

**SWAMI DAYANAND**  
**A CRITICAL STUDY**  
**OF**  
**HIS LIFE AND TEACHINGS**



BY  
F. K. KHAN DURRANI, B. A.

[www.aail.org](http://www.aail.org)

**SWAMI DAYANAND**  
**A CRITICAL STUDY**  
**OF**  
**HIS LIFE AND TEACHINGS**

**BY**  
**F. K. KHAN DURRANI, B. A.**  
**MUSLIM MISSIONARY :**

- AUTHOR OF -

**"The Future of Islam in India," etc., etc.**

---

---

*All Rights Reserved.*

---

---

LAHORE 1929.

CAN BE HAD OF :—

1. Tabligh Literature Society, Lahore.
2. Qaumi Kutub Khana, Railway Road,  
Opposite Islamia College, Lahore.

**First Edition.**

**Price Rs. 1/4/-**

[www.aail.org](http://www.aail.org)

## THE PROPAGATION OF ISLAM.

The urgent necessity of the propagation of Islam is now admitted on all hands. Islam is a blessing to humanity and it is the moral duty of every Muslim to do his bit to extend this blessing and reach out its healing message to every man. But in India the necessity has been forced upon us especially by the anti-Islamic propaganda of other communities. Christianity on one side and Hinduism on the other are threatening the existence of Islam in India, while the spirit of scepticism imported along with European education is undermining the foundations of faith among the Muslims themselves, and indifference is growing apace. Religion is the only force that is keeping the Muslims together, and if its bonds become loose, the political unity of the Muslims will be in danger. If the Musalmans wish to maintain an honourable existence in this country, they must strengthen their ranks and expand their community.

The propagation of Islam, which must include the work of social reform and educational and economic advancement of the Muslims themselves, can be carried through by means of public lectures and by the publication of suitable literature. The production of Islamic literature, which should take account not only of modern thought but also of the present social and political needs of the Muslims, is an especially pressing necessity. I am glad to say that I have been able to induce a number of friends to join with me in promoting this work, and we have organised ourselves into

an association called "The Tabligh Literature Society, Lahore." We propose to resume the publication of the Journal "Muslim India" as early as practicable, and have the following works in hand, which would be published one after the other as the funds permit :—

1. Islam, An Ethical Study ; 2. Life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) ; 3. The Muslim Home (on social reform) ; 4. Orthodox Islam (a plea for inter-sectarian tolerance) ; 5. Christianity and Islam ; 6. A Critical Study of the Bhagavatgita ; 7. Iqbal the Poet of Islam ; 8. Nietzsche and Islam and 9. A short History of the Expansion of Islam. The society will publish Urdu editions of some of these works as well.

The publication of these books requires a considerable amount of money. Those who sympathise with our aims are requested to kindly assist us to carry out the same by accepting membership of the society and by helping in the circulation of the books. The amount of subscriptions paid by the members will be made good to them in full in the form of books, as soon as the same are published.

F. K. KHAN DURRANI,  
Secretary, Tabligh Literature Society,  
LAHORE.

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE.
Preface           ...           ...           ...           ...	4
Chapter I.—Life of Swami Dayanand           ...	13
„    II.—Satyarth Prakash           ...           ...	31
„    III.—The Vedas           ...           ...	36
„    IV.—The Conception of God           ...           ...	47
„    V.—The Conception of God— <i>Contd.</i>	57
„    VI.—Creation           ...           ...           ...	65
„    VII.—Salvation           ...           ...           ...	82
„    VIII.—The Doctrine of Transmigration	99
„    IX.—The Ritual           ...           ...           ...	111
„    X.—Dayanand's Criticisms           ...           ...	139
„    XI.—Dayanand's Personality           ...           ...	159
„    XII.—The Arya Samaj           ...           ...           ...	173
„    XIII.—Conclusion           ...           ...           ...	181

# PREFACE.



**T**HE ARYA SAMAJ AND ITS FOUNDER SWAMI Dayanand Saraswati are well-known names in India and require no introduction. The Arya Samaj movement is a powerful one. One may differ from its tenets of faith. One may not approve of its methods. There is likely to be difference of opinion with regard to its usefulness or otherwise. It has already been condemned in fairly strong terms by almost all thinking minds in India. Its adherents claim that they are serving India, while those who are not within its fold proclaimed as vehemently, a little while ago when they still believed that Hindu-Muslim unity was necessary to the attainment of Swaraj, that it was ruining the country. Certainly, if we look back at the last sixty years of the religious history of India, we see but one incessant war of creeds and sects, one long panorama of religious hatred, fanaticism, bigotry and every form of uncharitableness, and in the midst of it all, the red banner of war held

aloft by the Arya Samaj ! But after all is said and done, it cannot be denied that it is a powerful movement. For good or ill of the country, it is there, and it should be worth our while to know what it is.

From the extent of its activities and from the torrent-like way it sweeps over the country one would expect that its tenets and fundamental principles were well-known in India. Yet, strange as it may seem, the true character of the movement is hardly known. We know its work and its methods of work ; we know its achievements. But its character, its constitution, the foundations from which it draws its strength, are known to but few. There have been summary condemnations by the politicians ; there have been criticisms of isolated details by religionists. But a comprehensive treatment of its teachings and a dispassionate evaluation of its principles in an academic spirit by a non-Arya Samajist is still to be desired.

This general lack of understanding is easy to grasp. The Samaj never tells what it teaches. The perusal of Arya Samajic periodicals gives no help. They have a lot to say about Christianity and Islam. In fact, these are their only subjects

of discussion. About the teachings of Arya Samaj itself, there is never a word. One may go on listening to the Arya preachers year in and year out and yet remain in the profoundest ignorance as to what it has to teach. The Arya Samaj bestows great attention upon the religions of others; about its own teachings it observes a discreet silence. Doubtless, its abjuration of image-worship, its doctrine of the transmigration of souls and its principle of what it, in our opinion wrongly, styles Monotheism are well-known. But these are not the exclusive property of the Arya Samaj. She holds them in common with the other sects of Hinduism. Nor are they the source of its strength. Those features of the Arya Samaj movement that distinguish it from all other sects of Hinduism, the spirit that characterises it and is its main source of strength remain, however, a mystery. It is with a view to lifting the veil from the face of this mystery and to understanding the true character of the Arya Samaj that we propose to offer in the following pages a critical study of *Satyarth Prakash*, the Bible, so to speak, of this new movement.

Dayanand published many works. They are



exegetical, grammatical, liturgical, ritualistic and philological, and, as such, naturally do not come within our purview. The *Satyarth Prakash* is the only book we are here concerned with. It is a compendium of all his teachings. It contains everything essential he had to say, and when we have learnt to know this book, we have known all that the Arya Samaj stands for.

There is much inter-communal ill-will prevailing in India just now. The state of affairs was never so hopeless as it is to-day. The atmosphere is charged with an intolerant spirit of controversy. It is well, therefore, that before we proceed a step further we explain the point of view adopted in this study. For one thing, we shall enter into no controversy. Controversy, on the basis of religion or of philosophy, appears to us to be unnecessary. We aim entirely at scientific objectivity, a standpoint which precludes all personal element. The student of Comparative Religion, *i.e.* the historian of the evolution of the religious consciousness of humanity, is concerned in the main to explain what a certain religious phenomenon is, how it came to be, what it signified and what it led to. The scientist judges but does

not condemn. What the moralist and the religionist condemn with passion, the scientist may approach almost with reverence. The temple prostitution, still prevalent in some parts of India, is a thing of horror to the moralist. The scientist mildly says, it is a corruption of a primitive philosophic notion, and its only fault is that the theory assumed the form of gross symbolism and that it has outlived its age. He regards it as a relic of the hoary past, when the spirit of man was struggling in its own crude way to find a solution of the eternal mystery of life and death. But as the scientist is not out to offend, he also does not care to please. Science knows neither toleration nor fanaticism, neither courtesy nor politeness. Coldly and mercilessly it proceeds to label things as they are. But the scientist is also a human being and cannot wholly detach himself from his intellectual environments. In order to interpret the past to his modern readers or a strange institution to a particular community, he must perforce express his meaning in terms to which they are used. This often involves moral judgments, but these judgments differ from those of the moralist in this that, while the latter

judges and denounces with passion, the former does so with personal detachment, scientific objectivity and without passion. The fanatic condemns before he has tried to understand, whereas the scientist very often withholds judgment and contents himself only with understanding.

This shall be our own method too. We propose to give an *exposé*. We intend neither to praise nor to condemn. Save for such helps as a writer is bound to give, we shall leave it to the judgment of the individual reader himself to form his own opinions. We shall first give a short sketch of the founder's life, followed by a comprehensive review of his teachings. The second part of the *Satyarth Prakash* is taken up entirely by criticisms, which, in spite of their great length (they cover 251 pages), are quite harmless; we shall briefly deal with their quality and the writer's methods, and close the discussion with a short *résumé* of the results of our enquiry. For my text of *Satyarth Prakash* I am indebted to its English translation by the Arya Samaj missionary Durga Prasad, published at Lahore from the Virjanand (name of Dayanand's spiritual instructor) Press in 1908. All our references are

to this edition. Many 'lives' of Swami Dayanand and books on the origin and history of the Arya Samaj have been published. They are the works of propagandists and admirers or of opponents and therefore equally valueless for a scientific study. It may be noted in this place, however, that Dayanand steps into the daylight of history only after he had entered upon his public ministry. For his earlier life his own autobiographical note prefixed to the *Satyarth Prakash* is the sole source of information extant, from which every writer of his life, like ourselves, has to draw.

In conclusion, I beg to say that this book supplies a real want. The missionary problem is becoming very urgent and the Arya Samaj is the principal foe of Islam in India. The Samaj counts its preachers by the thousand, who are spread over the length and breadth of the country. They are carrying on a vigorous propaganda to pervert the Muslims from their faith. It is necessary that the Muslims should be made acquainted with the real teachings, character and aims of this body. The *Satyarth Prakash* is a very voluminous book and not easily accessible.

Its reading is exceedingly wearisome and "very disappointing" as Mr. Gandhi mildly put it, and the same has been the verdict of every other reader. This booklet should save the readers the weariness of wading through an enormous bog at a fraction of the cost of the original. My object has been to present a comprehensive summary of all the Swami has said in his book, and nothing of importance, however small its value, has been omitted.

In the preparation of this book I have kept another point steadily in view. I have tried as far as it was possible to say what I had to say in the Swami's own words. *Satyarth Prakash* is a worthless book and the teachings and ideas contained in it are so absurd and so amusingly childish that one finds it hard to believe that a man, who became the founder of such a powerful organisation as the Arya Samaj, could be the author of such drivel, or indeed any man who claimed to be a scholar. That in spite of his reputed learning Swami Dayanand could not do better and was not at all conscious of the absurdity of his writing is a psychological phenomenon which I will explain in its place. But to convince

the reader that the Swami was no better than he was, I have given extensive quotations from his work to enable the reader to see for himself the child-like simplicity of the Swami's ways of thought and argument. The absurdity of his teachings and arguments is so apparent that I have considered comment to be unnecessary and have contented myself with a bare statement.

F. K. KHAN DURRANI.



# SWAMI DAYANAND,

I.

## HIS LIFE.

Swami Dayanand was born in 1824 A.C. of a Brahman family of Kathiawar in a town belonging to the Thakore Sahib of Morvi. His real name, the name of his father and that of the town in which his family lived he does not give, fearing lest his relations should seek him out, for then, says he, "it would have become incumbent upon me to follow them home. I would have to touch money again, serve them and attend to their wants." He wrote these words in 1882, one year before his death, when he was 58 years old. Were his parents still alive, they must have been in their extreme old age. His mother tongue was Gujarati, but he wrote in Hindi, a language which he learnt after a sojourn of more than thirty years in Northern India. But supposing that his relations had also learnt Hindi in the meantime and come into possession of *Satyarth Prakash*, the mere suppression

of a few names could certainly not keep his identity hidden from them. He mentions several incidents of his early childhood, the scheme of studies followed in his training, the books he learnt, his mother's opposition to his father's plans and consequent "everlasting quarrels," his visits to temples in the company of his father, etc., etc. He says, he had two younger sisters and two brothers, the youngest of whom was born when he was sixteen years old. His father was the proprietor of a banking concern, besides holding the office of town revenue collector and magistrate, which was hereditary in his family. He had many and violent differences with his father, and at last left the parental roof when he was 21 years of age. These and other details given in his autobiography are more than enough to disclose to any parents the identity of their lost child.

Furthermore, the dread of the calamity of having to follow his parents home, if found out, and of being called upon to serve them and attend to their wants, was quite unreasonable. Hindu society, especially at the time when Dayanand wrote, attached extraordinary sanctity to the person of a Sannyasi. No pious Hindu would ever



dream of inducing, much less forcing, his 58 years old son to break his vows of renunciation and return home, and the piety of Dayanand's father, he tells us, verged upon superstition. Besides, it is unthinkable that a man, whose name as a great reformer is already resounding through the length and breadth of the Indian continent, who stands at the head of a powerful All-India movement, who is the honoured guest now of this Maharaja and now of that, should be afraid of being carried away home by an angry eighty year old parent. These considerations lead us to the conclusion that the two names, of the family and the town, were suppressed not from fear of discovery by parents who might themselves be dead, but from fear lest any one else should attempt to ascertain the truth or otherwise of what he relates about his parentage and early life. The suppression of the names does not hinder discovery by parents; it effectively bars the way of other enquirers.

He was five years old when his education began, and was invested with the sacred thread at 8. From pp. 90 and 97 we find that this is exactly what he prescribes for every Hindu child, except that what he prescribes for others with

authority, he regards in his own case as pathetic. With regard to the wealth of his father, his magistracy, banking concern and "his sepoys" (p. 5), we know, if we only care to enquire, that almost every Sadhu is either a prince or the son of a banker, the only two incarnations of worldly prosperity known to an old-world Hindu. He was fourteen, when the first breach occurred with the hereditary faith. Keeping vigils in a temple on a Shivaratri, the great question arose in his mind: "Is it possible that this semblance of man, the idol of a personal God that I see bestriding his bull before me.....can be the Mahadeva, the great Deity, the same that is invoked as the Lord of Kailash, the Supreme Being and the Divine hero of all the stories we read of him in the Puranas?" Unable to bear these questionings, he immediately told his father that he felt it "impossible to reconcile the idea of an omnipotent, living God with this idol which allows the mice to run over its body.....without the slightest protest." The father tried to remove his doubts, "but the explanation fell short of satisfying" him. Four years later, he had another experience. His fourteen year old sister died. "It was my first

bereavement," he writes. "While friends and relatives were sobbing and lamenting around me, I stood like one petrified and plunged in a profound reverie. It resulted in a series of long and sad meditations upon the instability of human life. .... Whither, then, shall I turn for an expedient to alleviate this human misery connected with our deathbed; where shall I find the assurance and means of attaining *Mukti*, the final bliss? It was there and then that I came to the determination that I must find it, cost whatever it may, and thus save myself from the untold miseries of the dying moments of an unbeliever. The ultimate result of such meditations was to make me violently break, and for ever, with the mummeries of external mortifications and penances, and the more to appreciate the inward efforts of the soul."

All this reads like a fairy tale. We must not forget that he was only eighteen, when he thought of these things. What was the connection between deathbed and the idea of the assurance of *Mukti*? Wherefrom had this lad of eighteen learnt the "untold miseries of the dying moments of an unbeliever? How did he come to know the difference between "external mortifica-

tions" and "inward efforts of the soul?" We know from a study of the *Satyarth Prakash*, which received its final touches only a year before the author's death, that Dayanand was no genius, that he was intellectually incapable of grasping any large idea or of distinguishing the essential from the accidental and that his mental culture left him unfit to take systematic view of any problem. How was it, then, that already at the age of fourteen he could differentiate the idea of a "personal God" from that of an impersonal deity? We see that in these representations he is projecting his ideas of a maturer age back into his childhood. Dayanand had an uncommon amount of sacred texts by heart. His acquaintance with the ceremonials and usages of the various Hindu sects, however superficial, was yet extensive. Both of these circumstances testify to a memory, which makes it impossible for us to believe that this projection of the ideas of riper years to boyhood was merely the result of mental confusion. More likely, he was led into it by the desire to impress his readers with his greatness and to make them feel that he was a born reformer.

We have a feeling that we know nothing of

his childhood. What he tells us, is meant only for effect. He does not show one tender feeling for his brothers and sisters. He speaks of his father as of a hard-hearted stranger. Although he speaks of his mother as taking sides with him, he has not a single word of affection, not even a shadow of a tender memory for her. As if he never had any father or mother! Once out of his life, they pass out of his memory, as if they had never existed. The system of training for children and of family life he proposes in his book and with which we shall make our acquaintance presently, bars out all human affections. No man who had ever lived in the midst of parents, brothers and sisters, could have conceived of such a system. Is it possible that Dayanand had no such memory, that the Brahman family and the brothers, sisters, father and mother he speaks of, were mere creations of imagination born of necessity? Was he so early separated from his parents that he had lost all memory of them? And why the pall of mystery he throws over his antecedents? Was there something to hide? The man is gone, the dead tell no tale, and we shall never know the truth.

Dayanand goes on to inform us that he was 21, when he left the parental roof for good. His parents wanted him to marry. But he had an "insurmountable aversion for marriage." "The very idea of married life seemed repulsive" to him. To avoid the uncleanness of marriage, he left the house secretly. "A large party of men including many horsemen" went in search of him. All his money, his "gold and silver ornaments, rings, bracelets and other jewels" he gave away in charity, and a couple of days later joined the Holy Orders. (Do young men of 21 wear gold and silver ornaments, rings, bracelets and other jewels?) But his father soon traced him out and came "with his sepoy's" to carry him home. But Dayanand told a flat lie and escaped. He then settled for some time at Baroda, where the young man "held several discourses" upon Vedanta philosophy. Leaving that city, he met another scholar, with whom he "discussed various scientific and metaphysical subjects." Parting from him, he left for the banks of the Narbuddah, where he fell in with a company of real initiated Yogis, with whom he began to study some philosophical treatises. It was here that, although

"too young," he was initiated into the fourth order of Sannyasis, and received the name of Swami Dayanand Saraswati.

The following years were devoted to travels, studies and the practice of Yoga. He wandered from place to place in search of Yogis and Sannyasis. At Tehri, he was invited to dinner by a Brahman. On entering the house, he saw "a large company of pandits seated with a pyramid of flesh, rump-steaks and dressed-up heads of animals before them." The meat was beef and the heads must consequently have been of cows or oxen. We know dressed calves' heads in the West, but the Indian *menu* contains no such dish, nor yet rump-steaks. Also we know that a Brahman, however rotten and debased may be the rest of his moral and religious life, will never touch beef. The pious Hindu mind revolts from it. In these days of international commerce, laxity of practice in this respect has been occasionally noticed, especially in the port-towns like Bombay. But in Northern India, in the days of which Dayanand writes, this thing could not be. Dayanand hates the Brahmans as his book shows. He spent almost the whole of his life in religious

disputes with them. We feel convinced that in order to blacken the character of his opponents and to bring the whole class of Brahmans into ill-repute, Dayanand fabricated this story. It is a deliberate calumny and a falsehood. The story of cannibals sitting around a pyramid of flesh is, of course, very picturesque and points to a great power of imagining things he had never seen.

We need not follow him step by step in his wanderings. The places mentioned are obscure and the details devoid of interest. One pathetic account of sufferings, however, deserves mention. On p. 11f he speaks of fording a river, and adds: "the river-bed was covered with small and fragmentary bits of ice, which wounded and cut my naked feet"! Ice at the bottom of a river! It is an elementary principle of physics that water freezes from top downwards and not from bottom upwards, and that ice being lighter than water, no piece of it, whatever its size, can rest at the bottom of any water, running or stationary. Dayanand's ignorance of this elementary principle, which has enabled him to perpetrate this impossibility, is intelligible, for his studies were limited to what the Arya Samaj calls the "scientific"



Vedas and other Sanskrit texts only. That he should have mentioned it so realistically, as a personal experience shows that here as elsewhere the desire to pose as a martyr has overcome his sense of truthfulness. The incident is a pure invention.

