



VOL. I ]

MADRAS, AUGUST, 1931

[ No. 4

## MANU SMRUTI

We have dealt with this subject on some previous occasion and have emphatically expressed our opinion that at least *Manu Smruti* and *Bhagarad Gita* must be thoroughly and properly studied by each and every Dwija without fail. It is very timely and appropriate to quote here the words of Mr. J. S. Siromani, a Professor in the College of Pandits of Nadiya, from his '*Commentary on Hindu Law*' (pp. 15) as extracted by Mr. John Murdoch, L.L.D. in his book '*Laws of Manu*' published by C. L. Society :—

"The Code of Manu is not only the most important of all the legal codes, but it is regarded as almost equal in holiness to the Vedas. Every Brahman is enjoined to read it, at least once in his lifetime. A Brahman family in which Manu has not been read for seven generations ceases to be Brahmans."

It is unnecessary on our part to quote authorities to support our view. Every true thinking Brahman knows it already and if he had not

already realized it he will easily understand it now, provided he cares to bestow a little attention on the matter.

With a view to help those, who had not studied *Manu Smruti*, by enabling them to gain some rough knowledge about its contents, we have proposed to devote a part of our attention every month to the translation and detailed explanation of the work. We do not say we will be perfect and complete in our work in this direction, but we intend doing it with the best hope that it will serve at least as a starting point to our readers to induce them to build up still their knowledge of this work by further more discussions and researches.

Before entering into the work proper it is necessary to spend some time over a few preliminary ideas to prepare ourselves to understand the general nature of the work and the trend of its injunctions and arguments.

At the outset, it must be plainly



expressed that we are not viewing it from the standpoint of one who does not consider its authority as binding upon every true follower of Sanatana Dharma of the Hindus to be observed; but, we desire, with due regard to its authority and sacredness, to grasp the spirit of its revered author and his recollections of the Vedic commandments. It does not follow thereby that it is impossible to prove even rationally, before assuming it as sacred, the superior wisdom and the divine nature of its laws, but as we now intend to assist those who hold it as sacred and authoritative, and who want to know its ideas, we think an elaborate discussion of such sort is undesirable here. By means of special articles we shall separately discuss it when time permits us. Let us keep ourselves at present in the position of an ardent follower of the Vedic Dharma and attempt to learn what Manu has ordained us to do in conformity to the Vedic principles.

#### SMRUTIS

The expression *Smṛuti* has taken its origin from the root *Smru*, *Smar* to remember, recollect and so *Smṛuti* will mean 'remembrances' or 'recollections'. These recollections are not the result of faint memories and superfluous observations of any imperfect personage, but they are the outcome of deep thought and serious penances of the most responsible *Thapasvis* like *Manu*, *Yagnavalkya* and other sages.

The great Sages, overwhelmed by a thirst for the correct, accurate and full knowledge of the Vedas and finding it too vast and deep to be easily acquired by mere studies of them, began to perform *Thapas* and concentrate their whole attention upon God and Vedas and invoke His Divine blessings in understanding them rightly and thoroughly. Blessed and inspired by the Supreme Almighty Father, the Sages were able

to grasp the spirit of the Vedas and record those 'recollections' in the form of the *Smṛutis*.

Materialistic minds unaccustomed to such ways of living may not perhaps keep faith in such things, but persons born and bred in the dharmic fold of the Hindu Society and who are exerting themselves in following the footsteps of such great men, will surely be able to realize the significance and force of such activities and inspirations.

*Smṛutis*, though considered to have been composed by human authors, are in fact, collections of inspirations flown from God Himself and hence they are revered equally authoritative with the *Smṛutis* or the direct revelations from God. The main *Smṛutis* are eighteen in number and are even calculated as twenty. We need not plunge ourselves into the comparative study of various authors to fix the exact number of such works, but enough for the present to take the version of the great sage *Yagnavalkya* on the subject. He says in the 4th and 5th slokas of the first *Adhyaya* of his *Smṛuti* as follows:—

*Manvatri Vishnu haarita  
Yagnavalkyo osano ngiraha |  
Yamaastamba Samvartaaha  
Katyayana Bruhaspati ||  
Parasara Vyasa Sankha  
Likhitadaksha gautama |  
Saataatapo Vasisthascha  
Dharma sastraprajakaahah ||*

(1) Manu, (2) Atri, (3) Vishnu, (4) Haaritha, (5) Yaagnavalkya, (6) Usanas, (7) Angiras, (8) Yama, (9) Apastambha, (10) Samvartha, (11) Kaathyaayana, (12) Bruhaspathi, (13) Paraasara, (14) Vyaasa, (15) Sankha, (16) Likhitha, (17) Daksha, (18) Gautama, (19) Saathaathapa, and (20) Vasistha are the various authors of such *Smṛutis* or *Dharma Sastras* which are named after them.

Of all these *Smṛutis* *Manu's* is considered to be the oldest and foremost



and most authoritative. The description of the origin of the author, which we will give out later, will prove that it was 'Manu Smruti' that came first into existence.

*Bhrugu*, who brought to light the ideas of *Manu* says in the 7th and 8th slokas of the 2nd Adhyaya of *Manu Smruti* as follows :—

*Yah kaschit kasya chit dharmo  
Manuna Parikirtitaha |  
Sa Sarvo abhikrito vede  
Sarvagmanamayohi saha ||*

(Whatever Dharma is said by Manu on behalf of anybody—Brahmana or Kshatriya or Vaisya or Sudra,—is all said in the Vedas. He is the very embodiment of Knowledge itself.)

Even Vedas refer to his work and strongly recommend it as fully authoritative. They also add that Manu's words are 'curative' meaning as good and helpful as a medicine. It is so found in Chandogya Brahmana :—

*Manurvai yatkimchidavadat  
Tatbhesajam bhesajatatayaha |*

(Whatever little Manu said is medicine, 'curative'.....)

Another Smruti writer *Bruhaspati* emphatically expresses that, because of the fact Manu has closely followed the spirit of the Vedas, his work deserves to be highly regarded as supremely authoritative. He further adds that any work, we may even call it plainly as *Smruti*, that contradicts Manu is not worthy of acceptance. The text that conveys these ideas to us runs as follows :—

*Vedaartopa nibaddhativaat  
Praadanyamhi manosmrutam |  
Manvartha viparitaa tu  
Ya smrutihi Saa Na sasyate ||*

Countless instances can be cited to corroborate this statement that Manu's injunctions demand highest regard from every true follower of the Vedic Dharma of the Hindus. The proud and majestic nature of Manu's sayings will also prove, in the course of

their exposition an explanation, how supremely Manu deserves to be ranked and respected in the field, not only of Hindu Sastras but also of every other scripture and code adopted by other faiths.

We shall further discuss it by and bye consecutively in the ensuing issues. Though we impose upon ourselves this heaviest responsible task of dealing with this subject every week, we intend publishing it, from the next time, not in this editorial column but only in some other pages of our paper [*As we have begun this work with the hope of bringing out all these in a book form later, we take this opportunity of announcing it to the public that we reserve the Copyright of the articles on this subject for ourselves—*

EDITOR :—DHARMIC HINDU.

## EDITORIAL NOTES

### STRANGE EXPOSITION OF DAYANAND :

We believe that the world will be fairly aware of *Sri Swami Dayaanand*, the founder of *Arya Samaj* and his perverse views and interpretations of our Shastras. During this occasion we desire to invite the attention of the public to his daring exposition of the term and practice of *Niyoga*. *Niyoga* was a sort of custom permitted in the previous Yugas other than this *Kaliyuga*, and then too only on extraordinary times and on exceptional cases, in case a husband of a woman dies without any issue, to beget a son through her husband's brother. There are specified rules and bindings for contracting this association and moreover it seems to have prevailed mostly among Kshatriyas alone; and our readers ought not, we pray, to form any conclusion on this matter, before we elaborately discuss this in some ensuing issues. But we stop with this that it is not at all allowed in *Kaliyuga* and even conceding for the sake of argument



that it may be followed even this yuga it can never be and it is not really, as what Dayanand had so audaciously expressed in his book of '*Sathyartha Prakash*' in Chapter IV page 140 as follows:—

"If a man be not able to control his passions while his wife is pregnant, he may contract Niyoga with (a widow) and beget offspring on her."

It is hardly possible to measure the depth of this venturesome exposition and the disastrous consequences it is likely to produce. If every person whose wife becomes pregnant is granted the privilege of effecting a sexual union recklessly with a widow, it is no exaggeration at all to say that the world, with its good number of widows who are living idle, will scarcely be able to supply the needed number of widows who would be willing to incline to these ways, to satisfy the lust of such brute-like men; and enough number of them will have to be kept always in stock as the relieving hands in public services, to take charge from the legitimate wives of such men when they take leave from their husbands during the times of their pregnancy.

It is certainly ridiculous to discuss about this piece of dirty topic but it is out of necessity to let the public know the peculiar and perverse ways of the founder of the Arya Samaj and his repulsive and misguided interpretations of our Shastras that we had a recourse to this short note. We challenge the Arya-Samajists to prove to the assembly of honest and impartial men, which text of the Shastras support this curious practice as advocated by their venerable leader Dayanand.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THE CRADLE OR THE TRENCH?

Too much is made out of the infantile mortality happening in India and it is attributed to the early marriages of girls here. What then is the

cause of death of so many babies in other countries like America where such marriages are not found prevalent? We have reproduced an extract from the *Literary digest* and let the Reformers express their views over it:—

Which would you rather be, a new-born babe or a soldier in the trenches? In which condition would your chances of living a year be greater? This sounds like a foolish question. One would naturally suppose that a baby, sheltered in the home and tended constantly by loving hands, would have a better chance of living than a soldier in active service. And yet the contrary is true. The perils of shot and shell, of bayonet thrusts and bursting hand-grenades, of disease from exposure or infection—all these exact a toll of life considerably less than that paid by the nurseries.

"Let us compare the losses. In a statement recently made public, Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, says: Up to June 1 the losses of the British expeditionary forces from deaths in action and deaths from wounds were about 7 per. cent. of the total of all the men sent to France since the beginning of the war'. The war began some years ago, hence this total loss of 7 per cent 'since the beginning of the war' means a yearly loss of but little more than 2 per cent.

"The accuracy of this statement is strikingly confirmed by the published statement of an English insurance company—the London Prudential—which shows that out of a total of two million British soldiers insured, the losses during the past war have amounted to 30 per 1,000 per annum; but since the deaths in times of peace among men of the same age amount to 10 per 1,000 per annum, we must deduct the normal mortality (10 per 1,000) from the war-losses (30 per 1,000), leaving



war responsible for only twenty deaths a year in each group of 1,000 men in service. Twenty deaths per 1,000 is two deaths per 100, or 2 per cent. as stated by Secretary Baker. This is the toll of war.

"Let us see now what happens in the nurseries. Out of every seven babies born, one dies before it is a year old. One in seven is more than 14 in the hundred. So the soldier braving disease and death in the camp and on the battle-field has a seven times better chance of life than the new-born baby.

"Out of 2,500,000 babies born every year in the United States, more than 350,000 die before they are a year old. Of the same number of soldiers only 50,000 will die in a year as a result of their exposure to the risk of war.

