

An Examination  
Of  
VALLABHA SECT

Translated with an Introduction

By

Prof. Tulsi Ram Sharma M.A., Ph.D. (London)

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Swami Dayanandaa Saraswati: A Brief Life-Sketch | 3  |
| Introduction by Prof. Tulsi Ram Sharma          | 7  |
| An Examination of The Vallabha Sect             | 10 |
| Tributes  | 33 |
| The Translator                                  | 35 |

## Swami Dayanandaa Saraswati A Brief Life-Sketch

Swami Dayanandaa was born in the year (1881 Vikrami) 1825 A.D., in an Audichya Brahman family of Tankara, Morvi state, Kathiawad, South Gujarat. His name was Mool Shankar and his father's name was Karshanji Tiwari. Karshanji was a very respectable man of his village and a devout Shaivite. Mool Shankar had his Yajnopavit Sanskar (baptism) at the age of eight and was initiated into the worship of Shiva at the age of ten. He had started his studies at the age of five and by the age of fourteen he had studied a lot of Sanskrit Grammar and vocabulary and learnt by rote a large part of the Yajurveda in addition to Nirukta, Nighantu, Purva-Mimansa, and a lot of rituals necessary for a devotee of Shiva. This was the end of his education so far as the father was concerned.

But Moolji had other aims in view which were not yet very clear'. A few incidents, however, made him see the things in reality. At the age of thirteen he was made to observe the rituals of Shivratri in full. He kept fast and joined his father and others in the nightly observances and worship in a Shiva temple. The priests and others including his father were overtaken by sleep but Mool Shankar kept awake waiting for a vision of Shiva. And lo! what did he see! A mouse climbed on the Shivalinga, an iconic representation of Shiva and started eating the offerings. Mool Shankar asked himself: "Is it Shiva really? Is it alive or dead? Can't it defend its authority? Is it helpless even before a rat?" Doubts and questions such as these troubled his soul. He awoke his father and asked him,

"Is it the real Shiva?" The father replied: "No, it is only a Moorti (an icon)". The father sent him home. The fast was broken. His mother gave him food. He ate and went to sleep.

But the question remained urgent all the time: "What is the real Shiva? Where is He? I must seek and find".

Five years later, Mool Shankar's sister died of cholera. Others wept and wailed, but Mool Shankar was stunned and sat stoned with silent grief. Still later, death struck his uncle. The grief was repeated and hurt deeper. The one question of all questions which has troubled all people big and small shook him to his roots: "Why death? What is it? Shall I too die? Is there any way to escape or conquer it?" Moolji was lost in thought.

The parents thought of getting Mool Shankar married. The young seeker of Shiva and immortality refused to change his course for the chains. In 1846, (Samvat 1903), one night he quietly left home never to return. Mool Shankar moved in the direction of the great man that he was later to become, Maharshi Dayananda.

He moved around in search of holy men, yogis and Brahmacharis wandering around and living in holy places. The mission was the same one: search for Shiva and the conquest of death. He met a Brahmachari in the town of Sayale who initiated him into his order as a Brahmachari and named him Shuddha Chaitanya.

Shuddha Chaitanya continued moving around until he was spotted and caught at Siddhapur by his father. The father tried his best to take him back home with a strong escort, but Shuddha Chaitanya gave his guards the slip, moving on in search of his mission. He met Sadhus, Brahmacharis, mendicants, yogis, devotees and scholars, read and meditated and moved around wherever he heard he would find them. He visited holy places, went over the Himalayas even up to the sources of rivers, wandered through forests fording even dangerous rivers and met strange people and watched their ways. During this course of search, he decided to turn a Sanyasi and met one Suami Purnanandaa Saraswati. Swami Purnananda initiated him into Sanyasa, saintly order, and named him Dayananda Saraswati.

Swami Dayananda Saraswati wrote a short sketch of his life which covers his life before he met his Guru, **Swami Virajananda Saraswati** in Mathura.

During his wanderings in search of knowledge and truth, he heard of Swami Virajananda Dandi of Mathura. Swami Virajananda was a blind Sanyasi who had kept alive the ancient tradition of the knowledge of the Vedas, Vedic philosophy and Grammar. He was a mighty scholar and a conscientious teacher who never deviated from the tradition of the Vedas and the Vedic rishis. He believed in the Vedas as the true knowledge and Vedic Dharma as the eternal dharma. Swami Dayananda knocked at his cottage in 1860. Swami Virajananda responded: "Who is there"? Swami Dayananda replied: "This is exactly what I want to know. I have come to you in search of the mystery who I am". The teacher was convinced that the right disciple had arrived, the disciple knew that he had reached the right teacher. Swami Virajananda never charged any fees from his disciples.

Swami Dayananda read Panini's *Ashtadhyayi* and Patanjali's *Mahabhashyam*, and Yaska's *Niruktam* and the *Nighantu* and such other basic works of the Rishis as were necessary for the right interpretation of the Vedas and Vedic literature. On the

completion of his studies Swami Dayananda offered to give a token of gratitude to Swami Virajananda in the form of clove 'Lawanga', as Swami Virajananda was fond of it. But the Guru said; "Dayananda, I want your life as *Gurudakshina*, nothing less, nothing more. Go out into the wide world, proclaim the truth of the Vedas, and preach the *Vedic* Dharma. Before the light of *Vedic* knowledge, ignorance and darkness will disappear". The disciple bowed his head and replied; "I shall do so".

Swami Dayananda committed himself to the Vedic mission. No doubt, no confusion, no compromise. The core of his belief is contained in the ten principles of the Arya Samaj and his own statement of his beliefs in his book named *Exposition of Beliefs and Non-beliefs* (Swamantavyamantavya)—the rock-bed-foundation being the Vedas. He was a clear thinker, a forthright speaker and an uncompromising writer. He declared: Veda is the eternal truth, pure truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. There is no history in the Vedas. All historical truth is conditioned by time and place. Pure truth is true for all time and all places. Therefore, while he spread the message of the Vedas, he fought against superstition, the deadwood of custom, the evil practices of religion and the social disabilities of the weaker sections of society. He fought for the equality of all men and women, education for all men and women, simplification of all religious practices and rituals and declared that poverty, injustice, ignorance, inequality and untouchability were sins against humanity and against God. He founded the Arya Samaj on 10th April 1875 in Mumbai (India) to carry on the work of his Vedic mission.

Swami Dayananda was one of the greatest men ever born on the earth. Romain Rolland says of him and of the Arya Samaj. Indian religious thought raised a purely religious Samaj, and at its head was a personality of the highest order, Dayananda Saraswati: This man with the nature of a lion is one of those whom Europe is too apt to forget when she judges India. He was that rare combination, a thinker and a man of action with a genius for leadership". Shri Aurobindo wrote of him. Here was a very soldier of light, a warrior in God's world, a sculptor of men and institutions, a bold and rugged victor of the difficulties which matter presents to spirit. And the whole sums itself up to me in a powerful impression of spiritual practicality. He was a man with God in his soul, vision in his eyes, and power in his hands to hew out of life an image according to his vision. Dayananda Saraswati was one of those personages whom History will pronounce as supermen. He was one of those whom the Vedas and the Brahmanas call Devas, to whom is due puja, i.e., the reverence of mankind".

Swamiji's work for the upliftment and enlightenment of society challenged vested interests. Some abused him, others threw stones. Some got him poisoned too.

One of the culprits was caught, arrested and brought to him by the police for punishment. But Swamiji was all compassion. He declared: The world is fettered by the chain forged by superstition and ignorance. I have come to snap asunder that chain and to set slaves at liberty. It is contrary to my mission to have people deprived of their freedom". On another occasion he said; "I am not anxious about my salvation: I am particularly anxious for the salvation of those lakhs of people who are poor, weak and suffering. I do not mind if I may have to take birth again and again, I will attain salvation when these people will attain it".

Swamiji's work went on apace. He delivered lectures, held debates with Hindu, Muslim and Christian scholars wrote and published. His most important work is *Satyartha Prakash (The Light of Truth)*. His commentary on the *Vedas* and his introduction to it, *Rigvedadi-Bhashya-Bhumika* are works of rare vision and scholarship. In addition, there is *Sanskara Vidhi* and many short works. All these works are embodiments of ancient wisdom. They cross the bounds of time and place and present eternal truth in a modern language. Swamiji was thus a man of all time—a modern man whose modernity is dynamic, which will not grow out of date.

Along with work, opposition too went on apace. He was poisoned and he breathed his last on the Diwali day of 1883. This is how the scene of his death is described by Harbilas Sharada; "Between five and six p.m. he asked for those who had come from different places and told them to stand behind him. He asked the doors and the two skylights of the room to be opened and enquired what the Hindi date, day of the week and Paksha (half of the month) was. Someone said it was Krishna Paksha (dark half of the month) and Amavasya (fifteenth) and Tuesday. Hearing this he looked at the roof and all around and recited Veda mantras. Then he did Upasana (prayer) in Sanskrit and recited God's attributes in Hindi and with pleasure began to recite Gayatri. He went into Samadhi for a while and then opened his eyes and said; 'O merciful, almighty God, this is thy will. This is thy will, let it be done. Ah! What a lila is thine!' After saying this, he lay sideways and holding his breath, he breathed out with some force and passed away at about 6 p.m. A death so peaceful and happy was not even that of Socrates."