To the same category belongs the story of anatomical dissections. He happened to possess some books, which gave exhaustive descriptions of the nervous system. He was sceptical about their accuracy and resolved upon testing their truth. Pulling out one day a corpse that was floating down a river, he cut it up with a large knife to examine the nervous system. Finding that the descriptions did not tally with the reality before him, he tore up the books and threw them into the river along with the corpse. "From that time gradually I came to the conclusion that with the exception of the Vedas, the Upanishads, Patanjali and Sankhya, all other works upon science and Yoga were false." The Vedas are books of hymns and rituals, Upanishads and Sankhya of philosophy and Patanjali is a commentary of a grammatical work. How his experiment in physiological research convinced him of the truth of

certain religious, philosophical and grammatical works in preference to others is a mystery to us. He says, the corpse was "floating" on the river. Can a dead human body "float" on a river? Apparently, the principle of specific gravity is not known to the Vedic science. He certainly could not have found a human body "floating," and the whole story is a fabrication, about as bad as finding bits of ice at the bottom of a running stream. Cutting up a dead body sounds grauesome enough, but to examine the nervous system with a "large knife"! That can be possible only to a surgeon of the skill and dexterity of Dayanand! The story is so ridiculous that no intelligent man could have invented it.

At this time he was 31 years old and addicted to *bhang*, whose narcotic juice often kept him insensate. The life of a Sadhu is generally spent in aimless wanderings, and so was the case with our Swami. He now started for the sources of the Narbuddah. In the forests, he met a huge black bear. "The beast growled ferociously, and rising on its hind legs, opened wide its mouth to devour me." The bear's hug is known, but possibly this one began with devouring. Anyhow,

the Swami raised his "thin" cane, and "the bear ran away terrified," and roared so loud from fright that villagers ran to his (the Swami's, not the bear's) assistance. They begged him to return. But "I asked them not to feel anxious for my safety, for I was protected." They then offered him a thick stick for self-defence, which he threw away "immediately." After this miracle, he proceeded on his journey unmolested. In the evening he encamped near a village, and told the villagers that he was on his pilgrimage to the Narbuddah sources, although he did not believe in pilgrimages at all. Anyhow, this slight "terminological inexactitude" brought him a bowl of milk. The villagers invited him to their huts, but he refused, "for they were idolators." He slept soundly that night and rising early, prepared himself for further events. Here ends the autobiography.

The narrative is now taken up by the translator, but there is a break of four years. At 35, Dayanand went to Mathura to study with Swami Virjanand, a blind man but immensely learned. This old sage was a great believer in Panini's grammar and Patanjali's commentary on it, called

the *Mahabhashya*, for it is only by this circuitous road that one may hope, if at all, to understand "the otherwise sibylline books of the Holy Vedas" (p. 60). When Dayanand came to the sage, the latter refused to accept him as a pupil, except on the condition that he should throw all his books into the Jamna, which he accordingly did. So, that was the end of the "metaphysical discussions" of his boyhood! We do not know how many years he stayed with his new teacher. Charged by the master, on completion of studies, with the task of reviving the study of Panini and Patanjali, he entered upon his reforming career. He preached in Sanskrit, which the designing pandits misinterpreted to the people in the vernacular. Dayanand himself is supposed to have been even then so ignorant of the language of Northern India that he never found out, until informed by another good pandit, that he was being misinterpreted. He had already spent above twenty years in Northern India. How he had kept himself so perfectly ignorant of its language, how he had managed to exist and begged his way about for so many years among a people who spoke neither Gujarati nor Sanskrit, how he had held conversa-

tions with ignorant villagers and illiterate women, which he reports, the biographer does not tell. We are told that on being informed of the trickery of the pandits, he changed his plans, started establishing schools, writing books and lecturing before assemblies. How he so suddenly turned into a writer and lecturer in Hindi is another astounding miracle.

We have seen that the account of his life left by himself is pure fiction. A pall of mystery hangs over his origin and early years. The details of subsequent career are either devoid of human interest or too childish to deserve notice. He may have studied with Virjanand, but Dayanand really steps into the light of history with his entrance into missionary life. Henceforth, like a true *Sadhu* he is ever on the move, visits every important town from Bengal to the Punjab, holds discussions, debates and controversies wherever he goes, and leaves behind him ill-will, hatred and sectarian strife. He visited Lahore in 1877. Before long, his disputations raised such a storm that a Hindu newspaper *Koh-i-Noor* prayed for peace in the following words in its issue of May 19, 1877: "May God end the excitement of the

enraged populace and restore peace and quiet!" But the city became so uncomfortable for the Swami himself that he had nowhere to live, until he found refuge in the house of a Muslim gentleman, Dr. Rahim Khan, who, our authority tells us, very gladly placed it at his disposal.

Dayanand was much addicted to debating. He debated with all and sundry, with Hindus, Muslims and Christians, and was prepared to cross swords with any one who cared. In fact, he held debates and discussions to be "the chief duty of all the human beings" (p. 396). He became famous. "The triumph of Vedic religion," says his biographer, "and the fame of the Swami-ji's learning spread not only in India, but *in all other countries*, and attracted the attention of the Rajahs or kings, who are the last to join in a good work but the first to take advantage of it. Accordingly, he was called upon by some of the kings of Rajputana." It means that, according to the geography of the "scientific" Vedas, Rajputana is not in India! He went to Udaipur in 1882. The result of his preachings there was that sacrificial altars for burning *ghee* and fragrant herbs were erected in the royal palaces and in

gardens outside the city "to purify the air, the common receptacle of breathing" (p. 54), the trees and plants in the gardens not being equal to the job. The biographer certainly does not mean that the arrival of the Swamiji had added so much stench to the city's atmosphere, that the ordinary apparatus of nature having been considered inadequate, a special one became necessary to meet the emergency!

Before leaving Udaipur, he founded a *sabha* and drew up its charter. The first object of this association was to protect his person and property, which was considerable. How he, a *Samnyasi*, bound by his vows not to touch money (p. 1), to avoid which calamity he suppresses the name of his father and that of his birthplace, came to own so much property, is not explained. The articles of association are in fact his will, and one of its provisions relates to the disposal of his body after his death. His pyre was to consist wholly of sandalwood. "If it be impossible, it should take 2 maunds (160 lbs.) of sandal-wood, 4 maunds (320 lbs.) of clarified butter, 5 seers (10 lbs.) of camphor, 2½ seers (5 lbs.) of fragrant roots, and 10 maunds (8 cwts.) of wood (fuel) to consume

my body, according to the precepts of the Vedas laid down in the *Sanskarbidhi*" (p. 57). The reader may count the cost. The Vedic religion must, indeed, be very expensive and wasteful!

In May 1883, he went to Jodhpur, where he fell sick in October. Brought to Ajmere for treatment, he died there on the 30th of October, at the age of 59. It is said that a Brahman had poisoned him. He was tall in stature, plump and somewhat corpulent in person, shaved all his hair, wore the simple garments of a *Sannyasi* and lived like one. We shall be in a better position to appreciate his character and intellectual powers after we have learnt to know his teachings.





## II.

# SATYARTH PRAKASH

## A GENERAL VIEW OF ITS CONTENTS.

*Satyarth Prakash* is an enormous book. My edition contains as many as 547 closely printed pages of large size, besides Preface and Index. The introduction covers 70 pages, and there is an Appendix of 7 pages, which contains a summary of Dayanand's beliefs. The remaining 470 pages are divided into fourteen chapters, of which the first ten (219 pages) give his teachings, while the last four (251 pages) are devoted to a criticism of other faiths. These criticisms we shall consider later, limiting our enquiry for the present to the teachings contained in the first ten chapters. In these chapters, too, there are many side-thrusts at other religions; but we shall ignore them for the sake of brevity.

The whole book is written in the form of questions and answers. An anecdote, a short story or a brief account the author can relate with tolerable success. But a consistent well-considered doctrinal or philosophical discussion, throwing light on the various aspects of a question, is nowhere to be found. As he approaches a discussion, immediately he breaks up the discourse into questions and answers. He follows this method with tiresome persistence throughout the work. No doubt, some very profound work written in this form have come down to us from antiquity, and some have been written even in modern times in the same style. But there is one great difference between these works and *Satyarth Prakash*. In the former, the questions and answers form one consistent and continuous argument, and both the questions and the answers are so conceived as to cover all the various aspects of a problem. This characteristic is totally absent from *Satyarth Prakash*. There is neither consistency of discussion nor continuation of argument. The dialogues are not conceived in any rationalistic spirit. The questioner has a text put in his mouth, and he is answered with a text, and the

dialogue continues only so far as the texts help. The whole book is, in fact, a commentary on isolated Sanskrit texts. We cannot say what value these commentaries possess for the history of Sanskrit literature. To one who takes up this book for a study of its thought-content, they are an offence and a source of confusion. As the main concern is a war of texts, the discussions are aimless and end in inconsequence.

Further, the book contains an uncommon amount of irrelevant matter. The author rambles. For instance, on p. 91 he advises that children should be cautioned against superstitions. Not content with this caution, he goes on to give an account of every superstition known to him. In Chapter III, he does not think it enough to emphasise the importance of education, but goes on to lay down a detailed scheme of instruction, tells us which sciences are to be studied and prescribes the exact books, by means of which those sciences must be learnt. He does not stop even at that. If he is speaking of logic, he goes on to treat us with definitions of Logic. If he mentions astronomy, he tells us as much of it as he himself knows. He lays special stress on grammar and

lexicology; consequently, the major part of the work is devoted to the correct definitions of words. One text says that salvation is by knowledge. This gives occasion for mention of the categories of existences. Then, one thing leading to another, he proceeds to classify substances, gives their definitions, tells us their qualities, then on to the definitions of those qualities, which lands him in the region of non-existences, gives their varieties and the definition of each variety, and so on and so forth. These and other irrelevant details of similar nature are exceedingly wearisome. We need hardly say that they have no place in a book of religion. Their importation into *Satyarth Prakash* points rather to an undisciplined and barbarous mind, which failed to exercise any restraint upon the author or to distinguish the relevant from the irrelevant.

The first ten chapters of the book may further be divided into two parts. Chapters I, VII—IX deal with the doctrinal portion of the Arya Samaj faith, while Chapters II—VI and X treat of the ceremonial commandments. Each of the two parts forms a separate entity, with nothing to bind them into one unified harmonious system of faith.

The dogma and the ceremonial lie side by side, like two neighbours who refuse to make mutual acquaintance. This absence of consistency cannot, indeed, be charged to the account of Dayanand. It lies in the nature of Hinduism and has existed in that religion from time immemorial. Ancient Hindu sages thought freely and fearlessly, untrammelled by the traditional faith or the superstitions of the vulgar. Popular Hinduism permitted them to indulge in free thinking as they liked, and the sages in return sanctified the superstitions of the populace. Their metaphysical theories left the popular superstitions intact. Hence, in course of time, what those sages had regarded as tentative efforts to unravel the mystery of things, later generations raised to the dignity of dogmas and, as a practical religion of daily life, have continued to wallow in their ancient superstitions. Dayanand made no effort to bridge the gulf between these metaphysical dogmas and the practical ordinances of the faith. In fact, he is not even conscious of the existence of any disparity between the two.

With this general view of the contents of *Satyarth Prakash*, we proceed to give a brief summary of its teachings.

### III.

## THE VEDAS.

The Arya Samaj calls its religion the Vedic Religion and claims that it is based upon the *Vedas*. The Vedas are four in number—*Rig*, *Yajur*, *Sama* and *Atharva*. They are 'eternal, living in the mind of God,' and are given to the world by revelation. It is not that God revealed ideas to the ancient sages, who then developed those ideas into the Vedas. They were revealed in the same verbal, metrical and musical arrangement, in which they now exist. According to the Swami, their metres, musical notes and accents are not possible to human beings. "Therefore the Vedas are the *speech* of God" (p. 232). Speech, to the Swami's mind, presupposes vocal organs, which God cannot have. "If He is incorporeal, how could He teach the knowledge of the Vedas, and how was the pronunciation of

letters possible without the mouth?" The question is childish, but is answered very philosophically. The necessity of pronunciation arises only where a person has to inform others, 'but not to inform one's self.' Similarly, "God has revealed knowledge to the souls in virtue of His being the innermost ruling spirit.....He reveals His whole Vedic knowledge to the souls in virtue of His being present in their interior" (p. 229). The expression 'His *whole* Vedic knowledge' is no mere slip of the pen. It means that the Vedas contain the entirety of Divine knowledge. In the words of the Swami, they 'contain omniscience' (pp. 232, 234). God is infinite, so is His knowledge infinite. How the infinitude of Divine knowledge came to be confined within the compass of four volumes, the Swami does not tell us. Otherwise, the doctrine is very encouraging, for a thorough study of the Vedas puts one in possession of as much knowledge as God Himself possesses. Again God is eternal; His knowledge is eternal, and His pervasion, 'His being the innermost ruling spirit,' and His presence in the interior of the souls, are also eternal. Revelation, then, if not constant, should at least be possible

at all times. But the Swami does not believe in the possibility of revelation after the Vedas.

The Vedas were revealed in the beginning of creation, about 1,960 million years ago (p. 251), to four sages, because they were holier than all other souls. On p. 27 the author tells us that these sages were the most perfectly ignorant people, who had neither knowledge nor means of gaining knowledge. Apparently, they were called 'sages' on account of their profound ignorance.

The Vedas were revealed in the Sanskrit language, which the sages did not know. They just received the words in their present metrical arrangement, learnt them, parrot-fashion, by rote and communicated them to others. Afterwards, God revealed the meanings of the Vedic verses to saints and sages. When these revealed significances cumulated into a sufficiently large number, other sages and philosophers put them into books. These books, called *Brahmanas*, are the commentaries on the Vedas. Later on came other sages, who composed works of Sanscrit grammar, philology, etc. How these sages succeeded in writing philological works on a language which had originated in heaven before the creation of the world



is more than we can tell; for the sages to whom the Vedas had been revealed did not know the language in which they were composed. How the latter reduced the communicated words to writing is also not told. In any case the significations of the Sanskrit words came to be known only after the significations of the Vedic verses had been revealed to later sages, and the language could be of use to the people only after still later sages had succeeded in making out a workable grammar of this language, much in the style of modern archaeologists.

Whether Sanskrit ever became the language of popular speech is also problematic. The Swami expressly tells us that it never did. For he raises the question, why God revealed the Vedas in a language which nobody understood, instead of revealing them in some other language, which the people could understand, and he answers the question as follows: "Had He revealed the knowledge in any vernacular (*i. e.*, the indigenious language of a country), He would have become partial; for the people of the country in whose language the Vedas were revealed would find facility in learning and teaching them, but the other

people would have found it very hard. Hence the revelation was given in the Sanskrit language which is not the tongue of any country.....so that the people of all countries have equal labour to bestow upon it in learning and teaching the Vedas, which proves that God is not partial." So, then, in order to save Himself from the charge of partiality, God revealed the Vedas in a language which none on earth understood. What purpose such a revelation could possibly serve, we need not enquire. It would have been much better for us, if God had been a little less sensitive to charges of partiality.

The Vedas were revealed 'in the beginning of creation.' Had each country of the world its own separate language 'in the beginning of creation?' From the above quotation it is apparent that it had. Sanskrit is certainly not the language of any country at present. Was it never spoken anywhere? From the Swami's writing it is manifest that it never was. Or is it that he confuses the present with the beginning of creation, of which he has spoken only a few lines before? Anyhow, Divine impartiality demands that Sanskrit should never have been the language of India.

Strangely enough, on p. 376 he says, as one of his most powerful arguments, against the Brahma Samaj, that its followers do not know 'Sanskrit of *this* country' !

In the quotation given above I have omitted some words. They are : "The Vedic speech is the mother of all languages." The Swami's desire to claim this honour for Sanskrit has again betrayed him into a hopeless position. For how can a language be the mother of other languages, when it itself was never spoken on earth. Sanskrit was not known even to those sages, to whom the Vedas were revealed. How did it give birth to other languages ? The claim that Sanskrit is the mother of all other languages vitiates the very argument for the impartiality of God, which he is trying to support. The Swami says, at the beginning of creation each country had its own separate language. Had God revealed the Vedas in any of these languages, He would have become open to the charge of partiality. To escape that charge, He chose for the Vedas a language, Sanskrit, which was not spoken anywhere nor understood by any one. It is clear then, that 'Sanskrit is distinct from all languages,' as the Swami him-

self tells us on p. 495 of his book. In fact, other languages were already there in existence and spoken in each separate country, before Sanskrit came into being, as the Swami's argument shows. Of course, in itself the idea of each country having its own separate language in the beginning of creation is absurd; only a primitive savage can hold such notions. But we are concerned here with the argument of the Swami alone, and he says, all languages were there, before Sanskrit was created specially to be the medium of Vedic revelation. How did then Sanskrit, which was created 'distinct from all languages,' become the mother of those languages? Does the Swami mean that daughter-languages were created first, and their mother afterwards? From the primitive notions with which this book *Satyarth Prakash* is full, I would not be at all surprised if the Swami held that view.

But let us proceed. On p. 230 the Swami raises a very interesting question. It runs as follows: "There is no necessity of the Vedas being from God, for persons can make books by developing their knowledge gradually." The question hints at the idea of natural evolution and

the Swami replies to it as follows : “ No, they can never ; for it is impossible that an effect can take place without its cause. The savages have not become *servants* by observing nature, but they become so when they get some teacher. Even now nobody ever becomes a learned person without being instructed by some other person. In like manner, if God had not instructed the sages in the beginning of creation and if they had not imparted their knowledge to others, all persons would have remained ignorant.....The people of Egypt, Greece, Europe and other countries were ignorant and illiterate, till the light of knowledge went to them from Aryavarta.....In like manner, human beings were endowed with knowledge and civilization by the Supreme Spirit at the beginning of creation and they have kept up that knowledge by transmitting it to their posterity generation after generation.”

The Swami is very jealous of Divine impartiality. He turns to it ever and anon, and in the most unexpected places. But what had happened to that impartiality of God who confined Vedic knowledge and civilization to Aryavarta alone and kept all other countries in ignorance and illiteracy ?

The Swami gives no answer. In any case, he does not believe in natural evolution. Human knowledge is what it was in the beginning of creation and no addition has been made to it since. All those advances in science, technique and philosophy, of which the modern age is so proud, are sheer nonsense. They are an illusion and do not exist. No effect can take place, says the Swami, without a cause, and no one can learn anything without a teacher, nor, of course, can a pupil learn anything more than what a teacher has to teach. No advance or progress in knowledge is possible, and education consists only in the 'transmission' of such knowledge, generation to generation, as was revealed in the Vedas on the day of creation. The simplicity of the Swami's mind is really delightful. His mind can conceive of only direct and simple causes. He is unaware of that complexity of causation, which we observe in almost every occurrence in nature and which defies analysis. There are more factors than we are aware of, which contribute to the enlightenment of the individual. Human mind is, in the last analysis, itself the creator and unfolders of itself; the teacher is only a secondary means. No, says the Swami; human

beings, he would have us believe, are but monkeys, who cannot be trained without a teacher. "This fact is exemplified in the savage Bhils and other barbarians of India." The light of Vedic knowledge and civilization enlightened 'Egypt, Greece, Europe and other countries,' but these Bhils, who have been sitting cheek by jowl with that light from the 'beginning of creation' are still savages! What a pity that the broad-minded and enlightened Aryas never sent a couple of Rishis and Swamis to teach them Sanskrit !

From the above considerations we can imagine what the condition of the world would have been, if God had not revealed the Vedas. To save humanity from the awful calamity of barbarism "has the Supreme Spirit, out of His infinite love for all human beings, revealed the Vedas to them, so that they may get out of the darkness of ignorance" (p. 232). We have learnt above that this Supreme Spirit did not reveal knowledge as such ; He did not communicate ideas to the souls. What knowledge He had, He took care, to escape the charge of partiality, to put it in a language, *i.e.* Sanskrit, which nobody knew, not even the sages to whom the revelation was made. In other

words, God Almighty, 'out of His infinite love for all human beings,' sent them out into the world like a pack of idiots to jabber away Sanskrit texts, until in course of time sages should arise, some to sit in trances to hold their breath in *Yoga* exercises, others to compose grammars, philologies, prosodies and the rest of the paraphernalia necessary for unlocking the mysteries of the Vedas, who should then explain to the chattering idiots what all the hubbub was about!

Now, I hope, my readers have learnt what exalted station belongs to the Vedas. They are not only the speech of God, but contain also the entirety of Divine knowledge. They 'contain omniscience.' We ought to be thankful to the Swamiji, who has unlocked this Divine knowledge for us, and we hasten to make our acquaintance with it.





