

**MY FINDINGS
FROM
GITA
CONFORM WITH
QUR'AN...**

Title of the book : My findings from Gita-
Conform with Qur'an...

written by : Ahmed Ali

All Rights Reserved
For legal proceedings : Subject to Kakinada Jurisdiction only.

First Edition : 2001
Copies : 1000

Published by : The True Message Institute
Recharla peta
Kakinada - 533 003

Contact No : 9848516362
9948434267

Ahmed Ali

In the name of Creator

My findings from Gita...

Conform with Qur'an

What does Karma mean?

KARMA YOGI: Geeta ordains that everyone should become a karma yogi to get MOKSHA. Literally Karma means - ANY ACTION, for example even silently thinking of anything, eating, sleeping etc., etc., all come under the term of KARMA. So doing something and not doing anything is also karma(3:5)¹. But in religious terminology, karma is defined as to act (do compulsorily) that what has been enjoined upon to do, and to desist from doing that which has been prohibited (should not do under any circumstances). Thus karma is interpreted as complete obedience to God's commandments or total submission to the will of God.

1. Everyone is forced to act helplessly according to the qualities he has acquired from the modes of material nature: therefore no one can refrain from doing something, not even for a moment -Gita As it is 3:5

Thus karmas are classified under two categories (viz.)

- (a). Lawful karmas - as have been enjoined upon to do, and
- (b). unlawful karmas which have been prohibited to do.

Thus Geeta explains:

For, thou hast to know even of the enjoined actions (lawful acts) and of the prohibited actions (unlawful acts) -Geeta 4:17

How can one know the lawful actions (enjoined upon) and the unlawful actions (prohibited ones)?

For this Geeta suggests that one should take scripture (SASTRA) as an authority in deciding the matter.

We read in Geeta

Therefore, the scripture (Sastra) is thy authority in deciding as to what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. Now thou oughtest to know and perform thy duty laid down in the scripture. -Geeta 16:24

Purport: The above sloka explains that man should do only such deeds as have been enjoined to do in the scripture. And desist from doing any such deed as has not been permitted. One should not do the prohibited acts as according to sastras under any circumstances. So before doing any act, one should consult the scripture (sastra) whether it is lawful or unlawful. If the act decided to be performed is found to be lawful, only do it, otherwise refrain from doing it.

And at the same time Geeta makes it clear that those who do not take the scripture as the source of knowledge, and setting it aside, act according to their whims and fancies would never get MOKSHA.

Thus we read

He who neglecting the scripture acts under the impulse of desire, attains not perfection, nor happiness, nor the supreme goal (Moksha). -Geeta 16:23

Purport: Desires are the main enemies of man. They do not allow him to discriminate what is right and what is wrong. They make him blind and think that what all he does is absolutely correct. And this is why in the foregoing sloka 16:24, it is warned that one should act according to the instructions as provided in scripture (sastra). And in this sloka a stern warning is given. A person who acts according to his own will, prompted by his desires, taking not into consideration of scriptural orders, will have no peace in this world nor moksha in the life to come here after.

Thus in view of the above points it is made clear that to ATTAIN MOKSHA one should do only that which has been enjoined upon to do and that one should not do such things as have been prohibited. Observance of these two is altogether collectively called KARMA or SHARIYAH according to Qur'anic term; without the observance of which Moksha is not possible.

Man has been created by God

Observe what Geeta says about this.

Neither the hosts of the dewatas nor the great rishis know my origin; for I am the first (Aadih) of all the dewatas and the great rishis. -Geeta 10:2

Purport: God says in this sloka that His origin is not known to anybody. As devatas and great rishis were created by him they too do not know. Thus God Almighty is the first person. The word first discloses the fact that He was not created, nor begotten by anybody

else. Thus He is self subsistent.

Aadih - The first

The first means, there was none in the beginning except Him, THE FIRST. It does not mean that God had a beginning. No. The being which has a beginning must have an ending too. So, a being which has an ending (KSHARA) cannot be God. So God must be beginningless. This is agreed in its successive Sloka.

He who knows me as unborn and beginningless, as the great Lord of the worlds, he among mortals is undeluded, he is liberated from all sins. -Geeta 10:3

Then what does the word (Aadih) the First, of the sloka 10:2 under discussion mean to say? It means that both dewatas and mankind have been created by Him. Thus the mankind came into being. This implies the fact that WE WERE NOWHERE before our creation. And for man God has created all things.