"Terrible as is the toll of life exacted by war, the losses suffered by our infant population through improper foods and clothing, the ignorance of midwives and—alas! of mothers also, is yet more terrible. To our shame be it said that our soldiers on the field of battle are safer than our infants in their cradles.

"It is not possible, of course, to save the life of every little one that is born; but infant-welfare experts estimate that at least 50 per cent. of the deaths are preventable. This is proved by the fact that in other countries the death-rate in the first year of life has been reduced to less than half the death-rate in the United States. Also, by the fact that in certain cities in the United States infant mortality has been reduced to a point that is less than half the average for the whole country."

It might be added, of course, that every soldier has to pass both the perils of the cradle and the trench, since every soldier has first to be a baby, while every baby does not necessarily become a soldier, and hence may face but one of the two dangers.

#### OVER-EATING.

The following extracts are made from an interesting and informing article appearing in the *New Statesman* from the pen of *Lens*:—

Tissue waste and need for fuel foods are exceedingly small in the case of the brain-worker, but may reach almost incredible figures for hard manual labour. As for heat-production, its amount is largely determined by heat-loss, which is greater in winter than summer, and for a very small body, such as a child's, or for an extended lean body, each of which has a relatively large surface for heat-loss in proportion to its mass. The large body of spherical form, on the other hand, needs relatively less fuel food, since its form minimizes heat-loss. Again, the warmer the clothes we wear, the less rapidly we lose heat and the less fuel we need. An evident form of food economy, therefore, is the adoption of abundant warm clothing and housing.

No amount of feeding with the fattest foods will alter the contour of the razor-backed pig, and there are human persons who show the character which marks that species. Lean though they be they may be habituated over-eaters nevertheless, just as persons whose hereditary type, badly called habit, of body is obese may be most moderate eaters, and cannot be made lean without injury to health.

It is very intelligible that the Polar explorer should easily and eagerly consume, in one day, more fat than we, in these latitudes, could accommodate in a week without continuous nausea.

The old estimates of our protein need were markedly excessive, and that average conformity to them means gross over-eating on the part of the population as a whole.

On any reasonable reckoning, the great majority of civilized men and women above the poverty line are habitual over-eaters. As they grow



older and exert themselves less they need ever less food, but tend to eat no less, or even more than ever. At this season of the year, most of us do less work and eat more food than at any other. The most odious consequence is not the inevitable Nemesis of gluttony, but the deprivation of the children of the nation, whose dietary needs are relatively so high, for the three cogent reasons that they have not merely to maintain but actually to aggrandize their bodies, that they are very active and continual in movement, and that their small bodies cool more rapidly.

There is "conservation of matter and energy" within as without the living body. If excess enters it, that excess must either remain or be disposed of. It may remain as fat, visible under the skin, or surrounding the heart, creeping between the muscular fibres and hampering their action. It may be disposed of, at a price, involving not merely extra work on the part of the liver and kidneys and other chemical destructors within the organism, but also the chronic presence of products of katabolism, which are toxic, and circulate as such in the blood. The first and most characteristic effect of their presence may be an habitual tightness of the arteries, which are stimulated to unnatural contraction in order to favor the removal of the poisons by the kidneys. The pressure of the blood within the circulatory system is thus raised. The heart has harder work to drive the fluid along against such pressure. The coats of the arteries, thus strained, must thicken in order to maintain themselves, but this involves the need of more blood for their own nourishment, as is the case with the hypertrophied heart. If the minute vessels that feed the heart muscle itself and the arterial coats do not increase proportionately to the need, as they may well fail to do, these hypertrophied structures will tend to

degenerate. "A man is as old as his arteries." The renal arterioles will be involved, and the function of excretion will be less well discharged. A vicious circle has now been closed, to be broken, perhaps, by the bursting of a degenerate artery in the brain, and the destruction of nervous tissue upon which the movements of the limbs, or even of the heart and respiratory muscles, may depend. Short of this, the excess of food causes the victim of food-intoxication to have less, instead of more, energy at his disposal. He becomes "old" before his time, "digs his grave with his teeth," and prematurely fills it.

#### SOME NEPALESE IDIOMS

(1) One may take the lion's share when food is served with one's own hand.

(2) One falls into the pit dug by oneself.

(3) To speak about heaven before *Indra* (who is the king of heaven).

(4) The fish missed by the angler is big.

(5) It is no good to a crow when the *basl* fruit ripens.

(6) To run after a crow believing it has taken away the ear, i. e., to depend too much on guess.

(7) A frog in a well is always there.

(8) To acquire learning by beating the preceptor.

(9) A slippery tongue with a wicked heart.

(10) There is hope of life so long as there is breath.

(11) A millionaire in whose house the mice are crying (ironical).

(12) One's own caste-people are one's enemy.

(13) Winter does not end with one (the coldest month of the year).

(14) Every one sees when a forest is on fire, but none sees when the mind is burning (with grief).

(15) The tiger in the forest may not eat one, but the tiger in the mind (imagination) does so.



## M I L K

In an address delivered at the Y. M. C. A. Madras Mr. T. Murari, B. Sc. (Oxford) F. L. S. of the Live Stock Research Station, Hosur, observed the following facts about the valuable properties of Milk. We jot down below only a few extracts from it for the information of our readers :—

‘.....Broadly speaking, milk of all mammals resemble that of cow’s milk in composition. The milk consists of fat in the form of globules of varying sizes, sugar, pro-

teins and minerals. The proportion of these vary, depending on the species, breeds, the period of lactation, the individual and the environment. The milk of the cow, goat, sheep, buffalo, mare, camel, ass and the sow is used for human consumption. The milk of the sow, however, is confined to countries like Spain. In this Presidency, we are mainly interested in the cow, buffalo, sheep and the goat’s milk. However, the composition of the milk of all the mammals mentioned above is given here for your information. I have also included the human milk for the purposes of comparison :

|         | Water. | Fat. | Sugar. | Casein. | Albumen. | Ash. |
|---------|--------|------|--------|---------|----------|------|
|         | %      | %    | %      | %       | %        | %    |
| Woman   | 88.50  | 3.30 | 6.80   | 0.90    | 0.40     | 0.20 |
| Cow     | 87.32  | 3.75 | 4.75   | 3.00    | 0.40     | 0.75 |
| Goat    | 86.04  | 4.63 | 4.22   | 3.49    | 0.86     | 0.76 |
| Ewe     | 79.46  | 8.63 | 4.28   | 5.23    | 1.45     | 0.97 |
| Buffalo | 82.34  | 7.57 | 4.66   | 3.62    | 0.60     | 0.84 |
| Mare    | 89.80  | 1.17 | 6.89   | 1.84    | ...      | 0.30 |
| Ass     | 90.12  | 1.26 | 6.50   | 1.32    | 0.34     | 0.46 |
| Camel   | 86.67  | 3.07 | 5.59   | 4.00    | ...      | 0.77 |
| Sow     | 84.04  | 4.55 | 3.13   | 7.23    | ...      | 1.05 |

.....Milk generally absorbs dirt and odour easily and it is also a good medium for various types of organisms like the bovine tuberculosis to thrive.

.....Having given the composition of milk it is not necessary to emphasise the importance of it as an article of food. It would, however, be interesting to put before you the value of milk as compared with other food-stuffs.

One quart or 2.25 lbs of milk is equal in food value to any of the following (From London Observer):

10 eggs, 15/16 lbs of lean-beef, 2½ lbs of potatoes, 7½ lbs of spinach, 8¾ lbs of lettuce, 5 lbs of cabbage, 2¾ lbs of fresh and cod fish, 2½ lbs of chicken, 5 lbs oats, 6¼ lbs turnips, 5/24 lbs butter, 5/12 lbs wheat flour, 5/12 lbs cheese.

In addition, I may mention that milk is not only a suitable food from

the point of view of catoric value, it also contains what we call vitamins. The milk contains abundance of vitamins A and some of B and D but little of C. As vitamins A and B are essential for growth, milk is the most suited food for the growing children.

## HINDUS HELPLESS

The following letter communicated by Dr. J. N. Guha, 11 B, Dr. Rajendra Road, P. O. Elgin Road, Calcutta has been published in ‘*Amrita Bazaar Patrika*’ :—

“Chittagong has revealed the utter helplessness of the Hindus of India particularly of Bengal, to-day. We realised our helplessness at Dacca, Kishorganj, Pabna, but Chittagong has given the proof of the extent of the helplessness of the Hindus.



I am not a Congressman nor a public-man. I am only busy to earn my bread and maintain my position by hard labour. The news of plunder at Chittagong of Hindu properties, in broad day light, in presence of Military and Police, within a few hours, worth more than a crore of rupees, by unarmed Moslem village mob, has terrorised me so much that my nerves are shaking, my blood is cooling to the freezing point and it seems to me Hindus were never so helpless as they are now.

My belief was that we are ruled by a strong nation and as such we are safe so long as they are at the helm of affairs. I had suspicion as to their negligence of duty in connection with Dacca, Kishorganj, Pabna and Cawnpore affairs, but Chittagong affair has revealed the real position and my belief in British capacity is totally shattered.

Hindus are totally disarmed and they live entirely on the mercy of the British force. British Government have thoroughly disarmed 28 crores of Hindus and they are thoroughly disorganised for the purpose of defence. If the British nation refuse them help when Mussalmans—men, women and children, loot their properties, burn their residence, and outrage the modesty of their women, as has been done at Dacca and Chittagong, I fear, unless God interferes, all the Hindus will be received as the Hindus of Chittagong have been totally ruined within a few hours! The more I think about it, the more my nerves are collapsing. The utter helplessness of the Hindus, to-day, has no parallel in the Indian History. Even under the Moslem Rule, they had the power to defend their hearth and home and in extreme cases to die fighting. But what happened at Chittagong? The helpless Hindus of Chittagong saw, as silent spectators, their houses, burnt, properties looted and destroyed worth a crore of rupees, by the simple

Moslem villagers (women and children taking part in the loot) in broad day light, without any resistance from any quarter.

Now the very grave question is that if this plunder of Hindu properties is repeated as is already repeated at Pabna, Dacca, Kishorganj, Chittagong, in the presence of the Government force, what can we do to check it? So far as the Hindus are concerned the situation is very serious. The question of political rights is altogether a different thing from what has happened at Chittagong. The time for enquiry is passed.

I do not like to discuss about the Moslems or the Europeans in India. I do like to know the real position of the Hindus. It is no time to sleep over the matter. It requires speedy solution. Hindus must know the real position and face it.

#### OUR PROPOSAL.

We are seriously thinking over the redress of a long-felt grievance about the non-existence of trained propagandists for impressing upon the minds of the wavering and weak-minded public the magnificent truth inherent in the principles and course of conduct prescribed for us by our Hindu Sastras. No doubt, there are some who are naturally fitted for such mission but they will not be sufficient. Nor have they such a facility as to engage themselves wholetime and heart and soul in this service. The present age, moreover, needs an expert type of very intelligent men endowed with supreme presence of mind and extraordinary patience and courage to face the organised sophistry of modern ill-advised and badly-trained men.

We propose therefore to organise an institution to train a set of young men to be entrusted with this most responsible mission. It is also our ambition to launch a trial whether the profits of this *Dharmic Hindu*, would suffice to work out this plan.



