Let me tell him now that I should be most indebted to him if he could show me the absurdities there—even if I fail to reply his present notice.

Fail ! He says that I falsely urge that Murghi Swamigal has visited Bangalore for the first time in the annals of his Mutt. The writer discovers for me that many times his predecessors went out of their home to make converts and bless the world. Indeed I do not deny that even the present Swami, once before now, might have gone as far as Kasi probably booking a First Class Ticket by Calcutta Mail ! Will he permit me now to explain to him what I meant there ? Never before this time with so much paraphernalia and orthodox shows like Veda Parayanam and so much tom-toming of the title of " Jagad-Guru " any Swamigal of this Mutt left his cloister at Murghi to recruit men for his Salvation army ! And surely during the present Swami's life, his visit to Bangalore has been the first in the annals of his Mutt. I shall exceed the limits of the present hand - bill if I must expose the patent truths which our learned Sastri has treasured and charitably placed at our disposal. He informs me that there are four Siddhantas and counts his Sakti Visishtadwaitam as if different from Visistadwaitam.† He asks me whether I know that there are more classes of

† Read sec-9, page 17.

Brahmins than Smarthas, Srivaishnavas and Madhwas. Gentlemen, I must here make my answer bold. I know Brahmins besides these three, for instance among the followers of Sri Vallabhacharya; but I must stop before I give my judgment about Lingayets as Brahmins. Even if I should forget the Bombay High Court ruling that they are not Brahmins, † I cannot value the Brahminical claims of these Angles on wings of fancy any more than when a medley of Hindu Converts from Christians, Muhammadans and Negretoes should making themselves efficient in Sastras lay forth the same claims! I cannot bring forward within the small space at my disposal the numerous facts and arguments in my support here. But I will make my friend understand that his caste is properly speaking not a caste but a class "recruited from all castes" ¶ To spare his feelings for the present I reserve many of my discoveries about this wonderful set of people! I may close the present letter by a word about his Vaidika claims.

He writes "Hindu Vedas (evidently not Muhammadan or Christian Vedas!), Sastras (what are these if different from Smritis?), Puranas (are these Vyasa's Eighteen?), Agamas, (are these Pancharatra, Vaighanasa and Saivagamas?), Upanishads (should these be put near the Vedas?), Itihasas (are there any more than Ramayana and Mahabharata?)" Indeed a complete list of Hindu Scriptures on which Sri Sankaracharya, Sri Ramanujacharya and Sri Madhwacharya spent their lives! What claims have these Basava and Company on these works given to us mostly by Sri Vedavyasa Maha Muni? Alas! they hanged Vyasa, his shoulder on Nandi Dhwaja, his hand as Vyasa Hastham, an all-time ideal of Acharya Bhakti! Cram the lesson; kill the Teacher! We know from History that since the last eight centuries and more they uniformly were hating Vyasa and all his associations; and more! they became notorious for their inveterate spite against Brahmins. Look at their pro-

† I. L. R. Bombay III 273.

¶ Thurston's castes and Tribes IV.

cession bells! An out-caste kicks them—a standing insult to the Brahmins! Sri Vedavyasa's shoulder, his bleeding hand and the bloody heads, which they carry in pompous processions always remind me of a custom which European professors of Anthropology describe of barbarous people who with pride dance on festival occasions and exhibit the skulls of men whom they eat. I honestly think therefore that these Vaidika claims are not worth the consideration by one who knows these facts and more.

Gentle Reader, I have tried your patience. We may make more points out of our Sastri's ferrago of nonsense, mine of empty words! (his permutations and combinations on the poor name of Visistadwaitam.) With a tattered livery of phrases our Pandit breaks his opinions like crackers in an empty barrel; and closes his mock volley by a pistol-shot! Ho! I thought I were gone! I touched my temples and saw my breast. It was a dream. Probably a play-boy's gun can do better feats!

Yours etc.