## IV

# THE CONCEPTION OF GOD.

It is said that the religion of the Arya Samaj is monotheistic. As the Samaj eschews image-worship and as the Muslims who are the representatives of Monotheism *par excellence* also eschew image-worship, by a confusion of ideas the claim of the Arya Samaj to be a monotheistic faith has been generally admitted. The admission is mistaken and is due to want of clarity about the idea of Monotheism. The Monotheism of Islam is wholly different from that of any other faith. It is a fundamental doctrine of ancient philosophy that the universe consists of two distinct and mutually antagonistic principles, *viz.*, matter and spirit or body and soul. Matter was conceived of as something inanimate, inherently corrupt and incapable of light and life, whereas the human soul was considered to be of divine origin and its

salvation consisted in its liberation from the bonds of matter. This is a dualistic view of nature and forms the basis of Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Zoroastrianism and other ancient faiths. Islam, on the other hand, in common with modern philosophy and science, holds that in spite of apparent diversity there is unity in nature and that there is only One Will working throughout the universe. Islam is in fact the only religion which holds a really consistent doctrine of Monotheism and stands unique in this respect, not to be compared with any other faith. As we shall see presently, the central doctrine of the Arya Samaj, like other sects of Hinduism, is the transmigration of souls, based upon the dualistic distinction between matter and spirit. The claim of the Arya Samaj to be a monotheistic faith cannot, therefore, be admitted. It is not monotheistic but dualistic. Closer enquiry, however, reveals that it is not even quite dualistic. Its views are much more primitive than, for instance, those of Buddhism and hang somewhere between gross polytheism and dualistic Monotheism. The great difficulty in understanding the Swami's position lies in the fact that he gives no clear and systematic account

of his faith. Indeed, the most annoying feature of the *Satyarth Prakash* is that it gives no systematic account of anything whatever. No doctrine, no idea is presented systematically. Quotations follow upon quotations in a most disconnected manner, and the reader is left to construct a system out of them as best he can. Context is wholly absent and contradictions are many.

On p. 208 the Swami tells us that there is "no whisper" of a plurality of gods in the Vedas. "On the contrary, it is clearly written there that there is but one God." That clear word, however, is given nowhere. Not a single text is quoted anywhere in the book, which should say, there is no god but God. Instead of that, the question is raised: "What is the object of many *devatas* mentioned in the Vedas?" and is answered as follows: "The objects which have wonderful and extraordinary properties are called *devatas*." He then takes up 33 Vedic gods and explains them away as objects possessing "wonderful and extraordinary properties" as follows: They are (i) 8 *Vasus* or the abodes of creatures, *viz.* the earth, water, fire or light, air, sky, sun, moon and planets. In this enumeration, it should

be noticed that fire and light are classified as *abodes* of creatures, the seven planets are reckoned as one, while the waters are counted as separate from the earth, and the sky, here called an *abode*, is said on p. 258 to be invisible and incapable of reflection, *i.e.*, immaterial, although on p. 227 it again becomes material, only it is "all, encompassing, delicate, formless, infinite, and has other peculiar qualities." (ii) 11. *Rudras* or vital processes. The etymology of this word is delightful. Rudra is derived from *ru*, to weep, so called because "on the disappearance of these vital forces from the body, it ceases to live, when the relatives of the deceased *weep!*" These vital forces are : swallowing, belching, twinkling (blinking ?), yawning, hunger, inbreath, outbreath, motive power, recuperative power, decomposing power and the ego. (By the way, Rudra is raised to the status of a divine name in the first chapter and enjoys a different derivation and on p. 214 he becomes "the Vanquisher, the Almighty Lord, who terribly visits the wicked.") (iii) 12 signs of the zodiac, which are in reality nothing more than mathematical fictions adopted for purposes of astronomical calculations but are treated by the

Swami as something real. (iv) Indra, which is a name of God in the first chapter but becomes electricity in the seventh. (v) "Prajapati or the lord of creatures or *Yajna* (sacrifice), as it is a cause of purifying the air, water, rain and plants. It (?) also gives an opportunity to respect the learned and it is the mother of inventions and various kinds of manufactures. These are the 33 gods, denominated from their having wonderful properties mentioned above." None of these wonderful properties, belching, yawning, blinking, swallowing, etc., not even the lord of creatures who purifies the air and plants, teaches respect for the learned and is the author of many inventions and manufactures, are to be worshipped. The Great God or *Mahadeva* is the only adorable being. The name "Great God" presupposes the existence of smaller gods, and so the Swami understands it. Accordingly, on p. 380 he condemns the Brahmo Samaj for not believing in these smaller gods. "It is not proper," he writes, "to believe no creatures of glorious qualities and learned people to be gods except God; for the Almighty God is called the Great God, which cannot be if there be no small gods."

The above dictum ought to settle the case for Monotheism. Mahadeva is the Great God, who has many smaller gods below him. But on p. 76 the Swami tells us that this Almighty God Mahadeva was himself originally nothing more than a learned sage. On p. 209 Brahma becomes the Supreme Being, the Lord of all and the revealer of the Vedas and so he is at numerous other places. But on p. 76 he too, along with Vishnu, is a learned sage, and p. 229 God (which one, we are not told) reveals the Vedas to Brahma, not even directly but through the channel of four other sages! This confusion prevails throughout the book, and it is impossible, try as best we may, to find out who is after all the Almighty God, for the Almighty Gods mentioned in one place become mere learned sages in other places. As there is no way out of this difficulty, we take up another line of enquiry and proceed to enquire whether there is a God, and what are His attributes.

The Swami has raised the question of God's existence thrice. On p. 71, the explanation of some Vedic terms leads to the following dialogue

which is introduced to prove the Oneness of God in the Vedas :—

Q.—Why should not *Virat* and the like words be taken to mean objects rather than God? Do they not mean the universe, the earth and the similar creations; Indra and the like gods, etc.?

Ans.—Yes, they do. But they also mean the Infinite Spirit.

Q.—Don't you take them to mean gods only?

Ans.—No. What is the authority for your taking them to mean exclusively so?

Q.—Gods are well-known and are also considered the best of all; hence I take these words to mean them.

Ans.—Is not God well-known? Is there anybody better than He? Then why don't you take them to mean God also? How can anything be better than God, when He is well-known, and there is none equal to Him? Therefore your objection is untenable.

Has this argument any sense? But we go on. On pp. 209-210 the question of God's existence is discussed as follows :—

Q.—You talk glibly of God. But how do you prove His existence?

*Ans.*—By means of all kinds of proofs, called the testimony of the senses—perception and the like logical tests. Perception or perceptual evidence is the knowledge produced in the mind from the contact of the will, ear, skin, eye, tongue, and nose with sound, touch, form, taste, smell, pleasure, pain, real, unreal and other objects. But the perception *should* (!) be free from doubt or error. Bear in mind that the senses and the will perceive the properties of objects, but not their substance in which these qualities inhere. Thus, for instance, the four organs, *viz.*, the skin and others perceive, touch, form, taste and smell; and the will joined to the mind perceives the substance which is the earth. In like manner, the perception of God results from the perception of wondrous design in the visible world and of the phenomena of knowledge and virtue. When the mind or soul impels the will or conative power, and the will incites the senses towards any object, whether it be theft or other vices or beneficence and other virtues, and it begins to do the thing, its desires and judgments are bent upon that desired object. At such a time fear, doubt and shame rise in the self-consciousness for evil works, and boldness,



conviction, joy and encouragement for good works. This internal voice or impulse is not from the ego but from the Infinite Spirit. When the mind is engaged in contemplating God in all its purity of intent, it perceives both of them (God and soul). When God is evident from perceptual evidence, what doubt can there be in the evidence of inference and other logical tests of the knowledge of God? For the knowledge of the effect leads to that of the cause.

I hope, the reader will understand. The above is a fair sample of the Swami's philosophic discourses. The book is full of this kind of empty verbiage. He means simply to say that one can deduce the existence of God from the observation of design in the external world. His second argument that the voice of conscience is not from the ego but from God is a pure assertion. He had started to give perceptual evidence, which he has not given at all. Nor is perceptual evidence possible. If God is incorporeal, He cannot be perceived with the senses. Of course, the passage is otherwise utter nonsense.

On p. 217, the question of God's existence is again raised in the following words :—

Q.—There is no proof of the existence of God, which can be referred to the testimony of senses. When there is no evidence of the senses, the other tests or canons, such as inference and the like laws of logic, cannot be applied. Also there can be no syllogistic inference from want of certainty as to the inherence of attributes in the Divine substance. Then again, the absence of the evidence of the senses and of inference does away with the authority of scriptures or assertions of learned men. Hence the existence of God cannot be proved.

As a rule, Dayanand introduces only those questions and objections which he can easily answer, and for this reason his dialectic becomes purposeless. But the above quoted objection he leaves unanswered. The Swami quietly admits that "there is no evidence of the senses for the existence of God," but goes on to say that God is not the material cause of the universe, which is quite irrelevant. In the passage quoted above from p. 210 he undertakes to prove the existence of God from perceptual evidence; on p. 217 he says, there is no such evidence. Are we then to understand that his previous argument was only a foolish bluff?

## THE CONCEPTION OF GOD.—(Contd.)

We have noticed all that Dayanand has to say about the existence of God. So we go on to consider the Divine attributes.

God is omnipresent. “Had He been limited to one locality, He could not have been the inner soul of all” (p. 210). In other words, He is omnipresent, because He is omnipresent. He is incorporeal. Had He been corporeal, He could not have been omnipresent; He would have been open to all kinds of diseases. “Had He been material and so had a definite form, there would have been another higher being than Himself to make His nose, ears, eyes and other organs to give Him a shape and form” (p. 211).

Divine mercy and justice are dealt with in the following dialogue :—

*Q.*—Is God merciful and just?

*A.*—Yes, He is.

*Q.*—These attributes, *viz.* mercy and justice, are contrary to each other. The doing of justice admits of no mercy, and *vice versa*. For justice is the giving of rewards and punishments according to deeds, neither more nor less, and mercy consists in letting off a criminal without punishment.

A.—The difference between justice and mercy is merely nominal ; for they both serve one and the same purpose. The object of punishment is to deter people from doing evil and suffering pain. Mercy is to relieve persons of pain. Your definition of justice and mercy is not true. For justice consists in giving condign punishment to a person who has committed any wrong according to its nature and magnitude. If a criminal is not punished, mercy will be destroyed ; for to forgive a wrong-doer is to bring suffering to thousands of virtuous people. How can it be mercy, which causes pain and suffering to thousands of people ? Properly speaking, mercy is shown in putting the felon in jail and thereby restraining him from doing wrong. It is mercy to him also. Nay, *his capital punishment will be an act of mercy to thousands of people.* (Italics are ours).

Q.—Then why are mercy and justice two distinct words ? If they mean the same thing, their being separate words is useless. It would have been better, had there been but one word. It is thus manifest that the object of justice and mercy is not the same.

A.—Are there no two words of one and the

same meaning, and is there no word having various meanings?

Q.—Yes, there are such words.

A.—Then why do you doubt it?

A little further down on the same page (211), another curious distinction between mercy and justice is given: “The difference between them is that mercy is the desire and consequent action to give ease and remove the suffering of others, and justice is the external action or measures such as the use of fetters, mutilation and other just punishments.” These opinions are ferocious enough, but we gather from them that justice and mercy are incompatible, and that God has only the former attribute. It follows therefrom that God cannot forgive sins, and so the Swami says on p. 219: “Does God forgive the sins of His saints and devotees?” “No; for if He forgives their sins, His justice will be done away with and all the people will turn sinners. Learning that sins are remitted, they will be emboldened and encouraged to commit them. Thus if a king pardons crimes, his subjects will be fearless to commit them more, and those more and more heinous than before. For they come to believe

that the king will give them pardon and so are sure to get his forgiveness by supplication and crouching before him. Then those who do not commit crimes will begin to commit them, being without fear of consequences. Hence it is the duty of God to deal out rewards and punishments for all deeds according to their merits and demerits, and not to forgive them."

In the common worldly life we forgive and we deal out justice without worrying ourselves whether justice and mercy are compatible or not. But religious psychology thinks otherwise and immense dogmas, like those of vicarious redemption in Christianity and of transmigration of souls in Hinduism, have been erected upon this supposed incompatibility of justice and mercy. If my servant offends me, it is open to me to forgive or punish him, and no injury is done to anybody else. But if that servant injures one of his fellow-servants, then it certainly is not open to me to forgive. I must then do justice. Similarly, if I sin against God, then He is Master; He can forgive me if He pleases, or punish me if He so decides. But if I have offended my fellow-man, then I must first obtain his pardon before I can

hope for Divine forgiveness, and if I do not obtain the forgiveness of the person whom I have offended, then God too cannot forgive me. This is the doctrine of Islam, which recognises the intrinsic distinction between the two sentiments of justice and mercy and removes their apparent incompatibility by assigning their exercise to different occasions.

We shall examine this doctrine of justice and mercy when we come to speak of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. We shall here consider the immediate moral consequences that follow from the teaching that God does not forgive and ought not to forgive, and that human beings can be kept in the path of righteousness only by fear of punishment—out of their own nature they cannot be good, and as soon as the fear of punishment is over, they naturally turn wicked. Human beings strive naturally to attain to those morals, which they ascribe to their Deity, and Dayanand too teaches that human beings ought to imitate Divine virtues. Muslims and Christians, then, who believe in Divine forgiveness, also strive to act upon the teaching of mercy and forgiveness and often forgive those who do injury

to them. In actual life, too, it is frequently observed that human nature is not really so depraved and that the very lowest hound of a sinner would respond to kindness. Mercy and forgiveness exercised at the right moment save many from a life of crime and sin, while punishment has often quite the reverse effect. A criminal is generally a greater criminal when he comes out of the jail than before he goes in. If my brother does me some injury and I forgive him, hundred to one he will not hurt me again. But Dayanand, the founder of the Arya Samaj, says that human beings cannot be kept straight except through fear of punishment and fullest vengeance must be taken for every injury. Shylock must insist upon his pound of flesh and the *mahajan* must extract his last penny from the defaulting *ryot*. Dayanand is not, however, satisfied with equal justice. He prescribes "condign punishment" for an injury. "Nay," he writes, "his capital punishment will be an act of mercy to thousands of people."

This teaching of heartless and what I should call ferocious justice, based as it is upon the doctrine that human beings cannot be good except through fear of punishment, is a frightful teaching,



and most dangerous for social peace. It amounts to a denial of every good in man and would replace the principles of mutual consideration and compromise, which form the basis of our civilization, with brutal force. It would have the rule of the *lathi*. What should be the moral condition of the community which is brought up on this teaching? Such a community cannot appreciate toleration or forbearance on the part of other people. As it itself cannot forbear and believes it its religious duty to take fullest vengeance with some additional injury to strike terror into the hearts of those who should do any injury to it, it cannot be kept in its place except through fear of swift reckoning. Pure logic leads only to one conclusion and that is, that when an Arya Samajist commits any injury, a swift and severe punishment ought to be meted out to him. The Arya Samaj denies every goodness in man and believes in force alone. This worship of brute force is a dangerous doctrine. It can only mean that the followers of Dayanand's teaching cannot be held in check but by brute force alone.

The God of the Arya Samaj knows no forgiveness and has no mercy in Him. Is it then

right to pray to Him? Prayer for forgiveness of sins and for success in any undertaking, the Swami says, is useless (pp. 212, 214). As was to be expected from a religion that so idolises brute force, one is required to pray for "valour" and strength (p. 213), and for knowledge. One should pray to the "supremely learned Lord of all" for knowledge of the Vedas and for "complete systems of knowledge from the best sources." As if there could be any source better than God's own grace! The confusion in the Swami's mind is apparent. While thinking of knowledge, his mind immediately turned to the difference of canonical and uncanonical texts and forgot that he was speaking of God and prayer. "Learned Lord" is, however, unique and quite like the Swami.

There are some more attributes of God mentioned by Dayanand. We shall be in a better position to understand them as well as the use of prayer, after we have acquainted ourselves with his doctrines of creation, destruction and transmigration of souls, to which we now pass on.

## VI.

### CREATION.

How the world originated and how it is going to end, are questions that in reality do not belong to the province of religion. Religion, as the modern mind conceives of it (and as Islam teaches), is but a guide in private and public life. It is a moral principle that concerns itself more with the conduct of life than with theories on the origin of life. Primitive nature-religions, however, occupied themselves mostly with questions of creation and the like. In Hinduism, especially, cosmological theories form the central pillars of the dogmatic structure, and so they do in the Arya Samaj. As in other matters, here too Dayanand does not present us with any uniform system of his own. He quotes texts, many of which appear contradictory to us. He himself is, however, aware of no contradictions.

God is the Creator of the universe. "He is the Maker of all this past, present and future world" (p. 234). "The Supreme Self existed

*before* the creation of the world.” But on p. 249 we are told that there is no beginning of the world. Just as night follows day and day follows night, so does destruction follow creation and creation follow destruction. “The rhythmic cycle of the world proceeds with regularity and constancy from all eternity. There is neither beginning nor end of it.” Can we then say that God existed *before* the Creation of the world, when there is no beginning at all?

This regularity of creation and destruction follows as a matter of necessity, because the three substances which constitute the universe, God, soul and matter, are eternal, unbeginning and uncreate. “Nature (matter), soul and Supreme Spirit are uncreated, that is, they were never born, nor do they ever take on flesh” (p. 236). I do not really know what to make of the last sentence, for ‘flesh’ is a piece of matter and therefore as eternal as the other things which it may be called upon to clothe, and if the souls never take on flesh, where do men and animals come from? Anyhow, matter, souls and God are equally eternal and uncreate. God cannot create any more matter nor can He destroy any. Also He cannot create any new souls nor

can He kill any that exist. "If God creates new souls, the material out of which He creates them will be exhausted: for however much a treasure may be, it will sooner or later run out, if there be nothing but drawings upon it and no puttings in it" (p. 264). On p. 221 he says that souls are immaterial, but the way he speaks of their creation out of material which could become exhausted if always drawn up and not added to, it would appear as if he believed them to be material after all. Also when Dayanand says that God is Almighty, that "God stands in need of nobody's least help in doing His work of creation, preservation and destruction," and that "He accomplishes all His work out of His own infinite power" (p. 211), it is to be understood under the proviso that God's infinite power is powerless to create anything without having an abundant supply of matter ready to hand and a large supply of ready-made souls. God's work of creation is like that of a potter. He takes the dead matter, fashions forms out of them and puts the souls into those forms. During the period that elapses between the day of destruction and the day of creation, the souls lie asleep in God, and matter lay "enveloped in

darkness," "in chaos," "at a place in space in the presence of Infinite God" (p. 235). On p. 239, however, we are told that "the primordial matter and the atoms" existed in God in an invisible form. On the day of creation, He "conferred corporeality and visibility on it."

The last two statements are contradictory. Either the primordial matter lay "at a place in space" or "in God," unless God is to be understood as a spatial entity, *i.e.* an immense, though invisible, form which encloses all space. Besides, what is incorporeal matter? Matter is something that occupies space. Bodiless, immaterial matter is a contradiction in terms and we cannot even conceive of any such existence. If matter then existed in an incorporeal form *in* God, it can only mean that the idea of matter and not matter itself existed, that on creation this idea assumed visible form. For God, Who is a soul and immaterial as the Swami himself tells us, cannot carry matter *in* Him. We can only say then, that God created matter at the time of creation. But Dayanand denies that in the plainest terms. Matter, he says, exists from eternity and is uncreated. Matter, therefore, could not exist in God in any form

whatever, unless God Himself is a material thing, which Dayanand also denies. We are then compelled to conclude that matter existed in space, apart from God and exterior to Him.

The same considerations apply to the souls. In their essence, God and the souls are the same. They differ only in degree. "God is more delicate and subtle than the soul" (p. 226). "She acts at one *spot* (does she)? Had she been present in all the body, the phenomena of waking, sleeping, dreamless sleep, death, birth, union, separation, ingress and egress would never take place. Hence, the *form* of the soul is small or finite, or better still, delicate and subtle, and God is still subtler" (p. 221). (*The italics are mine*). "The soul is grosser than God, and God is more delicate than the soul. Consequently, God pervades the soul" (p. 222). This pervasion is conceived quite physically and is illustrated as follows:—"Iron is denser or more bulky and fire is finer or more delicate. Therefore, fire penetrates iron and electricity pervades the sky." Now, although Dayanand tells us that the soul is not corporeal (p. 221), from the above quotations it is as plain as it could be that he understands the souls as well as God to

be material things. For the attributes grossness and subtleness and the functions of egress, ingress and the like can be predicated only of material things and not of spiritual or conceptual existences. If God is subtler than soul, how could the whole multitude of these grosser-than-God souls exist *in* Him before creation? The only consistent view can then be that the souls existed by themselves, God by Himself and matter by itself, each separate and apart from the others.