## REASON! WHITHER HAST THOU FLED?

It is incessantly alleged by modern men, especially by some reformed Brahmans and rebellious non-Brahmans that the *Manu Smruthi* had been compiled by the Brahmans of ancient days favourably towards their own class of people. One need not labour hard to understand the hollowness of such misconceptions. Even a superfluous observation of the trend of *Manu's* expositions could reveal well the unnaturalness of such a theory.

All the injunctions enunciated in the *Smruthi* are mostly in favour of non-Brahmans and brahmanas are asked to observe very many rigid rules of discipline which a non-Brahman would not at all like to welcome for himself. The general view of the *Smruthi* that:

*“Brāhmanasya tu dehoyam  
Nopabhogaaya kalpyathe |  
Iha klesaaya mahathe  
Prethyaamantha Sukhaaya Cha ||*

The Brahman is not born or the body of the Brahman is not created for enjoyment of wordly pleasures, but is intended to undergo hard discipline and troubles in this world and secure never-ending bliss and happiness in the next.” Will anybody like to forego the *prathyaksha sukha* or the happiness in this present visible world with a hope—the reality of which is more a hypothesis based on uncertainty—to enjoy a supposed eternal happiness in the other unseen world and that too after death?

Ever since he was born here what a lot of duties, which afford no earthly benefit, has been imposed upon him? He has to submit himself to inexpressible pressures of finance and other unsuitable environments before he satisfies himself with the performance of any religious rite. Imagine please, what sort of unbearable and never-ending rigorous courses

of conduct he has to pass through in his Brahmacharya life. The family life is in no way less anxious. His *nityakarmas*, which include the feeding of guests too, offer him no freedom to divert his attention towards any secular matters.

Even conceding for the sake of argument that they do, does *Manu Smruthi* permit the brahman to take to any profession in life for financing himself to appease his hunger? No, it practically forbids him from resorting to cultivation, trade or any other avocation that would facilitate the earning of a decent sum for his livelihood. Trade is allowed in extraordinary cases as *apaddharma* and even there the common articles of easy sale such as rice, ghee, salt, oil etc., are all prohibited.

The ‘*Nityakarmas*,’ which Sanskrit term means “daily duties” have to be performed more as a sort of disciplinary observance for the sake of duty than for realizing any earthly or heavenly benefit. The *Karma mimamsakas* define the nature of *Nitya Karmas* as follows:

*“Yesham cha karmanaam Karane  
palaabhaavaha akaranecha pratyaya  
va baahulyam thaanyeva cha karmani nityani”*

“The karmas, by the observance of which there is no fruit or remuneration but by their negligence there is much sin of the violation of duties, are called *nitya karmas*.” Let our anti-Brahman reformers kindly and calmly spend their thought at least a little on the point whether anybody, brahman or non-brahman, would like to set apart such an undesirable function for himself. Is it unnatural to think, therefore, that if brahmanas would have had chance or privilege to freely meddle with the texts of such Dharma sastras, they would never have imposed upon themselves such irksome task? Ever since the twilight begins to set in at daybreak till the stars again



appear in the blue canopy of the boundless heavens, to what sort of rigorous discipline has he to submit himself before he is satisfied of the proper discharge of his duties of the day? When his entire attention has been demanded at his endless religious duties, how and wherefrom could he hope to derive the sources of his income for his unavoidable necessities?

Diving deep into the question of the margin which *Manu* has granted to the brahman for securing his food-stuffs (*Yaatraamaatra prasidhyatam*—for the bare keeping up of the body only) we find: "*Rutamruthabhyam jiveth.*" To briefly explain the spirit of the above commandment it must be said that the first course allowed for him is to pick up one by one the corn scattered here and there in the harvested fields or in the paths and live upon them. The sanskrit term *Rutam* has been explained by the famous commentator *Kullukha Bhatta* as follows:—

*Abaadita sthaleshu pati vaa kshe-threshu va apratihataavakaaseshu yatra yatraushadhayo vidhyanthe tatra tatra angulibyam ekai-kam kanam samuchayithweti.*

There are two principles hinted herein in the accumulation of the required food-grain. One is that it must be gathered from a harvested field, from the pathways or from any other place without disturbing anybody, man, bird or beast. For example, if sparrows or any other kinds of birds are found in a field satisfying themselves with the corn in a field he should not go there and disturb them. Such is the rigidity of the injunction imposed upon him. These are the favourable dictates that help the Brahmins to lead an easy-going life!

If he could not live up to this ideal he must look up to the kings and other communities for support. To be brief his position has been reduced

to such straits as to be ever dependent upon non-brahmans—call them Kshariya Kings, Vaisya Lords or by any other name—even for their daily bread. Thus, in all ways his freedom has been checked at every stage.

A calm consideration of the entire laws of *Manu* is sure to convince an impartial researcher that only the brahmans have enough grounds to accuse *Manu* of having been partial towards his own classes of people, the non-brahmans, by granting them freely all the benefits of cultivation, industry and commerce and enjoining upon the brahmans a despicable dependency upon his own caste men. Even in the matter of crossing the seas and colonizing elsewhere *Manu* has placed a bar, a prohibitory injunction that brahmans should not travel across seas. Take into consideration any aspect and we find the brahman, according to *Manu's* dictates, always held in a disadvantageous position. It is this sort of enviable and oligarchic supremacy that the brahman has chosen to impose upon himself when he undertook to compile this *Smruti* under the name of *Manu*! Reason, whither hast thou fled?

Let not the public confuse the ideals placed by *Manu* with the practices of modern brahmans and attempt to refute our arguments. We are judging only the ideals of *Manu* whether anything has been included by him in his famous *Dharma Sastra* partially to the full advantage of the envied and despised brahman. We shall again advert to this very same subject sometime later.

## MODERN RELIGIONS OF INDIA

SYT. N. S. ACHARYA, B.A., B.L.

All Religions base their faith ultimately upon revelations peculiar to their own. One's Religion is practically settled by what one's ancestors



have been following; and it follows that one's beliefs and conduct are based upon such tenets that have transmitted from father to son. It is futile for the follower of one faith to attempt to convince a person of another religion of the reasonableness or otherwise of Religions other than that person's own. As the ultimate authority of religion is scripture it is perhaps not possible to assert that the particular scripture alone is revealed by God.

But when people profess to adopt a particular scripture or scriptures for the foundation of their faith they are expected to interpret the texts as they are without introducing their whims and fancies. Those that start with fixed notions do not bring to bear an unbiassed mind upon what they preach and when their teaching conflicts with their authority they are forced to distort the texts in the struggle between their whims on the one side and patriotism on the other and the result is a ridiculous mongrel of a religion leading to certain disaster. This is expressed in the Mahabharatha thus :

*Dridapurvasrutho murghaha  
Dharmaanaam avicaradaha !  
Vridhdhanapruchhan Sandehasn  
Andhaswabhramivarchchati ||*

"He who obstinately clings to the ideas acquired previously without having clear conceptions of the Dharmas and without clearing his doubt with the help of the elders falls like a blind man into pits treacherously covered."

Arjuna in a weak moment had made a vow to kill any one that spoke disparagingly of his bow (Gandiva). In the Great Bharata war Yudhistira was for a time cowed down by Karna and feared fainting. Just then Yudhistira appeared to suspect the prowess of Arjuna's Ghandiva. This enraged him and brought his vow to his memory and he almost made up his mind to kill

Yudhistira. It was at this juncture that Sri Krishna spoke thus to Arjuna who for a moment forgot all ideas of true Dharma and thought his supreme duty was to keep his vow.

Bhuddha was disgusted with the killing of animals in Vedic sacrifices. "Ahimsa," he said, "was the greatest of all Dharmas. The Vedas which approved of such cruelty to animals cannot be our authority. Hence, the greatest Dharma of this life is to do good unto others. We cannot have faith in a state of *Moksha* hereafter which cannot be established either by *pratyaksha*, direct perception, or *anumana*, reasoning. It follows that there is no such thing as a soul or Atma apart from the living beings that we see around us or God. Pleasure and pain that we enjoy incessantly change and so they are momentary. They disappear as soon as they come into existence. Everything is transient and nothing is permanent. Hence nothingness, *Sunya*, is the ultimate truth. That is *Moksha*, that is *Nirvana*."

Such was his teaching. The natural consequence of such a teaching based upon pessimism is atheism leading to a violent wreck of moral character. The one aim of every man will be to make the most of this transient life, no matter what means are adopted. This is the logical result of the reasoning from the above premisses. Self-control, altruism or other virtues of that sort, cannot be the consequence of this religion. They must derive their inspiration from elsewhere. It was, therefore, no wonder that when secular support as under Emperor Asoka failed to prop it up, Buddhism lost its hold in the land of its birth, where it could not satisfy the innate spiritual cravings of the people nourished from immemorial time, on Vedantic ideal. It vanished like a phantom before a religion which



based its faith on clear and definite conceptions of God, Soul, and Matter their relationship *interse* and fashioned its dharmas on the commands of an all-intelligent all-powerful and all-merciful Iswara. Ahimsa is the first of the dharmas taught by the Sanatana religion. It is also a matter for special notice that the successors of Buddha who were anxious to make the new religion acceptable to the people at large invented several stories of Buddha's previous lives, several worlds through which the soul must pass in transmigration before reaching Nirvana, several goals of enjoyment many Sadhanas or means for reaching the goals, several gradations of souls, avatars and Mahapurushas and a host of other things to bring Buddhism in a line with the ancient faith of the land with its metaphysics, puranas, avatars, paradise and so forth. This seems to be the conclusion of scholars who have made wide research into the Buddhist literature.

A similar story may be traced in the Jaina Religion. Jainism did not accept the sunya theory of the Buddhists; but, like them it denied God and the authority of the Vedas and their Dharmas. But Jainism recognised other worlds, goals to be reached, the means therefor and so forth. Like Buddhism too it had to resort to several inventions; and for their authority they quote from the teachings of an 'all knowing persons,' *sarvagna* whose words are accepted on faith. In vain did this religion expect people to throw away their allegiance to the immemorial Vedas and accept without demur the words of a person whom they set up as the supreme authority.

These two religions illustrate how from time immemorial religions have sprung up in our land primarily inspired by pertinacity in some idea or another which led ultimately to the

destruction and misinterpretation of ancient scriptures and which though flourished under the sunshine of Royal support or political revolutions had in time found their proper place. It is the Sanatana Religion that has survived such age, long perturbation and violence there must, indeed, be something inherently virile and grand in it. And so it is, that it has been a standing wonder of the world.

If we examine religions that have come into existence in our land in this manner, we find that their protagonists have chiefly quarrelled with the Varnashrama Dharmas, restrictions like those regarding food and marriages and so forth were unwilling to recognise God and fashioned their teachings upon the conceptions which they strongly cherished in certain matters. Added to this, foreign political authorities like Muhamadans before and Christians in the present time, have each in their own way spread their religion in this land. At the present day Christian missionaries make use of educational, medical and other institutions to further the propagation of their religion and the youth of the land, who have taken to Western education, are not a little influenced by it. Moreover the stress of circumstances consequent upon our contact with the civilization which places a high premium upon secular advancement leave us little time to think of Religion.