Swamiji died but he lives and will live forever in his works. We should study his writings carefully and objectively and we will see that his vision will never fade, his word will never cease, and his mission will continue forever.

A list of the books written by Swamiji is given at the end.

—Tulsi Ram Sharma

# A Critique of Un-Vedic faiths

## An Examination of VALLABHA SECT

### Introduction

(By Tulsi Ram Sharma)

In his Examination of the Vallabha Sect, Swami Dayananda subjects the beliefs and practices of this sect to a microscopic observation and logical analysis against the background of the Vedas and the Vedic tradition. The followers and the founders of the sect do not deny the Vedas in principle, but they depart from Vedic thought and tradition in practice. Since they profess to believe in the Vedas, the ground of criticism is solid not only in terms of Swamiji's faith in the Vedas but also in terms of the Vallabhi's faith. And for this very reason, the ground under the feet of the Vallabhis is found to be shaky. They deny the Vedas in practice and belief, therefore they are atheists, says Swamiji.

Swamiji examines the sect mainly on three counts: the founders, the faith (both belief and practice), and the followers. The details of the examination have to be read in the text, but here is an indication in brief:-

**The founders** of the faith were mainly three; First, Lakshmana Bhatta who first became a Sanyasi from a householder and then recanted and went back home. Then followed his son, Vallabha who repeated the performance of his father. He took to sanyasa from grihastha and went back on sanyasa to lead the life of a householder. He was followed by Gokulnath Vitthala who lived a life of colourful faith. In this sense, the name of the faith is appropriate – ‘Vallabha’ which means ‘the darling faith’. And why not? The members of the faith imagine that the males are Krishnas and the females, Radhas, and all of them in ecstasy can have a pious good time. They can even meditate on the breasts of Radha, imagining that they are sumptuous sweet. A ‘darling’ faith indeed of anyone's imagination.

**The main points of faith or belief in any religion are three:-** 1. The concept of God; 2. The relation between God and man; and 3. The relation between man and man which includes the relation between man and woman also.

**God:** According to the Vallabha faith, God has form as that of man. He is

represented as having four as well as two arms and lives in Baikuntha or Goloka (the paradisaical legion of the cow). Krishna was His incarnation and He has to be worshipped as Krishna. Swamiji says that this concept of God is totally against the Vedic concept of God. According to the Vedas, God is without form. He never descends into human form because, He, being infinite and omnipresent, He cannot be contained in any form whatsoever. The Infinite can never be in a finite form. God is existent, intelligent and blissful, omnipresent in (the Universe, but the universe too does not contain Him because He contains the universe. He is both Saguna (with attributes and qualities) and Nirguna (without and beyond qualities and attributes). As Creator and an infinite reality, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, giver of light, life and knowledge, etc., He is Saguna. But He is not subject to definite qualities and conditions to which forms of existence are subject; for example, we have a form, but He is without form *Nirakara*; we are subject to birth, age and death, He is not. He is *Ajanma* (unborn), unaging (*ajara*) and immortal (*amara*). We are changing and mutable; He is immutable (*Nirvikara*). and so on. Krishna was a very very great man, still he was a man, one who was born and died. We pray for Godly qualities and may have them. Krishna too prayed to God and was blessed with great divine qualities, was a superman, but he was still a man. God never incarnates in any form what so ever.

**God and Man:** God is the one creator, Father of all; the human beings are all His children. There is love between God and man but it is love as between a parent and child, filial love in piety. It has no element of the physical kind of love as between man and woman. It is purely spiritual and it cannot be expressed in any image or language of sexuality. Certain sects such as the Vallabha Sect describe it and inculcate it in terms of the images of feelings and emotions of sexual love. The result is that an element of sexuality and obscenity creeps into their kirtan, community worship and meditation in theory as well as practice. Swami Dayananda rejects this way of thinking and religious exercise because it breeds corruption and exploitation in practice besides being wrong in principle and theory.

**Man and man:** If God is the one creator of all human beings, the whole humanity is one family and the relation among them is the same as between brothers and sisters in general. In the personal situation of each human being, the relation is particular as between husband and wife, mother and child, father and child, teacher and disciple. But in all these particular relationships too, the essential and natural sanctity of the soul remains. All are equal as children of God, the one and only One God, father, protector and dispenser of love and justice. No human being whatever can take up the role of God for another human being. The guru in certain sects, such

as the ones under examination, takes over the godly role and the disciple is required to surrender everything — his money and property, even wife and children— to the guru. This is sheer fraud and exploitation, says Swami Dayananda.

Exploitation and corruption must be exposed and uprooted. Our beliefs, relationships and practices must be clear and stated in scientific and practical language. No playing about with words and images. Therefore there is no compromise in Swamiji's language. It is forthright. It states clearly and hits effectively where it should. The language of compromise may please, it may survive for sometime, but it cannot endure in effect. Swamiji's language may hurt the selfish and the non-committed casual pastimer, but those who love the pure light of truth and the crystal reflection of it do not value any colour.

Thanks to Swami Dayananda and his insistence on the Vedas and pure reason, many sects have been compelled to think, re-interpret and redefine their faith. We should feel grateful to Swamiji for the revolution in religious thought in India and elsewhere and continue to carry on the torch that he lighted.

*Note: In Swamiji's writing, questions and answers are given separate numbers; 31 questions and 31 answers, in all 62. In the translation, only the questions are numbered. There are 31 questions, each followed by its relevant answer without a separate number.*

## An Examination of

# The Vallabha Sect

1. Q: Who is this man named Vallabha? And what is the meaning of the word Vallabha?

A: Vallabha is our '*Acarya*' (Guru) and the meaning is "the dailing one with a heart of love and virtue".

2. Q: What is '*acarya*' and who are you?

A: The Guru (teacher) is *acarya* and we are established in the system of *Varna* and *Ashram*.

3. Q: What do you mean by 'being a guru'?

A: To teach and preach a gospel of truth, that is being the Guru.

4. Q: This man called Vallabha is dear to learned men of virtue, or is he dear to the fools and scoundrels too?

A: The former is not true. He cannot be dear to men of knowledge and virtue because not many among you are men of knowledge and virtue. He cannot be the favourite of the foolish and others void of virtue, because if he were, he too would be regarded as one of them. Birds of a feather flock together. The learned and the wise go together, as the foolish ones also join together. Also, all love the living ones only, there can't be any love between the living and the dead. Moreover love of the living for the dead bears no fruit. Therefore, it is impossible that a dead man could be dear to the living or that he could be the teacher—the dead cannot initiate or teach. It is written in the Veda that the disciple should approach the teacher a scholar of the Vedas of divine vision, with sacrificial wood in hand to request him for initiation. It is clear and certain that it is not possible for any disciple to approach a dead person. And a teacher is a scholar who may initiate a disciple with the sacred thread and teach him the Vedas along with the *kalpasutras* and the *Vedanta*. According to this principle of *manava-dharma*, Vallabha cannot possibly be the teacher, because according to these

*Shastras* the relation between the teacher and disciple is not just that of physical presence, it is also spiritual—learning and teaching means that. Therefore the living disciple and the dead teacher cannot fulfil these obligations of the relation. For these reasons, it is illogical to accept Vallabha as the teacher. It is impossible and fruitless to love a dead person; and because he was confused and in error, it is wrong to describe him as a man of love and virtue.

5. Q: What is it then to be a teacher? Teaching of truth or teaching of untruth?

A: The first case does not apply to you. None of you can be a teacher of truth because there is none among you who is a scholar of the Vedas with knowledge of the divine. If you say there are such teachers among you, it is not true, because clearly you are dedicated to the love of passions. The Dharma Shastras say that only they can know and teach Dharma who are not involved with desires and material wealth. As against this, you are known to be deeply in love with material wealth and pleasures of sense. You are deeply in love with money and women, it is clear and obvious. Even on the death of your disciple, you place your foot on the chest of the dead body and extort money and other things. Like the *Mahabrahmanas* and the *Chandalas*, you take away the clothes and ornaments of the dead person. You are thus nothing better than *Mahabrahmanas*.