Be that as it may, we have existing from eternity a God, an adequate supply of matter and a multitude of souls. To these three must be added another entity. It is the law of nature. God cannot change it (p. 240). The Swami, no doubt, immediately identifies the laws of nature with the laws of God. But that cannot be, because Nature or *Prakriti* is matter itself. Here again, however, there is confusion. Nature or primordial matter is itself inert, inanimate and incapable of assuming any form. It means that nature has no law of its own. It appears to me that Dayanand, who so frequently tries to weave modern concepts into his ancient systems, has also borrowed the idea of "laws of nature" from



the common speech of his day and woven it into his theory of the universe, not realising that modern science that speaks of the laws of nature does not regard nature as primordial, inert and inanimate matter.

We have then a world of eternal spirits and a world of matter. This is what dualistic faiths have always taught. The world of spirits is populated by a multitude of souls. One of those souls, stronger and bigger than the others, called *Puram-atma* or the supreme soul, rules over them in a mild helpless fashion, for He can do them no harm. This bigger soul then is the God. He is called Mahadeva because He is bigger than them all, and because the other souls, when they attain to glorious qualities and become very learned, also become gods (p. 380). What happens then to the so-called Monotheism of the Arya Samaj? Of course, all these smaller gods are again deprived of their divinity, but how the Great God (the mere name 'God' is misleading and wrong, because there are so many of them) manages that, is not quite clear. The Great God is otherwise quite helpless. He is not a creator, for He creates nothing, and the high-sounding titles bestowed upon

Him, like 'the preserver of all,' 'the author of all in the world,' etc., are mere empty names. This is then the conception of God in the Vedic religion of the Arya Samaj. Matter and a whole multitude of souls of same substance as, though a little grosser than, God, are co-eternal with Him, and His authority over them is very limited. God is indeed one among many, only one of the brotherhood, though a little stronger than the rest. Can such a faith with propriety be called Monotheism? It may be called dualistic; it may be called polytheistic. It is certainly not monotheistic.

From the picture of God presented to us in the *Satyarth Prakash*, He appears to be a non-entity and we could as well dismiss Him from our subsequent discussions. But as Dayanand still goes on speaking of Him as if He were somebody and as we are bound to follow the Swami faithfully, we waive our objection and proceed. The question that next presents itself to Swami is the object of the world's creation.

Q.—What is God's object in creating the world?

A.—What can His object be in not making it?

Q.—Had He not made it, He would have been happy, and the souls would not have experienced pleasure and pain?

A.—It is the talk of idle and poor or desperate fellows, but not of the courageous and enterprising" (p. 240). The Swami here enters upon a long argument, the upshot of which is that if God had not created the world, His powers would have remained without exercise. It is only through the creation of the world that "His infinite power is turned to use." Two more reasons for the creation of world are given, which are that if God had not created the world, they could not have enjoyed the fruits of their good deeds done in previous lives. (What if there were no previous lives!) The second object is: "Many pure and virtuous souls attain the happiness of salvation by working out the method of emancipation from worldly bondage." But who put them in the worldly bondage? God, Who created the world to show His own powers as the Swami tells us, made forms of clay and imprisoned the souls therein, is Himself bound in honour to liberate them. Instead of putting them in worldly bondage and then laying upon them the duty of emancipating

themselves, it would have been much better to leave them alone. There was no need of salvation, if there had been no creation. The question that was raised remains, therefore, unanswered.

Who supports the world? is the next question. The Swami writes (p. 253 f.): He who says that the earth is supported on the head of a serpent, the horn of a bull, should be asked on what it rested at the time the parents of those creatures were born. The Mohamedans who maintain the bull hypothesis (do they?) will hold their tongue at the interrogation." The Swami, being much more philosophical than the poor Muslims, holds that "the supernal soul pervading all creatures supports all. Had He not been pervading, He could never have supported all the universe; for none can support a thing without having it *in the hand*." So it is neither the serpent nor the bull nor yet the tortoise but God, who supports the universe by holding it *in the hand*!

The manner of creation is as follows (p. 248);—"when it is time to make the world, the Supreme Spirit unites the sublimated particles of matter. In the first stage of development what becomes a little grosser than the highly subtle

nature or *Prakriti* or material substance, is called the great element. What is still grosser than that is called the *Ahankara*. Then there come from the *Ahankara* five distinct and subtle elements. Then again are produced the five organs of the cognitive senses, *viz.*, the ears, skin, eyes, tongue, nose, and five organs of the active senses, *viz.*, the throat, hands, feet, generatives, excretives; the eleventh is the will or *manas*, which is somewhat grosser. The five subtle elements produce five material or gross elementals in order, many degrees removed in grossness from their originals, and so visible to us all. They produce many kinds of herbs, plants and other things; from them come forth food substances, which generate seed, sperm or semen, ova, which produce the body. But the creation at first is not sexual; for when the Supreme Being makes male and female bodies and vivifies them with souls, then the development of the sexual creation takes place." That is, after eating the food stuffs which generate semen and other things, does the process of sexual generation begin. As usual, much of what he says in the above quotation is senseless twaddle. It has no meaning whatever. It

should be noticed, however, that he regards the will as something gross and physical, something apart from the mind (p. 210). Indeed, we have it on p. 257 that "the will or *manas* is an inanimate or unconscious entity; it cannot feel pain or pleasure. On the contrary, the soul feels pleasure or pain through the will." Volition, then, according to the Swami, is not a function of the soul. And if the will itself is inanimate and incapable of feeling pleasure or pain, how can the soul have those feelings through it?

"Many men were created in the beginning; for God gives birth in the beginning of the world to those souls, the merits of whose works entitle them to be born of the divine agency." In this way, "hundreds and thousands of people were created in the beginning," all of a sudden. "The ethnological researches prove that the people are the children of many parents." He means to say, the various races were created different in the very beginning. He does not believe in the unity of the human race. The ethnological researches, of which he speaks, were known only to himself. Again, the human beings that were created directly by the Deity were created in youth. "Had God made

children at first, their support would have necessitated other men. Had He made them in old age there could never have been sexual generation. So he created them in youth." This is then the kind of science of the Vedic religion, of which the Arya Samaj boasts so much. One can well understand a country yokel arguing in this childish fashion. But it is hard to reconcile oneself to the fact that the author of these puerilities should have encomiums heaped upon him by the leaders of thought among the Hindus and should have been accepted and revered as the Messiah of Modern India, as Mr. Ranga Iyer, M.L.A., calls him in *Father India*. But let us go on.

Mankind was first created in Tibet. The people were divided into two sections; the learned and noble and virtuous were called Arya and the low and vicious, the ignorant and idiots were called *Dasyu*. We have learnt before that at the time of creation, all were ignorant. The four sages, to whom the Vedas were revealed, were themselves profoundly ignorant. How did this distinction of learned and ignorant come to be made in the very beginning, we are not told. We have also been told that God created only those

first, whose merits entitled them to be born of the divine agency. Were the 'low robbers' and 'ignorant devils,' the *Dasyus*, deserving of this honour? In any case, quarrels arose between the Aryas and the *Dasyus*, i. e. the learned (*sic*) gods and the ignorant, devils." Due to these bitter and frequent quarrels, the Aryas left their home and came to settle in India, "as the best country in the world," leaving the rest of the world to the barbarians. On the advent of the Aryas, India received the name of Aryavarta. Formerly, it had no name and there were no inhabitants in it, for the Aryas came to this land direct from Tibet, a little after creation.

Q.—Some say that they came from Iran (Persia), hence they were called Aryas. The land was before them inhabited by savages, who were called the *Asuras* and *Rakshasas*, while the Aryas called themselves gods or *devatas*. When they fought together, their struggle was called the war of gods and demons in mythology.

A.—This assertion is absolutely false; for here is a verse of the Vedas. It has already been mentioned above that the name Arya was given to the virtuous, learned, divine, and their opponents or



the people having qualities contrary to them, were denominated *Dasyus* or robbers, evil-doers, irreligious and ignorant people. Also, the Brahmans, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas were termed *Dwija* or regenerate and Aryas, and the Sudras, *Unaryas* or idiots. When such is the authority of the Vedas, the discriminating learned men cannot believe the whims and suppositions of foreigners, etc.

We have learnt that the Vedas were revealed in the beginning of creation. How came they to be authorities on matters of history, which happened long after creation? It reads like Moses writing of his own death and burial and forgetting his own burial place as in the Book of Deuteronomy (ch. 34)!

The Swami goes on to tell us (p. 251) that all the foreign peoples are barbarians and demons. "It is evident now that the shape of the Negroes is fearful as the devils are described." After the Aryas came away to live in India, we do not know how the struggle ended. But the Swami tells us that from the beginning of creation to the time of the Pandawas the rule of the Aryas extended over all the world and the religion of the Vedas was professed "to some extent" in other

countries too. "The proof of this is that Brahma's son was Virat, Virat's son was Manu, Manu's ten sons were called Marichi and the like, whose seven descendants, called Swayambhava and others, were all kings. Their descendants, called Ikshwaku and others, were the first kings who colonised Aryavarta. But on account of their ill-luck, indolence, negligence, and internecine quarrels the Aryas have lost their own undivided, independent and peaceful rule of Aryavarta, much less to talk of their rule over foreign countries. Whatever rule they have left to them is trampled down by foreigners. A few kings are independent. When evil days come, the people have to suffer many troubles. Whatever good may be done to them, the Home Rule is the best." This is then the unanswerable proof that the rule of the Aryas once extended over the whole earth!

The present cycle began 1,960 million years ago, when the Vedas were first revealed. All the stars and planets, the sun, moon and the like, are inhabited. "If all these innumerable worlds have no men and other creatures, can they be of any use at all? Hence, the human and other races are in them all."

**Q.**—Have the human and other families the same kinds of features, organs and limbs as on the earth, or have they different?

**A.**—It is possible, they should differ a little, as the Chinese, Negroes, Indians, Europeans have a little difference in their limbs, organs, colour, complexion and shape. In like manner, there exist similar differences in their bodily formations. But a species begets its like in all these worlds as it does on earth; and the organs and their position in the body have the same correspondence there as here" (p. 254). "The same Vedas are revealed there. As a king's rule and policy are uniform throughout his dominions, so is the Supreme Ruler, the Lord of Lords' law proclaimed in the Vedas enforced equitably in all the varied creations." Except perhaps in the land of their birth—India!



## VII.

### SALVATION.

There is no salvation in the Arya Samaj faith. What it calls salvation, is a temporary condition, at the close of which the souls are sent back to the world to start their earthly career all over again. From the rambling discourse of Dayanand against the eternity of salvation careful analysis yields the following five propositions :—

(i) Sweet is sweet because of its opposite. If it is all sweet and there is no bitterness, sweet itself will become bitter. Hence, everlasting salvation is an evil. (ii) By eternal salvation, heaven will become over-crowded, "for there will be arrivals but no departures, so there will be no end of over-crowding," and over-crowding is a "positive evil." (iii) Souls earn salvation by the exercise of limited powers within a limited period of time. "If God rewards limited actions with unlimited consequences, His justice and equity will go to the winds." (iv) Souls have only limited powers

of enjoyment. They cannot endure endless and unlimited pleasure. It is the mark of wisdom to put as much burden on a beast as it can bear. The man is blamed, who puts ten maunds of weight on a person who can carry but one maund. In like manner, it is not right of God to put the burden of infinite pleasure on a being of little knowledge and limited powers." (v) If salvation be eternal and there be no return to earthly life, all sentient life will disappear from the world. There will be over-crowding in heaven and the earth will be left empty, because God cannot create new souls. If He attempts to create new souls, "the material out of which He creates them, will be exhausted." The Swami concludes the argument: Hence, it appears to be the correct rule that souls attain to salvation and also return therefrom. Does anybody prefer a whole life imprisonment or capital punishment to temporary confinement? If there is no return from salvation, it is like a whole life imprisonment, only that a person has no need to work for bread there. As to the absorption of the soul into the Supreme Being, it is like death by drowning in the sea" (p. 264).

The duration of salvation is 311,040,000,000,000 years (p. 263). The span of human life, on the other hand, is only a few score years. If it is unjust on the part of God to bestow everlasting happiness on souls for deeds done in a limited period of time, is it just on His part to bestow so many years of happiness? The question does not occur to the Swami. He, however, raises the question, why should one at all strive to obtain salvation if it is temporary. Dayanand replies: "Why do you strive to earn bread, seeing that you become hungry the day after you take food? Why should no effort be made for salvation, when it is considered necessary to try for the alleviation of hunger and thirst, for the attainment of a little wealth, kingdom and honour, for bringing about marriage and begetting children and similar other worldly purposes? Though death is certain, yet struggle is made for existence. In like manner, though the soul returns to the world from salvation, yet it is indispensably necessary to try for its attainment." But why? And if salvation is really like imprisonment, why should one seek imprisonment? Imprisonment, whether life-long or short, is bad in itself. According to this

teaching then, the God of the Arya Samaj, who never forgives, rewards the efforts of His devotees with a *short* imprisonment of 311,040,000,000,000 years! We are afraid, it is not a very encouraging doctrine. The only way of escape from this intolerable bondage of salvation is to damn it all and be sinful. Eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow you die.

Salvation is defined as follows :—

Q.—What is salvation ?

A.—It is one in which liberty is obtained.

Q.—What is freedom sought from ?

A.—From what all souls desire to be free.

Q.—From what do they desire to be free ?

A.—From what they most avoid.

Q.—What do they wish to avoid ?

A.—Pain or misery.

Q.—What do they get after their freedom from pain and where do they live ?

A.—They get happiness and dwell in God.  
(p. 260).

We have already learnt that “dwelling in God” is “like death by drowning in the sea,” which is a calamity quite contrary to the idea of salvation. In the *Satyarth Pra'casha* this is a

small inconsistency. But the dialogue is highly edifying and in the best style of the Swamiji. It demonstrates the stupendous powers of fencing and sparring the Swami was endowed with, and we gather from it that earthly life is in itself the seat of pain and misery and one ought to strive to seek release from it. On p. 240, however, the Swami tells us that this life is the only place, in which the souls reap the fruits of their good or evil deeds. If God had not created this world, He had nowhere to give them rewards and punishments. It is difficult to make head or tale of it. If the earth is a seat of pain, salvation ought to consist in release from it, and if it is the only place where rewards of former deeds can be enjoyed, release from earthly life cannot mean salvation. Salvation in that case would mean deprivation of the just rewards of one's good deeds.

What does the happiness of salvation consist in? "True salvation consists in liberty to go anywhere the saved like," (p. 269). "The saved soul moves at liberty in the infinite Supreme being. She sees all the creation in virtue of her pure intellect. She meets other saved souls.



She becomes acquainted with the systematic knowledge of creation, and makes a tour in all these visible and invisible spheres. She views all the objects which are worth knowing. The more she knows, the more she becomes happy. Being pure and stainless in salvation, she comes to have perfect knowledge and realises the nature of objects at hand!" (p. 273). "They have access to all the worlds and power to gratify all desires; in other words, whatever worlds and desires they set their minds on, they get to their satisfaction" (p. 262).

This perfect freedom to make as many pilgrimages as you like without expense does not last for ever. You feel a strong desire "to see the face of the father and mother" (p. 263), (as if after so many billions of years, father and mother were still there waiting for the dear departed son; as if eternal uncreated souls could have father and mother), and as by virtue of your salvation all your desires must be satisfied, you are sent back to the world. On the next page, however, you have to come back, whether you wish it or not, because by giving you ever-lasting salvation God will become unjust, heaven will

become overcrowded and sentient life will disappear from the earth. As the number of souls is limited and the world must be kept full of life, the saved souls are forcibly driven out of heaven, or rather, if salvation in the words of the Swami signifies a term of imprisonment, the "saved" souls are at last forgiven the audacity of having been good and are given another lease for a life of crime and wickedness.

What happens to those souls, which enter the world without having any account of evil deeds of former lives against them? The Swami does not tell us, but he goes on instead to deal with the question of reincarnation in general. On leaving the body, the soul "sojourns in the ethereal regions of the sky.....After her temporary sojourn in the ethereal regions, God restores her to life according to the merits of her virtuous or vicious deeds. She enters the bodies of the animal species (sentient life?) by means of ether, air, food, drink or the pores of the body by order of God. After her entry into these bodies, she gradually passes into the semen and is lodged in the womb, whence putting on the body she comes out and sees the light. She is manifested in the female body, if

the consequences of her deeds can be borne in it, and in the male body if they can be endured in it. She is born eunuch when the male sperm and the female ova are equal at the time of impregnation. (This transition from the moral to the biological is rather comical). Thus the soul passes through birth and death into the various kinds of bodies" (p. 272). The souls of human beings, of birds and beasts and of plants and trees are in their essence the same. They wander from one body to another, from species to species and genus to genus, according to their deeds. "A man in his next life becomes a plant for sins committed by him with the body, such as theft, adultery, murder of the virtuous and other wicked actions. He incarnates as a bird, a brute and any other lower animal for the sins perpetrated with the organ of speech. He is born as a low caste for committing sins with the conative power (will)" (p. 273).

A soul may have one of three qualities, *Satwu* or good quality indicated by her taste for knowledge, *Tama* or dark quality indicated by her ignorance and *Raja* or energy which is indicated by love and hate. Cheerful, calm and contented mind indicates the predominance of the good quality;

the desire of amassing wealth and any expression of restless energy indicate the presence of *Raja* or the active quality, whereas desire and lust point to *Tama guna* or passion. "The person possessing the good quality becomes a god or learned person; he who is endowed with the active quality becomes an ordinary person and he who has the dark quality goes to a degraded state." Each of these three qualities has three degrees, each of which leads to reincarnation in certain forms of life, as follows:—

"They, who are excessively imbued with the dark nature, pass into the life of plants, worms, insects, fish, serpents, turtles, cattle and brutes. They, who possess the mediocre amount of the dark nature, are born in the world as elephants, horses, low castes, barbarians (foreigners), the doers of evil deeds, such as the lion, tiger, boar or hog. They, who possess the best part of the dark nature, come into the world as bards who compose verses to panegyrisse people, beautiful birds, arrogant persons who extol themselves to get ease, murderous devils, demons of bad conduct, *i.e.* drunkards and felons.

"They, who possess the worst part of the

active nature, incarnate as swordsmen, diggers with pickaxes, mariners, actors, acrobats, gymnasts, armed servants and toppers. They, who possess the mediocre activity of nature, are born as kings, priests of warrior kings, controversialists, ambassadors, barristers, pleaders and commanders of army. They, who possess the best part of the active nature, are born as singers, organists, millionaires, servants of learned persons, fairies and beauties.

“The possessors of the first degree of the good nature are born devotees, hermits, monks, Vedic scholars, the drivers of balloons, astronomers, hygienists or the preservers of the body. The possessors of the second degree of good nature are born sacrificers, the expounders of the Vedas, the masters of the Vedas, electricity and chronology, protectors, *savants*, professors able to accomplish great works. The possessors of the third or best degree of the good nature are born as the seers of the Vedas, as masters of the orders and laws of nature and architects of various kinds of conveyances and balloons, mechanics, divines, geniuses, occultists and masters of nature.”

If the reader can detect any principle

underlying these gradations, he must be very clever. The present writer confesses himself wholly at sea.