Political exigencies also require persons of all religions, classes and castes to come together and co-operate for the common welfare thereby creating a desire to level down as far as possible the differences between man and man. Under such circumstances and with the natural patriotism of man for his heritage the conceptions of religion often receive violent shocks in the hands of impatient reformers. And



the consequence is that strange religions arise offering momentary glamour threatening to destroy time-honoured beliefs and *acharas*, conduct but finding their level not long afterwards ! Some of these religions will be examined later in due course.

### VARNASHRAMA

SYT. R. CHATTERJEE

A Brahmo friend writes :—"..... You observed that the ruling principle constituting the backbone of Hindu society was Varnashram and that a departure from that principle would spell ruin to the said society. Varnashram at least was not the ruling principle of Buddhism. If so, was not Buddhistic period in India long enough to spell ruin, indeed thorough ruin, to Hindu society ? How is it that your Hindu society still exists ? Will you kindly explain this paradox ?"

The fact that Hindu society still exists necessarily leads to the fact that Varnashram also still exists, for the Hindu Society cannot be Hindu society without Varnashram. And the fact itself, as admitted by our friend, that Hindu society still, exists, constitutes an explanation of the so-called paradox. So far as the main body of society was concerned there was no deviation from the compass; so to say, even in the Buddhistic period. Whatever departure there must have been from the principle referred to was obviously confined to the lowest classes. The higher castes were, as a rule, as unaffected as they have been through all the social revolutions that have since followed. The Vaishnavism associated with the appearance of Sri Chaitanya Dev in Bengal developed in due course, for reasons which it is not necessary to mention here, into a mighty revolt against the established order of society and rolled over that Province

like a tidal wave. But so far as Varnashram was concerned, it failed to affect more than the fringe of Hindu society. In its social aspect its converts were confined as a rule, to the lower strata of society. The higher castes remained as unaffected as they had remained through the social revolution associated with the Buddhistic period of Hindu history.

If our Brahmo friend is not still satisfied we may refer him to the social revolution associated with Guru Nanak in the Punjab. It was a powerful movement, but it proved powerless against the ruling principle constituting the backbone of Hindu society. In theory Sikhism is a revolt against Varnashram, but in actual practice we find no deviation from the compass. The main body of Sikh society is socially as much Hindu as any Hindu can be. The Brahman, Kshatriya and Vaishya converts to Sikhism are still Brahmans, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas, being as much proud of *gotra* and blood as any Varnashrami Hindu. Socially at any rate, and speaking generally the long hair and the beard constitute the only marks of distinction between a Sikh and a Hindu.

If our Brahmo friend is not still satisfied, we may refer him to his own Samaj. The Brahmo Samaj, as originally established by Raj Rammohan Roy did not depart from the ruling principle constituting the backbone of Hindu society, namely, Varnashram. Raj Rammohan Roy himself remained throughout his life a Varnashrami Hindu, so to say, even to the extent of retaining the *yajnopavit*, the holy badge of Brahmanhood. In marrying his sons and daughters he strictly followed the Varnashram law and when he died at Bristol his body was cremated, according to the instructions he had left before his death, in strict conformity to the Hindu custom by a number of Brahmans he had taken



with him to England. His successor in the Brahma Samaj, Maharshi Devendranath Tagore—was, as is well known, a strict Varnashrami. He was proud of his *yajnopavit* and believed as fervently in the purity of blood as any Varnashrami Hindu does. He publicly dissociated himself, on the Varnashramic ground from the marriage of his daughter's son, Mr. Jyotna Ghosal, in the Kuch Behar royal family. The Maharshi's family associated with the Adi Brahma Samja,—one of the leading families in India as regards culture and genius—is strictly Varnashramic so to say in its pride of caste, *gotra* and blood. No daughter of this family has so far been married to one who is not a Kulin Brahmin. Our Brahma friend must be quite aware that apart from the first enthusiasts, few among the followers of even the Sadharan Brahma Samja have openly defied Varnashram. Many of them for all practical purposes are as much "caste-ridden" as those they condemn on that very account. The number of high caste Brahmos is not large who have entered into marriage relations with lower-caste families.

By the way, a rather amusing instance of the influence of Varnashrama on the Hindu mind is furnished by the Indian Christian community in the Madras Presidency. There are actually "caste" Christians among them. There are Brahman Christians and Sudra Christians! The former, for all practical purposes, are strict Varnashramis, some of them even retaining the usual *tilak* marks on their foreheads! They would not mix their blood with converts from a different *Varna*. Even Northern India converts from high-caste Hindus are generally found to dislike giving over their sons or daughters in marriage to low class Christians. The same is more or less the case with Hindu converts to Islam. There are Rajput Mohammadans, for instances who

are Varnashramic to the point of retaining their *gotras* and avoiding marriage relations with non-Rajput Mohammadans. The famous Tiwanas of the Punjab furnish a striking example of this fact. Indeed, to Hindu blood under any circumstance a conscious or subconscious obedience to the laws of Varnashram has become apparently through its perpetual continuity in the Race since the dawn of history, almost instinctive.

So far as Hindu society is concerned, Varnashram is ineliminable. The system is too deep rooted for that. The one is inconceivable, indeed insupportable without the other. It is Varnashram which saved Hindu society from the colossal social revolution of the Buddhist period and has made it survive all the terrible trials and tribulations that have since followed. But for Varnashram the Hindus would have been dead and gone like the ancient Romans, Assyrians and Greeks and it is through Varnashram that they will live, as they have lived, to fulfil their divine mission of bringing once again wisdom to a wayward world and peace to the brows that bleed.

## SWADHARMA AND THE SO-CALLED SWARAJYA

### II

BY ANANTASOONU

#### (1) *The anti-Brahman and anti-Aryan group:*

It is no use considering seriously the motives, actions and speeches of this group of people, possessed by *Brahmana phobia*. Anything savouring or connected directly or indirectly with Brahmin or Aryan origin stinks badly in their nostrils and their sacred duty is to extirpate all ancient institutions good or bad, smacking of Brahmin or Arya. From an ordinary hostility against Brahmins in political matters, it has grown to rank hatred



and bias, in all fields, social and religious, economical etc, so that recent phases have developed into 'Ravana cult' and 'self-respect mentality'. The former class would rather owe allegiance to the Dravidian monster hero. Ravana (they forget he is pucca Brahmin born), and advocate doing puja and worship to him as demi-god, in preference to the Aryan Rama, who is so much inferior to Ravana in chivalry, righteoussess, heroism etc. To these the name of Rama was so odious, that they cheered and congratulated the person, who under the inspiration of the movement, changed his name from *Ramadas* into *Ravanadas*. With this class, oppression of the Brahmin in thought, word and deed must be the aim and motto of a Non-brahmin. The *Self-respect mentality*, the most recent phase of the anti-Brahmin cult, goes a step further. God, the Dravidian civilisation and culture, which was once said to be the proud heritage of the Non-brahmin aborigines in India, their Social customs and manners, all alike became the target of their attack in most violent and vulgar language imaginable. All the customs and habits of the Dravidian people are said to have been tainted and spoiled by Brahmin contact and influence, and the best thing to do to make the Non-brahmin *happy* and *great* as a community or nation, is to denounce downright everything ancient though it has come down to them from thousands of years. So, even the worship of God is a fetish; marriage is a cumbersome restriction inconsistent with ancient Dravidian spirit temples and other sacred places, said to have originally belonged to the Dravidian and lately captured by Aryan usurper, from whom it was their duty to secure these holy seats, have now become burial ground and unholy spots, which must be levelled down and converted into pleasure parks or recreation grounds;

marriage is no sacrament but a simple civil contract terminable at will with no restriction as to either party's loyalty for life. Ceremonials etc., are degrading, though benefit of all connection with the hated priestly class and ought to be avoided by a self-respector. Young ones of either sex should aim at 'Epicurian life' and look to the foreign social custom and manners for guidance as to the best mode of enjoying the pleasure of life. Is it any wonder then that social legislation, contemplated in Sarda's Bill and the Age of Consent Bill is most welcome to this class of people?

(2) *The Congress or Swarajist Group*. Mostly, this group holds the creed that, to attain political greatness, all distinctions social and religious should be levelled down, so that Indian society may become one homogeneous whole and march, like the Macedonian phalanx in solid array in the battle for Swaraj! If Sastras and ancient religious codes are helpful in this direction, so much the better for them. Let them be allowed to remain; if not, let them be ignored or wiped out of existence. 'If the Sastras had any injunction in the matter, the Sastras have no use for me,' was the autocratic verdict given by the leader of the Congress group in the Legislative Assembly, the other day. So, the Sastras must conform to his view, if they should be honoured by his caring for them! This legislature is but a foretaste of what kind of religious freedom, toleration, freedom of worship personal liberty and can be expected under the 'Swaraj Government' to be established in the very near future. A sincere patriot and devout Hindu, who cherishes any respect for the ancient Hindu culture and ideal of the motherland cannot look with complacency on such a prospect. But then there is the consolation that that evil day will be far, far off!



(3) *Religious Reform Associations, Clubs, individuals, etc.* (1) Here, one section holds that Sastraic injunctions in these matters were framed for our society as it existed thousands of years before, by Manu and other law-makers who could not be expected to provide for the future, and periodical social arrangements and re-adjustments are necessary to suit the existing conditions in the light of the knowledge of western customs and manners which are so well adapted to the enjoyment of material prosperity and human happiness in this world. These openly say that these innovations should be introduced by means of penal legislation, so as to re-form Hindu Society, in disregard of hoary traditions, religious faiths and beliefs.

The other branch is not content with playing a moderate role like the other group but aspires to play the Samaritan, by preaching that the Sastras do approve if not certainly dam, *post-puberty* marriages, restrictions as to age of consent, widwre-marriages etc., which are the subject matter of legislation, past and present, that they alone are gifted true insight and proper perception of the spirit of the Vedas, which alone ought to be accepted as our sacred writings to the exclusion of smriti, and that the people ought to place implicit faith in them as the right interpreters of the Vedas. It is to be noted that these representatives of God on Earth, entrusted with the sacred duty of inculcating the true spirit of the Vedas, would talk of naught else than what is prescribed in the Vedas, and would cite Vedic sanction for the reforms they preach as if they themselves are following or want other people to follow the life of elaborate rituals, sacrifices, daily fire-rites, Brahmacharya, etc., depicted in them. These people want to level down distinctions and secure equality of sexes and classes, and

this they do by giving tickets of admission, (in the shape of certain Dwija rites at which they officiate, to lower classes to enter the portals of the higher classes, with result that a *new class* is created, separate and distinct from the ancient ones already in the Hindu fold.

*The so-called educated Brahman leaders and high personages.* Here, the reformers reflect different shades of opinion, and advance different arguments. But one thing is common with these. While doing most unbrahminical and unsastraic things (in the accepted sense of the terms), openly or covertly and flouting public opinion by virtue of their power and affluence, they would, for purposes of giving opinion on the proposed legislation, never admit they are not orthodox, but on the other hand, they would even claim to be more orthodox than the so-called pandits, middle class people, Acharyas, Heads of mutts who believe in and act up to Sastraic injunctions, as far as possible under modern conditions. With this common ground, one branch wants to work out the reform by saying that the Smritis and Vedas are not against the proposed restriction in the age of marriage or consummation thereof, and that the evils of the present system, as depicted by political leaders and doctors trained in the western system, are so injurious in effect that the readjustment of society on modern western lines is to be welcomed, though it may be a *gauna* religious practice.