According to the second view too, Vallabha cannot be called 'guru' for the reason of teaching untruth. It is against the *Shastras* to accept someone as 'guru' for his teaching of untruth, because such a teacher and his disciple both come to grief in the end. First of all, the father has the right to be the 'guru' of his children. You cannot justify your position as 'guru' because no one else can be a self-appointed 'guru' according to the *Shastras*. The *Dharma Shashtra* says: "That is a *brahmana-guru* who performs the seminal rites according to customs and brings up the child with food and clothes". So it is wrong to accept anyone else as Guru according to the *Shastras*. And it is a sin to mate with an unmanned woman, therefore it is only the father who can be the Guru for the child. If you call yourselves part of the social system of Varna and Ashram, why don't you observe the rites and obligations prescribed by the Vedas? If you say you do observe the Vedic rites, then, give up the worship of idols, wearing a garland, putting a mark on the forehead, surrender and the teaching of non-Vedic formulae. If you cannot stop all these practices, you cannot be part of the *varnasrama* system because you are acting against the Vedic teachings. You should know this for certain.

6. Q: Are you gurus? disciples? Or just neither, in between the two?

A: If you are teachers, why don't you teach the Vedas and their meaning in the school? If you are disciples, why don't you read them? And if you are just in between, why do you feel proud of your being *Brahmanas* and Gurus, though you are neither, in reality. Know this for certain.

7. Q: Are you followers of the Vedas or do you follow an un-Vedic religion?

A: If you are followers of the Vedas, why do you follow an imaginary guru like Vallabha and a sect which is against the Vedas? And if you go against the Vedas, why don't you call yourselves '*nastikas*' (atheists) and join the lowest class of humans? You know this is what *Dharma Shastras* say: One who denies the Vedas is an atheist, and one who spends his time and energy reading works against the Vedas, reduces himself and his family to the lowest class of humans. Why do you worship gods in human form, persons such as Krishna who were subject to birth and death? If you say that you don't believe persons such as Krishna to be God. why do you install their idols in material form, worship them with bells and music, pretend to preach the divine message and cheat the simple and ignorant people of their money and materials?

8. Q: Do you believe you are *Krishnas*, or do you think you are just human beings?

A: If you believe you are *Krishnas*, why don't you accept and practice all the actions of the yadava kshatriyas, actions such as fighting? Why don't you study the great and heroic acts of *Krishna*? *Krishna* rose to the highest state of existence, *Moksha*, why are you still alive, suffering in the human body? If you regard yourselves as human beings, give up the pride of feeling that you are the highest of all.

9. Q: Are you *Vaishnavas*, or something else? If you are *Vaishnavas*, what do you understand by the term *Vaishnava*?

A: If you say that a devotee of *Vishnu* is a *Vaishnava*, it is not true of you. According to a rule of Grammar, *Tasyaidam*, '*Vaishnava*' means a 'descendant/relative *Vishnu*'. There is no rule to describe a devotee of *Vishnu* as '*Vaishnavas*'. Just as you have accepted a devotee of *Vishnu* as '*Vaishnava*', although '*Vaishnava*' means ' a relative of *Vishnu*', similarly an enemy, a son, father, any other relation, disciple, teacher, etc., of *Vishnu* also can describe himself by the name of a '*Vaishnava*'. So the meaning of '*Vaishnava*' as you understand the term is not correct. It is arbitrary and imaginary.

10. Q: What according to you is *Vishnu* like as God?

A: If you believe that he has human form, lives in Goloka (the sphere of the cow), or in *Vaikuntha* (paradise), or he has four arms or two arms, and he is the husband of *Lakshmi*, then forget that he is omnipresent (because he cannot be). If you believe that he has the human form with four arms and so on, give up the idea that he is God, because if he has a body with parts (as a body has parts), he is subject to birth and death. He cannot be eternal. A body with parts means a body constituted of elements which come together and join as a body. Anybody joined together into form by elements disintegrates (because the joining elements fall asunder). Therefore, a person in such a body cannot be God. Better accept the God who is above and beyond the elements and their joining together and falling asunder. God does not have a body- form. To say that He has is against the Vedas. The Vedas say that God is formless, free from body, nerves and muscles, and binding or disjoining. He is beyond all bondage, pure, immaculate and omnipresent. So what you say is against the Vedas.

11. Q: IF you wear a rosary and put the holy mark on the forehead, is it an act of merit or demerit?

A: It you call it an act of merit, not sin, it is not correct. If you wear a small rosary, put a small mark on the forehead, and worship a small idol, and you say you earn merit, then you will earn a greater merit if you wear heavy loads of rosary, paint your whole face and body with sandal paste and worship the mountains and the whole earth; say this and do so. But if you say that you don't worship the mountains and the earth because the Vedas do not prescribe the worship of these, then please know that the Vedas nowhere prescribe the construction and worship of idols. Nor do they prescribe the wearing of rosary and the holy mark on the forehead. Thus what you say is meaningless.

12. Q: What is *Pratishtha*— consecration/deification of idols?

A: It you say that *Pratishtha* means the invocation of divine energy and spirit with Vedic hymns and the investment of the idol with that whereby the idol is consecrated into a deity, it is not correct, because no energy or movement is seen in the idols. If the idols had energy, breath, and senses, they would be seen moving, speaking, eating and even defecating. If you have the power to energize and spiritualize whatever and wherever you wish, why can't you bring back energy and life into a dead body? You will get a lot of money and social prestige

by this act alone. And know, there is no room in the idols for the movement of breath. There are no blood vessels for circulation, no holes for the organs of perception. In the dead body there are all the nerves, blood vessels and all the holes of the organs of sense, only there is no breath. So if you restore the breath and bring the dead body back to life (the way you say you bring life into the idol), no one in the world will ever die. And you will earn great merit and virtue in the world. So you should begin this work at the earliest. But we know that there has never been, nor shall ever be, a person who can bring the dead back to life. We should know it for certain that no one has ever had the power, nor shall any one ever have the power, to act against the law of God. Just as you can know the taste of a thing with the tongue only and with no other sense as is the law of God in nature, and as we know that no one can have the power to violate or supersede this law, so should we know that all the laws of God are inviolable—no one can break them or escape them. It is certain that the material (inanimate) never comes to life and intelligence, while the living and intelligent never changes to the material. (In other words, the stone never becomes a God, and a God is never a stone).

And if you say that God is omnipresent, so He is present in the idols also, and therefore there should be no objection to idol-worship, and my criticism of idol-worship is wrong, my reply is this; If you worship the idols with this deep faith, why do you pluck the flowers, rub sandal to paste and fold your hands to do obeisance to the idols-gods? After all, God is present in the flowers, sandal, hand and mouth also. If God is worshipped in the stone, similarly, being present in the flowers etc., He is plucked and rubbed through the flower and sandal, and that is an act of irreverence. And if He is present in everything, why don't you worship other tiny things and why do you condemn them instead? If God is present everywhere in everything, it is a sin to believe that He is present in a small thing only such as an idol. If there is a ruler of the whole world and you tell him that he is the king over a small piece of land, say twenty- five square yards, the king will feel angry. Similarly you should know that to confine the God of the universe to a single small idol is an act of sin and will call for the wrath of God.

13.Q: Is it good or evil to worship the idols of stone or metal, etc.?

A: The former view is not correct. If it were an act of piety to worship small idols made of brass and other metals, it would be an act of sin to beat other sacred objects such as large bells in the temple (in order to ring them to please the gods—after all God is present in them too). Indeed, it is bad to worship idols

of stone since it is not sanctioned by the Vedas. And if you violate the Vedas, you earn the title of 'atheist'. The other view too is not correct because the Vedas do not say that. But if you worship the idols, it is waste of a life time. If you say that idol worship is a means of salvation, it is not correct; the idol was made by a sculptor and installed in a fixed place by a priest. It is lifeless, material. What can it give to anyone?

14. Q; What is the authority or reason for wearing specially marked rosary or foot mark on the forehead?

A; "The mark (tilaka) of the shape of (Hari's) or Krishna's foot is worn on the forehead because Radha printed her foot-mark in red sandal paste on Krishna's forehead for the beauty of it." The question is: What do you mean by 'Hari'? Your answer is that Hari means Vishnu. This too is not wholly correct because Hari also means horse, lion, sun, monkey and it is the name of men too. To mark your forehead with the sign is also not proper, it is not religious because it is not enjoined by the Vedas. And what is Tilaka, the mark on the forehead? If you call 'tripundra' or '*urdhvapundra*' 'tilaka' it is wrong, because according to Grammar the picture of a sesame seed or a small grain of sesame (tila) is called a tilaka. This is established, so why should a long mark in sandal paste on the forehead be called a 'tilaka'? Yet you call it 'tilaka', it is all nonsense and negligence, surely.

15.Q: Is it good or evil to worship idols, etc.?

A: "There is nothing wrong in idol worship, wearing a rosary or putting a 'tilaka' mark on the forehead, because as is your faith, so is the fruit or reward".