I am the source of all; From me every thing evolves; thus thinking the wise worship me, endowed with contemplation -Geta 10:8

As He created everything and everyone,- everything and everyone came into existence only after He created them. In this way He was aadih the First. Thus there is no contradiction in His attribute of being Beginningless. Qur'an also emphasizes on His being Aadih, The First, just in the same meaning as mentioned in Geeta 10:2

He is the First and the Last and the Manifest and the Hidden -Qur'an 57:3

THE FIRST (AADIH) = He created all (Creator)

THE LAST = On the Dooms Day all will be destroyed and He alone remains- Thus He is the Last person that exists. (Qur'an 55:26-27 & Geeta 9:7)¹

THE MANIFEST = Everything reveals His GLORY and MAJESTY. Thus He is MANIFEST. The wise can witness His Manifestation in the whole creation.

THE HIDDEN = The Hidden being (AVYAKTA) cannot be devoid of form, NIRAAKAARA as many think, but SAAKARA. Yet He remains Hidden (Avyakta) till kalpa (Day of Resurrection).

The purpose of man's creation is explained in SLOKA 9:33

...Do thou worship me²

This speaks the fact that man has been created to worship his creator, BRAHMA the qualifying attribute of creator in Sanskrit, equivalent to QUALIQUE the Arabic term.

To worship God, man has been allotted a place called world, (Karma Bhoomi or Karmanushthana loka). The nature of this world is further explained as... TRANSIENT (impermanent) and JOYLESS (9:33).

pre-existence of man

Thus it is made clear that man has been sent into this world as a temporary abode. This discloses the hidden fact that man will have a place of permanent abode for him after passing away from this world. If it were not true, terming world as TRANSIENT remains meaningless.

1. a) All that is on it (earth) will pass away, And there will remain only the person of thy Lord, Master of Glory and Honour. -Qur'an 55:26-27

b) All beings at the end of Kalpa go into my prakriti... -Gita 9:7

2. ... Having attained this transient and joyless world, do thou worship Me -Gita 9:33

When once it is agreed that man has been sent into this transient world it implies to mean that he has been transferred from 'PARALOKA to this world (IHALOKA), and after this he passes again to paraloka, a permanent abode.

Why these transfers from one place to another?

Man has been sent into this world (Ihaloka) not as a punishment (because this is only impermanent), nor as a reward (because it is joyless). Then why?

... DO THOU WORSHIP ME (9:33). This speaks clearly that God has sent man on the earth with a free will and freedom of choice just as a trail, to see whether he performs karmas according as to his biddings (18:63)¹.

Therefore, without attachment, constantly perform the Karma, which should be done (As prescribed in Sastra); for performing Karma without attachment, man attains Moksha.

-Geeta 3:19

Constantly perform the karma = This means you should be ever engaged in performing the karma (karma yogi which can be interpreted to mean a Muslim according to Islamic terminology).

The foregoing explanation can be inferred from the following sloka too.

Having created mankind before, along with sacrifices, the PRAJAA PATI said- by these shall ye prosper, these are to you your desire yielding sources -Gita 3:10

1. Thus I have explained to you knowledge still more confidential. Deliberate on this fully¹, and then do what you wish to do². -Gita As it is 18:63

1. **Deliberate on this fully = Think over carefully on what has been explained to you. This implies the fact that man has been enlarged the power of discrimination.**

2. **Then do what you wish to do = This implies that free will and freedom of choice is given to man.**

Please take note of some important words from the above sloka.

1. Prajaa Pati = Peoples' Master
Rabb-ul Aalameen (Qur'anic term) Master of the peoples or Worlds
2. Puraa = Before (at the beginning of the creation). (here), even before man's arrival in to this Ihaloka.
3. Saha Yagnaah = Along with sacrifices. Sacrifices (here) Karmas to be performed for the pleasure of God without expecting the worldly returns.
4. Prajaa = Mankind (all peoples of past, present and future).
5. Uvacha = said

Thus in the above sloka it is made clear, that entire mankind had once in the beginning of the creation, been created, and at the same time a covenant was made between mankind and God that man should be obedient to God's will by observing the Karmas that were to be given from time to time, by which act that man would get Moksha -

Does this not point out clearly that our first creation was made in Paraloka (and that we were present bodily) and that from there we have been transferred to Ihaloka?