The souls are, then, re-incarnated in different bodies in order to undergo punishment for sins committed and to enjoy rewards for good deeds done in former births. But with rebirth the memory of all those good or bad deeds is washed clean off. No soul retains any memory of having ever before lived on the earth. The Swami says, the soul "is not the seer of three divisions of time," *i.e.* past, present and future. In other words, you forget what you learn by the time you have taken the next step. "The mind, which acquires knowledge, cannot be conscious of two objects at one and the same time" which, however, is not the same thing as remembering what has already happened, otherwise cumulative knowledge becomes impossible. (Two pages before (267), in a preaching mood, however, he asserts exactly the contrary and says, "we remember the past and cognise many objects at one and the same time.") Continuing the argument he says that as no one remembers each and every detail of all the life's happenings in the same birth, so the memory of

previous births is not possible. Indeed, "it is not the business of the soul at all" to know whether it had a previous life and what it did then. The question is then raised: "As the soul has no knowledge of pre-existence and God punishes her for sins committed in that past life, she cannot be reformed or derive good from chastisement. For if she has knowledge of her former sins and so of their consequences, she can desist from doing evil again." In the above question, the word "knowledge" stands obviously for memory or knowledge based upon memory of former lives. Also, the question is put from the ethical standpoint. But Dayanand takes advantage of the ambiguity of the word "knowledge," uses it in an empirical and inferential sense, goes on to deduce transmigration of souls from the inequality of human life and leaves the question unanswered! If not sheer intellectual dishonesty, it points at least to an utter want of mental discipline. How far would not such a person go to deceive others, who deceives himself so flagrantly?

Dayanand supports his doctrine of the transmigration of souls from the inequality of human lot. "Why don't you infer," he protests, "the

pre-existence of souls from your observation of amazing inequality of pleasure and pain in the world? If you don't believe in the pre-existence of souls, you must admit that God is partial." One sees that it is this dread of the partiality of God that lands the Swami in so many awkward situations. Why cannot God be just, if there be only one life, is the next question. This also is left unanswered. Instead, the Swami goes on harping upon his one eternal theme of partiality. "If He acts thoughtlessly, He will be disgraced and sink lower than the best human judge.....As God does no injustice, He fears none," (p. 270). What a poverty-stricken God He must be! And what an abject picture of God!

This doctrine of transmigration has become rather famous of late years and we shall return to it presently. Let us now make our acquaintance with the means of salvation. Unfortunately, Dayanand does not seem to be quite clear about them. Among the Hindu philosophers, two ideas have been current. There are those who make salvation dependent upon good works, while others regard right knowledge the necessary condition of salvation. In the last analysis, right knowledge



and right conduct are not incompatible ; in reality, one depends upon and furthers the other. But as conceived by the ancient Hindus, right conduct and right knowledge are not reconcilable and do not serve the same purpose. Dayanand puts both the views before us without taking the least trouble to bring any harmony between them. In fact, he does not seem to be aware that he is committing any contradictions.

We shall consider the gospel of works first. On p. 265 the Swami says that the attainment of salvation depends upon the practice of virtues and abjuration of vices. We have already learnt that the practice of virtues is an expression of the quality of *raja* or activity, which must be overcome before one can attain salvation. Also on p. 171 we are told that God is "not accessible to the performance of works or religious acts." "Intoxicated with the pride of works they do not know what God is." Indeed, how can good works lead to salvation? For if one became saved through works, there would be an end to reincarnation. The real reward of work is pleasure or pain in this world, and not salvation, as the Swami has already told us. Reincarnation is the only

means of awarding punishments or rewards for works (pp. 240, 269-271). The proper means of salvation, then, is right knowledge, and so we have it on p. 272: "on the spiritual vision of the Eternal, the soul's internal knot of ignorance is cut, all her doubts are removed and *her works destroyed*." The cutting of the knot of ignorance and the destruction of the works are synonymous, for "works and devotion are also called ignorance, because they are the names of certain external and internal actions, but they do not constitute knowledge proper." (p. 257).

Salvation then comes from right knowledge. The soul is "clouded with darkness." By works she is held in bondage. Among the functions of the soul are the propagation of the species, preservation of the offspring, faith, memory and consciousness (p. 220 *f*). This is senseless, for the doctrine of reincarnation does away with propagation and preservation of the species, while the will, understanding, memory and self-consciousness compose the internal sense, which is inanimate or material, as he himself says on p. 257 *f*. "It is the characteristic of the soul to be ignorant, limited, localised, insignificant and a little enlight-

ened" (p. 260). Its salvation then consists in complete enlightenment. This enlightenment she obtains (p. 265-268) by the study of the Vedas, by attending learned lectures, meditation by knowing that there are three kinds of bodies, visible, invisible and substantial, whatever that may mean, by 'studying' the three states, waking, dreaming and slumbering and by the knowledge of the five planes of life, which are : 1. The alimentary organic system containing the skin, muscles, bones, nerves, arteries, blood, semen, all made of the earth and water elements ; 2. the vital system containing inbreath, outbreath, digestive process, the vital action which passes the food down the throat and energy ; 3. the animal system, containing the will, consciousness and five active senses, *i.e.* speech, feet, hands, excretory organs and generative organs ; 4. the intellectual system containing intellect, memory and five cognitive senses ; 5. the spiritual system manifesting love, cheerfulness, joy, happiness and the material substance as the vehicle.

These are the means of obtaining salvation.

Of course, I do not pretend to understand all this nonsense. If an Arya Samajist hopes to

obtain salvation by learning the functions of alimentary, digestive, excretory and sexual organs and by studying the three states of waking, dreaming and slumbering, he is quite welcome to it. To me, the whole intellectual make-up of Dayanand's system seems to be hopelessly gross and vulgar. We shall now consider the doctrine of the transmigration of souls.



## VIII.

# THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSMIGRATION.

It is a very ancient doctrine and is held in common by all the sects of Hinduism. The ancient Greeks held it. The Western mind overcame it centuries ago, but the Hindus have held it most staunchly, and in our own day the propaganda of the Theosophic movement has made it world-famous. There are lots of people in the West, especially women, who are beginning to believe in it. The importance of the question demands that a few words should be bestowed on it.

What is the evidence of our having lived previously? Do we retain any memory of former births? Any Hindu will tell you that we do not, that the soul before re-birth is washed clean of all memory. Western Theosophists, however, are not satisfied with this plain answer. A young girl prodigy plays glorious music; the Theosophist

would immediately put her down as an evidence of transmigration. The girl must have learnt the music in a previous birth. Of late, another argument has come into vogue. It is a common experience that sometimes we visit a place which we have never seen before, but there is something about the place which reminds us as it were as if we had been there before. This feeling, which is always tantalisingly vague, is interpreted as a memory from a former birth. Before we take such a long leap to pre-natal regions, it should be our duty to see if we cannot account for this strange feeling otherwise.

What actually happens is simply this : We visit a place ; some of its features we perceive with full consciousness, while others, although perceived by us, remain in the sub-conscious regions of our minds. Later we visit another place ; it has some features similar to those we had seen at the former place but which had remained in our sub-consciousness. This second time we happen to perceive them directly ; what was in sub-consciousness comes into the upper consciousness and by the law of association we begin to feel as if we had seen the place before.

This is a trick that consciousness sometimes plays with us. In any case, the doctrine of transmigration is far too large a proposition to be proved by such extremely hazy "memories." In this respect, the Hindu philosopher is certainly much more scientific and truthful than the modern Theosophist in admitting plainly that there is no memory whatever of previous births.

As there is no memory, *the doctrine has no direct proof.* Positive data for the doctrine of transmigration fail utterly and absolutely. As to the argument from the inequality of human fortunes, a distinction ought to be made. There are two doctrines; one, of which Dayanand is a representative, assumes the existence of a God who gives rewards and punishments according to the deeds. The other, represented by the Theosophists, makes God a nullity and denies the idea of rewards and punishments. According to the doctrine of *karma*, so energetically propagated by Mrs. Annie Besant, God is an "Ocean of Love"; He is the Great Attributeless, ineffable and altogether too happy in Himself to worry about the affairs of other people. He neither rewards nor punishes; in fact, the idea of rewards

and punishments is altogether wrong and inapplicable. *Karma* means the law of cause and effect. You reap what you sow. If the harvest is pleasant, it is just the consequence of your deeds ; if it is unpleasant, that too is the effect of a cause. Neither the one is a "reward" given by God nor is the other "punishment." God is far too big to interest Himself in our affairs. The whole affair is managed by the law of nature.

Both of these theories are worthless from the standpoint of practical ethics. The one, intended to save God from the charge of partiality, makes Him out into a heartless tyrant who punishes without letting the sufferers know what they suffer for. Want of memory takes away all chances of improvement and chastisement becomes mere vindictiveness on the part of the Deity. *Karma* or the law of cause and effect is still more hopeless, because it excludes ethical considerations, as it does not recognise the idea of rewards and punishments. Rewards and punishments presume ethical judgments of good and bad. As the former are absent, so are the latter. Salvation will depend then, not upon the goodness of conduct, for the term "goodness" itself becomes



meaningless when there are no rewards and punishments, but upon cessation of all conduct. The doctrine of transmigration, understood one way or the other, is inimical to all good conduct; it means the negation of all activity. How can one conduct oneself, when one does not know for what he is suffering; how can one decide which line of conduct to adopt and which to avoid? The feeling that one is suffering from what one cannot undo, of whose very nature he is ignorant, cannot but be most oppressive. The sufferer must believe that his sufferings are unavoidable, because they are the just awards of the Deity according to one idea or the results of an inexorable law of cause and effect according to the other idea. This feeling of helplessness must naturally hinder activity and desire of self-improvement, and lead to the belief of fatalism. In fact, the word *karma* is used in the sense of fate. When a misfortune befalls, the Persian says, it is his *qismat*, and the Hindu says, it is his *karma*. Fatalism is the natural result of the doctrine of transmigration. In fact, there are sects among the Hindus, who hold that the effects of *karma* can never be wiped away.

According to the doctrine of *karma*, each separate action leaves a permanent indelible impression on the mind. Psychologically, this is not true. Every action leaves an impression, but this impression may be rendered deeper and more lasting by a repetition of the same kind of act, or it may be removed altogether and replaced by another by an action of the opposite kind. This also is the teaching of Islam. I cheat a person of one rupee. Immediately I receive a warning from nature and I feel sorry. I find a large sum of money lying on the road; I know the man to whom it belongs and I return it to him. Nature forthwith bestows abundant reward for this good action; my mind is filled with joy and I feel stronger for doing good than I did before. The good washes off evil and the slate is clean again of the dirty smudge that the dishonest act had left behind. Our God is a long-suffering God, and nature is never hasty with her punishments. Otherwise hardly any of us will be able to breathe for any length of time. Day after day we go on disobeying her plainest behests and yet she does not punish us. Every time she gives us the chance to improve ourselves, to turn a new leaf and begin

again. It is only when the waters go over-head, that the judgment follows. Not single actions decide the fate ; it is the cumulative effect of many repetitions, which forms dispositions. Even these dispositions are curable. These are ascertained psychological facts, which form the basis of all moral training. The doctrine of *karma* is, then, psychologically false.

The argument from the inequality of human conditions is also fallacious. Pleasure and pain are not absolute quantities and cannot be measured in terms of wealth and poverty. They are relative to the conditions, in which a person is used to live. Dayanand's argument (p. 271) that a poor labourer would gladly step into the shoes of a wealthy banker, but that the banker would refuse to exchange places with the labourer, is the result of confusing pleasure with comfort and pain with discomfort. Pleasure and pain are purely mental phenomena, whereas comfort and discomfort are but physical sensations. Besides, desire and refusal to exchange places are due to the wrong habits of the parties of putting absolute values upon wealth. Wealth has come to be regarded a good in itself and not for any ultimate

good that it might serve. Happiness and its opposite are subjective experiences, which can neither be measured nor compared, and it is foolish to assert that a rich man is as such happier than a poor man. Wealth has nothing whatever to do with happiness or misery. It is unscientific to regard feelings as identical with the causes, which give rise to those feelings. The sources of the pleasure and sorrows of the rich and the poor are certainly different, but who will compare their degrees of intensity? Contrary to the reckonings of the transmigrators, I do assert that a poor hard-working labourer gets far more enjoyment from his simple fare than a rich man does from his costly dishes, and that the average village farmer, who after the day's hard labour sits down to his evening meal with his wife and children, feels prouder than the proudest sovereign on earth. The rich man's son may be brought up in the lap of luxury, while that of poor parents has to meet hard knocks from early life. But who can say that one is happier than the other? Both may be equally happy or equally unhappy' in spite of the inequality of their material surroundings.

Also, wealth and the material comforts that

accrue from it are not necessarily the consequences of good deeds. If wealth were the outcome of virtuous deeds, then the pious ought to be the wealthiest. In actual practice, however, we find quite the other way about. Wealth and possessions follow from hard mental and physical labour and not from religious exercises or charitable deeds. No doubt, the pious too can be wealthy, provided that instead of counting beads they turned up their sleeves, set themselves to hard labour and gave to labour the same religious value which they give to their religious exercises. Wealth has nothing to do with virtue, and virtue has its own rewards which cannot be measured in terms of wealth. The assertion of the transmigratists, however, that good deeds done in one life are rewarded with ease, comfort and wealth in a subsequent birth, is utterly groundless, for wealth and goodness are wholly unrelated things. Measuring virtue in terms of money is a grossly materialistic doctrine.

The doctrine of transmigration is also immoral. God and unknown deeds being held responsible for all misfortunes, individual effort in life becomes meaningless. The doctrine puts too

much value upon wealth and station in life. Distinctions of birth and of wealth become the main concern. The Hindu does not seem to be able to get over them. The dignity of man as such, independent of his riches and possessions, goes to the winds and labour becomes despised. The poor man is poor because of his sins in a former life, and the labour he has to undergo to maintain himself and his family is a divine punishment. Small wonder then that in Hindu society one profession looks down upon the other; the merchant despises the tradesman, the carpenter or the blacksmith treats the weaver with scorn and the shoemaker and the sweeper are treated worse than dogs! Wealth is looked up to with awe and reverence, while labour and poverty are regarded with deep disdain. This is gross materialism. To believe that that poor sufferer, "with his mouth in the dust" as the Quran depicts human suffering in moving terms, is some wretched sinner undergoing well-deserved punishment at the hands of a just God, is inhuman enough. But the inhumanity of the faith becomes more hateful if we believe with Swami Dayanand that these pretty innocent birds and these dumb ani-

mals (*Gaumata* included !) are also miserable sinners paying the penalty of their crimes ! Holding the faith of *karma* or *awayawan* (transmigration), how can one with honesty sympathise with suffering or relieve pain ? If any still do, I can only say that they are better than their faith. To crown all, we must not forget that when Arjuna standing on the field of Kurukshetra is horror-stricken at the idea of shedding the blood of kinsmen and refuses to fight, Krishna moves him to battle and bloodshed by an appeal to this doctrine :—

Thou grievest where no grief should be !  
 thou speak'st

Words lacking wisdom ! For *the wise in heart*  
*Mourn not for those that live, nor those that die.*

Nor I, nor thou, nor any one of these,

Ever was not, nor ever will not be.

For ever and for ever afterwards,

All, that doth live, lives always ! To man's frame,

As there come infancy and youth and age,

So come there raisings-up and layings-down,

Of other and of other life-abodes,

Which the wise know, and fear not.

\* \* \* \* \*

But for these fleeting frames which it informs,  
With spirit deathless, endless, infinite,  
They perish. Let them perish, Prince ! and fight.

*Bhagavadgita, II.*

These are then the logical consequences of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. Bloodshed and carnage lose their horrors ; sympathy with suffering, relief of pain and kindness to the dumb creatures become meaningless ; labour is despised and wealth, power, possession and comforts of life take the highest place.





## IX.

### THE RITUAL.

Having finished with philosophy, we enter upon duties. A Brahman should shave his head, beard and moustache at the age of 16, a Kshatriya at 22 and a Vaishya at 24. These should be kept shaved ever after, for "the hair on the head produces much heat in the body. It also dwarfs the understanding. Eating is not well done from keeping the beard and moustache" (p. 279). By the way, hair is nature's protection of the head and the brain both against heat and cold.

Foreign travel is allowed. "Of course, it is true that the body, semen and other tissues of flesh-eaters and drunkards being putrid and offensive, it is feared rightly that the Aryas may not be degraded from contact with them." But it cannot be helped. They themselves should never eat meat. We for our part do not quite understand how the semen and "other tissues" of the meat-eating foreigners can affect the purity of the Arya boys who go to Europe for studies. "The twice-born (the three upper castes) should not eat

vegetables, fruits, roots and other food stuffs produced from the manure of filth, urine and other dirty things," (p. 285). They should not take their food at the hands of barbarians (foreigners, Muslims and Europeans) nor at those of the low castes, because "the sperm and ova produced in the bodies of a low caste man and woman are not so pure and free from impurity, stench or other kinds of taint as those of a Brahman's and his wife's bodies, which are nourished with the pure articles of food." This on p. 287; but on pp. 284 and 288 he says that the food ought to be prepared by the Shudras; for if the men and women of the upper castes were to engage in the "botheration of cooking, cleaning the eating spot and scouring utensils," they will have no time left for studies, affairs of government and other commercial and agricultural pursuits. But what have the sperm and ova to do with cooking or with accepting eatables from another's hand, he does not tell. No two persons, not even the husband and the wife should eat together, because the temperaments of their bodies differ. The food should be prepared "scientifically" and the kitchen should be kept clean and not dirty 'like the Mahomedans

and Christians.' Dayanand never saw a Christian or a Musalman kitchen, and what he says from his ignorance and Samajic charity matters little. The Hindu kitchen he depicts as follows: "Flies, ants and many other worms and insects frequent the kitchen from its dirtiness, as butter, sugar and the refuse of food are thrown at the time of taking food and when food is prepared. If the place is not daily cleaned and swept, it will soon look like a privy house" (pp. 287-288). The condition of the kitchen should throw much light on the table manners of those who eat therein.

The Arya should not kill "nor allow others to kill" useful animals, especially the cow. By some peculiar arithmetic the Swami finds that "one cow in one generation will support 475,600 persons at one time." Therefore, "those who kill these animals may be regarded as the murderers of all!" (p. 286). If any tiger or some other beasts of prey should injure a cow, then it is the duty of rulers to *punish* injurious animals and men, nay, to kill them if necessary." The influx of foreigners and followers of conflicting faiths, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Sikhs and the like, has inflicted much misery upon the

country. " It is the imperative duty of wise persons to remove this misery " p. (288). " The man who disrespects the Vedas and other sacred scriptures founded upon them should be excommunicated by the responsible great men, for he that slanders the Vedas is an atheist" (p. 279). Such persons should be driven away from " tribe, society and *country* !" (p. 109).

" The spiritual worship requires the regulation of breath " ( p. 99 f ). This is what they call " Yoga." Germans translate it as " Scheintod " (= seeming death) and the Swami renders it by " deep breathing," and both are right. One should take some water, neither more nor less than can be held in the palm of the hand and reach down the throat, and suck it by placing the lips in the centre. Some water should then be sprinkled over the eyes and other senses with the foreparts of the middle and ring fingers. Clearing the throat and setting the circulation going, deep-breathing should be started. The course is long and the exercises are hard. After long practice one succeeds in holding the breath for hours together. The Swami himself could hold it for eighteen hours. Great spiritual enlightenment is promised, the real-

ity of which we doubt. It is for a physician to decide what effect this course of straining inhalatory exercises would have upon the physique. For our part, we have never seen a "Yogi" having an enviable physique. For spiritual enlightenment it is wholly useless. We know from daily experience that for any piece of work that requires mental concentration, natural functions of the body should take place without let or hindrance. Any the least hindrance is likely to disturb the attention. The intensity of concentration depends upon and its degree may be measured by the degree of forgetfulness, into which we let the body and its surroundings sink. Far from throwing the body into oblivion, the Yoga of the Hindus demands the entire energy of the mind to be directed to the regulation of respiration! The so-called trance or "Scheintod" itself means nothing more than complete suspension not only of the natural functions of the body but also of the mind. Not spiritual enlightenment but rather emptiness of the mind and utter idiotcy is the natural result. And those who have followed this summary of the Swami's teachings will have seen that Dayanand, too, who could hold his respira-

tion for eighteen hours, was not far from the realisation of that "devoutly desired consummation" spoken of by R. L. S.

The other great duty of the Arya is the performing of *Havan* or fire oblations. Fragrant drugs and *ghee* ought to be burnt by every householder twice daily, morning and evening, these being the only two junctions of day and night (p. 101). The oblations of the morning keep their efficacy up to the evening and of the evening to the following morning (p. 145). In no case should they be made at mid-day. The exact quantity of *ghee* required at each offering is not given in the book. But one may well imagine what the condition of the country would be if every householder in India adopted the Vedic religion and performed the sacrifices twice daily. Among other costly things required in large quantities the cremation of one dead body alone requires 320 lbs. of *ghee* (p. 55). How much *ghee* the thousands of daily deaths in India and millions of sacrifices would require, how many cows would be needed to produce that amount of *ghee* and how much land they would require for grazing, are matters of simple arithmetic. I am afraid,

there would be no food left for human beings and no room for their habitation.