16. Q: Is faith as such true or false?

A: The former case is not correct, because all faith as such is not effective or fruitful. No one loves pain and sorrow, all desire happiness in full faith and yet they don't get it. They generally get pain and sorrow. So faith as such is neither good nor effective. Therefore, faith as such is not true. The second view, that faith is false, is also not correct because, without faith, you cannot achieve knowledge, Dharma, wealth, happiness and salvation. Therefore it is good to have faith but it should be faith of the right kind. If in something (an idol, for example) you can have the faith of another thing (say, of God), then you can have the faith in your body that it is a railway train. Now, if your body can take you as fast and as far as a railway train, then your faith is good and true, otherwise it is false. If you believe in full faith that a piece of stone is a diamond,

water is milk or curd, the dust is flour and sugar, sugar is roasted rice, the material is intelligent and the intelligent is material, the poor man is an emperor, and the emperor is a poor man—in such cases, if the actual thing becomes and behaves as the object of your faith and imagination, then faith is true otherwise it is false and a hoax. Then what is faith really? Faith means faith in things as they are in truth, in reality—that stone is stone, and bread is bread. To hold, believe and have faith that things are what they are, neither more, nor less, nor otherwise—this is faith and belief. To believe that bread is stone and stone is bread is no faith, it is false, false knowledge. Right knowledge is faith, to hold something for another and believe that it is different is confusion and illusion.

17. Q: What do you mean by an icon, an idol (*pratima*)?

A: "An icon/idol of the four-armed God meant for worship is the icon, according to us."

18. Q: What do you mean by the word '*pratima*'?

A: That by which you know the real form, nature, size or extent of something is '*pratima*' (icon/ idol/representation). If this is what you mean by *pratima*, then what is that original which it represents? What is the real form or nature or size of the original? What is that which it symbolizes? If you say that the idol represents the form of God, *Shiva* or *Narayana*, etc., then our question is; Have you, in reality, measured the form and body of God, *Shiva* etc. with the icons of stone or metal? Is this the reason why you call an idol a *pratima*? The *Shastras* relating to law of the state and Dharma lay down that the balances and weights and measures must be of the right standard, and every six months they should be tested and confirmed by order of the ruler. According to this proof and authority '*pratima*' means weights and measures by which quantities of sugar and butter and other things are weighed, measures such as a seer (900 grams) or grams etc. In *Yajurveda* 32, 3 the *pratima* (measure or symbol) of God is ruled out because God is measureless and infinite. Therefore, your interpretation of the word '*pratima*' is wrong and useless.

19.Q: What do you understand by the word '*purana*'?

A: If you mean the eighteen *Puranas* such as the *Brahmavaivartta* etc., and other such works, it is not correct. The word '*purana*' is an adjective and gives a meaning in the sense of something exclusive and different from certain other things. For example, the words *purana* (old) and *prachina* (ancient) exclude and distinguish certain things from the new and the modern. Similarly, the word

*purana* distinguishes old works or things from the 'new'<sup>1</sup>. For example, if you say 'old sari', 'old butter' or 'old jaggery' the adjective 'old' rules out all the new things. Therefore, the word '*purana*' means only the *Vedas* and the explanatory works on the *Vedas*, the *Brahmana* works and not the works such as *Brahmavaivartta*. etc. The authors of the *Kalposutras* say that *Brahmana* works are histories and *puranas*, (not any other). It is written that on the tenth day of *Ashwamedha yajna*, the performer should hear and recite some discourse from the *purana*. So 'hear and recite some *purana* discourse on the tenth day' means that for nine days there should be recitations from the *Vedas* (*Rgveda* and others), and on the tenth day there should be a discourse by the host and others from the expository works on the *Vedas*, which means the *Upanishad* part of *Brahmana* literature. This, is the evidence and authority for saying that the meaning of the term 'purana' is the *Vedas* and the *Brahmanas*, the *Vedas* being the earliest and most ancient literature. The *Vedas* are our basic faith, not other works—this is the principle of our life. Selfish and sectarian people have written works such as *Brahmavaivartta* in the name of Vyasa to mislead the people and earn their own livelihood. They have written the Tantra works in the name of Shiva, and *Yajnavalkya Smriti* in the name of Yajnavalkya and many other such works. Similar is the case of works such as *Brahmavaivartta*, etc.

20. Q: What is the meaning of 'devalaya' (house of God) according to you?

A: "According to us 'Devalaya' is the house where an image of God is installed for worship and where we ring the bells and sing the songs and 'arati' in praise of God that is a 'house of God'." If According to you such a house is 'the house of God', it is not correct, because it is misleading and against the *Vedas*. 'Devalaya' can be only that place where oblations are offered into the fire in the service of God. 'Worship or service to gods' is a phrase which means the offering of oblations into the fire in the service of God through His natural powers. Works on Dharma say that teaching is '*Brahmayajna*', service to parents and seniors is '*Tarpana*' or '*pitryajna*', offering oblations into the fire is '*devayajna*' or service to God through His natural powers, feeding birds and other living beings is *Bhuta-yajna*<sup>1</sup> or service to the living beings, and hospitality to the visitors is '*man-yajna*' or service to humans. We should do service and homage to the saints and the wise with good reading; to the gods (powers of God) through 'homa', i.e., offerings into the fire; to the parents and seniors through reverence and service; to human beings through hospitality; and to all the living beings through feeding. It is certain and proved on the authority of Manu that 'Devapuja' or 'worship or honour to the gods' is done only through 'homa' or offerings into the fire. Therefore, 'Devalaya' or the 'house of gods' is the *yajna-shala* or the place and

structure where homa (fire-sacrifice) is performed in honour of God and His powers (gods).

21. Q: What do you understand by the term 'Deva' / 'god'?

A: " Brahma, Vishnu and Mahadeva, the gods, and their images, which we worship, these are what we mean by 'gods'."

This is not correct, because in the Vedas, where the word 'devata' occurs, there the name- word of the 'god' designating the hymn and occurring along with the hymn is the devata. (This means that the devata signified by the name-word is the subject matter or theme of the hymn). This is the view of *Nirukta*. In the *Purva-Mimansa* and the *Brahmanas* the hymn itself, in the form in which it is, is regarded as the devata. In *Taittiriya Aranyaka*, the mother, the father, the teacher, the visitor and the saint are regarded as *devata* or worthy of service and reverence. On this evidence and these authorities, '*devata*' means the theme of the hymn and the hymn itself (in the Vedic context) and mother, father, teacher and a saintly visitor in the context of daily living. In the context of worship and the ultimate knowledge of reality, '*devata*' stands for God only (as the only object of worship). Therefore, your meaning of the term '*devata*' (i.e., an idol or a god other than the One Supreme God) is wrong. Then, if so, the person who believes that the word *devata* means an idol is as ignorant and not anyway more intelligent than an animal. In the Upanishad also it is said that the person who gives up the One Supreme God and worships other gods (whatever they may be) does not deserve any consideration among those who are worthy of reverence—he is just as good as a beast. Therefore, it is said; Awake, arise, ye men, know the One Supreme Soul of the Universe and give up the songs of praise in worship of any other power. It is certain on such evidence and authority that idols and images can never be gods.

22. Q: What do you understand by the words 'devala' and 'devalaka'?

A; "By 'devala' and 'devalaka' we mean those who worship idols and those who earn their livelihood by idol-worship".

This is not correct, because Manu writes in the Dharma-Shastra that the money and merit of those who do yajna is 'devasva,' pious, and the wealth of those who do not perform yajna is asura (evil). 'Deva' is the name of money and material set apart for yajna. If a person receives that and uses it for his own food, etc., that person is a despicable 'devala'. In this word-formation, according to

Grammar, the medical part. i.e., 'sva', is dropped and we get the word 'deva'. The person who steals or misappropriates the money and materials meant for yajna is an extremely despicable 'devalaka'. According to the rule of Grammar 'kutsite, the suffix 'kva' is added in the sense of something 'bad/despicable'. Therefore, your interpretation of 'devala' and 'devalaka' is wrong.

23.Q: Is God subject to birth and death?

A: "Yes, supernatural and divine birth and death do take place for saving the virtuous, destroying the wicked, establishing dharma and uprooting sin and evil. This way and for this purpose God is born in human form, not otherwise. This birth is divine and supernatural".

No, no, this is not correct. God is omnipotent, all-pervasive, whole and indivisible, omnipresent, infinite, unmoved and immovable. God being omnipotent, He can do everything without any other aid through His own law of cosmic justice. He has all that power. On the other hand, if He cannot do so through His omnipresence and power, and needs the help of a human body and has to take birth for that purpose, He is not omnipotent. Just as He creates and holds the entire worlds without any outside help, He has the power to destroy the demons such as Hiranyaksha, Ravana, Kansa, etc. without any other help. Similarly He can communicate His message/ teaching, save the good people, establish dharma, and destroy the wicked and adharma all by Himself without depending on any other means or power. Just as you accept that all the powers are in God, so should you accept that God is just and right by nature. If you don't accept this, then it would follow that, being all- powerful, He can destroy Himself and do injustice and adharma—in which case He would not remain God (because He would fall from God-hood). For this reason it must be accepted that God is infinite, unborn, and unchangeable. In relation to God, forms of nature (*prakrti*) and the entire world, space etc., are small, very small, limited and subject to end. Where, then, is the material for the body which could contain Him. The Vedas and the *Shastras* confirm that there is nothing greater than He. How can He be contained in a body? There is the authority of the Vedas and the Upanishads: God is light, present in all, without body, impenetrable, unbreakable, free from the bonds of ligaments, pure, immaculate and sinless. He is present in and out of all. He is Truth and Reality in the essence, knowledge and awareness itself, the greatest, the highest and beyond all limit.