Once man did exist - in his own body

Further, as regards to this we have another corroborative sloka which makes clear that we were present in paraloka before our arrival on the earth and that from here we pass again to the Paraloka.

Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these rulers of men; and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist. -Gita 2:12

Thus it is made clear that we did exist in Paraloka, from where man's journey was started towards attaining Moksha. Now the question is whether our existence in Paraloka was same as in this perceptible form (in which we are to-day) or just as a soul's (Atma's) state of imperceptible form.

A well-known fact is that Atma (soul) is an entity which cannot be seen nor can be distinguished as- I: thou: the kings in the battle field (2:12)¹ while this discrimination is possible in the case of visible bodies only. So from this point of view it can be well predicted that we did exist once in paraloka, with these same physical (visible) forms with same senses and faculties such as have been conferred with, in this present state of life.

*When thy Lord drew forth from the children of Adam- from their loins- (asked God) 'Am I not your Lord?' they said- 'Yea'
-Qur'an 7:172*

Allah said, "Go forth, all of you, from here. And if there comes to you guidance from Me then whoso shall follow my guidance, on them shall come no fear nor shall they grieve." -Qur'an 2:38

*He said, "Go forth, some of you being enemies of others. And for you there is an abode on the earth and a provision for a time."
-Qur'an 7:24*

He said, "Therein (on earth) shall you live, and therein shall you die, and therefrom shall you be brought forth. -Qur'an 7:25

Thus Qura'n also agrees that the entire mankind did exist in perceptible physical forms in Paraloka, once before their arrival into Ihaloka. The following verse of Qur'an illumines more on the point in nutshell.

1. Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these rulers of men: and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist. -Gita 2:12

Purport: I, you, these rulers of men (means all people) did exist once before coming on this earth planet. And hereafter we will continue to exist. There is no question of end.

Does not man remember that We created him **BEFORE** when he was naught? -Qur'an 19:67

No contradiction

Just to contradict the above points the following sloka may be forwarded.

Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen, and their end unseen again why any lamentation regarding them?
-Gita 2:28

How can you disbelieve in Allah? when you were without life, He gave you life, then He will cause you to die, then restore you to life, and then to Him shall you be made to return.
-Qur'an 2:28

One may argue saying that we were not with the visible forms but were in invisible forms as is evident from this sloka.

So let us examine:

In this sloka three different states of men have been described.

1. Pre-existent state as imperceptible (AVYAKTA) = Before our birth. In this state beings cannot be seen.
2. Existing state- as manifestation of body. (VYAKTA) = After our birth. In this state man becomes visible.
3. Ending- (here) to mean the end of the term of life on earth to perform Karmas. (AVYAKTA) = After death. Man attains again the imperceptible state.

According to this sloka (2:28) it is true that before man's birth he was in the imperceptible form, who became manifest in body after his birth and again after his death goes into the state of invisibility. However this does not contradict to our point that the whole mankind had been created all at once in paraloka, where they had been in these very physical bodies. These two slokas (2:12 & 2:28)¹ are not contradictory at all with each other, as they appear to be, but each of them corresponds to each separate state of man commissioned on two different occasions. The first half of sloka 2:12 speaks of the event of taking covenant (3:10)² while in the bodies (vissible) saying as - "*Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these kings in the battle field...*" thus distinguishing the visible bodies as - I, thou, the kings..., and thus stressing on the point of visibility and the second half speaks to mean as that death of man is not an end within itself but there is a further eternal life for him saying as- "*and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist*". Thus it is emphasising on the point that every one of us will have a life in paraloka after leaving this world.

Man dissolved into prakriti (first death)

Before discussing on sloka 2:28, let me remind you that all mankind (including all those that have appeared and passed away and those that are yet to come until the Dooms day) was brought into existence in paraloka all at once and God made a covenant (3:10)². In this covenant a condition was laid down that man should perform Karma as according to His biddings on the earth, for which act of obedience

-
1. a) Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these rulers of men: and no one of us will hereafter cease to exist. -Gita 2:12
b) Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen and their end unseen again. Why any lamentation regarding them? -Gita 2:28
 2. Having created mankind before, along with sacrifices [Divine injunctions] The Praja pati said- by these shall ye prosper, these are to you your disire yielding sources. -Gita 3:10

he would attain Moksha (3:19)¹. From this point it can be well ascertained that those who work contrary to this, for them there is no - Moksha.