The other branch includes in its fold eminent leaders gifted with great legal acumen, subtle powers of argument, and not weighted with a desire to conform strictly to ancient customs and practices, though wholesome, it avers that the Vedas contemplate only post puberty marriage as the *regular one* and that the pre-puberty marriage that have been in vogue for the past thousands of



years, are shastraically illegal (so that for thousands of years generations of Brahmans and Dwijas have been bastards from the standpoints of Vedic injunctions!) and that the proposed legislation is most welcome as it will tend to establish, ere long, a state of Society akin to that in primeval vedic age. One cannot resist a smile when one hears of such people talking about no less an authority than direct Vedic sanction for their religious sermons to the people at large. Would they now follow absolutely the life of a *Grahasta* etc., as depicted in the Vedas? Further, their interpretation of the Vedas is to be accepted as infallible authority, as if it were an American or English case law.

They talk of post-puberty marriages as being the right kind ordained in the Vedas. Do the Vedas anywhere speak explicitly of marriages give particulars of the ages of the couple or the classes that can intermarry, relationship to be avoided in marriage, marital ceremonies and rites etc? Most of the things are to be inferred from hints contained in Vedic injunctions connected with the performance of sacrifices, daily fire-rites etc, and it is the smritis that have collated the stray Vedic texts and grouped them as codes of conduct in regard to various practices. The only reference so-called in the Vedas to marriage is where they say '*A wife should seek a husband with many children.*' This, ordinarily interpreted as modern leaders would do, should mean that the special phenomenon of '*unmarried mothers*' who number many thousands in the famous land of Miss Mayo, represented the state of Society ordained in our Vedas, so that we could not be Aryans pure and simple, if we should revert to that system of marriage. The arrogance of Omniscience and Self-conceit could go no further than saying that Manu and

other seers could not understand the Vedas properly, that the codes of conduct ordained by them conflict with the Vedas, and that it is given to wiseacres like the modern Reformers to intepret the Vedas rightly and along really orthodox lines! Then again, they want to back up their hobby by quoting the ancient medical authorities. Here too, misinterpretation is the weapon with which they want to fight. They assert that Charaka lays down that conception before a girl attains 16th year is injurious and so, consummation before that age should be avoided! This has been pointed out to be an erroneous interpretation by an eminent Ayurvedic Doctor before the Age of Consent Committee, who found it a bitter pill to swallow and quietly ignored it. The same authority says that a man of 25 years of age should seek a girl of 12 for purposes of Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha. Is the author of Ayurveda so foolish as to say such inconsistent things in his works? Probably, this is research work carried on in a spirit of critical study and refined methods of interpretation. It will be interesting to note that *persona grata* who are wedded to the modern doctrine of Birth control as an efficacious remedy for early maternity and infantile mortality and who are doing sedulous propaganda work in that direction with all the zeal of *new converts* to a cause, hail the proposed penal legislation as a God-sent and exhort the ignorant masses to welcome it. Where is the need for this legislation, when birth control solves the problem?

#### THE FICTION OF SATI

Lastly this is the common weapon in the hands of reformers and others alike for disarming opposition to the bills and pooh-poohing the possibility of orthodox people revolting against the legislation, if passed. Of the many fictions, political, religious and



social, relating to the East India Company's administration in India the so-called abolition of *Sati* is pointed out as a 'Damocles Sword' to people who would put up opposition against the bill. 'Sati' (wife dying with her dead husband), they say, was a religious custom, but was an inhuman one. The benign East India Company put an end to it by penal legislation and thereby the lives of so many women have been saved. What was the result of agitation against it at first? Did anybody dare act against it after it was passed into law? So, even now the benign British Government, backed up by the authority of peoples' representatives, who are the reputed guardians of peoples' welfare, happiness, longevity of life, rights and privileges of widows, should interfere in religious matters and save the lives of some girls and infants forming a small percentage of the population. What a sophistic reasoning this is! Medical as well as lay opinion is agreed in holding that alcoholic drinks and tobacco act as poisons on the system and wreck the physique and life of a large number of people. Religion too forbids their use. Yet no legislation is forthcoming to penalise drinking and smoking or chewing tobacco. Probably such legislations will not hit against particular community, but will affect all. This is not a desirable thing, as it will put restraint on unfettered drinking which is considered to be an indispensable item of fashionable life as well as of low life.

Coming to *Sati*, God knows how far *Sati* prevailed. There is reason to believe that it was a nice fiction like the Black-hole tragedy, manufactured for the enhancement of the glory of the East India Company's administration and the masking of their defects in the estimation of the Directors in England. Even granting that the system existed in an appre-

ciable scale, its analogy in the present case is misleading and mischievous. The Sastras do not *enjoin* *Sati* as a religious act. No woman is compelled to die with her husband. At the most, as some ardent apologists believe and aver they may be said to consider it not *sinful* as a case of suicide. Manu says 'thousands of young widows have led a chaste life and attained Salvation.' If, in the early days of British administration during the many wars that afflicted the land, Hindu queens and heroic ladies took to *Sati* when widowed, to escape the outraging of their modesty and chastity by lustful conquerors and enemies it does not give a religious sanction to it. The abolition of *Sati* is not to be quoted as a precedent for religious interference either by foreign Government or by the so-called representatives of the people in the legislatures.

Let them enact laws as they like and show their power to convulse Society at their sweet will but let them not seek to justify their action as a humane measure consonant with the spirit of Hindu Religion and social polity and conducive to the growth of happiness of people whom they lord it over at present. Their specious arguments will not deceive the mass of people whom the new legislation aims and affects most *vitally* and who, though not physically powerful enough to remonstrate effectively, will join chorus with *George Canning* and pray :

"Give me the avow'd, the erect  
the manly foe,  
Bold I can meet—perhaps may  
turn his blow ;  
But of all plagues, Good Heaven,  
thy wrath can send,  
Save, Save, Oh ! Save me from the  
candid friend"—*New Morality.*

Will these prayers go unheeded now and for ever?



## FROM THE MASTER'S LIPS.

## I

SYT. R. KRISHNASWAMY AIYAR,  
M.A., B.L.

The several aspects of our religion and practice have been so exhaustively dealt with by a succession of brilliant authors that it would seem impossible to throw further light upon them. But one familiar with the method of teaching adopted in ancient India and still preserved in quarters, where the mania for thrusting ideas into the brain of the pupil rather than helping him to think for himself has not yet invaded, will know that the dialogue is more useful and of more permanent effect than mere books however interestingly written. The intrinsic greatness of Sri Ramakrishna could have been recognised and appreciated only by a very few of his disciples; but his sayings, embodying in the simplest language the highest teachings, appeal to the heart and the intellect of even the dullest of us. To one who does not aspire at proficiency in dialectics, there is ample material in his sayings from which a practical given for conduct can be made out. Such great souls who have lived and live the true life do not care to stoop to the level of authorship, for they know that their example and their occasional words of guidance are more potent to help the world than any book that they may write. It is my purpose in these pages to give a free rendering of some of such valuable words which I have heard from the lips of His Holiness Sri Chandrasekhara Bharati Swaminah, the present Acharya of the Sringeri Mutt. That he now occupies one of the four seats of learning founded by the great master Sri Sankaracharya is the least of his qualifications; that he has realised the truth and is living it is sufficient to endow his sayings with incalculable value to us all.

## HINDUISM.

While His Holiness was camping in a village in Southern India in 1926 during the course of his tour, an European gentleman accompanied by his wife and child and a friend of his came to see him. He seemed to have studied some popular books on the Vedanta philosophy and felt attracted by its teachings. Soon after they took their seats, the following conversations began. As I did not ascertain the name of the gentleman, I have to call him simply as A.

A: Swamiji, may I know if you are prepared to take converts to your religion? Personally I find much worth in it and I have known very many friends who so love your philosophy and religion that they would like to call themselves Hindus if that is possible.

H. H.: The Hindu system of philosophy and religion is bound to attract all thinking minds but we do not take any converts.

A: If you think that your system is an invaluable one and is bound to be useful to all mankind, does it not follow that you must be prepared to take in converts?

H. H.: It does not necessarily follow. Conversion is possible or necessary only when the person who desires to be a convert does not now belong to the religion to which he desires to be converted.

A: How is that? Do you mean to say that no formal conversion is necessary as those who desire to be Hindus are already Hindus by virtue of that desire itself?

H. H.: No. I mean that all are Hindus, irrespective of their desire to be called Hindus.

A: How can that be?

H. H.: Hinduism is the name which has now been given to our system but really it has always been known only as Sanatana Dharma or Eternal Law. It does not date from a particular date or begin from a



particular Founder. Being eternal, it is also universal. It knows no territorial jurisdiction. All beings born and to be born belong to it. They cannot escape the Law whether they concede its binding force or not. It is an eternal truth that fire burns. It does not depend for its validity upon *our* allegiance to it. If we accept that truth, so much the better for us. If we do not, so much the worse for us. In either case, the law is there immutable, universal and eternal. Such is our Sanatana Dharma.

A: If then the entire world is Hindu according to you, how do you justify the restrictive caste system?

H. H.: I only told you that all were Hindus and entitled therefore to seek guidance in the tenets of our religion. I did not say that the guidance will be the same for all. Countless are the varieties in temperaments, training, environments, hereditary leanings, parental tendencies and so on, that it will be impossible to expect of any single stereotyped system of conduct for all. On Dharma taking due notice of this undeniable fact resolves itself into two parts (1) *Samanya Dharma* or Ordinary Law and (2) *Visesha Dharma* or special Law. The former guides all mankind; the former and the latter both together guide those who come under the caste system.

A: If the rules of caste have any spiritual value, why not give the benefit of them to those who are outside it?

H. H.: If water is beneficial to a thirsty man, does it follow that it will be beneficial to give it to a man who is feverish and therefore feels thirsty.

A: Your illustration is not fair. There is nothing to show that a special rule of conduct prescribed for a particular caste will be *injurious* to others who do not belong to that caste or to any caste at all.

H. H.: On the other hand, you must say that there is nothing to

show that a special rule of conduct prescribed for a particular caste will be *beneficial* to others. For, the mere fact that it is prescribed for *that* caste makes it a special law and not applicable to the generality of mankind. If the Shastras are our only guide for telling us that a particular line of conduct *is* beneficial, we cannot throw them overboard when they tell us *for whom* it is beneficial. Our system and in fact any system which aims at a regulation of conduct, must be based on the principle of Adhikara or competency. Those who belong to the castes are competent to pursue *Visesha Dharma*; the others are competent to pursue only *Samanya Dharma*. Further the nature of the competence required can be learned only from the Shastras which prescribe the Dharma.

A: If then the Hindu Shastras are to be taken as the guide for all humanity and if all persons born are in your view born in your religion, how do you account for the prevalence of other faiths!

H. H.: It is their fault that they do not recognise that they are but aspects of the Aryan religion. The highest teachings of any other religion do find a place in the Hindu religion and are but a phase of the Ordinary Law laid down there.

A: Don't you think, Swamiji, that your claim is placed somewhat very high and that the other religionists may not be disposed to concede it?

H. H.: The disposition of others to concede the claim of Hinduism is quite beside the point, for, the intrinsic worth of anything is always there whether one recognises it or not. As for the claim being high, I desire to point out to you that I cannot possibly put it lower.

A: How is that?