The question arises naturally, why should so much good *ghee* be wasted away by offering to the fire, whereas the same could be given to the poor? The question is economic but is answered with Physics as follows: If you knew the physical science, you would never talk so, for nothing is destroyed or wasted "(p. 102). The Swami goes on to say that the *ghee* would feed only one person, whereas, if burnt, many enjoy the sweet affluvia wafted away by the wind far and wide. The purpose of these fire-oblations is to "purify the air." People commit much sin and crime by exhaling "all the stench and impurities" of their bodies into the air and thus spread disease. To make amends for these sins, equivalent amounts of sweet smells should be diffused into the air. Food may also be given in charity, "but the *havan* should always be done by persons. Hence the necessity of the ceremony of oblation to fire." Such enlightened arguments are scattered all over the book.

We know that nature has made sufficient provision for the purification of air by an easy

adjustment. The impurities that we exhale are needed by the vegetable kingdom, which returns to us what we need. But does the burning of *ghee* at all purify the air? Burning means so much expenditure of oxygen, which is the one substance animal life needs and the absence of which spells death to living creatures. If we use it away in burning *ghee*, far from purifying the air, we actually make it impure. The experiment can be made by burning a quantity of *ghee* in a closed room. Evidently, Dayanand is confusing the dissemination of pleasant smells with purification of air, as ignorant people often do. But is the smell of burning butter at all pleasant? Tastes no doubt differ, but I am afraid, it requires a very coarse mind to enjoy the smell of burning butter.

It need hardly be said that no sacred texts contain the idea of purifying the air by fire-sacrifices. The idea originates with Dayanand himself as one of his many attempts to rationalise the ancient teaching. Shorn of Dayanand's modernisation, *havan* means simply fire-worship. Worship of elements, a form of polytheism, has prevailed among all races of antiquity and burnt offerings are known to all ancient cults. The



Parsi, a near relative of the Aryas, still worships elements and so does the orthodox pious Hindu, except that the latter has also carved stone images. In the meantime, the Swami goes on purifying the air, and for that purpose lays another heavy duty upon the Aryas. *viz.* that every Arya should "make an oblation to the fire of the hearth of whatever is prepared in the kitchen in the way of food to improve the physical environments" and "to purify the air of the kitchen" (p. 148 f). Can one with propriety call this fire-worshipping faith of the Arya Samaj "Monotheism?" Of course, the idea of "improving the environments" by burning food is quite original!

Swami Dayanand undertakes to regulate the whole course of life from the hour of conception to the hour of death. On delivery, the mother should nurse the baby for six days, after which it should be made over to a wet-nurse, or, if the parents are too poor to employ a wet-nurse, it should be put on artificial food. The milk in the mother's breasts should be dried up by the application of medicines, and she "should try to heal her....." to be ready for the husband's embraces within two months. Dayanand gives

some fine advice on p. 90 with respect to children in his usually naked language, which we omit. Mothers should teach the children up to the 5th year, fathers from 5th to the 8th year, at the end of which the boys should be invested with the sacred thread and sent to the school. Children should as a rule be severely handled. "Those who fondly love them give them poison to eat" (p. 94). The schools should be four miles away from towns in unfrequented tracts of the country and the boys' schools and girls' schools should be two miles from each other. "The teaching staff, servants and followers should be all male in male schools and female in female schools. Neither a boy, even of five years old, should be allowed to enter into a female school, nor a girl of the same age into the school of boys..... Neither the pupils nor their parents should be permitted to see each other or keep any kind of epistolary communication between them," p. 98.

Investiture with the sacred thread is only for the three upper castes. Shudras are not to be invested with the thread, and must attend separate schools, where they learn reading and writing, *but not the Vedas* (pp. 94, 103). On p. 126 *f*, the

question is raised again :—Q. “ May women and serfs (Shudras) study the Veda ? If they read, what shall we do ? There is no authority sanctioning their education. (Sanskrit text). Here is a prohibition of it. It is a precept of the Veda that women and the servants should not be allowed to learn.” “ Damn your eyes !” says Swami Dayanand Saraswati. “ All human beings, whether men or women, have a right to study.” He goes on to say that “ Shudras and our servants, women and very low castes ” should read and teach the Vedas ! If women did not learn the Vedas, they would not be able to beget children properly, cook or superintend the cooking of food, supervise the building of houses or the making of suits and jewelry, etc., etc. The Vedas must be indeed very wonderful books, which teach architecture, tailoring and other crafts, besides cooking and how to bear children !

The students at school should wear no shoes, carry no umbrellas, should not be wicked and “ never waste their energy,” and should avoid dancing, singing and playing music. But among the prescribed courses of study stands one *Gandharva Veda*, which is wholly devoted to music.

So the Swami says that playing upon instruments, singing and dancing should be properly and particularly learnt! The course of study lasts 20-21 years and embraces the entire body of literature produced in ancient India, with the exception of certain uncanonical books. The minds of their authors were imbued with the deadly sin of partiality which the Swami holds in greatest dread. The studies cover every subject known to the ancient Hindus. The Swami treats his readers to a large number of definitions, like "Size is of two kinds, small and large," etc., as samples of the profound lore one meets with in these works.

On completion of education one ought to marry. Celibacy is, of course, the best form of life, but this is possible only to a perfectly learned person, and one who never marries lives to the age of 400 years, p. 105. (The Swami himself never married and died at 59!) The ideal time of marriage for men is when they are 48 years old and for women when they are 24. The lowest age limit permissible is 25 for men and 16 for girls. When the time of the marriage of boys and girls approaches, photographs of the marriageable boys should be sent to the mistress

of the girls' school, and those of girls to the master of the boys' school. Couples being selected for marriage, their life-histories should be obtained for comparing their merits, habits and tempers. This matching and comparison is to be done by the master and the mistress. The photographs and the memoirs of couples matched in this manner should then be handed over to the marrying parties themselves, who thereupon inform their masters and mistresses of their intentions. If they agree to the match thus made by the teachers, they should be immediately sent home. The parents should then set to feed them properly, so that they get strong and vigorous in a few days. As the Swami is a great lover of debates and holds debating to be the "chief duty of all human beings" p. 396, even on the occasion of wedding he does not forget this "chief duty" and prescribes that when the bride and the bridegroom are brought face to face, the teachers or the elders should make them hold a discussion between themselves in their presence.

The wedding ceremony should be held at 10 p.m. or at mid-night, on completion of which the couple should retire to their nuptial chamber.

We would gladly leave the happy couple alone now, but Swami Dayanand takes us by the hand and carries us along into the nuptial chamber to witness the mysteries of Venus and does not leave until the deed is done and the parties part for the night to sleep peacefully on separate beds. He who himself never married prescribes the entire ritual and uses the nakedest possible language, which it is not possible to quote. Indeed, the fact that he never married, alone explains the morbidity of his imagination and the utter nudity and shamelessness of his expressions, for no husband who has any respect for his wife and no father who has a daughter, would dare use Dayanand's language. I do not think, there is another 'religious' book on earth, that gives similar instructions and employs the same naked language.

Prof. Winternitz shows in his *Die Frau in den indischen Religionen* (Pt. 1, Leipzig 1920) that woman in Hindu society has no other function than that of begetting children and performing menial services towards her husband. Dayanand, whose chief aim it is to revive old ideas and usages, represents the same views. As we have seen, matches are to be arranged by school

teachers in a cold-blooded calculating way. Marriage is indeed robbed of all its romance, and the coming together of two young souls, driven towards each other by the power of passion, is declared beastly, if the object is not the procreation of children. How can there be romance, if the whole affair is to be managed by expert match-makers? Doubtless, in one place (p. 133f) the Swami says, that matches should be by the mutual consent of parties, because "marriage contracted by mutual consent is seldom attended with displeasure and variance, and it brings forth splendid children!" But the actual method of match-making, which he prescribes, precludes the possibility of mutual selection. The parties are brought face to face not until the whole affair has been arranged and the wedding ceremony is about to be performed.

To understand Dayanand's teachings about marriage, it is necessary to keep in view the main proposition that the object of matrimony is nothing but procreation of children. Marriage, he declares, is "not for carnal sports like those of beasts" (p. 160). Mere sexual intercourse, if its object is not the procreation of children, he prohibits as

waste of energy, and he warns his Arya readers perhaps a hundred times not to waste their energy. Not from any moral standpoint but from the standpoint of profit and loss is it that he prohibits adultery. Even ignorant peasants, he argues, do not throw their seed into fields other than their own. Is he not a greater fool then, who throws the seeds of human body into a bad field, for he gets no fruit therefrom? Indeed, he regards the sexual intercourse of husband and wife on other than the prescribed days (5th to 16th after menses excluding the 11th and 13th of the lunar month) and adultery equally sinful, because both are waste of energy (p. 143, 161).

Remarriage of widows and widowers is not permitted, (p. 156). "Like the cows not milked by anybody" only virgins should be taken in marriage (p. 134). The question is then put, will not men and women fall into adultery, if they do not remarry? "No, never," says the Swami, "if men and women wish to live a chaste life, there will be no evil. To continue their line of descent on the failure of issue, they can adopt a son of their own caste, if they like. It will prevent the occurrence of adultery." We for our part do



not quite see how the adoption of a child can affect the natural sexual passions of a man or a woman. But the Swami adds, they can satisfy their passions by *niyoga* or temporary nuptial compacts.

What is *niyoga* and wherein does it differ from marriage and promiscuous adultery? *Niyoga* is a union between two persons for the purpose of begetting children. If a husband is unfit, he should ask his wife to go to some one else for raising the issue, and if a wife is barren, she should ask her husband to do the same. If the husband is away, then the wife should wait for his return 8 years if he is gone for acquiring knowledge, 6 years if for fame, 3 years if for wealth and other purposes. "After the expiry of those years, she should beget children by *niyoga*. On the return of her married husband, the connection of *niyoga* should break off." Men enjoy similar privileges. "Thus, a man may bear with his wife for 8 years if she is barren, for 10 if children die away, for 11 if only daughters are born every time and *for no time if she speaks unkindly*. After these years, he should beget children upon another woman by *niyoga*. If a woman finds her husband very op-

pressive, she should leave him and forming *niyoga* with another man beget children to inherit her married husband's property.....People should adopt these to improve their families.”

“ If a man cannot restrain himself from sexual indulgence for a year while his wife is pregnant, he should go into *niyoga* with a woman and beget children for her. *But on no account must men commit adultery or whoredom!*” As if this promiscuity were not adultery enough! The above cases of *niyoga* pertain to the time, when both the husband and the wife are alive. The same rule applies to widows and widowers, because the main object is to raise issue. “ There is injustice and unrighteousness in marriages between widows and bachelors or between maids and widowers.” To avoid this injustice widows and widowers should perform *niyoga*. They cannot marry and “ it is rather sinful to prevent the celebration of *niyoga* ” (p. 158). Also, a widower can have *niyoga* relationship with a woman whose husband is alive and conversely, a man whose wife is alive can also enter into similar relationships with a widow or a woman whose husband is alive. The difference between marriage and *niyoga* is that

in marriage husband and wife live together, whereas in *niyoga* the parties to this compact "do not meet except in the season of women.... They should meet each other once a month for fecundation. If they continue their connection after it, they should be considered as sinners and punished by the Government." "If a woman contracts *niyoga* in her own interest, she should separate from her man on her second pregnancy. If a man enters into the compact of *niyoga* for his own sake, his relation with his woman should cease on the second pregnancy. But the same woman should nurture the children for two or three years and then make them over to the man. Thus a widow can raise up two children for herself and two children to each of four men united to her in *niyoga*. Also, a widower can raise up two children for himself and two to each of 4 widows." (p. 157). "A woman can take husbands (by *niyoga* and not by marriage) one after another up to the 11th number. In like manner, a man also can take women eleven in number one after another by means of *niyoga*." One pair of human beings may thus raise ten children by *niyoga*. Ten children is the limit in

the case of woman only ; men can go beyond this limit. " In fine, ten children can be begotten by the above compact. Afterwards, conjugal relationship between men and women is regarded as sensuality, and they are looked upon as fallen people. Also, if married men and women cohabit after the 10th conception, they are thought to be lecherous and censurable."

These are then Dayanand's ideas on married life. Morality and humane relationships do not enter into his calculations. In the meantime, a few more regulations may be noticed. A girl of yellow complexion, of a large size, with hair too much or too little, garrulous or with brown or inflamed eyes should not be married, nor one with the name of a constellation as Rohini Devi, etc., of tree as Tulsia, Genda, Gulabi, Champa, Chameli, etc., of a river such as Ganga, Jamna, etc., of a low caste name ; of mountain as Vindhya, Himalaya, Parvati, etc, of a bird as Kokila, Mena, etc., of a snake, a slave, a terrific object, etc. " He should marry a girl with sleek, proportionate limbs, with agreeable name, with the gait of a swan or she-elephant, with fine hair and teeth and whose body has exquisite softness " (p. 132). Indeed, her

body should be sweet and enjoyable, one likely to "exhilarate" and move to "conjugal embraces" (p. 143). No mention is made anywhere of her mental or moral accomplishments. Further, matrimonial alliances should be entered into at great distances, because change of climate improves health and commercial opportunities are great. On the other hand, marriages at short distances are dangerous, because the girl would often visit her parents who would be impoverished by making her frequent gifts. The couple is also likely to be affected by the joys, sorrows and quarrels of the families, and in case of disputes between themselves, they might receive help from their relations. These calamities can be avoided with justice to both parties, if they migrated to another land after marriage. But Dayanand seems to safeguard the interests of husbands alone. He distrusts the wives only and leaves them at the mercy of the husbands, away from the reach of parents' help!

Both marriage and *niyoga* are to be performed between members of the same caste, or between men of the upper and women of the lower castes. "The object is that the fecundation should be with the semen of the like or a better class, but

not of the class below hers" (p. 158). The main idea of the physical improvement of the race is never out of sight. Mere moral considerations have no value. We have seen that by reincarnation all souls are reborn in such forms and conditions as they deserve according to their pre-natal virtues and vices. One would expect that (see page 271) classification of castes would also be arranged through the same process. Dayanand, however, demands that the division into castes should be according to merit and not according to birth and that this division should be undertaken by the king or other governing authorities. When the girls are 16 years old and boys 25, the Government should hold a test and decide to which castes they should belong. When a person has been thus put into one caste, he remains therein all his life. As the children of the low castes are put into separate schools at 8 and are not to be given higher education, in practice they never have any chance of rising higher, and the rule of distribution in youth becomes meaningless. The question is raised, what would the aged parents of those children do for their support in old age, who have been promoted to the upper classes? Will

the family not become extinct? The Swami replies that those parents shall have their children allotted to them by the Government, so they would not be without descendants! The Swami is, in fact, out and out for a cast-iron system. Mere natural affections and feelings of human relationships have as usual no value with him.

The duties of the four orders are well-known and we pass them by. The fourth stage of life is renunciation. The regenerate householder, *i.e.* a member of the upper three castes, having discharged the duties of family life should retire from the world and live in a forest. On page 174, however, it is the privilege of the Brahman alone to adopt the life of renunciation; the other two castes are not entitled to this distinction. The renunciate should perform fire-oblations "to purify the air" of the forest, sing and teach the Vedas (to whom will he teach them in the forests?) and practice deep-breathing. "Deep-breathing is one of his primary duties." The renunciates are to act like wandering clergy to preach from place to place. Lay preachers are not fit for this work, because "they have not so much impartiality or time at their disposal as the clergy have."

We now pass on to the duties of Royalty, to which the Swami devotes a whole chapter. It is not quite clear what kind of government he proposes. In one place (page 190) he lays down a complete well-graded bureaucracy or a hierarchy of officials from the village *lambardar* to the king, such as that given in the code of Manu. In another place he speaks of a council, in whose hands the plenitude of power is to reside. "One individual should not have the absolute power of government; the council of which the king is the president, should be subordinate to him; the king and the council should both be subject to the people and the people should be subordinate to the council" (page 179). On the following page, the president is a different person and his appointment lies in the hands of the king. On yet another page, the administration is to be divided between three separate councils. There are also indications of the king being an omnipotent despot. All this confusion arises from the fact that the Swami is trying to take account of the constitutional demands of the people of his own days, of the municipal administration of the ancient city of Pataliputra as it was in the days



when Megasthenes visited the city and at the same time of the ancient texts which stand for a hierarchy of officials with a despotic king at the top, and he does not know how to evolve out of them a uniform system of his own. The King should appoint 7 or 8 ministers, beside the president, to assist him in the despatch of administrative work. The king, the ministers, the presidents of the councils, army commanders, administrative officers, judges and magistrates and members of the councils should all be thoroughly learned in the four Vedas and other scriptures. They should be well-versed in law, logic and metaphysics, *i.e.* they should have "the right knowledge of the attributes, action and nature of God, in other words, divine science, traditions and customs of the people, and mode of assertions and interrogations." To strengthen themselves, they should daily practice deep-breathing. The president should promote wealth "as quickly as lightning"; he should destroy the wicked like fire, vanquish the enemy, excel kings in excellence, be "awful like the sun, who strikes fear into the hearts of all by his power" and possess other virtues of the same kind. The home department of the

government should be in the hands of "shy and timid persons," while the foreign minister or the ambassador should be a clever man whose business it is to create disunion among enemies. The treasury and executive work should be in the charge of the king, whereas the prime minister is to look after the administration of justice.

The king should be the embodiment of punishment (page 181). He should eat delicious food, live in a whitewashed house in the centre of a well-fortified fort and eschew hunting, dancing, singing, playing music and other baneful habits. "As a heron attentively watches the opportunity to catch a fish, so let him muse on collecting wealth; having improved his finances, let him put forth his strength like a lion to vanquish the enemy; let him fall upon the foe like a leopard from an ambush; let him double like a hare on the approach of a powerful enemy, and then take him by surprise." It is the king's business to obtain by force what he has not got, to preserve what he possesses and to increase his wealth by lending money on interest. An extensive system of espionage is recommended. Any public servant who takes a bribe should be exiled from the

land and his property confiscated.

Dayanand does not believe in mercy of any kind and his criminal code is severe. Thieves are to be punished with amputation. False witnesses should have their tongues cut out. The adultrass should be devoured alive by dogs by the king's order in the presence of many men and women, and the adulterer should be laid on a red-hot iron bedstead and burnt to ashes. The severity of these punishments is excused as follows: " Those who regard it severe do not understand the intent of politics ; for the severe punishment of one man will keep all others aloof from the commission of evil deeds. They will give up committing crimes and be established on the path of duty."

Of the foreign powers, there will be either enemies or allies or neutrals. " He is called neutral who possesses praiseworthy qualities, knowledge of good and evil men, heroic temper, brave mind and benignity of heart, and incessantly talks of superficial matters!" (p. 197). Allies are quite well in their own places, but on no account should they be allowed to get strong or obtain any advantage over oneself. If the King

finds himself weak, he should make peace with the enemy and wait for his chance, and when the favourable time comes, should invade his territory with all his power. The time of peace should be devoted to perfection of armaments and preparations for war, and the king should be ready to take the field at any time. On the battle-field, he should take his stand in the centre of his army. For gaining victory it is necessary to divide the army into two divisions. When a soldier captures cars, horses, elephants, umbrellas, money, cows and other cattle, women and other substances, they should belong to him as his lawful prize, except that he should make over one-sixteenth to the king. There are hosts of more texts containing pious homilies, which however fail to veil the Machiavellianism of Manu's statecraft.

Our review of Dayanand's teachings is finished. We have stated in a brief manner almost everything of importance he had to say. We now pass on to a cursory review of his criticisms of other faiths.

---

## X.

### DAYANAND'S CRITICISMS.

Dayanand's criticisms deal with all ancient and modern religions that were ever represented in India, from the "very terrible Buddhism or (!) Jainism" down to Islam, Christianity and Sikhism. To understand the nature of these criticisms it is necessary first of all to familiarise ourselves with his criteria of judgments and with his method.