(vii) *Mr. Gurusanta's Reg. Notice to the author dated 22nd July 1919. [Trans. Abs.]*

Mr. U. P. Krishnamacharya of Banares, Tholasi Thottam, Bangalore City, is hereby informed:—

It is stated in your Notice of 23—6—19 that the opinions of the Swamigal of Murghi Mutt are contradictory to the three sampradayams of Brahmins and that Notices have been issued to the said Swamigal inviting him to a Public Controversy. I understand that in your English Notice answering my Canarese you have pretended to give a satisfactory reply to my reasonable criticisms on the idea of the three Brahmin Sampradayams. You also call me to a controversy. Yes. I am prepared. I know only Sanskrit and Canarese, but not English. Before arranging for a controversy I must know what you are, viz.

- (1) Along with your name there is the suffix Acharya; that is all. The term Acharya is in use among the *three* in the Mysore State. Of those to which do you belong? How did you acquire this Acharyathva?
- (2) If I have to discuss about religious matters with you, I have to do the same with good persons. (Uthamas). Your religion and sect are not known in your writing. Therefore inform me clearly about your religion and sect.

After you write to me soon about your Acharyathva as stated above, I will surely appoint a public meeting for a public controversy. At present it is the duty of us both to determine the subjects to be discussed, place, time and rules of the meeting.

If your side is weakened in the Sabha, you must give not only the expenses of the meeting but execute a deed of Jaya Patra.

You should also bear in mind that if you wish to clear your doubts you must come to *us*, and that it is not proper if *we* should go to you. You must give me a reply of acceptance within a week from the date of receipt of this notice. If you don't, I shall publish all these transactions in the Public through papers.

(viii) *The author's reply dated 24th July 1919.*

Sir,

I read your registered letter dated 22nd July 1919.

You do well to read my first letter and its enclosure to your Swamigal, my reply to your Canarese Public Notice and my last Public Notice, in order to understand the nature of the controversy I desire and the rules to be observed. You say that I called you to controversy, which proves that you have not understood my reply to your notice. Unless I know that you properly depute the cause of your so-called Jagad-Guru it is useless to hold discussion with you. My challenge is to him, not to you.

You also state that because I have doubts I must go to you (using royal 'we') as if a student would go to his teacher. Understand me better, Sir. I have no doubts. Yet neither you need come to me nor I to you. If you come with a proper deputation, you and I can meet at a common public place where your learning and my ignorance will be displayed.

First tell me, Sir, what you are? and also kindly read well my first letter to your Swami and the two enclosures of this letter.

As regards your Jaya Patra and expenses, you can take them after your dream of success will be realised !

You ask my religion and sect. If my fitness to talk to your Noble Self should depend upon my religion and Pravara, I must demand your Pravara and religion in order to know your eligibility to stand before me, one who is descended from one of the Sri Vaishnava Acharyas appointed by Sri Ramanuja and from Srivatsa. To what caste do you belong and what is your Pravara ?

On your reply I shall inform you whether I deem you fit to accept my challenge. By this, do not misunderstand me that I want to evade a difficulty. Let me assure you that if a controversy will be arranged by your Swamigal I shall be most ready to take part in it as was my intention when I first wrote to him.

Yours etc.

P. S:—Your public notice issued yesterday is also read. I think it is useless to reply it. Read my enclosure 2. You only villify instead of answering my points, saying nothing to support your Swami's Jagadgurutwam and the Vaidic claims of your caste and to repudiate my ideal of your caste history.

I am not surprised to learn that you do not know English; still I hope that you will have friends to make you understand what I write.

(vii-a) *Gurusanta's last letter dated 30th July 1919.*

I got read out to me your registered letter of the 24th July 1919. There is no necessity for me to read your letters to Swamiji to enable me to study the rules of etiquette and the spirit of your controversy. I am not convinced why I should argue with you for and on behalf of the Swami. If really you wanted a public discourse with him, you should certainly have requested a Swami of your sect of equal status to him to partake in it with him. If out of mere vanity you have begun all this, you could well have published only the fact that no reply was given to you for the notices you issued to him. Not content with this, you, though a Hindu, have published on 18th July 1919 a statement from some '*Anarya*' Sahib about our Lingayet caste, and with that as your authority you begin to cavil at us, which certainly has forced me to issue you a notice inviting you to a public discourse,

Are you justified in villifying others in the act of glorifying yourself? You do not in the first instance realise what your own defects are and you begin fault finding in others. Your very name and your writings made me doubt your caste and creed; hence my inquiry. My name and my writings must have disclosed to you my caste and creed; still it is curious why you ask me what my caste and creed may be; possible; it may be mere set off.