H. H.: Please excuse me if I take Christianity as an example to illustrate my point. If belief in the personality of Christ is a *necessary*



condition of salvation, we must be prepared to say that all those persons who have lived before the time of Jesus have been denied the benefit of salvation for no fault of theirs and simply because they happened to be born when Jesus was yet unborn. The same reasoning would deny salvation to those who have lived at the same time as Jesus and since that time but have not heard of him. Further don't you think that it was very unfair of God that He should suddenly wake up on a particular day and prescribe for all mankind a *necessary* condition of salvation? Did He forget that the people who had the misfortune to be born before that date had souls to save? If he did not forget, did He take care to prescribe for them the means necessary to enable them to attain salvation? If he did so prescribe, His prescription could not possibly have included a belief in the Jesus to be born. The only logical hypothesis therefore which any reasonable man can accept is that God *when* He created the first man (if there was such a time) simultaneously prescribed also the means for *his* salvation, for even he the first man was certainly in need of salvation and being the first man the teaching could have been conveyed to him only by the only other Being that then existed, namely God. We accordingly say your Vedas that they were co-eval with the first man (not in the sense that they were *created* together for we believe that there was no *first* creation but that everything is beginningless but in the sense that they were co-existing) and that they are the revelations from God Himself. Any religion which traces its origin from a later time, any time after creation, and from any teacher other than God, is bound to be short-lived and imperfect.

#### REVELATION

A: I understand your point but, Swamiji, you have made the assump-

tion that man is not capable of finding out the means of salvation himself and that he requires somebody, be it God, to point them out to him.

H. H: Before he can possibly find out the means, he must first know that there is something to be striven after at all. That there is such a something can be known by us only if somebody who partakes of that something or has realised it in actual experience informs us about its existence. This information coming from beyond the range of our experience is itself in the nature of revelation. Further how can one possibly know that a particular course of conduct *does* lead to salvation, unless this is taught to us by somebody who *has* pursued that particular course and *has* attained salvation or by somebody who by his omniscience is able to visualise at the same time the pathway as well as the Goal or by somebody who is the Goal itself.

A: Certainly we need no revelation to teach us that God exists? The means of knowing Him may be a difficult matter and some guidance may be necessary from those who have known Him. But the fact of God's existence does not require any revelation for we can ourselves infer it by the aid of our reasoning faculty.

H. H: If the existence of God is so patent a fact and so easily inferable, how do you account for the atheists and the agnostics in the world? Do you mean to say that their powers of intellect and capacity for reasoning out are in any way inferior to yours? On the other hand, you will find that the thinkers who have taken the trouble to think out the existence of God and failed are all men of extra-ordinary intellect and vigour. Their failure to prove God is not due to any fault in their intellectual equipment but due merely to God; being essentially uninferable. Further assuming that you



can by the aid of reasoning infer the existence of God, who told you that there is a God *to be inferred*? Certainly you depend upon a previous information for the knowledge. If somebody tells you that there is a God, you may try your reasoning power at proving Him. If you have never heard of God at all, there is nothing to incite or awaken your powers of reasoning.

A: It is not necessary that I should have heard of God before I exercise my reasoning faculty. The word God may not be before my mind but a conception of something changeless eternal underlying this ever-changing evanescent world naturally suggests itself to me as a matter of inference.

H. H.: Why?

A: It cannot be denied that the world is made up of opposites, light and darkness, activity and inertness, pain and pleasure and so on. I infer from this that in as much as there is change in the world, there must be a non-changing factor also. In as much as everything is dying every moment, I infer that there is a non-dying factor also. And so on, thereby I am able by mere inference to postulate the existence of a Single, Homogeneous, Eternal, unchanging Being as opposed to the many, heterogeneous, evanescent, changing, seeming.

H. H.: May I know what is the opposite of a "horse"? A horse is a positive object of perception. From its existence, you must be able to infer its opposite. What is that opposite? My question may seem somewhat crude but nevertheless requires an answer.

A: Well then. Swamiji, I shall say that the opposite of a horse is a "non-horse."

H. H.: Quite right. Is it a *positive* thing or is it only a mere negation?

A: In as much as I have called it the opposite of a horse, I must say that it is a positive thing.

H. H.: Is it an animal or do you

include in that conception everything else in the universe?

A: Strictly speaking I must include therein everything else in the universe for even a stone is a non-horse. But ordinarily as the negative goes with the "horse," it is sufficient to include the horse-ness alone and so by a non-horse is ordinarily meant an animal which is not a horse.

H. H.: That is, the conception of the opposite of a particular thing can only be of a thing akin to that thing but different from it in that particularity. In other words there is no *absolute* opposite for anything in the world; the want of a particular characteristic in one thing which we find in another makes us think that they are the opposite of each other. A particular intensity of illumination is capable of being viewed as a particular degree of light; it can also be viewed as a particular degree of darkness, light and darkness are not therefore the absolute opposites of each other but only relative aspects of light or of darkness as we may choose to view them. Your theory therefore of *absolute* opposites has no basis in fact.

Further you seem also to have misconceived the scope of inference. As I have told you before, unless you have a prior knowledge of the fact that there *is* something to be inferred, no inferential conclusion can possibly arise in your mind. Suppose a person who have never seen or heard of fire sees smoke. He cannot possibly infer the existence of fire, for to him the smoke that he actually sees is the ultimate fact. A thing which *is* explains itself and does not generate in us any desire to know what *may be* behind it, *unless* we have reason to think that the thing which *is* is really not the thing in itself but depends for its existence upon something else. Similarly if the world is ever changing and if we have never heard of a



changeless Being, we will accept the fact of the changing world as it is. The changing world will remain the ultimate *fact* for us. It requires no explanation, for it *is* there. If it is changing, what else is there to explain? It is its nature. If it ceases to change, it will cease to be a world. If however we *have* heard of a changeless Being, explanations are necessary to justify the changing character of the world, to point out the relationship between that Being and the world and to prove that relationship. Revelation is thus necessary to put us on the track of enquiry by positing the existence of that changeless Being. Reason will be of great help to us in that enquiry. In the absence of the sure guide of revelation, reasoning is mere groping in the dark.

Again, if you find that everything in the world is changing and if you want to *infer* something from this perceived fact, your inference can only be in this way. "Every thing is changing. If there is another thing it must also be changing." That is, in the region of inference you cannot get away from the perceived relationship between a cause and a phenomenon. In fact, inference is based only on that perceived relationship. If your experiences tell you that whatever *is* changes, your inference cannot possibly tell you that that there is something which *is* but does not change. On the other hand, it will tell you that in as much as that something *is* it also must change.

Finally the utmost that reason can take you to is that something changeless *may* exist; it cannot tell you as a positive fact that it *does* exist nor can it tell you what it is.

A: I am greatly obliged to you, Swamiji, for presenting before me the value of revelation in this light. I have never heard it so expounded till now.

#### OTHER RELIGIONS

A: But again my initial difficulty in understanding the need for, rather the fact of, several conflicting religions all purporting to point out the path to the light remains unsolved.

H. H.: I told you that the principle of Adhikara or competency rules the world. As there are various gradations in competency, there are various faiths suited to those particular gradations.

A: I can quite understand this. But no religion is prepared to admit that it is intended for people of a particular gradation alone. In fact every religion claims to be the highest and the only true one.

H. H.: Suppose a young boy is simultaneously asked by four persons to light a lamp, to trim the wick, to fill the oilcan, to put out the lamp, he will be in a hopeless mess and will not know what to do at all. All these things cannot be done simultaneously but each one of those persons insist upon his command being obeyed first. What is the poor boy to do? If a fifth gentleman turns up and says "Bring me a pair of scissors," he is adding one more command. The boy is already perplexed by the option which is given to him of choosing from among four alternatives. Now he has to choose from among *five* alternatives. That is, his difficulty is increased by the advent of the fifth gentleman and not at all lessened. If however this gentleman is kindly interested in the boy and does want to help him out of his difficulties and if the boy with unbounded faith turns to him for help, the gentleman has to tell him emphatically "Bring me the pair of scissors. You *need not* obey the other commands." That is, to serve as a practical guide to the perplexed boy, he has to say that his command alone is the one to be obeyed and that the others are not. Similarly, any religious teacher claiming at the practical guidance of those who have faith



in himself has necessarily to say "Do as I ask you to do. Ignore the commands of others."

A: That means that the religious teachers adopted their teachings to the calibre and competency of the people who came to them for guidance and to the circumstances of the times when they lived. In other words, their teachings were only relatively true though perhaps the teachers were themselves aware of the absolute Truth; in determining what to teach and what not they were guided more by diplomatic expediency than by unswerving regard for Truth.

H. H.: Rather, they were guided by the needs and the competency of the people. As I mentioned once before, cold water gives comfort to a thirsty man but it is positively harmful to a man laid up with fever. If a doctor allows one man to take cold water and prohibits another from taking it, no partiality can be attributed to the doctor. Nor can the cold water be blamed for relieving the one or harming the other.

A: How is then one to know whether a particular truth enunciated by a teacher is absolute truth or only relative truth?

H. H.: Why do you want to know it? Is it to determine the relative superiority or inferiority among the several teachers or is it to obtain for yourself a practical guide to regulate your life with?

A: It is really both; I want to know which religious teachers has approximated most to truth and then shape my life according to *his* teaching.

H. H.: It is an elementary proposition that an umpire who has to decide between the relative capacities two persons must himself possess a capacity higher than either of them for otherwise he will miss their weaknesses. Do you think that God has favored you with such a high power of intellect that you can claim

to sit in judgment over the intellects of Christ, Mahomed and other religious teachers? Further to decide between two conflicting theories, you must know each one of them thoroughly. Can you profess in the least to have made such a thorough study of any one religion, leave alone the others? Again, is our life long enough to permit of a thorough study of even a single aspect of a religion. Where is then the time to reduce the result of that study into practice?

A: What then, Swamiji, is your practical advice to me?

H. H.: You believe in God?

A: Yes.

H. H.: You believe in the wisdom of God?

A: Yes.

H. H.: You believe that that wisdom will be impressed in every act of God?

A: Yes.

H. H.: You grant that that wisdom must be apparent also in his giving you birth?

A: Certainly.

H. H.: God had then a purpose a wise purpose, in giving you birth?

A: Yes. Even my birth cannot be purposeless.

H. H.: God had a purpose, a wise purpose, in giving you birth as the child of a particular set of parents.

A: There must be.

I do not believe in chance.

H. H.: What more patent purpose need be sought after to explain your being born of christian parents than to admit that in God's view christianity was the best suited to one of your competence? The Lord in his supreme wisdom can well be safely relied upon to judge what is the religion best suited for us. He knows that our poor intellects will be helpless to decide for us the path which we have to tread, takes upon Himself the responsibility of deciding that path and gives us birth in that



country, clime, time and faith best suited for us. Why should we ignore this gracious mercy of the Lord and try to do the impossible in canvassing the relative value of the several religions?

A: I have tried to understand christianity and follow it to the best of my lights but very many doubts are cropping up now and then and I have not been able to meet with anybody who can solve those doubts. That is why I wanted to study other religions.