Now let us see about sloka 2:28. This speaks about the another state of man. After taking this covenant all mankind was dissolved and merged into prakriti. Thus mankind was put under the control of prakriti (9:8)². Man is made up of two main components (1) Body and (2) Atma (soul). Prakriti is also of two compartments. The one visible and perishable for visible and perishable body known as APARA PRAKRITI (7:4) and the other invisible and imperishable for invisible and imperishable Atma, known as PARA PRAKRITI(7:5). Thus the visible body of man was merged into the Apara Prakriti, and the invisible soul is preserved in para prakriti. Thus the mankind which did exist once (may be it for a short time) in, perceptible forms (visible forms) at the time of taking covenant, has been transformed into the state of invisibility of sloka 2:28³: and when they take birth in the world they become visible. And after their death they pass again into the prakriti where they remain again invisible.

For performance of karma, term of life on earth is given only once

I invite your attention towards the three states of man as described in sloka 2:28.

1. Beings have their beginning unseen (Before birth)

-
1. Therefore, without attachment, constantly perform the karma, which should be done (as prescribed in sastras); for performing karma without attachment, man attains Moksha. -Gita 3:19
 2. Resorting to my prakriti I again and again send forth all kinds of beings in groups (which are) helplessly put under the control of prakriti. -Gita 9:8
 3. Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen and their end unseen again... -Gita 2:28

2. Their middle seen (After birth)

3. And their end unseen again (After death)

In all the three states of man, his existence is emphasised. Before his birth he was present but unseen: after his birth he appears in the form of a man: and after his death again attains the invisible state. Yet existence is not denied. Thus ever since the mankind was created, after its dissolution into the prakriti awaiting for their turn (in invisible state) for the life on the earth to perform karma to get Moksha. This is regarding them that have not yet taken their birth. And those that have passed away from this world are awaiting for the judgement of their karma (after death) in the same invisible state as that of prior to their birth.

Thus according to this sloka (2:28)¹ man gets his chance of performing karma on the earth only once. And another important point which can be noticed from this sloka is that man came on the earth in the form of a human being NOT as a RESULT FOR HIS PREVIOUS KARMAS done, being in some other form (Janma) nor he gets some other form (Janma) as a result for his deeds (Karma) of this present life. Because according to sloka under discussion he remains in imperceptible (AVYAKTA) states in both former and latter periods except in the middle which is a temporary term of life given on earth for the performance of Karma. Thus this sloka rules out the false notion that man goes on getting Janma after Janma till he attains Moksha.

Were it a truth that man gets Janma after Janma, until he attains Moksha, he could ever have been present in one form or the other (visible) contrary to the invisible states as described in this sloka.

Prakriti is womb for out coming of all beings

-
1. Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen, and their end unseen again... -Gita 2:28

From the fore going points, it is made clear that the entire mankind had been created at once in the beginning of the creation and was merged into prakriti.

A. Having first created mankind... -3:10

B. Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these kings in the battle field... -2:12

C. Begins have their beginning unseen... -2:28

Thus the mankind has been put under the control of prakriti in the state of invisibility (2:28) where from, it takes its second state (of visibility- manifestation in body) on earth.

So this prakriti can be termed as the womb for the out coming of man on earth for the performance of his Karma- "... *Having reached this transient, joyless world, do thou worship me*". (9:33)- So according as to His will, God brings forth (sends) man from this prakriti.

Resorting to my prakriti I again and again send forth all kinds of beings in groups which are helplessly put under the control of prakriti. -Gita 9:8

Resorting to My prakriti = According as to My nature of creating mankind (or)

According as to My procedure adapted in sending the mankind (into the world)

PUNAH PUNAH (again and again) to mean here 'group after group' (a group - again a group - and again a group, so on)

VISRUJAMI create = send forth into the world.

KRUTHSNAM every kind of = All kinds of

BHOOTHA GRAAMAM groups of living beings (Animals - Fish, Birds, Plants necessary for the sustenance of mankind) including mankind.

Some interpret punah punah (again and again) to mean as Janma after Janma which is not correct according to our findings. These points have been discussed in our coming pages.

So the above sloka can be reproduced as here under -

According to my procedure (Adapted in sending mankind into the world), I again and again (groups wise) send forth all kinds of beings (which are) helplessly put under the control of prakriti. -Gita 9:8

As we said above that all kinds of animals, birds, fish and plants and all such other things as are necessary for man have been provided for his sustenance on earth can be seen from the following sloka.