The Supreme *Purusa*, the highest Divine Soul, He is without any form or body whatsoever, all pervasive, inside and outside of all, and beyond birth and

death. He is above and beyond all sound and word, touch, colour and form, taste, and smell. He is indestructible, eternal, without beginning and end, beyond any conceivable form (*mahat-tattva*) of matter and motionless. The soul gets liberated from birth and death and attains bliss (*moksha*) only by knowing Him. Greater than the greatest and subtler than the subtlest, He is present and realizeable only in the self within. It is fair and proper that man should be aware of His presence and be keen to know and realize Him—Him that is the greatest of all, bright and blazing more powerfully than the sun and beyond all darkness. One can conquer the pain of death only by realizing Him — there is no other way, no other way ! On the authority of mantras like this from the Vedas, it is proved and confirmed that God never takes birth, nor does He ever die. This is the Vedic truth, the foundation of knowledge, eternal and invariable.

24.Q: Does God have a form, or is He without form?

A; "He is without form. This we say and believe." It is o.k. if you say so and hold this. But if you doubt and ask that, being formless, how can He create a universe of mighty forms and how can he make so many shapes and bodies without such tools as the hands, then your doubt and question is not right. God has infinite powers of infinite kinds for all time in Him. Therefore, by the formless God, the world of forms can be created. For this there is the evidence; By the same Supreme Soul was created '*Akasha*', (Space); from space was created *Vayu* (air); from *Vayu*, *agni* (fire); from *agni*, *jala* (water); from *jala*, *prthivi* (earth); from earth, all vegetation; from vegetation, food; from food, *virya* (seed); from *virya*, the body. So this body is called of food and water (i.e. of plasma). In this process of creation, the soul and space are formless. *Vayu* is twice as solid as space, and fire, water and earth are thrice as solid in progression. Thus, this world of solid forms comes into being from the formless. Anyone can demonstrate this truth by grinding stone or magnet finer and finer to show practically that the solid becomes fine (and fine can become solid). So the world of solid forms is created out of the formless by God who is beyond form. God receives and holds and reaches without hand or foot, sees without eyes and hears without ears. He knows all but nobody knows Him. He is the eternal perfect Brahma, as the wise ones say. According to evidence such as this, God has infinite power to do things even without body-limbs such as hands and feet. In spite of such evidence and authority, if people say that God is corporeal (has a body-form) and the corporeal God creates a world of forms, and that He cannot create the world without hands and feet, they are simply creating confusion out of mischief in order to mislead others.

25.Q: Is god *mayavi* or not (past master artist like an all powerful juggler)? And what is the meaning of maya (the magic of creation)?

A: "*Maya* is the power of God, Shakti of the Almighty." Okay. But this statement of God's potential (Shakti) is not proper, because the word *maya* is generally used in the sense of 'magic, craft and illusion'. If someone says of a person; "This man is *mayavi*" it means that the man is clever and crafty. God is free from craftiness as well as from ignorance. He is pure, blameless, eternal, immaculate, omniscient and absolutely free in essence. One should never believe that God is crafty. The sage Patanjali says that God is free from wants and weaknesses such as ignorance and far above suffering the results of good and evil actions unlike as human beings do. God is the Supreme *Purusha*, but He is above and beyond all comparison to human beings. (In short, God is all-powerful, but *mayavi* is not the right word.)

26.Q: Is God *saguna* (with qualities) or *nirguna* (without qualities)?

A: God is both *saguna* and *nirguna* (He has qualities, and yet He is without and beyond qualities). This is sure and certain. For example, a jar has the quality/property of touch (since you can touch it and feel it is there), but it does not have the quality of awareness. So, having the quality of touch, it is *saguna* but free from the quality of awareness, it is *nirguna*. Similarly, God has the qualities such as omniscience, etc. So He is *saguna*. But He does not suffer birth and death, and He does not have the property of materiality, ignorance, etc., therefore He is *nirguna* too, that is, above and free from certain qualities and characteristics. The Upanishad says that the One Lord God pervades unseen in all the forms of existence. He is present in all, rules over all; the whole world—animate and inanimate resides in Him; He is the omniscient and silent witness of all, only one, sole existent, and *nirguna*. On the basis of this authority on the nature of God, the gods such as *Brahma* (of the imagination of those who believe and follow the so-called *Puranas*), supermen such as Shri Ram Chandra, Shri Krishna Chandra, and Nrisinha etc., all come to the class of being human surely and certainly. God is the only one Lord, says the Upanishad, none else. God is the creator of Rishis such as *Brahma* and all others. He is the support of all. He alone is the pervader, all-powerful, just Lord and Master, worthy of worship by all including *Brahma* and others. Different from and other than all, He is the sole supreme Lord and God. Thus should we know Him.

27.Q: Do you believe in liberation (*Mukti*) or not?

A: "We do, We believe in liberation of four kinds or liberation in four forms; *Salokya* (co- regional), *samipyra* (co-spatial), *sanujya* (co- fraternal), and *sayujya* (co-Relational)."

What do you mean by liberation of four types? "The presence of the soul with God in the same *loka* (region) is *salokya* *mukti*, co-regional liberation. (Similarly, *samipyra* means being close to God in space ; *sanujya* means being close to God as a brother, and *sayujya* means being directly in relation to God as a presence as in a state of yoga.)"

(Swamiji now observes): This belief of yours is not right, because God has created the one world with all its laws, and since all the living beings exist in the same world in the presence of God, even animals such as the ass are to be regarded as existing in the state of liberation in the presence of God. Thus *salokya* (co-regional) liberation is automatically attained. Similarly, God being omnipresent, He is present in and close to every living being; therefore *samipyra* (co-spatial) *mukti* also is attained automatically. *Sanujya* (co-fraternal) *mukti* is also automatically attained by all the souls, because, God being infinite and omniscient, the souls are comparatively limited in consciousness and knowledge, and therefore all of them are like His younger brothers. Lastly, *Sayujya* (co-relational) *mukti* is also automatically attained in general; God is present everywhere. So the soul is in Him and He is in the soul. Hence the relation between the two is that of the pervader and the pervaded. The two are naturally together, at one with each other, the soul is automatically in a state of liberation. Therefore, to believe in the four forms of liberation of your view is useless. When your sort of liberation is meaningless, what other sort of liberation would you hold as right? If you say that residence in Vaikuntha or Goloka or on Kailas, etc. is liberation, it is, again, not correct because unless you are free from subjection, you will be miserable, and being miserable, one cannot be called liberated. It is clear and confirmed by reason and Veda that liberation is of one and only one kind, not more or different. And that is; freedom from all pain of birth and death and presence in the divine bliss of God. This is attained through getting knowledge of reality and the wisdom and value of knowledge, living a life of Dharma and, through these, knowing the true God and experiencing the bliss of the presence of God. In view of this it is clear that the liberation according to your faith and belief is unreal because subjection is misery while freedom is happiness, and you always remain in subjection during your kind of liberation.

28. Q: Are the Visnuswami and the Vallabha sects in accordance with the Vedas

or contrary to the Vedas?

A: The former view—that they are Vedic is not correct because there is no mention of these sects in the Vedas. Thus they are non-Vedic and hence mere superstition. Manu says in the *Dharma-Shastra*; "Don't entertain the counterfeits who act against the Vedas and who, being cattish by nature and in behaviour, selfishly and wickedly target the others' money and property for personal gain just like the crane which, appearing in a pious garb, devours the fish." They don't deserve to be called by the name and title of '*Vishnu-sampradaya*' (the Vishnu sect), in fact deserve to be called '*Vishnu-sampradaha*' because they are destroyes (not saviours). The sect whose members have destroyed their knowledge and Dharma neatly and completely is to be called *sampradaha* (that which has burnt itself out completely). No one should trust such people.

29. Q: "*Shri Krishnah shranam mama*" (I take the shelter of Shri Krishna): is this formula true or false?

A: It is not sanctioned by the Vedas, and therefore it is fictitious and false. You have given up the Vedic hymn *Gayatri* and taken to a fictitious formula of your own creation. You are heading toward atheism and suffering.