H. H.: Doubts can never be solved unless you approach the persons who have not merely studied their religion but are daily living it. For the purpose of trade you are prepared to cross the seas and explore the air but for the purpose of truth you want the teachers to go to your door and resolve your doubts. This attitude that religion is an interesting side aspect of life must go. It once you realise that religion is life itself and not an *aspect* of it, you will begin to explore the entire world earnestly for a proper teacher who is ever waiting but is waiting for a symptom of that earnestness. I am *not* prepared to admit that there are not such teachers in christianity. They may not be in the ordinary world of strife, for such a world does not want them and they have no use for such a world. They may be even in the midst of that strife as that strife cannot injure them and as the world cannot recognise them. Go therefore in search of such true christians and ask them in true humbleness of heart to solve your doubts. They will do so in no time and you will find that God, in spite of your doubts, was after all justified in making you the child of christian parents.

A: I cannot sufficiently thank you, Swamiji, for your kind words of advice. Please allow me to confess that when I came here I had no idea that I would be going away from you

with a sincere desire to be a better christian. But that is the desire which you have inculcated in me. If your aim is to make a christian a better christian, a Hindu a better Hindu and so on, your religion is certainly more catholic than I thought it was. In parting, may we have your gracious blessings?

H. H.: Blessings are the monopoly of God and we shall all pray for *His* gracious blessings. Please let me once more point out to you that God has already blessed you with a good physique, a virile mind and a keen intellect. An artist ever so capable even though provided with the finest of colours and with the finest of pencils and even though he may have thought out the finest of subjects cannot depict a picture on the vacant air. To use and give expression to all these facilities and conceptions, he does require a stable back ground of canvas, however thin and worthless it may be. Don't waste therefore your gifts on airy speculations as to the relative value of the several religions. Apply your God-given gifts on the stable back ground of your God-chosen faith, Christianity. When the painting is over and you are contemplating the beauty of the picture, the back-ground may fade away from your view of its own accord. But not till then. Remember!

#### PRAMANAS

SYT. S. MAHALINGA IYER, B.A., B.L.

India is a land of philosophers. It is narrated in the life of Sri Sankaracharya that when he went to Benarees and wanted to be directed to the house of Mandana Mishra, he was told that he should WEND his way to that door where even the parrots, as would appear from their talk, were familiar with the discussion of the question whether the Vedas were of self-dependant validity, or derived



their authority extraneously. We are living in a different age now. But even to day we may be none the worse for devoting a little of our attention to a topic which was of fundamental and absorbing interest to our ancient sages and savants.

The word *Pramana* is derived from the root *Ma* to measure. *Pramana* has been explained to mean *gnana sadhanam* that is, means to knowledge. The means or instrument which enable us to obtain correct knowledge is a *Pramana*.

We perceive the existence of the external world by our sensory organs. They are called *Karanas* in Sanskrit. There is the sixth *Karana* which is mind. It is known by various names *Chiththa*, *Budhi*, *Manaha*, and *Antah-karana*; when engaged in a particular function it is known by a particular name. The senses are aids to *Prathyaksha Pramana*. They produce direct perceptions. The eye enables us to see the forms of objects. By the senses of hearing, smell, taste and touch we are brought into direct contact with the fields of perception which are particularly cognisable by those senses respectively.

In Hindu philosophy, we hear of the five elements, *Akasa*, *Vayu*, *Agni*, *Ap*, and *Prithivi*. They are not correctly translated into Sky, Air, Fire, Water and Earth. They bear an entirely different significance as conceived in Hindu philosophy. *Sabda* is the Guna of *Akasa*, *Sparsa* that of *Vayu*, *Rupa* of *Agni*, *Rasa* of *Ap*, and *Gandha* of *Prithivi*. Hence *Prithivi* does not mean solid, *Ap*, water and *agni*, fire. An object becomes perceptible to our eyes because of the element of *Agni* present in it. The taste of any substance is due to the element of *Ap* in it, and so also its smell to the element of *Prithivi*. It is the presence of *Vayu* in any object that makes it perceptible to our tactile sense. The quality of *Akasa* is sound. That

portion of the universe whose existence we perceive through one sense of hearing answers to its *Akasic* element.

The physical world around us is real and existent to us only through the five senses. A blind man has one fifth of the world cut off from his vision. The numbness or non-functioning of each of the other senses would mean the removal out of perception of the respective spheres of each. We have thus the three categories, the seer, the senses and the seen.

What we see with our own eyes or know with the aid of our other senses by direct perception is *Prathyaksha Pramana*. At first sight it would seem that knowledge obtained through the senses is infallible. But it is not so. A true *Pramana* is that which produces knowledge which is true for all time—past, present and future—and not liable to be varied or falsified by the testimony of some other *Pramana*. Applying this test, we can cite instances where even the testimony of direct perception by the senses fails. A person with jaundice in his eyes sees all things yellow. The sky appears to be blue to the naked eye, though it is mere space and the colour is an illusion. The sun, moon, and other heavenly bodies appear of small size to the naked eye, though we know their real sizes to be vastly greater than their appearance. Standing between the rails in a railway line, we see the rails appearing to approach each other closer and closer in the remote distance. In all these cases, the testimony of sense-contact does not produce correct knowledge.

There are cases where our senses are not capable of perceiving infinitely small things or phenomena. The vibration of atoms in a heated body, our naked eye cannot see. The presence of microbes in the air or bacteria in water is not visible to the



ordinary eye. Touch and taste require the immediate contact of the objects to be sensed. The senses of sight, hearing, and smell can operate at a distance, but only up to a limited extent. Objects cannot be seen, heard or smelt from an indefinite distance. We cannot disaffirm the existence of anything, because it is not directly perceivable by any of our senses. Such non-perception may be due to the imperfect capacity of the senses, or to separation by a distance. To sum up (a) direct sense-perception constitutes Pratyaksha Pramana; (b) the testimony of sense-contact is not always infallible; it is liable to be superseded by some other means of knowledge, which make out the thing to be different; (c) Direct sense-perceptions have a very limited sphere of operation.

With the fund of knowledge and experiences which we possess through our sense-perceptions we extend our field of knowledge by what is known as Anumana Pramana. Where Pratyaksha decides, Anumanam has no scope. A man sees smoke at a distance. He infers that there must be fire. If he approaches and finds the fire there, then his knowledge becomes Pratyaksha. Till then it is only Anumana. In a series of facts or happenings where we have known a uniformity of co-existence or sequence, the presence of one fact or set of facts in the series, leads to the inference of the existence or the happening of the other facts or events which constitute the series. We make the assertion that the Sun will rise tomorrow morning, because it has been the case every morning in the past. When the moment of sunrise arrives tomorrow, what was a belief due to Anumana, becomes certainty by Pratyaksha.

Assertions and beliefs based on Anumana are weaker than the knowledge based on Pratyaksha. All Anumanams to be valid must stand on, and make their ultimate appeal to

Pratyaksha. Any application of Anumana which does not rest on the solid basis of actual experience in respect of the premises and the fixed correlation (Vyapti) between the premises and the conclusion, will be the projection of a mere fancy—a bare play of imagination and not the means of attaining valid knowledge. We can proceed only from the known to the unknown *Drushtachcha adrushta siddhihi*. A valid *Anumanam* must rest upon facts and experiences within the cognisance of all, or which are accepted without dispute by those who are called upon to accept the result of Anumanam.

The facts and experiences which can form the basis of Anumanams are infinite in number and variety. Hence there is a vast field for the play of Anumanam. But we have also to realise its limitations. We should be alive to the chances that are likely to affect its validity, or make it erroneous. I stated that the correct application of Anumana depends upon the existence of a known series of facts or events, with fixed or uniform correlations. Under such circumstances, a premise leads to a valid conclusion. But the exact nature and the total number of all the factors which go to make up a particular series cannot be predicated with certainty by our finite understanding. Suppose one hundred factors constitute the true make up of a series, but we are aware to certainty of a smaller number—whether fifty or ninety-nine. The ignorance as to even one factor may vitiate the Anumanam based thereon. The statement that the sun will rise tomorrow morning, philosophically speaking only a surmise of a probability—however high such probability may be. We cannot—strictly speaking—assert it has a certainty. Some factor may intervene which is beyond our knowledge and calculation, and prevent the happening of



the event. Thus all conclusions based upon Anumana constitutes only beliefs and expectations—with varying degrees of probability of their proving true. Anumanas operate only in respect of a matter not within immediate cognisance—on account of separation by time or space or other impediment. The inference becomes a reality, and finality attaches to it, only when it has passed into the region of the actual, that is when tested and verified by experience.

We have spoken of Prathyaksha and Anumana Pramanas. The third main Pramana is Sabda Pramana. In a general sense we can say there is Sabda Pramana wherever any knowledge is based upon words spoken or written. In the special sense, the Vedas constitute the supreme Sabda Pramana.

A little reflection will reveal the immense part Sabda plays in the affairs of mankind. Wherever in any matter of knowledge or belief reliance is placed on another's word, the operation of the Sabda Pramana in its largest sense is seen. It is not a fact that we are guided in the affairs of our life solely by the knowledge derived directly by us. For one thing, our senses can operate only within a limited sphere. In respect of everything that lives beyond, it is only others' words that we believe. To all those of us who have not personally visited London or New York, it is only through Sabda that we can claim to know of the existence of these cities, and everything connected with them.

In fact we have only second-hand knowledge of every event which does not happen within cognizable proximity in that little corner of the earth which we inhabit. The newspaper brings us news every morning from the four corners of the earth. But it is all reported knowledge. It is the mere illusion to suppose they

are all true, or even substantially true. The report might have been sent by persons who have not seen the things. They might have been mistaken or misled. What is worse, they might have indulged in conscious or deliberate misrepresentation, distortion or invention. Man's selfishness, greed, anger, jealousy, and a hundred other motives induce him to spread falsehood. We all know the extent to which false propaganda was resorted to during the recent European War. The propagandist calculates upon the inveterate tendency that exists in all of us to believe the spoken of the written word. To many people, what has appeared in the morning newspaper is their gospel for the day. In the modern age nothing is or can be great, good, or true, which has not been noticed or featured in the newspapers. As in regard to matters existing or happening at a distance, so also in regard to events of the past, we have necessarily to rely on the words of others. When a person states the date of his birth, or his grand-father's name he does not speak from direct knowledge, but repeats what he has heard from others. To this same category belongs all the knowledge enfolded in the vast literature of History and Biography. Historians may compile their volumes from contemporary records and original documents. But what of that? Is there any guarantee that those contemporary records and original documents speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? A hundred years hence the students reading in colleges then will have perhaps a hundred different versions of the motives, the origins, and the events of the great European War. The student in New-York will believe as true that history which happens to be put into his hands, but his compeer in London will sincerely believe a wholly different version. Of course there will not be variations in the



dates and the bald facts which have no bearing upon the passions, pre- or the interests of the parties. But histories are written and taught more for developing feeling of national pride and patriotism, than to serve as lifeless records of the bare events as they occurred. All the infirmities which are liable to affect Prathyaksha and Anumana are also liable to affect Sabda Pramana in a greater degree, because Sabda Pramana rests ultimately upon the Prathyaksha or Anumana knowledge had by the reporters.

### THE ROOT CAUSE

(By T. K. J.)