O Arjuna! By me as supervisor, prakriti brings forth the moving and the unmoving: by this cause the world revolves -Gita 9:10

Moving = Animals, birds, fish etc (including man)

Unmoving = Plants, trees and all necessary things

And again

O Arjuna! All kinds of beings (whatever) are born; for them all, the mulaprakriti is the womb and I the seed giver, am father -Gita 14:4

O Arjuna! The great mula prakriti is my field of origin. In it I place the seed of life and thence occurs the birth of all kinds of beings. -Gita 14:3

*I am the source of all; from me everything evolves, thus thinking
the wise worship me endowed with contemplation*

-Gita 10:8

All above quoted slokas tell in an unequivocal term that the mankind is being brought forth from the prakriti as it is put under its absolute control (9:8)

Invisible beings transform as visible - how?

Well, it is agreed that the mankind, after having been merged into prakriti became invisible (the first state of sloka 2:28)¹ where from it again takes its visible forms on earth (second state of sloka 2:28)¹. Now the question is- how the invisible beings hidden dissolved in prakriti are being transformed into visible state on earth. This transformation, as we know, is not being miraculously given effect to either by means of shedding the beings from above the sky nor by means of causing them to spring from the earth. But for bringing out mankind on earth God has adapted a procedure.

God is creator of all beings

Resorting to my prakriti... 9:8

What is that prakriti (procedure) that God has adapted in sending the mankind on the earth? (or)

How the beings which are kept hidden dissolved in the prakriti (of the first state of 2:28)¹ are being transformed into the second state (manifest in body)?

As regards to this read what Gita says...

1. Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen and their end unseen again. Why any lamentation regarding them? -Gita 2:28

*know me o Partha, as the eternal seed of all beings, I am the
intelligence of the intelligent: and the bravery of the brave.*

-Gita 7:10

'O Partha, know me as the eternal seed of all beings' can be reproduced as here under.

O Partha (know it) I am the eternal seed of all beings

some commentators went so far as to attribute our geneology and ancestry with God taking the literal meaning of- " I am the eternal seed of all beings" to mean as saying that all mankind has been sent forth from that seed which is God Himself. Thus they profess Adwaita (non duality).

So to arrive at its correct interpretation, the first thing that we must know is - whether God Himself is the eternal seed or that God created the eternal seed.

God is dispenser of all faculties

Let us examine the sloka carefully.

We have, in the sloka, three principle clauses which are descriptive as well as figurative.

The sloka is reproduced here under.

O Partha (know it)

*I am the eternal seed of all beings (1) I am the intelligence of
the intelligent (2) (and) I am the bravery of the brave (3)*

Before discussing on the point "The eternal seed", let us first think of the two qualities of man as mentioned in the 2nd and 3rd clauses (viz.) 'intelligence' and 'bravery'. Intelligence means knowledge, wis-

dom and the power of discrimination (denotes to all mental faculties).

Bravery: Bravery of the brave can be calculated by means of courageous acts that one discharges comparing with the cowardly deeds of a coward. So it can be well inferred from 'Bravery of the brave' to have been figuratively spoken about the physical capabilities of man.

Now observe what these two words 'intelligence' and 'bravery' mean to say. These two words collectively convey the meaning as - 'Intellectual and physical capabilities' of man.

So we can interpret the last two clauses 'I am the intelligence of the intelligent and I am the bravery of the brave' to mean as follows.

O Partha (know it) I am the dispenser of the intellectual and physical capabilities to all beings.

*...From me are memory, knowledge, as well as their loss.
-Gita 15:15*

Here we must know that the intelligence and bravery by itself can in no way be attributed to the person of God Himself. In the very same way "I am the eternal seed of all beings" does not mean that God Himself is the eternal seed, but to mean as 'I am the creator of the eternal seed'.