30. Q: What is the meaning of the said mantra according to you?

A: "I take the shelter of Krishna with his consort Lakshmi ", this cannot surely and necessarily be the meaning. The reason is that the phrase '*prapnotu*' (may grant, may admit) is not a part of your formula. (Had the word '*prapnotu*' been a part of the formula, the meaning would be "May Lord Krishna, give/grant me shelter and protection). Since it is not there, the mantra can mean; 'May Lord Krishna be under my shelter.' And if in place of the wanted word someone were to supply the word '*himsatu*' (destroy), the meaning would be; 'May Lord Krishna destroy my shelter and refuge'. How can you stop him from doing that? For this reason, your formula is wrong, and since it is incomplete it is ambiguous and meaningless. Therefore one should neither give nor receive nor believe this formula as a word of faith. Similarly other formulas too are false formulas such as "*Namo narayanaya*", *namah sivaya*', '*namo bhagavate vasudevaya*'. "*Aim him klim camundayai vicce*,' etc. One should know that all such formulas are fictitious and false.

Infact, the initiation of the Vallabha Sect, with the formula '*Shri Krishnah sharanam mama*' is patently wrong. It doesn't mean to join the disciple with God,

it disjoins the poor soul and vitiates him against God. The formula means: "May Lord Krishna be my shelter and refuge/ or, may Lord Krishna come unto my shelter and refuge. For thousands of years I have suffered the pain of separation from Krishna. Beset and surrounded by that pain, I surrender my body, senses, breath and energy, my heart and inner being, my wife, and children, my home and all my wealth and property, all the acts of body and mind, and indeed my very soul to Lord Krishna. O Krishna, I am thy servant". Now, it is futile and wrong to count the number of the years of separation in thousands because neither you nor Vallabha is omniscient or knowledgeable enough to determine that the separation has been for a thousand years, nor can you know and count in actual fact that a thousand years have passed. Therefore, the separation from Krishna being indefinite, the count of years is improper and wrong.

31. Q: What do you mean by Krishna?

A: "By Krishna we mean the Lord Supreme who resides in Goloka, the region of the Cow".

It is neither correct nor appropriate nor true. A human soul born and subject to death cannot be the God Supreme. A region of the cows will be dirty and foul smelling, and for that reason, full of discomfort and misery. Those who reside there would be like the cow-herds, stupid, ignorant, uncivilized and uncultured. And, in fact, if we come to think of it in reality, there is no other heavenly region of the cows different from a village of the cowherds. This we should know for certain. The devotees and admirers of that resident of the cow-region are or would become the same rustic sort as cowherds. It is said by the initiate that since time immemorial he is beset with and surrounded by "suffering (*tapa*) and pain (*klesha*)" in separation from Krishna. This too is incorrect because *tapa* and *klesha* mean the same thing and the formula suffers from the fault of repetition and redundancy. Again, pain and suffering has been there since endless time. If so, no place, time and thing will ever be free from pain. (If the beginning of the suffering was across endless time, the end too will be across endless time. In other words, pain and suffering will ever be there as ever before.

It is not fair to call Krishna the God because like other men he was born in a physical body, was of dark colour (as anybody is of some colour) and he suffered death (like any other mortal). It is impossible to surrender and give up the body, senses, breath, heart and being and all the acts of body and mind to Krishna because all the limbs and organs remain with a person naturally. It is not possible to take them away from one person and give them to another. But if you

say no and insist that this total surrender is surely possible, then it follows that all the excrements of the body and pain, attachment, hate, sin and evil too will be Lord Krishna's share as part of the total surrender, and the Lord will have to suffer all the pain and hell as a result of this evil. This is what seems to be the reasonable conclusion. Moreover, the surrender of wife, home, children, wealth and property and all the acts of body and mind implies that the results would be evil—because the surrender of one's wife to another person (and the other person's acceptance of her) is an evil act. Moreover, the structure of the mantra is grammatically defective because the neuter gender '*vittehaparani*' goes with the masculine gender antecedent '*taddharman*' while the word '*para*' can be used in any of the three genders. "O Krishna, I am your servant, and I surrender with my soul...", upto this point the Vallabha formula is faulty and meaningless; when the soul is only one entity, not two, then "I surrender with my soul, body and senses..." etc. is wrong and lacks logical and grammatical unity. (The subject T of the verb 'surrender' and the object 'my soul' are in fact one, but the structure shows as if they are two, hence it is wrong logically and grammatically). Further, the mantra says; I am thy servant'. Now, a servant is a *shudra*, the name of a *shudra* ends in the suffix '*dasa*' according to the *Manusmrti*. Hence also according to the *Dharmashastra* you are like a *shudra*. In fact, the purpose of this Brahma mantra (formula) as given by Vallabha in works such as *Siddhanta-Rahasya* was to confuse and mislead simple people and to promote something wrong. Read, for example, the following;

"Whatever the Lord God Himself spoke in person in the month of Shravana, second and bright half of the month, on the eleventh at the midnight hour, that is reported here word by word. By taking initiation into the sect with the mantra relating to Brahma, the person is absolved of all the ills of the body and mind and of all the sins of the soul. The evils (ills and sins) are of five kinds: 1. natural; 2. arising from time; 3. arising from place ; 4 as described in Dharma Shastra or determined by society and tradition; and finally. 5. as laid down in the Vedas. These five kinds of evil can affect the human being but they can be washed off with the mantra which joins the initiate with Brahma. However, the faults and weaknesses which arise from touch or mating with woman should not be regarded as evil, because if they are counted as evil, then evil can never be washed away. But all the evils can be washed away and the soul can be cleansed through surrender. Therefore, surrender must be done. The rule, therefore, is that the disciple should first surrender everything whatsoever to the guru (the Gosain) and then have something for himself. The law of Lord Vishnu. God of gods is; Let not the disciple have anything before surrender. And surrender means this; The Guru (Gosain) must first taste the things offered by the disciple by way of

surrender, [he disciple may follow alter. Therefore it is proper that in the beginning of every work everything is offered in surrender. This means; first, make the offering to Hari, Vishnu (which is the guru, the Gosain), and then partake of it. The disciples must not hear even a word of any faith or sect other than the Gosain's. They must behave and conduct themselves just as servants should do in life. Having surrendered everything, the disciples should regard everything as Brahma. Just as other impure and contemptible things become pure and admirable when they immerse into the holy Ganga, so they should describe and hold everything of their faith as good and sacred, and regard things of other faiths as faulty and evil. "

We have repeatedly said before that Krishna ji died about five thousand years ago. So how could he come to Vallabha and speak to him? The truth is he never said anything to anyone, the story is fiction. It appears that Vallabha has simply woven a net in order to catch simple fish for his selfish purpose and to promote superstition and adharma. The initiation of a disciple with the mantra called 'Brahma-sambandha mantra' produces nothing but falsehood and evil, and as such it is meaningless with no relation whatever to God.

If you believe that the disciple is free from all faults and evils by the mantra, where do the faults and evils go after they leave the disciple? If you say that they will be destroyed, it would not be correct because the evils committed by one person can never pass on to another person. Only the doer of actions good as well as bad suffers the consequences, no one else. If you say that after the total surrender the evil actions pass on to Hari, Krishna, then it is certain that Hari will suffer the pain of hellish misery as a result. In fact, the law of God is that man is absolved of his actions and their consequences only after he has undergone suffering of the results good and bad. For this reason, Vallabha's imagination of surrender and salvation is useless because all must earn their salvation. If the natural limitations and weaknesses of the soul were to be absolved, the soul itself would be absolved of its own nature and identity. If fire were to lose its essential property, i.e., heat, fire would lose its own identity, it would no longer be fire. Similarly, the soul itself would not remain soul if it gives up its power of action and the karmic sufferance. Even if the disciple says he surrenders his all to the guru or to Hari, Krishna, neither the disciple nor you would be saved of your physical ailments such as leprosy, bodily needs of hunger and thirst, the hardship of cold and heat, pleasure and pain, ignorance, etc. Therefore your surrender and its rewards, all is unreal and wrong.

If the Brahma-mantra is really effective, why doesn't it protect you from

the disorders of health such as the imbalances of wind, bile and phlegm and ailments such as fever and others caused by change of season and climate? And shouldn't the members of your sect from Vallabha to you and others not accept the sins and weaknesses described in the Vedas and the Dharma Shastra, faults such as telling lies, stealing, incest with mother, daughter, sister and daughter-in-law and others and breach of faith. Should you not suffer the consequences of the sins of touching and mating with women such as the guru's wife? Should you all not accept all these sins and their consequences according to your own preaching—the preaching of your god Vallabha? (But you don't.) Which means that the teachings of Vallabha (the God) are counter to the teachings of the Vedas. Because of this negation of the Vedas, your God and Vallabha both are atheists, violators of Dharma, ignorant, supporters of adharma and indeed the destroyers of Dharma. According to Dharma Shastra, an atheist is one who insults the Vedas and Dharma Shastra by abusing logic and acts against the Vedas for his selfish purposes. It is fair and proper for the good people to keep him out of their company. One who speaks ill of the Vedas is an atheist, so all of you acting counter to the Vedas are atheists. When you say that man cannot be saved from sin and its consequence in any other way than accepting the Vallabha religion, this gospel seems to be written in a state of intoxication. This is certain because such a gospel destroys true Dharma and virtues of human character. No one should have faith in such a gospel because it is meant only to mislead people from virtue and true Dharma to sin and vice.