Did your Ramanujacharya and Srivatsala ever unreasonably blame other religions as you do in all your vanity? You say "if you arrange with your swami for a public discourse etc." These words themselves indicate to what creed and religion our Swami belongs and you need not have taken all this trouble to find out what creed we his Sishyas belong to. I know far more about your caste and creed and its history than you yourself seem to know. Your very undertaking discloses that you know not a whit about ourselves and this leads me to invite you to a public discourse. It is but right that you should attend a meeting we convene if you want to set at naught our tenets and our ideals. I need not of course attend any meeting you may

convene as I have learnt enough from my own Acharyas and nothing new I need learn from you. If you had answered my previous writings in the proper spirit, I would have shewn my own worth in a public meeting as well as expounded the true philosophy of my own faith for a little of your edification. Your writings themselves disclose to me your worth and ideals. This is why I pay no heed to your correspondence further.

Sd/—Sirisi Gurusantasastry etc.

My public reply to Mr. Guru Santa through this Memorandum, dated 21st November 1919.

SIR,

Refer my card dated 7th Aug. 1919 replying your reg. letter of 30th July. I did not like to reply you earlier than now, because of the uselessness of private correspondence with you who declare that *you are not convinced why you should argue with me* (as if you were invited), that *I know not a whit about your sect*, that *you know far more about my sect and religion than I seem to know*, and especially that *you pay no heed to my correspondence further*.

I issue then this public reply to you not that you may be profited, (for you are too wise to hear me), but that the public may understand, how you and myself have behaved and what we are worth.

You say that 'out of vanity' I have begun all this and that I 'villify' and 'cavil' Who is vain? Who is sharp-tongued? Only read the italics which are your own proclamations. Need I point out that they are full of vanity, arrogance, effrontery! Ho, if I did, I would have sinned to your sin. Yet had you supported your dogmatisms by pointing out my errors and proving your superiority, your case would be different. Without an answer to any of the points raised in my notices, your charging me with vanity ignorance etc., and your boasts of superiority resemble the feat of a man who sits on a tree and cuts his base.

Ha! your logic, how it evidences your greater worth than mine! you *are not convinced why you should argue with me.* (For) you know far more than I, (and) I know not a whit and *this leads you to invite me to a public discourse.* My writings disclose to you my worth and ideals and *this is why you pay no heed to my correspondence further.* What a strange muddle!

That is why I do not correspond with you further.

You asked me for my *pravara* and faith, because you pretend or confess that they are not clear from my writings. But I do not want to tell a lie that I asked you yours, because they were not clear from your writings. I knew them before I asked you and I asked for two reasons. that you may see your folly in asking me mine and that the world may know *your* pravaras and gotras from your own statement. The first object I gained, for you are shy or afraid of mentioning *your* pravaras. But for my second object though you have sulked away by an artifice, *not an art*, I may refer the reader to the Mysore Census Report of 1891. To spare your feelings here, let me only state that they are poor imitations of the ancient Brahmin gotras—a shabby after-thought!

What do you gain by such terms as "anarya Sahib" or by saying that you know much or I know little? When there is a challenge before you, why do you indulge in personalities and insinuations? No amount of *vaishya* trafficking will avail, when your opponent stands undismayed and holds fast to his statements. Controvert them and deny. Meet his arguments and pull down his standard, *if you can and if you want.*

I sum up the present situation.

(a) Call forth in your mind the points collected in our Chapter III.

(b) Add to it the point raised by *your* Correspondence, that of gotras.

(c) Let there be an open Controversy at a common place, towards which the Government of His Highness

55824

always guided by the spirit of Dharma may be pleased to lend their co-operation as the maintainers of order. Otherwise, it is unwise for one to be in one's enemy's camp.

(d) The details of controversial conduct may be discussed later on.

(e) The parties must publicly swear to be faithful to the cause of Truth.

(f) In consideration of para (e), I declare that always I uphold Truth's Noble Cause.

MADRAS.
21-11-19. }

I am yours truly,
U. P. KRISHNAMACHAR.