Man is eternal - but not like God

So it is made known that God is the Creator of the eternal seed. Eternal seed of all beings apply to all creatures in general, but here it refers to mankind in particular. Eternal means- a being free from end. So it is continual as well. So the seed is eternal as well as unending. These two meanings very aptly applicable to. Unending seed in the sense, that ever since it began to produce, it is going on producing

continuously and the question of cessation comes only on the Dooms Day. (Thus its progeny continues until the Dooms Day). And it is eternal in the sense, - its posterity is blessed with eternity. Here we must bear in mind the difference between the eternity of God and the eternity of Man. Man's eternity is not like the eternity of God. There is inconceivable difference between these two. God is self subsistent but man is created by God. God is independent of all and of every thing- but man is wholly dependant on the will and the Mercy of God. God in His Majesty is an INFINITE BEING while man is conferred with finite abilities. In brief the eternity bestowed on man is subject to the will of God.

Death inevitable

Then does it mean that there is no death for man?

True it is that death is appointed for man just as his birth. One who is born, must have to taste death too. Death is an inevitable process by which man has to pass through. So it is sure that man has to die and it is stressingly mentioned in all the scriptures too. Medical science also admits 'death'. If this be the case, where is the eternity for man? This is where most often we err. We have mistaken the meaning of death for complete destruction of man. In fact, death is only a transfer of man from Ihaloka to Paraloka: or in other words- TRANSFORMATION of the visible body into the invisible state (the third state of 2:28)¹. To say in clearer terms that death is the cessation of the appointed term (of life) given to man for the performance of Karma on earth which is, as a matter of fact not the end of the life as most of us think, but it is the first entrance to the eternal life to come. This is why it is said in the sloka that why lamentation for such a life (2:27)²

1. Beings have their beginning unseen- I state before birth. , their middle seen- II state after birth and their end unseen again - III state-after death. -Gita 2:28
2. One who has taken his birth is sure to die. And after death one is sure to take birth again... -Gita 2:27. **A Similar verse from Qur'an...** -... He gave you life, and then He will cause you to die, then restore you to life... -Qur'an 2:28

First seed of Gita is first man of Qur'an & Bible

Now let us go back to our discussions which we are making to find out that what procedure that God has adapted in bringing out the mankind on earth. In this regard our analytical observation on sloka 7:10 under discussion revealed the fact that 'God created the eternal seed of all beings'.

The seed of all beings = (let us think of only mankind) the seed from which all mankind takes birth. Thus the whole mankind is the offspring of only one seed. So every man's ancestry reaches to the first seed. Thus the first seed is the progenitor of all mankind. In this way there is no variation from man to man. None is superior to another. And none is inferior by birth. All are equal, in the sense, of one's own nature of being a man. Thus there is no chance for the racial or sectarian divisions or discriminations claiming superiority over one another on the casteism basis. Of course, variations in status, knowledge, and physical abilities became inevitable, as all such variations among mankind have been conferred by God Himself for the smooth running of the world.

This seed of Gita very reasonably bears significance to the first couple sent on earth according to both Bible and Qur'an. Here the first couple of Qur'an is figuratively compared with the eternal seed. Just as a seed germinates and produces a tree, which again produces a great number of such seeds as again each seed of these, produces a tree like of it again, the process which continues endlessly multiplying innumerable- so also through this one couple (seed) the entire mankind has been appointed to come into the world.

First couple - created miraculously

From the foregoing explanations it is proved that God created 'The seed of all beings' (7:10). This seed refers to one couple each

from every kind of its beings. Thus every kind of beings have been appointed to come into the world through its respective couple. Thus every couple became the first of its kind. Every couple being the first, it goes without saying that they (the first couples) had no parents. This implies the fact that they had been created miraculously.

Thus along with man and his spouse, the couples of all creatures came into existence and their off-spring not only became food for man but also their services were utilized by him in all necessary matters such as the production of food (cultivation) and the transportation and travelling purposes etc: Not only this, but those animals have been sacrificed (in Yagna) for the pleasure of God as according to His injunctions. However this process is being continued and will continue for ever. Thus every creature and thing became subservient to man and man attained a place of supremacy over all¹.