Let us listen a little to the message of the Vallabha sect; Man cannot be saved from all sin without complete surrender. Therefore it is proper and good for the disciples of the Gosain to surrender their all and offer everything including wife and children to the Gosain before the disciple himself uses anything he has. After marriage, everything required for any purpose for the enjoyment of life should be surrendered to the guru, only later should the person use it for himself.

Now, let us examine this gospel critically; If you preach that after marriage, before a person has anything for his own enjoyment and experience, he should surrender it—even if it be his wife or child - to the Gosain for the purpose of sanctification, why don't you really offer your wife, daughter, sister, child etc. to the others for purification? If you say that you don't because you don't feel like doing so, why do you ask others to do the sinful act of offering their women to you? If you say that their act of surrender to you is an act of piety, why is the surrender of your women to others not an act of piety? The principle is that when a man and woman are married, their surrender to each other is complete. No

other way can further surrender be made, it ought not to be made, know this for certain. The truth for certain is that the message of the Vallabha sect is one of permissiveness and adultery, and never should man or woman have faith in it. Those who have faith in it or will have faith in it will condemn themselves to evil and sin. It is inevitable because the result of an evil gospel is evil.

It is the tradition of the Vallabha sect to give full , and free expression to the body and let the energy of body and mind How naturally. The question arises whether the natural expression of body and mind is for the fulfilment of Dharma or for indulgence in adharma and evil? The former case (i.e., the fulfilment of Dharma) is not time of the Gosains: By direct observation and by inference it is clear that the Gosains are notorious for the evil operation of adultery, etc.

Just as the animals such as horse, bull, monkey and donkey feel excited with the flow of passion for mating with the female of their species, similarly you too seem to believe in the excitement and gratification of passion. The bounds and tradition of your faith seem to be that the natural expression of your life is realized though giving up Vedic knowledge and Vedic observance of Dharma, adultery, grabbing other's money and property, practice of evil and violation of the Vedic dharma. The natural observance of your faith is confined to these evils.

Indeed, in this context Vallabha himself says: "The secular tradition and Vedic Dharma both are false and full of pretension, hence they are untrue. There is no doubt about it. Only the Vaishnava faith is natural and true, all the rest is false and contrary to truth. This alone proves that Vallabha was an atheist because he has counted all the secular and spiritual knowledge of the Vedas as false. In fact, all the followers of the Vallabha sect should be regarded as atheists because they are against the Vedas. Infact, they arc not Vaishnavas, because they do not believe in Vishnu. Vishnu means the omnipresent Lord, and Yajna. They do not worship the omnipresent Vishnu, nor do they perform yajna, instead they are dedicated to idol-worship. Hence they cannot be Vaishnavas for certain.

(In fact, the Gosains are not even, 'purjaris', i.e., priests. They are 'pujaris' in a different sense.) 'Puja means reverence to the good persons, and 'ari' means an enemy. Thus 'pujari' means an enemy of puja, one who does violence to the reverence of the good (and worship to God). (Then priest claims to offer 'arti' to God). But 'Arti' in the case of the Gosains means pain and suffering. So one who does the arti is not a priest but one who is an enemy of reverence and worship. 'Gosain' means a 'sain', i.e., teacher, of Muslims who has the animal qualities of the cow, who has no sense of discrimination between what can be known and

achieved and what cannot be known and achieved, one who is incapable of renunciation, one who cannot give up even his partiality against justice and Dharma, and if he gives up anything, it is Dharma according to the Vedas. The Gosains appeal' to be like that. And what is the meaning of the word vavapi (or Babaji which means a saint or sadhu or sanyasi in the language of the simple folk)? 'Vaji' means a horse, and the prefix 'va' suggests an alternative, that is, a donkey or the hybrid which is a mule. (So the word vavaji means a donkey or a mule). And what is the meaning of 'Vairagi'? 'Ragi' means one who is deep in passion and attachment. 'Vai' is a prefix which means 'surely'. So 'vairagi' means one who is surely and deeply steeped in greed, passion and attachment. What is: 'dandavat' i.e., the prostrate position of the body in salutation to the guru? Danda means a thick stick of wood and 'vat' means 'like'. So 'dandavat' means one who is like a thick stick of wood, a blockhead. And what is the meaning of the word 'Hindu'? It is one who is black, a robber, the worshipper of idols of stone, metal or wood, a servant, a slave and one void of the worship of God. Thus the blind tradition of the use of words such as these has been in vogue because, having given up knowledge of the Vedas, we fell victims to ignorance and lost the meanings of words such as 'arya', and this tradition has reached the climax in sects like Vallabha's. It is worth giving up at the earliest, there is no doubt about it.

Now, let us critically examine *Shuddhadvaita-martanda*: what do you mean by 'Shuddha' and 'advaita', which two words make up the word *Shuddhadvaita*? That which is perceived as dual or two-fold is '*dvaita*', and '*dvaita*' is '*dvaita*'. What is not '*dvaita*' is '*advaita*'. Then, '*Advaita*' is said to mean that the same one Brahma is the cause as well as the effect of the universe ; Brahma and the world are the same Brahma—they are not two, they are the same one. The same way, man and woman are the same one Brahma, appearing as man and woman for the sake of enacting the grand play of the world. But saying so is not right. Brahma, being omniscient and free from weaknesses such as ignorance cannot become the world of matter. It is impossible. If the living beings and the created material world all are Brahma, why is it that the world lacks infinity, complete knowledge, power of creating and supporting the world, omniscience, true and inviolable intention and other such attributes and qualities of Brahma? And if Brahma is taken to be the same as the created world, then Brahma would be subject to the limitation and weaknesses of the worldly creatures, that is, birth, death, joy, sorrow, hunger, thirst, expansion and growth, contraction and decrease, etc. With all these, Brahma will be subject to bondage, hell, pain and passion as ordinary beings. Thus the meaning of advaita as given by Vallabha is illogical and wrong.

"*Dvita* is the same as *Dvaita*. and the negation or denial of *dvaita* is *advaita*." In support of this, Vallabha quotes the . *Sruti (upright) sarvam khalvidam brahma*. Quoting words like this is nothing but prattling and raving. If Brahma becomes both the creator and the created universe, then Brahma would be subject to suffering, bondage and hell and all such other imperfections. When an existent substance changes into another state or form, the process is called '*parinama*' or variation. According to your view, since Brahma Itself has changed into the state of the universe, do you know the implications? (Brahma becomes *parinami* subject to variation. It doesn't remain constant and eternal.) Listen, Vallabha reduces Brahma to a variable substance subject to ignorance, fever and pain. Know that your faith is contrary to Veda and reason.

Vallabh has not understood the meaning of *Srutis* such as *sarvam khalvidam brahma*. This quotation is an expression of the yogi's experience of the reality and presence of Brahma in the state of Samadhi. In other words, when someone says: all this is gold, the meaning and implication is that there is no adulteration of brass or any other metal. Similarly, when it is said that 'all this is Brahma', the meaning is that the existent, omniscient, blissful and constant reality, Brahma, is pure Brahma, eternally Itself with nothing else in its nature and essence. Brahma is pure and constant, know this, because Brahma is eternal, constant, whole and indivisible. Similarly, in the words *ayamatma brahma* (this *atma* is brahma), the word *idam* (*ayam*) refers to the soul that is Brahma, there is no implication of anything of the world sharing the nature and essence of Brahma. Similarly, the statement *tajjalaniti brahma* should be understood. *Taija* means; this world is bom of brahma, that is, it is created by Him, *Talla* means that it goes back into Him. *Tadan* means that the whole world breathes, wills and lives in That. Knowing this, with perfect peace at heart, the yogi should meditate on Brahma and worship the Lord as the sole efficient cause of the creation, destruction and activity of the whole world. His is the infinite power and the glory. He alone is worthy of worship, no one else. This meaning of the *sruti* Vallabha has not understood. How could his disciples and followers understand?