The earliest and freshest period of our life must be devoted towards the Study of Sanskrit Literature. There must be a healthy and rigid discipline in all the courses of our education. The literature, indeed, offers food for thought, but, discipline alone could transform it to practice and give a satisfactory meaning to it. It is not very much difficult to recollect our experiences that sometimes our body does not obey the mind; we are not able to do what we earnestly long at times to do. Want of discipline is alone the cause here. Let us quote an example. Rising up early in the morning is, no doubt, healthy and is also a necessity for us who have to perform our daily religious routines before Sun-rise. We know it and also desire to follow it. It is sure, that, unless our body had fostered a habit, by a rigid control in the early days to pursue such a thing, we would not be able to do it in spite of our seriousness or earnestness about it. A person, though uneducated in the sense it is understood in these days accustomed to this early rising, would be found to easily stick up to it without any effort whatso-

ever, what a supposed highly-educated gentleman of now a days, could not achieve even by any amount of exertion. In the same manner, a grown-up glutton, who is accustomed to a varieties of dishes, five or six times a day, however strong-minded he may find himself to be, would find it very much difficult to effect a change in him. Let it be imagined a while, how many of our English-educated advanced men and Sanskrit-educated Vaidiks are continuing, even to-day, the Coffee, Tea, and Co-coa drinks, though it must undeniably be held that they are not unaware of their disastrous consequences. How many of us, who may be presumed to have fairly understood the usefulness and the necessity, as a religious injunction, of fasting on Ekadasi days, have courage to submit ourselves to that worthy and holiest of habits? Shall we say, that the Sanskrit-learned Purohit or Pandit, or an aged English-educated Hindu, who is convinced of the nature or necessity of preferring Sanskrit to English language, is bold enough to engage his sons in the study of his own Sanskrit Literature before giving chances for alien ones take root in them? Have the educated rich realized that wealth is not the standard for measuring the greatness or worth of a man and that they should not exploit upon poor men, by standing in competition with them or by being less sympathetic in any way towards them? Is it an exaggeration to lay down, in brief, that the purpose of Education has not been properly served in these days? And is it erroneous to conceive that the want of discipline in School life is alone responsible for this unpleasant result? It is therefore that we often insist on the maintenance of a perfection in the system of our Schools for effecting a change, a revival or a preservation of an order, in the frame and flesh of any Society.



There are certain fundamental principles to be remembered in this connection. The Educational institutions of a land or a particular Society must be under the unquestionable control of the representatives of the people of the Land or the members of such Society, including the selection of text books, prescription of the courses of lessons, methods of teaching to be adopted and other items of discipline to be insisted on the conduct of the masters and the pupils. The publication and supply of books must never be left with any commercial firm; they must unchangeably rest with the central authorities themselves, the sale proceeds or profits being utilized for the benefit of institutions. Due care and responsibility must be exercised in the choice of teachers; perfect and strict discipline must be followed in all movements towards the progress of the Schools. Selfless, loving, energetic and truly-cultured and disciplined men must be in charge of the Supervision over these institutions. They must be of such type as the Society would desire every one of its members to become; they must serve as a model for the pupils to become; they must serve as a model for the pupils to imitate. They must be the members of the same order of Society to which the boys belong. The institutions of a Society must restrict the admission to its boys only. For example, the Schools intended for the Brahman boys must not on any account take in pupils belonging to other castes and likewise the boys of the Vaisya or Kshatriya caste ought not to be given chances to associate with the boys of other castes or races in Schools.

Perhaps some may differ and argue that only the mixed Schools composed of all types of boys belonging to various classes and creeds would facilitate a mutual advancement producing a uniform state of

intelligence amongst all of them. We do not totally deny it; but there are also some other causes that act as disadvantages to many of them in certain respects. We shall discuss both sides of this question next time. But we trust fully that it will stand uncontradicted that the attempt desiring to better the condition of any society of race must begin always, necessarily and inevitably, only from schools. If our Sanatana Dharmists fail to note it, it is almost uncertain, then, that they would be able to land at the port, towards which they imagine to be steering their ship across the stormy surface of the boundless Sea.

### SOME VALUABLE THOUGHTS

"Respectfulness without the rules of propriety, becomes laborious bustle; carefulness, without the rules of propriety, becomes timidity; boldness, without the rules of propriety, becomes insubordination; straightforwardness, without the rules of propriety, becomes rudeness"—*Confucius*.

\* \* \* \* \*

"A good character is a coat of triple steel, giving security to the wearer, protection to the oppressed, and inspiring the oppressor with awe"—*Cotton*.

\* \* \* \* \*

"A fool's tongue is long enough to cut his throat," while "words fitly spoken are like apples of gold in pictures of silver"—*Tsze Kung*.

\* \* \* \* \*

True Religion is the death of egoism; for true Religion is Poverty.—*A devotee*.

\* \* \* \* \*

Adversity can prove a wonderful tonic. Nothing is lost until you have lost your courage.—*Popular sayings*



## INDIAN CENSUS STATISTICS

10.6 PER CENT INCREASE IN  
POPULATION

"The Gazette of India" has published the following revised totals of population in India as the result of the last census. A resolution by the Government of India explains that the figures published in the tables regarding population by religion may be taken as approximately correct although they are incomplete in respect of figures in certain parts of the Bombay Presidency and Burma. In some provinces only the more important religions are shown so that in the case of some religions whose numbers in a particular province are few they are included under the head minor religions and the grant total to this extent qualified.

The total population of India is 352,986,876 of which 181,921,914 are males and 171,064,962 females.

There is an increase of 10.6 per cent of the population since 1921. The present total population of Hindus throughout India is 238,330,912. Muslims number 77,743,928, Sikhs 4,366,442 and Christians 5,961,794.

## BRITISH INDIA

The following are the figures in British India where grand total is 271,273,107 of whom Hindus are 176,934,435, Muslims are 67,085,510, Sikhs are 3,192,169, Christians 3,531,703.

The following are details province by province in British India:

Ajmer-Merwara: The total population: 560,292, of which Hindus are 434,509, Sikhs 341, Jains 19,497, Muslims 97,133, Christians 6,947.

Assam: Total population 8,622,251 of which Hindus are 4,931,760, Sikhs 2,497, Jains 2,636, Buddhists 14,955, Muslims 2,755,914, Christians 202,586

Baluchistan: Total population 463,508 of which Hindus are 91,432,

Sikhs 8,368, Muslims 405,309, Christians 8,044.

Bengal: Total population 50,122,550 of which Hindus are 21,537,921, Buddhists 315,801, Muslims 27,530,321, Christians 180,072.

Bihar and Orissa: Total population 37,676,576 of which Hindus are 31,010,660, Muslims 4,264,776, Christians 341,710.

Bombay: Total population 21,854,841 of which Hindus are 16,619,866, Sikhs 20,723, Jains 199,979, Buddhists 1,890, Zoroastrians 89,543, Muslims 4,452,133, Christians 317,042, Jews 17,443.

Burma: Total population 14,645,969 of which Hindus are 574,697, Jains 77,895, Muslims 606,841.

Central Provinces and Berar: Total population 15,507,723 of which Hindus are 13,460,105, Muslims 682,854, Christians 50,584.

Coorg: Total population 163,327 of which Hindus are 146,007, Muslims 13,777, Christians 3,430.

Delhi: Total population 636,246 of which Hindus are 398,863, Sikhs 6,437, Jains 5,345, Muslims 206,960, Christians 16,989.

Madras: Total population 46,575,670 of which Hindus are 40,392,900, Muslims 3,316,083, Christians 1,770,328.

North Western Frontier Province: Total population 2,425,076 of which Hindus are 142,977, Sikhs 42,510, Muslims 2,227,303, Christians 12,213.

The Punjab: Total population 23,580,852 of which Hindus are 6,328,588, Sikhs 3,064,144, Jains 35,284, Buddhists 5,723, Muslims 13,332, 460, Christians 414,788.

United Provinces of Agra and Oudh: Total population 48,408,763 of which Hindus are 40,905,523, Sikhs 46,500, Jains 67,954, Muslims 7,181,927, Christians 205,009.



## STATES AND AGENCIES

The following are the grand total for States and Agencies :

The total population is 79,080,571 of which Hindus are 61,396,377, Sikhs 1,114,273, Jains 796,613, Buddhists 56,841, Muslims 10,658,418 Christians 2,431,091.

Following are the details :

Assam States : Total population is 625,606 of which Hindus are 272,890, Muslims 24,600, Christians 46,660.

Baluchistan States : Total population is 405 109 of which Hindus are 11,148, Muslims 393,885.

Baroda States : Total population is 2,443,007 of which Hindus are 2,152,071, Sikhs 521, Jains 48,408, Zorastrians 7,127, Muslims 182,630, Christians 7,262.

Bengal States : The total population is 973,316 of which Hindus are 641,892, Buddhists 14,532, Muslims 312,619, Christians 2,768.

Bihar and Orissa States : The total population is 4,651,076 of which Hindus are 4,193,878, Muslims 19,807, Christians 74,613.

Bombay States : The total population is 4,468,343 of which Hindus are 3,921,056, Jains 87,368, Muslims 414,865, Zorastrians 1,468 and Christians 16,011.

Central India Agency : Total population is 6,615,120 of which Hindus are 5,835,486, Sikhs 1,426, Jains 99,780, Muslims 376,173 and Christians 10,476.

Central Provinces States : The total population is 2,483,214 of which Hindus are 1,788,401, Muslims 23,254 and Christians 51,701.

Gwalior States : Total population is 3,523,070 of which Hindus are 3,271,576, Jains 45,079, Muslims 204,297 and Christians 1,198.

Hyderabad State : Total population is 14,437,541 of which Hindus are 12,173,327, Sikhs 5,197, Jains 21,543, Muslims 1,535,022 and Christians 151,946.

Jammu and Kashmir State : Total population is 3,646,244 of which Hin-

dus are 734,607, Sikhs 50,662, Buddhists 38,725, Muslims 2,817,695 and Christians 2,177.

Madras States : Total population is 6,754,484 of which Hindus are 4,323,150, Muslims 467,396 and Christians 1,958,811.

Mysore State : Total population is 6,557,302, of which Hindus are 6,015,880, Muslims 398,628 and Christians 87,538.

N. W. F. P. (Agencies and tribal areas) : Total population is 46,451 of which Hindus are 13,651, Muslims 23,086, Sikhs 5,425 and Christians 4,286.

Punjab States : Total population is 4,910,005 of which Hindus are 2,271,133, Sikhs 1,007,480, Muslims 1,597,436, Christians 4,565.

Rajputana Agency : Total population is 11,225,712 of which Hindus are 9,578,805, Sikhs 41,605, Jains 300,748, Muslims 1,069,325 and Christians 5,778.

Sikkim State : Total population is 109,651.

United Provinces States : Total population is 1,206,070 of which Hindus are 950,724, Muslims 252,131 Christians 2,890.

Western India States Agency : Total population is 3,999,250 of which Hindus are 3,246,803, Jains 203,626, Muslims 545,569 and Christians 1,396.

He is not worthy of honeycomb that shuns the hive because bees have stings.—*Shakespeare*.

\* \* \* \* \*

Without charity work profiteth nothing ; but whatever is done out of charity, be it ever so little or contemptible, becomes fruitful. Since indeed God regards with how much love a person performs a work, rather than how much he does—*Thomas a Kempis*

\* \* \* \* \*

If you want to put anything into a nation put it into schools—*Gladstone*.