Matter plus spirit becomes living being (Jeevatma)

Now the question is that how the mankind is being brought out of the Prakriti in which it is kept hidden dissolved (9:8)². Man eats food which is being produced from Prakriti (nature). The food thus

1. **A.** And the cattle too he has created: you find in them warmth and (other) uses; and some of them you eat. And in them there is beauty for you when you bring them home in the evening, and when you drive them forth to pasture in the morning. And they carry your loads to a land which you could not reach except with great hardship to yourselves. Surely your Lord is compassionate, Merciful. And he has created horses and mules and asses that you may ride them and as a source of beauty. And He will create what you do not (yet) know. After this revelation till now, so many new things have been invented which were not in or knowledge. This is not the end, but many more things may be invented. This is the meaning of the verse 'And He will create what you do not (yet) know of the Qur'an. -Qur'an 16:5-8
- B.** Call unto me and I will answer thee, and shew the great and mighty things which thou knowest not. -Bible - Jermiah 33:3
2. Resorting to my prakriti I again and again send forth all kinds of beings in groups (which are) helplessly put under the control of prakriti. -Gita 9:8

we eat transforms into necessary sperm and when it associates with the ova of female (in the course of cohabitation), she conceives and a structure of body develops within the womb. Thus the physical bodies are given shape in the womb. This process is done by the potency abstracted from Apara Prakriti.

Such is the knower of the unseen and the seen, the mighty, the merciful, who has created and he began the creation of man from clay. Then he made his progeny from an extract of an insignificant fluid. Then he fashioned him and breathed into him of his spirit. -Qur'an 32:6-9

In this regard, the following sloka of Gita may be referred

Beings are born of food; food is produced from rain; rain arises from sacrifice (Yagna); sacrifice is born of action; action arises from vedas; vedas are born from the imperishable Brahma; Therefore know that the supreme being is established in sacrifice (Yagna). -Gita 3:14-15

Now let us consider that how the life (Atma) enters into the body in the womb.

We read in Gita 15:7

A ray of myself, the eternal jiva in the world of jivas attracts the senses with manas (Mind) the sixth, abiding in prakriti. -Gita 15:7

To know the correct meaning of the above sloka let us examine carefully.

'MYSELF' (Sanskrit Text - Mam Amsa) : If it were to be taken as one word as pronoun, it becomes a source for confusion. The whole sloka gets ambiguity.

A known fact is that in Gita 'Self' is referred to Atma (soul). In

this sloka it is attributed as 'the eternal Jiva' which is to mean 'Atma' which is further described as My Amsa- Myself. Therefore MYSELF may be taken as two separate words. My (as possessive pronoun) and Self (as noun) for Atma (soul). Then it means to read as- My Atma (soul): Here also there is ambiguity. This may also be twisted to mean 'Atma' (soul of man) as an integral part of God's own Being. Thus Adwaita (Non-duality or unity) may be professed.

So, according to me, My Soul (Atma), shows God's owner-ship over soul (Atma). My soul here used, just as 'My pen' of the following example.

Example: I write with my pen. Here the pen with which I write cannot be an integral part of my own being. So is the case with 'My Soul' of the sloka. 'A ray of My Soul' is explained in its subsequent clause- as, 'The ancient Jiva (life)'. Where does it come from? - 'it comes from the world of Jivas' (This is para prakriti of 7:5). So the first line of the sloka 'A ray of My self the eternal Jiva, in the world of Jivas' means as- 'The ancient soul which was preserved in the para prakriti'. (What does it do?)

'Attracts the senses with manas (mind) the sixth, abiding in prakriti'. This is to mean as saying- 'Associates the body in the womb, which happens to be a developing structure as a result of cohabitation of the couple by the potency acquired from food which is produced from apara prakriti'.

To say in clear terms, the soul of man which was preserved in para prakriti, by the command of God, associates with its respective body in the womb.

Thus the matter plus spirit becomes a living being (Jiva-Atma)

Kalpakshaya (doomsday) - Kalpadi (Resurrection)

Again we read in Gita 7:6

Know this prakriti (Apara Prakriti 7:4 (+) Para Prakriti 7:5) to be the womb of all beings; I am the source of the out coming of the whole universe; and likewise the source of its dissolution -Gita 7:6

The above sloka explains that the mankind which has been kept under the control of prakriti (9:8) is being brought again into existence from the prakriti by His command and goes back to the prakriti after its death by His command. This process continues till the last group of mankind comes into the world.

Then PRALAYA will take place. On that Day all those living beings that exist on that Day at once die. This Day is described as KALPA-KSHAYA. Thus the whole mankind those that die on Kalpakshya and those that already died before this, remain together in an imperceptible and senseless state the third state of 2:28¹ till kalpadi, the Day of second creation. On that Day all mankind right from the first couple to the last group of people who died and remained under imperceptible state (Third state of 2:28)¹ at once will be brought forth again from prakriti. Thus the whole mankind will be resuscitated. This Day is called the Day of Resurrection (KALPADI).