The most important criterion of religious truth with Dayanand are the Vedas. "The Vedas are the highest authority on religion" (p. 279). "A saying may be of anybody, however great. If it is against the spirit of the Vedas, it cannot be accepted" (p. 163). "To assume those books as authority, which are against the Vedas, is to become an atheist. Therefore all the Tantaras and Puranas being against the Vedas are false" (p. 322). In the first chapter of his book, the Swami says, it is not right to begin a writing or any piece of work with an invocatory expression. Reasons for that are given on p. 319 as follows :—

**Q.**—Is muttering the name of God entirely false? **The Puranas** talk everywhere of the great merit accruing from repeating the Name.

**A.**—Your manner of repeating it is not good. It is entirely false.

**Q.**—How is our manner of invoking God's name false?

**A.**—It is against the Vedas.

And with that the question is settled. The ceremony of obsequies is disposed of summarily in this fashion: "Being not sanctioned by the Vedas, it *deserves* refutation" (p. 401).

**Q.**—If Wam Margians and Shivites are not good, are the Vaishnavas good?

**A.**—Being against the Vedas, they are worse than they" (p. 314).

Guru Nanak is criticised as follows:—"St. Nanak's motive was righteous, but he had no scholastic learning at all. He did not at all know the Vedas and other scriptures and Sanskrit. Had he known the Sanskrit language, how could he write the word *nirbhaya* as *nirbaho*? Another instance of his unacquaintance with Sanskrit is a Sanskrit prayer composed by him. He wanted to make an attempt at Sanskrit composition.

**But how can Sanskrit be known without study?** However, he might have passed as a Sanskrit scholar by making those Sanskrit verses among the villagers who had never heard a word of Sanskrit before. He would never have done it but for his desire for popularity, honour and fame. He must have had a desire for honour, for else he should have preached in the language which he knew. He should have said that he never studied Sanskrit. Since he had some pride, he wished to commit arrogance for the sake of honour and esteem. It is on this account that calumny and praise of Vedas are found here and there in his book.....(Nanak says : all the four Vedas are tales. O Nanak, the Veda does not know the greatness of a saint.).....The Veda is the treasury of all knowledge, but all his chattering, who calls the four Vedas tales, are myths themselves. Since ignorant men are called saints, they cannot know the worth of the Vedas” (p. 362).

From the above quotation, it is abundantly clear that Dayanand's only charge against Nanak is that the latter did not know Sanskrit. Indeed, the Swami holds that “those who are unacquainted with Sanskrit write and talk nonsense” (p.

293), and those who are ignorant of Sanskrit scriptures "rave incoherently like beasts" (p. 228). In short, the Vedas are the final authority in religious matters. This being the criterion, other religions must of necessity be false; reasons and arguments are therefore useless.

The *bona fides* of Dayanand's criticism may be judged from the following sentence (p. 303): "If the doctrine of the identity of the soul and Brahman and the illusion of the world was really believed in by Shankaracharya, it was not good; but if it was assumed only to refute Jainism, it was somewhat good." One can see that the man is thoroughly unprincipled. His sole aim is to vanquish the adversary in argument. What means, fair or foul, he adopts to achieve his end, is a matter of no concern. The same dishonesty of method runs through all his arguments. He is not concerned with truth as such, but cares only to win victories at whatever cost. To take a few examples. On p. 235 he says on the authority of Rig Veda that "all this world was enveloped in darkness before creation; it was in chaos." A similar statement occurs in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. There, of course, the Swami is



full of objections. "Now," says he, "God is omniscient. His knowledge is perfect. The work He has done with His knowledge cannot be imperfect or void and without form....If God alone created the world, could He not create it out of His knowledge from the beginning with some kind of form?" The idea is the same. Only when it occurs in a Vedic text, the Swami accepts it; but if it occurs in the scriptures of another faith, the Swami is full of objections! The Quran begins with the formula "In the name of God, the Beneficent, the Merciful." The Swami objects to it as follows: "The Musalmans say that the Quran is the word of God. But the above verse shows that its author is somebody else; for had it been made by God, He would not have used the expression 'in the name of God'; but He should have said 'to preach to the people' (p. 494). On p. 27, however, occurs the following dialogue:—

"Q.—Vedas contain the praise of God. Has He written His own praise? A.—As the parents instruct their children to serve their parents and teachers and obey their orders, so God, by way of instruction, has given the Vedas." In other words, a thing is right if it occurs in the Vedas;

if it occurs in the Quran or in the religious scriptures of some other faith, it is objectionable and false! This utter want of principle gives him full freedom to pull anything to pieces. For he seeks victories and not truth.

It is a self-evident principle that before we proceed to criticise anything, we should know what it is. Bare justice demands that the position of the adversary should be first of all clearly understood. In the absence of this understanding, criticism not only becomes profitless, it very often degenerates into simple abuse. Now, although Dayanand devotes 251 pages to his criticisms, there is not a single religion whose teachings have been reproduced with any care. He often condemns without letting us know what he is condemning. It is apparent from his discussions that he never even tried to understand the teachings of religions he had taken it upon himself to criticise. Beyond a superficial bazaar acquaintance with the unessentials, it is impossible to know from his writing anything of the religions he criticises. For example, on p. 361 he introduces a dialogue on Kabir's religion:—

Q.—Are the followers of Kabir good?

A.—No, they are not.

Q.—Why are they not ?

In answer, Dayanand enters upon retailing some bazaar tales and ends them up suddenly with the remark, “they put a mark on the forehead like a lance and tie a rosary of wooden beads to their neck. Now, think a little, how spiritual progress of knowledge can be made in this faith? It is like child’s play only.” So he condemns it without telling us anything of Kabir’s teachings. Criticisms of Christianity begin with the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. The Swami goes on picking up verses from here and there right to the end of the Book of Revelations. Similarly, criticism on Islam begins with the first verse of the Quran and goes on right to the end. As he knows neither Christianity nor Islam, one wonders what he is criticising ! On account of his ignorance of the teachings and fundamental principles of the two faiths, his discussion reads more like calumny and ill-tempered abuse than criticism. With this summary of his principles or rather want of principles and methods, we shall go on to give some examples of his criticisms.

He gives 16 reasons against idolatry. Many of them are wearisome repetitions. They are :— The mind cannot be fixed upon a corporeal thing ; for it grasps it at once, and then it runs from one of its parts to another. But nobody's mind is ever tranquillised until he directs it to the incorporeal God ; for it rests in Him as He has no organs. Therefore, image worship is irreligious. It produces poverty, because the building of temples costs money. (I suppose, four *maunds* of *ghee* at one cremation and large quantities spent upon fire-oblations do not impoverish !) The assemblage of men and women in temples begets adultery. The unity of priests is destroyed through worshipping different idols. A person gets angry if his image is made. So God too will get angry. Idolators wander from place to place and are harassed by robbers. Money is given to wicked priests, who spend it upon whoring. If the images be broken or stolen away, they beat their breasts and weep bitterly. Flowers are meant for perfuming the air. Instead, they are offered to the idols, and are afterwards thrown away. They rot and produce disease. What wonderful arguments ! The priests are oppressed

with the company of the wives of others and their own wives associate with others, and both lose the pleasure of connubial love. Low minds always go to the gutter ! And Dayanand is no exception to the rule.

Sixteen objections are raised against the Brahmo Samaj (p. 376 *ff*), many of which are bare repetitions. They are :—Their principles are not good, for “ how can the supposition of persons destitute of the knowledge of the Vedas be entirely good ?” They have adopted Christian manners and customs and changed the rules of eating, drinking, marriage and ceremonies. They do not believe in the Vedas, do not know Sanskrit, do not sing the glories of the ancient Rishis of India, although they are born in India and derive their support from it. On the contrary, they speak of Jesus, Muhammad, Nanak and others in their books. They have given up the caste system and eat with the English, Muhammadans and low castes. “ Such things do not lead to improvement, but on the contrary to degradation.” Like Christians and Muslims they do not believe in the eternity of soul and matter. They believe in the removal of sins by

means of repentance and prayer, which makes God unjust. This divine injustice becomes still greater by the Brahma belief in the infinity of rewards and rejection of the doctrine of re-incarnation. "You should bear in mind that the soul is eternal, and so are her actions by virtue of their persistence." (This eternal repetition of justice and injustice is sickening. If God becomes unjust by giving infinite rewards for deeds done in a finite life by a finite soul, does He become any the more just by making the consequences of an evil deed done in one finite moment persist for ever so long?). The Brahma belief that there was nothing but God before creation is absurd. They do not believe in smaller gods besides the Great God and do not perform fire-oblations. To follow Jesus and others and ignore the sages and divines of ancient India is also bad. They do not wear the sacred thread and do not keep the crown lock. The Brahma Samaj believes in instinctive knowledge, which is absurd, for truth can be found only in the Vedas. Without knowing the Vedas one cannot distinguish right from wrong. Imparted knowledge is the only cause of progress. "See, you and we

never knew accurately about duties and prohibitions, virtue and vice in our infancy. But when we studied with the learned, we came to know of our duties and prohibitions, virtue and vice." The Swami means that right and wrong are not determined by man's own self, but by an extraneous standard of judgment; that virtue is virtue and vice is vice, not because the human mind instinctively and by knowledge derived from experience decides it so, but because some power, let us say God through revelation, lays down the norm which determines them. Falsehood is a vice, not in itself but because the Vedas say so. Actions are neither right nor wrong in themselves. They become virtues and vices, duties and prohibitions, by the division effected between them by the Vedas. Indeed, according to Dayanand, virtue means the following of a juridical code, which may not be quite consonant with human nature. The Arya Samajic preacher who has translated *Satyarth Prakash* into English expressly tells us that the Vedas are an "extraneous communication of God's commandments" and that its teachings are not inherent in the human nature (p. 45). Of course, in another place, they

become " seated in man's heart " (p. 290) !

Criticisms on Christianity are in reality criticisms on isolated texts of the Bible and cover 50 pages. A few examples will suffice.

Gen. I, 3*f.*—" And God said, let there be light, and there was light. And God saw the light that it was good." Swami :—" Did the material light (Is light material ?) hear what God said ? If it did, how is it that the light of the sun, lamp and fire does not hear what we say at present ? Light is material ; it cannot hear what anybody says. Did God know the light to be good when He saw it ? Did He not know it to be so before ? If He knew it, why did He say it was good, after seeing ? If He did not know it, He cannot be God. So your Bible is not said by God and the God described therein is not omniscient.

Matt. 5, 3—" Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Swami :—" If heaven is one, there should be one king. If all the poor go to heaven, who will have the royal authority ? They will fall foul among themselves and upset the order of government. It is not proper to understand paupers by the



poor; also it is not proper to take it to mean prideless. For the words poor and prideless do not mean one and the same thing. For one who is poor in mind has no contentment. Hence, the doctrine is not right."

Matt. 7, 22—"Many will say to me that day, Lord, Lord." Swami:—"See, Christ wished to be the judge of heaven to inspire belief into barbarians. It is simply a device to tempt simple folk." About the moving of mountains by faith, Swami says: "The above description of the impossibilities reveals the ignorance of Christ. Well, if he had a little share of knowledge, why should he have uttered so entirely barbarous a gibber?" Rev. 12, 7: "And there was war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon." Swami:—"Whoever goes to the heaven of the Christians must suffer horrors of war. Better give up the desire of going to such a heaven and sit down, bowing to it from a distance. The place, where there is no peace and war is raging, is for the Christians alone."

Rev. 19, 7: "Let us rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come and his wife hath made herself ready." Swami:—

“ Now listen, marriages are celebrated in the heaven of the Christians ! For the marriage of Christ was performed there by God. It may be asked, who his father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law and other relatives were. How many children were born to him ? The loss of energy (in sexual intercourse) decreases strength, understanding, valour, life and other qualities. Therefore, Christ must have left his decayed body there by this time. For an object produced from the union of others must undergo disunion.”

Rev. 21, 9 : “ There came unto me one of the seven angels and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the Bride, the Lamb’s wife.” Swami :—“ Hallo ! Christ has got a nice wife in heaven. He must be enjoying conjugal pleasures. Those Christians who go there probably get women for wives and children are born to them. The increase of heavenly population must give rise to diseases, and they must be dying. It is better to be away from such a heaven.”

A few examples of his so-called criticisms against Islam may now be given :—

1. 3-5f.—“ The king of the day of judgment ! Thee do we worship and of Thee alone do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right path.” Swami : “ Does not God judge always ? Does He sit in judgment on some particular day ? It then shows the reign of injustice. It is right to worship Him and to ask help of Him. Will they ask help in evil ? Is the right way (the way) of the Musalmans only ? Or of others too ? Why do the Musalmans not accept the right way ? Does the straight way lead to evil that they do not like it ? If the good of all is one, there is no peculiarity in the Mussalmans. If they do not wish the good of others, they will be unjust.”

1, 6f.—Direct us in the way of those to whom Thou hast been gracious ; not of those against whom Thou art incensed, nor of those who go astray.” Swami : “ As the Mussalmans do not believe in prior existence and good and evil works done in that life, God will be unjust by giving blessings and showing mercy to some and withholding them from others. For to give pleasure and pain without consideration of merit and demerit is injustice ; while to show mercy to some and to be angry with others without any cause

whatever is not in the experience of nature. Equitable justice requires, He cannot have mercy and wrath without a cause. In the absence of good and evil works being accumulated in the previous life, mercy to some and wrath against others are not possible in the face of justice. If it is a fact what is written in the commentary on this verse, that God made men pronounce it so that they may always repeat it in that way, the alphabet of Arabic must also have been taught by God. If it be said that this chapter could not be read without the knowledge of the alphabet, it is asked if they were made to utter it out of their throat and they uttered it so. If it is so, the whole Quran must have been taught with the utterance of the throat. Therefore the book which contains things of partiality cannot be called as made by God. As it is given by God in Arabic, the understanding of it is easy to the Arabs but difficult to others, a fact which charges God with partiality. This defect or blame could not have been imputed to Him, had He revealed it in Sanskrit, which is distinct from all languages, out of His equitable justice to the people of all the countries in the world." (Cp. Ch. III *ante*.)

2, 1-6 : “ This book, there is no doubt in it, shows the way to the pious, etc., etc.” Swami : “Is it not an instance of arrogance on the part of God to praise His own book ? Those who are pious are on the right path by themselves, and this Quran cannot show it to those who are in the false way. Then what is the use of it ? Does God make bestowals for expenses out of His own treasury without regard to virtue, vice and exertion ? If He does, why does He not give it all ? Why do the Mussalmans work ? If it is proper to believe in the Bible, Gospel and other revealed books, why do the Mussalmans not believe in them as they do in the Quran ? But if they do, what is the need of the Quran ? If it be said that the Quran contains more things, God must have forgotten to mention them in previous books ! But if He did not, the making of the Quran was useless, etc., etc.”

2, 24 : “ And bear good tidings unto those who believe and do good works that they shall have gardens watered by rivers ; so often as they eat the fruit thereof for sustenance, they shall say, this is what we were formerly given, and there are for them holy wives always dwelling there.”

Swami : “ Well, in what respect is this paradise of the Quran better than the world ? For the same objects that are in the world are also in the heaven of the Mussalmans ; only that the dwellers of the paradise do not die, come and go as the people of the world, and (un-) like the women of the world, who never live here for ever, the holy wives of the paradise live for ever. Well, till the end of the world comes, how will they pass their nights ? Yes, it is all right, if God is kind to them, and they pass their time in His service. For this paradise of the Mussalmans looks like the Golok or heaven and temples of the Gosains of Gokul or monks of Brindaban. For women are held in great honour but not men. In the same way, women are held in great esteem in the house of God. God’s love for them is also great, but not for men ; for God has suffered the women to dwell there for ever, but not men. How can those women live for ever in paradise without the consent of God ? If it be so, God may fall in love with the women.” O horrors ! Vulgarity and blasphemy could hardly go farther. How women can spend their nights without having men in their beds is the one great problem

that puzzles the head of this great Hindu Reformer !

The cited passages are enough to show up the critical powers of Dayanand. All his criticisms run in the same low style and in the same low taste.

The superficiality, vulgarity, indecency and utter senselessness of these criticisms is so apparent that any comment would be sheer waste of time. Criticism is a useful art and a means of public enlightenment. But in the hands of Dayanand it degenerated into wholesale abuse. Whatever the occasion he feels it his duty as a critic to say something and is not at all conscious that he makes himself ridiculous by so doing. As a religious teacher and as a writer it is a sufficient condemnation of Dayanand that he was the author of *Satyarth Prakash* and of these criticisms.

Some Muslim controversialists raised the question a short while ago that the last two chapters of the *Satyarth Prakash* which are devoted to criticisms on Christianity and Islam, are not from the pen of Swami Dayanand, but from a different hand and

were added to the book after the author's death. The edition of 1875 contained only twelve chapters, and the second edition was prepared only a few months before his death. But there is no ground whatever to suppose that the last two chapters were added by somebody else. The author clearly states in the preface to the second edition that he has added two new chapters, and there are frequent references to them in the text of Part I of the book. The first twelve chapters as well as the last two are written in the same uncultured style, and the same taste and spirit pervade the whole book. The unity of style and spirit is an unshakable evidence that the book is from one and the same hand, and remembering the life that the Swami had led and his education, his studies and the people among whom he moved and the taste he thereby developed, one cannot escape the conclusion that the hand was of the Swami himself. Also, I do not see why the Muslims should feel perturbed at his so-called criticisms. They are not criticisms but ill-tempered abuse, which like all abuse affect no principle of Islam. Far from turning from Islam by these criticisms, the sensible reader would rather feel enraged against their author. They fill one with disgust rather than conviction and I do not believe, any Christian or Muslim ever became an Arya Samajist or gave up his faith by these slanderous attacks upon his faith.

---



**DAYANAND'S PERSONALITY.**

We have examined the entire contents of the *Satyarth Prakash* and are now in a position to form an opinion about Dayanand and his work. I have not only put before the reader in succinct form all the teachings, important or unimportant, of Dayanand and the arguments which he adduces in support of those teachings, but also, by citing extensive passages from his book, brought my readers into direct personal touch with the founder of the Arya Samaj, so that they should be able to form their own estimate of the man. *Satyarth Prakash* is a disappointing book, more disappointing than one can imagine. Without reading the book one can have no idea how utterly empty it is. From the noise the Arya Samaj makes, one comes to the book with great expectations, but at every step one meets with disappointment. One goes on reading, hoping that perhaps the next page or the next chapter will reveal something, but all hopes prove vain. In

the 547 pages that this book contains, not a single idea of any worth is to be found. It requires, indeed, heroic strength and patience to go through this dreary, empty waste.

Doubtless, Dayanand speaks throughout the book with the most perfect self-confidence and assurance, as if he were uttering the last word of human wisdom, as if what he says is the highest expression of religious truth. In reality, his talk is that of a child, and his self-assurance is the result simply of ignorance. His education was limited wholly to the ancient Sanskrit texts and that narrow intellectual sphere had stunted his growth and warped his intellect. Had he had access to other literatures, had his education been more liberal, he would have realised that religious truth was much bigger and profounder than he thought it to be, and his self-assurance would have changed into humility. We know that the Vedas are the product of the time when the Indian section of the Aryan race was yet in its infancy, and naturally the world of ideas, with which the Vedas bring us face to face, is also infantile. It was but natural then, that Dayanand, whose education never went beyond the Vedas, should get

stuck in the infantile stage of intellectual development and should never be able to grow out of childhood.

There was yet another circumstance which not only narrowed down his mental outlook but also left him incapable of appreciating religious truth. That was his way of life. It is an ancient blunder that the truth of religion can be studied better in seclusion and retirement from the world. The fact is that religion and morality have their value only in society. A person, who cuts himself off from his fellow-human beings and lives solely by and for himself, can have neither religion nor morality. Richness of religious experience demands as a necessary preliminary condition a richness of life's experience, in absence of which religion has the unfailing tendency of degenerating into dead formularies, meaningless literalisms, narrow-mindedness and every kind of uncharitableness. Now, this richness of life was denied to Dayanand. From early life we find him a homeless wanderer who spends his days in the company of other homeless wanderers, away from the world and its occupations. He was never brought face to face with actual

life and its problems. The motives from which men generally act and the problems the man of the world is ever and anon called upon to solve, he never learnt. The world outside the dead texts of antiquity remained wholly closed to him. He never understood religion and was unfit to teach it.