'This whole world is Brahma': This has already been dealt with. In the words of Vallabha, the word *sarva* (all) means "this whole world which can be seen and heard. This we ought to know. For this reason, this whole world is the eternal Brahma, because the cause (both efficient and material) of the Brahma—world/world-Brahma—can be Brahma only. That Brahma is corporeal (of the form of the world), Omnipotent, One, Omniscient, creator of all, existent, intelligent and blissful. This world has evolved from Him...." and so on. Such

verses of Vallabha in his work *Suddhadvaita-martanda* are, in fact wrong. We should know for certain. The compound *Suddhadvaita* cannot be *karmadharaya* compound. The reason; In the words of Vallabha '*suddha*' (pure) is the effect, the world, and '*advaita*' (one with nothing second), God, is the cause. As a *karmadharaya* compound, *suddhadvaita* means the *suddha* (pure) that is '*advaita*' (the one). Being the effect and the cause, the two constituents cannot be joined as equal parts of the compound, because the two are not identical in essence and property. The compound cannot be the possessive *tatpurusa* either. The reason; If the two are two substantially, they cannot be one essentially; and if the two are really one, they cannot be the cause and the effect (which implies duality). If you explain it as *Ekasesa* compound, i.e., two combining as a third entity, even that is unreasonable. If *suddha* means one man and one woman, the two being one in the state of sexual union, i.e., identified as one, that too is no good. The members of the sect, men and women, in a state of excitement, say: "I am Krishna, I am Radha, let us be one!" Such passionate and sexual communion of the followers of the Vallabha sect is all evil in thought and practice and degrading for all.

The first acharya of the Vallabha sect was Lakshmana Bhatta who first became a sanyasi and later renounced sanyasa to go back to '*grihastha*', the life of a house holder. Thus Lakshmana Bhatta, the very first one, recanted and like a dog, licked up what he had thrown out, i.e., he first gave up *grihasthashram* and later took to the same and gave up sanyasa. Then his son Vallabha took over. He too like his father took up sanyasa with initiation into the Vishnuswami sect and later went back to the life of a house-holder. Then Gokul Nath Vitthala indulged in various kinds of permissiveness. All these things are recorded in the books of their sect. From the first acharya Lakshmana Bhatta till today permissive corruption is clearly seen about the history of this sect. In fact, all those who have faith in the Vallabha sect and accept Vallabha and others as guru should be regarded as of the same kind. It is no sin to reject such an evil and irreligious guru, in fact the rejection would be an act of virtue. The Dharna Shastra lays down very severe punishment for such evil people. It says; the guru, the young, the old, or a learned Brahmana, should they be cruel evil doers, destroyers of Dharma and supporters of adharma, all should be punished with death by the ruler without hesitation. If the evil-doer is eliminated, the eliminator commits no sin, whether the punishment is awarded publicly or not. Poison counters poison, but this is not counted violence. The man who gives up Dharma and takes to adharma is a perpetrator of evil.

Q: Is Shuddhadvaita a gospel that is light itself or in the essence a message of darkness?

A: The former view is not correct, it is not light itself, nor a gospel of light. If it were light, it would be self-illuminated like the sun. It would not need the light of the sun to see the meaning of a work such as *Martanda*, instead it would reveal itself without any aid of light. But this is not possible. Nor is it by nature darkness itself, because if it were it would be impossible to see it even with the light of the sun. This by implication is the criticism of *Sat-siddhanta-Martanda* also. Thus so far as *Suddhadvaitamartanda* and *Sat-siddhanta-martanda* are concerned, even the names are not correct, the contents are a far cry. The same is the case with the book entitled *Vidvanmandana*. When the teacher, Vitthala, himself was not a learned man, how could he write in support of the learned? Of course, he was surely able to support adultery, appropriation of other's money and property and immoral conduct, if nothing else. For the sake of illustration and example, we may refer to "*nijamuralika..* " etc. The meaning is: "Having heard the music of the flute of Krishna, the beautiful women of Gokul came to him. To play with them, Krishna received them with love. That is having seen them, he assumed as many individual Krishna personalities as were the beautiful women and had sexual communion with them". For this kind of immoral words. *Vidvan-mandana* is an improper title for this work as it prescribes foolish, immoral and impious conduct. Similarly the *Anubhasya* too is immoral, and the other hundreds of works in spoken language such as *Rasa-bhavana* are immoral and obscene. For illustration, only one sample is given here; "It would be felt that Radha's breasts and other parts of the body are as sweet as modaka (laddoo a lovely form of sweets). In Goloka (region of the cow), Krishna is the only one man, the rest are all women. Krishna plays with those women day and night. With the rising of the sun, from the one body of Krishna as many Krishnas arise as the women, and each holds one woman in his arms and all the couples have intercourse."

Vallabha is given the name of *Mahaprabhu*. In fact, *Prabhu* (Lord) is the name of God. God pervades everyone of the living forms, says the Veda. When there has been none equal to God, and never shall be. then who can be greater than God? Then it appears that just as the addition of '*maha*' gives us the term '*maha-brahmana*' which means the 'lowest order of Brahmana', so the addition of '*maha*' to '*prabhu*' gives us the term '*mahaprabhu*' which means the 'lowest and meanest lord and guru'. Just as the Vallabha sect is counter to reason and the Vedas, similarly the other sects such as Shaiva, Shakta, *Ganapatya*, Saur and *Vaishnava* are all counter to reason and the Vedas.

The End

## Tributes

Dayananda Saraswati was a personality of the highest order. This man with the nature of a lion is one of those whom Europe is too apt to forget when she judges India but whom she will probably be forced to remember to her cost for he was that rare combination, a thinker of action with a genius of leadership.

Dayananda Saraswati was the most vigorous force of the immediate and present action in India at the moment of the re-birth and re-awakening of the national consciousness. He was one of the most ardent prophets of reconstruction and of national organization. I feel that it was he who kept the vigil.

—Romain Rolland

Swami Dayananda Saraswati had not only studied from his youth onwards that supreme Vedic culture out of which India has risen to her full height of spiritual wisdom and experience, he had lived it.

—C.F. Andrews

Swami Dayananda was the first to proclaim India for Indians.

—Dr. Annie Besant

Dayananda Saraswati was a man of large views. He was a dreamer of splendid dreams. He had a vision of India purged of her superstitions, filled with the fruits of science, worshipping One God. fitted for self-rule and honoured as the primeval source of the world's science and religion. All will admit that the vision of regenerated India seen by the prophet and founder of Arya Samaj is a splendid and inspiring.

—A German Critic

I offer my homage of veneration to Swami Dayananda, the great path-maker in modern India who through bewildering tangles of creeds and practices—the dense under-growth of the degenerate days of our country cleared a straight path—that was meant to lead the Hindus to a simple and rational life of Devotion to God and service for man, with a clear-sighted vision of truth and courage of determination, he preached and worked for our self-respect and vigorous awakening of mind that could strive for a harmonious adjustment with the progressive spirit of the modern age and at the same time kept in perfect touch with that glorious past of India when

it revealed its personality in freedom of thought and action in an unclouded radiance of spiritual realization.

—Rabindranath Tagore.

What is the greatest asset of the nation? Its Pioneers and Prophets. One of them was Swami Dayananda. His is the character of a man of whom any nation and any age may be proud. Think of his passion for truth. He is not afraid of being 'inconsistent'. Consistency, says Emerson, is hobgoblin of little minds. Truth as he sees it, is what Dayananda worships. He leaves Sivaism for Vedantism and again Vedantism for Vedism as seen in the light of Sankhya-Yoga. He is not afraid of changes; he must follow the light where it leads.

And to light this way, God put a torch in Dayananda's hand. In Dayananda I see reflected, as in very few others, the spirit of Aryavarta. Dayananda is to me an exponent of Aryan India, a symbol of Indian India, a prophet of dawn, a herald of the future.

—Saint T.L.Vaswani

## The Translator

Professor Tulsi Ram Sharma M. A., (Delhi), Ph. D. (London) in English language and literature is a teacher, administrator, researcher and author of long standing. Initiated into the Vedic lore and the intellectual mission of the Arya Samaj in 1940 when Swami Omananda Saraswati (then Brahmachari Bhagwan Dev) was the presiding presence of Arya Samaj, Narela (Delhi), he has been reading and writing as a man of reason and faith-both integrated in his commitment to the Veda and Swami Dayananda in the modern context.

Born and brought up in a village and educated in the village and town in India and abroad, Dr. Tulsi Ram Sharma is a man of wide and varied experience and liberal understanding. His readings range over Urdu, Hindi, Sanskrit and English literatures and the Vedic, Christian and Islamic scriptures. His works include *The Neo-classical Epic* (1971), *The Story of English in India* (1983), *The Original Philosophy of Yoga* (1989), *Bharat Mein Angrezi* (1997) in Hindi, *Glimpses of Swami Dayananda's Satyārtha Prakash*, and translations of *Nine Upanishads*, Swami Dayananda's *Samskar Vidhi* and the short writings in *Dayananda Granth Mala*, and Swami Satyapati's *Simple Yoga for God Realization*.

In the universal Vedic tradition, Dr. Tulsi Ram Sharma is dedicated to Swami Dayananda's idea of *Sarva-tantra Siddhanta*, a common, rational, human faith based on universal, positive and non-conflicting values distilled from all religions through open, objective and bold interfaith dialogue.

Dr. Tulsi Ram Sharma's Address:  
22 Warden Woods Court,  
Markham, On.  
CANADA L3R 5W5

Phone: (416) 412-1616  
(416) 725-3737