These two circumstances, the kind of education he had and the life he led, account for all the failures of his work. As I remarked in the second chapter of this book, his is an undisciplined mind, that rambles and wanders from subject to subject, without any pretence at coherence. From the consistent review of his teachings that I have presented, it would be a mistake to conclude that Dayanand himself has treated of the various subjects in logical sequence. As a matter of fact, it has caused me no end of labour to collate passages dealing with the same subject, that are scattered all over the book. As the author follows no principles, contradictions are many, of which he seems to be wholly unaware. Beside the childish superficiality and inconsequence of his ideas, the book is also full of abusive expressions. He conjures up imaginary questioners and

abuses them heartily. "Damn your eyes," "damned, get thee away," "damn you urchin," and like expressions abound in the book. When a person can abuse cold-bloodedly imaginary persons in writing, how frightfully he would not have abused his actual living opponents! "You do not know Sanskrit," "it shows your poverty of Sanskrit," are the arguments, with which he frequently seeks to silence his adversaries. He never married and his ideas about women and marriage are disgusting in the extreme. He speaks of women and men and their private parts with morbid frequency and in a most nude manner. A *Sadhu*, who knows not what reverence is due to mother, who has neither sister nor wife nor daughter, could hardly speak otherwise. In his criticisms we have seen that he is wholly unscrupulous. Intellectually he is incapable of taking a synthetic view of any thing whatever. Like the uncultured man he was, he raises every scrap of knowledge that he possesses to the dignity of a religious dogma. At the close of the book he gives a summary of his beliefs and counts no less than 51 dogmas! How destructive of all religious freedom this frightful number of dogmas

must be, one may well imagine. But the nature of these dogmas is still more astonishing and gives us much help in making an estimate of his personality. Most of these dogmas are nothing more than philological definitions of words. To take some examples. "Wealth is a thing earned with honesty and justice. Its opposite is the mammon of unrighteousness"; "The learned are called *devas* (gods), the ignorant *asuras*, the vicious *raksasas*, and the hypocrites *pishachas*"; "India is called Aryavarta, because the Aryans lived here"; "the validity of the octave evidence of logic is unquestionable"; "the *janma* is the entry of the soul into the world in conjunction with the body"; "the union of body and soul is called birth, and their separation death"; "Definition is the description of qualities for remembrance. It inspires love and the like generous feelings and sentiments"; etc., etc. From the nature of these "religious" dogmas, one can judge of the mental constitution of the author.

The great difference between human beings and lower animals is that whereas the latter can be conscious only of external objects, the former

are capable of subjective consciousness as well. Man makes his own self his subject of study, which is not possible to lower animals. This subjective consciousness, *i.e.*, the awareness that it is 'I' who am acting at a certain moment, is the source and basis of religion and morality. Human beings are moral or immoral to the extent, to which they are aware of themselves and sit in judgment over their own actions and motives. All men are not alike. There are, comparatively speaking, only a few who turn the flash-lights of criticism on to their own minds now and then. It is this self-examination that raises them above their fellows in moral consciousness. The majority of us go through life like so many sheep and cattle and never trouble themselves to look into their own minds. Now, the perusal of the *Satyarth Prakash* leaves an unmistakable impression on the mind that its author has never stopped to think whether he was acting morally or immorally. His gaze is fixed unalterably on the external world, on the dead texts of the Vedas and other Hindu scriptures or on the supposed defects of other religions. In plain words, he has not been able to rise above the level of the low

and the ignorant. The natural result of this mental attitude is that his so-called criticisms are not meant to distinguish truth from falsehood but to abuse other religions. In his preface (p. 67) he says about his criticisms, " Had I leaned towards any religion, I would have become like one of those gentlemen of modern times, who are ready to extol, support and spread their own creeds. and slander, censure and obstruct and persecute those of others. But these things are below the dignity of man. Because it is the characteristic of the lower animals that the strong afflict and prey upon the weak. And if a person takes advantage of his efficient machinery of the human body to perpetrate similar acts, verily he is not endowed with the godly virtue of humility, and there is no reason why he should not be called a human beast." When after characterising unjust criticism of other faiths as beastly, he devotes the major portion of his book to the most unscrupulous abuse of every religion known to him, and having done that, he comes up immediately to tell us, " But I detest the religious warfare of sects " (p. 547), one can only say that the man suffers from sheer lack of moral sense,



that he is one of those men of low mentality, who cannot be held responsible for their words and actions.

The question now forces itself upon us : How was it that Dayanand succeeded in forming a powerful movement ? To fill a community of men with enthusiasm and move them to joint action for the realisation of a common aim requires a powerful personality who can teach noble principles. In Dayanand, both were absent. His ideas are low and his speech is vulgar. It is true that in absence of noble principles even race or religious hatred against one community can lead another to joint action. And there can be no doubt that Dayanand preached both religious and race hatred. He abuses Islam, Christianity and other religions without conscience. He lays it down as one of the duties of a future Arya Samaj government that it should drive out of the country all those who do not profess its faith. He condemns Sikhism, but extols Guru Gobind Singh for his enmity towards the Muslims (p. 363). His chief objections against the Prarathana Samaj and the Brahmo Samaj are that they are conceived in a spirit of broad-minded tolerance.

Swami Dayanand would have nothing but hatred and enmity against the Mussalmans. Also, if we look back upon the history of Arya Samaj and take account of its past and present activities, we cannot but acknowledge that by far the greater part of its energies has been and is devoted to opposition and enmity towards Islam. One will not, therefore, be far in the wrong in concluding that it was Dayanand's hymns of hatred that brought the Arya Samaj into existence. But I say, even to preach hatred successfully and found a community thereupon requires a powerful personality. For men cannot be moved even to hatred by small causes. And Dayanand did not possess that personality. What were the causes then that brought him success ?

I believe, the true causes of his success must be looked for in the constitution of the Hindu community itself. The concepts " high " and " low " are after all relative. What a community with a higher mental and moral culture regards as low, may by another community at a lower stage of culture be regarded as high. A man of Dayanand's type could have no success

among the Muslims. His vulgarity of speech and hollowness of teaching would have brought about his speedy fall. Not so the Hindus, whose religious ideas and moral consciousness are still of the most primitive kind. The popular Hindu mind is superstitious. It attaches great sanctity to the person of a *Sadhu*. However rotten the life of a *Sadhu* may be, his person still evokes great awe and reverence among the Hindus. And Dayanand was a *Sadhu*! His character as a *Sadhu* opened to him the portals of every Hindu community and secured to him a respectful hearing among the high and low. (One should not forget that we are speaking of about sixty years ago, when Western culture had not yet exercised much influence upon India and superstitions of all kinds stalked in the country.) There is another peculiarity of the Hindu mind, which we must not overlook. It places the personal lives of Swamis and Mahatmas above question. They are not to be measured by the ordinary standards of right and wrong. The *Sadhu* is a man of God, who has renounced the world. This saves one from all awkward questionings. Although psychologically the spiritual value of *yoga* is nil, still the Hindu

looks upon a practitioner of *yoga* with great awe and reverence. Dayanand, who could hold his breath for many hours, had then an easy way with the people.

The Hindus put great value upon pilgrimages. As we have seen from Dayanand's autobiography, he had spent more than twenty years in wanderings and had visited all holy places of India. This circumstance added to his glory. The *Sadhus* are, as a rule, an ignorant, illiterate people. An educated *Sadhu* is a rarity. And Dayanand was educated and spoke Sanskrit! In the matter of Sanskrit learning, he could cross swords with the most learned pundits of India. This was another source of his glory. Again, the Hindu mind is conservative. Instinctively it turns back to bask in the sunshine of the glory of the Vedic age. The golden age of the Hindu lies behind, and no one can hope to move them except by appealing to the past. Even Mahatma Gandhi, when he wanted to appeal to the masses, had to hold up before them the ideal of a revival of the ancient culture of India. Now, Dayanand spoke of nothing but the Vedas. He stepped forward as an apostle of the departed Hindu civilization,

which he desired to restore. Again, the Hindu loves to think that every modern invention, every modern science and every mechanical contrivance which the modern age has produced, was known to the ancient Aryas. Let any one come forward to-day to announce that wireless telegraphy was in use in the Vedic age. He is sure of a huge following. Now, Dayanand claimed that all the goods of the modern civilization were to be found in the Vedas. Accordingly, Indra the god of thunder he changes into electricity, and he puts electricians and drivers of balloons in the highest category of men. If there had been aeroplanes in his day, we are sure, he would have found them too in the Vedas! By these means he succeeded in creating enthusiasm among the masses.

We have seen that Dayanand is extremely vulgar in his talks. He abuses those who come to argue with him. Those who have bestowed any attention upon studying the psychology of the lower and uncultured classes in India would realise that his abusive language, which would have brought about his condemnation among another people, actually contributed to his success. "I lost the case," says the illiterate Indian litigant, "but my Vakil has done wonders," these wonders

consisting generally in a great lot of excited talk of the lawyer in the court, however empty of sense it may be. Among the vulgar, the ability to talk down your opponent and silence him by hot and vulgar speeches is itself a great virtue. Dayanand gives us many examples of his power of talking down his adversaries, *E.g.* on p 382, *ff* he holds an assembly of religions, treats us to a good deal of idle chatter, finds fault with every religion, and without making the Vedic religion represent its own case, draws the most astounding conclusion: "O holy father, you have saved me, or else I would have been perverted and ruined by falling into the snares of some of these faiths. I shall henceforth refute these hypocrites and advocate the true religion of the Vedas!" The so-called polemics of the Arya Samaj are generally of the same character. It never dawned upon Dayanand and his followers that the being false of other faiths does not necessarily prove the truth of the Vedic faith. Even if all the religions were proved false, it would yet be necessary to prove that the Vedic religion was true. In any case, Dayanand took the fullest advantage of the backwardness of the religious and moral consciousness and of the superstitions of his fellow-Hindus, and succeeded by the means pointed out above in building up a community. The building of societies and *sabhas* was the universal occupation of India in his days as it is to this day, and he did the same. This is then the natural history of the rise of the Arya Samaj.

## XII.

### THE ARYA SAMAJ.

We have noticed in the last chapter the factors which contributed to the personal success of Swami Dayanand. They are of a nature that may produce a short-lived effervescence among the vulgar and the uneducated, but are wholly inadequate to explain the growth of a powerful movement, such as the Arya Samaj has become. To found a new religion or a reform movement of lasting value requires a great personality. The man must be very great, indeed, who would inspire men with enthusiasm for a great ideal as well as for his own person. It is not necessary that he should be a great scholar or a philosopher. Religion is neither philosophy nor learning. It is rather the realisation of truth by personal experience, and the man who would speak to others of truth must do so from personal experience. He must have re-discovered truth and lived it in his life. Unless he can speak from the depth of his own soul, unless he can speak of truth as his own self has realised it, his voice will be a cry

in the desert and his efforts will be lost in the sands. His voice will never carry conviction to the hearts. Now, Dayanand never speaks from experience. We know nothing of his inner life. It looks, as if he had no inner life. His experiences are those of a wandering *Sadhu*, tales of external happenings of no interest or significance whatever. He was no thinker, and throughout his voluminous book one does not meet with a single idea of any worth, while his learning was limited to ancient Sanskrit texts, which for want of a liberal education he could not manipulate with judgment.

Religion differs from philosophy in this that whereas the latter only explains, the former supplies motives for human conduct. It is the chief purpose of religion to create zeal and enthusiasm among men for righteousness. If a religion fails to create zeal for righteousness, if it fails to move men to be good and to eschew evil, it has no use whatever and sooner or later it must die out. The foregoing study of the *Satyarth Prakash* shows that the book makes no appeal whatever to conscience and the idea of zeal for righteousness is farthest from the author's mind. Who would care to pray to a helpless God such as the



one depicted in this book, who cannot forgive and has no mercy in him? The ideas of love, charity and fellow-feeling are wholly absent and their place is taken by the doctrine of unforgiving retaliation. Dayanand's naked language about women and his morbid interest in sexual matters to which he turns ever and anon and on which he dwells at great length are calculated to induce looseness of sexual morals. The impressions they leave on the reader's mind are certainly not very wholesome.

The mental equipment of Dayanand was so common, his ideas so banal and his style and taste so low, indecent and vulgar that if he had founded only a religious movement, it could not have possibly survived him. The factors so far examined being obviously inadequate, we must look for some other cause to explain the continued existence and growth of the Arya Samaj. That cause must be sought in the gradually awakening political consciousness of the Hindus. The Arya Samaj would have died along with its founder, had it not been for the spirit of communal hatred, the seeds of which were being sown in the schools, and a considerable part of the *Satyarth Prakash*

is devoted to hymns of hatred against non-Hindus, especially the Muslims. From the time of its inception to this day, by far the largest part of the activity of the Arya Samaj has been directed against Islam in this country. The history of the Arya Samaj proves abundantly that it is not a religious but a political movement. In more than half a century of its existence it has not produced one single man of a truly religious type. The Brahmo Samaj is a much smaller body, but it can point to a number of men of deep piety and great spiritual enlightenment, who have sprung now and again from its bosom. The Arya Samaj, on the contrary, has produced only an army of debaters, propagandists and preachers of hatred, who, as Mahatma Gandhi once said, are never so happy as when they are abusing the founders of other religions. It could not be otherwise. Dayanand himself was no more than a debater and held debating to be the chief duty of mankind. It has been and is the chief duty at least of the Arya Samaj. Far from setting any high example of righteous conduct, the Arya Samajists have earned a reputation for disturbing the public peace by abusing the

founders of other faiths. The leaders of the Arya Samaj have been and are those who have distinguished themselves above their fellows in bigotry, debate and fanatical abuse of other religions and especially of Islam.

The Arya Samaj is not a religious movement, and has produced no men of piety and spiritual enlightenment so far. Neither Dayanand nor any of his followers have made any contribution to the religious possessions of the world, unless that mass of muck and filth of controversial literature, with which they have vitiated the atmosphere be called a contribution. Criticism is not a bad thing in itself. Applied in the right way, it is a creative force of great usefulness. But the criticisms of the Arya Samaj are generally brainless and in extremely bad taste. They are abuse and not criticism at all. From sheer inanity and poverty of internal content the movement would have died out, had not the spirit and tendencies of the age contributed to its maintenance and growth. Christianity as a system of faith is almost dead in Europe. It still lives because the Church has transformed itself from a religious into an institution of social

service. By social service the Church justifies its continued existence and for that reason still exercises great influence upon the people. The Arya Samaj too has maintained itself as an institution of social service, not that there was anything in the teachings of the founder that directed its energies into that channel, but because of the spirit and tendency of the age in which the movement came into being. Had Dayanand lived a hundred years earlier, his movement would have died along with him, because the ideas of social service and public education did not then exist. Public education and social reform have been universal occupations during the last three quarters of a century in India ; the Arya Samaj could not escape the influence of public opinion, and having no spiritual goods to occupy its mind, it could not but direct itself to these pursuits. This circumstance has been the salvation of the Arya Samaj. In this occupation the Samaj had frequently to throw the teachings of the founder to the winds. Dayanand held widow-remarriage to be a sin and recommended *niyoga* in its place as a highly meritorious thing. The Arya Samaj has declar-

ed for re-marriage and is too ashamed to speak of *niyoga*.

But for all its educational effort and social reform the Samaj had until recently no friends among the orthodox Hindus. The intelligent Hindus, especially those who were spiritually inclined, had realised that the Arya Samaj, so far as the life of the spirit was concerned, was a barren movement. There was nothing in it to attract those who had a thirst for spiritual life, and the orthodox Hindus despised it and disliked it. The last ten years have, however, changed the whole course of affairs and the political activity developed during this period has made the Arya Samaj a most powerful organisation in the country. Those Hindu leaders who used to dislike the Samaj have become its warmest friends and supporters and all Hindus, orthodox and heterodox, have joined together on one platform. They have done so because religion as such is no longer a matter of any concern to them. The Arya Samaj is now out and out a political movement and uses religion only as a weapon of politics. Dayanand, as we have seen in Chapter IX of this book, has taught that the followers of

non-Vedic religions must be driven out of the country, and as the Muslims are the largest non-Hindu community in India, the brunt of their opposition and hatred falls naturally upon the latter. It is no longer a secret to be inferred by logical deductions from stray references but an open declaration of the Arya Samaj and its greatest ally the Hindu Maha Sabha. From a thousand platforms they have declared unani- mously that Islam must be banished from India and the history of the Moors in Spain must be repeated in this country.

The Arya Samaj is then a political and not a religious movement. As a religion it is far too barren to be able to live. It must die from sheer inanity. It lives as a political movement. It distinguishes itself by its undying hatred of Islam and the Muslims and its chief object is the banishment of Islam and the Muslims from India. By its hatred of Islam it has been able to main- tain itself ; hatred of Islam is the condition of its existence and by its ceaseless activity against the Muslims it grows and prospers.

---

### XIII.

## CONCLUSION.

How far the Arya Samaj and the Hindu Mahasabha —there is not much difference between the two now, when they follow the same object— have succeeded in the realisation of their aims, I have discussed in another place\*. Their energy, relentless perseverance and all-encompassing activity which comprehends every aspect of life is really worthy of the highest admiration. The question that demands our most serious attention is, how the Muslims are to defend themselves against this united attack of Hinduism and how they can maintain their existence in this country. The question has been considered in sufficient detail in my book mentioned in the footnote. Both the Arya Samaj and the Hindu Maha Sabha use religion as a political weapon. Now, the faith of the Arya Samaj, as indeed of any sect of Hinduism, can be shattered into a thousand bits at any time. It does not require much learning or philosophical acumen to expose their hollowness

---

\* "The Future of Islam in India."

and blow them to bits. But an effort is needed, a strong and persistent effort to meet the danger.

Islam is the only true faith in the world to-day. It is a blessing for mankind, and it is the moral duty of every Muslim to extend this blessing to others as far as in him lies. If we love our motherland, if we want to make India a great and a civilized country, it is our duty to wash it clean of the stains of the ancient superstitions of Hinduism and reach out the healing of Islam to every child of the motherland. Far too long have we neglected this duty, and it is no more than a well-deserved punishment for our neglect that we are being trodden down to-day and told to move ourselves away. If we do not waken now and gird ourselves up to preach the message of Islam in the length and breadth of this country, we shall soon be swept out ourselves. The preaching of Islam to-day is no mere theological necessity but a matter of sheer self-preservation.

Islam is a most glorious religion. As a faith it is so rational and so powerful that no religion on earth can make a headway before it. I remember, during my missionary career in the West.



the champions of Christianity made open confessions before me in the face of crowded halls that it was not possible to fight Islam, that it was an irresistible faith. When the enlightened men of Europe have had to make such confessions, what are the superstitions of Hinduism that they should be able to make a stand against us? The readers of this book have seen how childish, how superficial, absurd and senseless is the faith preached by Dayanand and represented by the Arya Samaj. That these absurdities should be able to prosper is due only to our own neglect. Islam is the light of truth and no darkness can make a stand before it. We are passing through fateful days. A sustained effort is being made to uproot Islam from this country. Several thousands have been taken away from the bosom of Islam and anti-Islamic propaganda is going on steadily. If we neglect our duty, there will come a day when a Muslim will not be able to lift his head.

Islam is a conquering force and the Muslims were born to freedom and empire. Both can come to us, if we exert ourselves to expand our numerical strength. We are children of the soil of

India and we owe a duty to the motherland. Like other lands, she too should have a place of equality in the comity of nations. Hindu India will never be able to do that. She can be free and rise to power and glory only under the banner of Islam. It is an act of highest patriotism to wean the children of the soil from their superstitions and bring them into the light of Islam. It is an act of patriotism on the part of the Hindus to study Islam and consider whether it is not worthy of their acceptance. And it is the moral duty of the Muslims to reach out the message of Islam to every man. To this work I invite my brethren in Islam.



**BY THE SAME AUTHOR.**  
**THE FUTURE OF ISLAM IN INDIA.**

**A Warning and a Call.**

The first sensible and exhaustive examination of political tendencies in India from the Muslim standpoint. A forecast and a political creed for the Muslims. As its sub-title indicates, it is a warning to the Muslims and a call to action on sound lines. PP. 100, price 8 annas.

---

**ISLAM—AN ETHICAL STUDY.**

The author has struggled for light for many years and gives in this book the results of that struggle. Here he speaks from conviction and experience rather than from scholarship. The book is in preparation and would be out in May.

---

**THE MUSLIM INDIA.**

**A Weekly Journal of Politics and Literature.**

The publication of this journal has been suspended for a time and will be resumed before long. Back numbers can be had at 2 annas per copy. Applications for registration as subscribers are invited.

MANAGER,  
MUSLIM INDIA, LAHORE.