Thus we read in Gita 9:7

O Arjuna! All beings at the end of kalpa (kalpa-kshaya) go into my prakriti; and create them (bring them forth) again at the beginning of the kalpa (kalpadi) -Gita 9:7

1. Beings have their beginning unseen (invisible) I State- before birth. Their middle seen (visible) II state- after birth. And their end unseen (Invisible) III state- after death. -Gita 2:28

It may be noted that all mankind will be raised and assembled on the Day of Resurrection which is according to Gita KALPADI (The beginning of the Kalpa, the second creation). On that day every one of us will be raised to life again with these very physical bodies in which we are living today with all same faculties and senses such as have been conferred upon us in this present state of life. This is what the above sloka stressingly says about- "And create them (bring them forth) again" (9:7).

One should not mistake the words "Create them again" of 9:7 to have been spoken about those who die on Kalpakshya. No, it is not said particularly about them only, but it is said in general to mean for the entire mankind as a general Resurrection.

Changes that man undergoes between his first creation and second

To understand whether -Resurrection (Kalpadi) will be of

1. entire mankind,
2. with their former physical bodies
3. in a visible state,

the examination of sloka 2:12 is very essential

Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these kings in the battle field, and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist. -Gita 2:12

And at the same time we must bear in mind the sloka 2:28 also which has a close connection with the sloka 2:12, and is helpful to bring out the facts.

Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen and their end unseen again... -Gita 2:28

Sloka 2:12 makes mention of three periods of mankind, while sloka 2:28 mentions three states (of mankind). In all the three periods man's existence in physical body (visible and with senses) is affirmed in the former sloka 2:12. In between these three periods there are two intervals which are two separate states of latter sloka 2:28.

Three periods of man - visible in physical bodies

Ist period: as according to sloka 2:12

"I, thou, and the kings in the battle field" did exist once before coming into the world.

Q1. When and where did we exist?

Ans: Before sending into the world, God created all mankind all at once and made (or) took a covenant. This was our first creation (for this Gita 3:10 may be referred)¹

Q2. Were we not in physical bodies (visible and with senses) at our first creation?

Ans: Yes. At our first creation, we were all in physical bodies (visible and with senses) in the very same state as we are today. This point is precisely corroborated by this sloka 2:12 by saying that "I, thou, the kings in the battle field did exist once" Thus distinguishing and discriminating their bodies in their individual and personal identity as- I, thou, the kings... our existence in physical (visible) bodies at the first creation is affirmed. Discrimination of beings is possible only when they are in physical forms (visible) the fact of which is note worthy.

1. Having created mankind before, along with sacrifices (Divine orders), the Prajapati said- by these shall ye prosper, these are to you your desire yielding sources. -Gita 3:10

Three states of man - Two invisible and one visible

Q3. Then after taking the covenant what happened to the mankind?

Ans: All mankind was dissolved and merged into prakriti. Thus whole mankind transformed into invisible state. (This fact can be disclosed by reading sloka 3:10 together with 9:8)¹. This is the first state as mentioned in sloka 2:28² saying as "... *Beings have their beginning unseen...* to mean as saying that we all were in imperceptible state before coming into this world. This is the first state of man under sloka 2:28² and first interval between the first period of man and the second period (on earth after birth).

2nd PERIOD: AS ACCORDING TO SLOKA 2:12² AND SLOKA 2:28² (After birth - on earth)

SECOND STATE AND SECOND PERIOD COMMON - VISIBLE FOR PERFORMANCE OF KARMA

God sends forth (creates) the mankind which is thus kept under the control of prakriti, in groups after groups (9:8). And thus mankind becomes visible and reappear on earth (after birth). This is the second period and second state of sloka 2:12³ and sloka 2:28² respectively.

1. A. Having created mankind before, along with sacrifices, (Here divine commandments) the Prajapati said- by these shall ye prosper, these are to you your desire yielding sources. -Gita 3:10 B. Resorting to my prakriti I again and again send forth all kinds of beings in groups (which are) helplessly put under the control of prakriti -Gita 9:8. 2. Beings have their beginning unseen (invisible) I State- before birth. Their middle seen (visible) II state- after birth. And their end unseen (invisible) III state- after death. -Gita 2:28 3. Never did I not exist nor thou nor these rulers of men in paraloka before coming into the world) I Period visible forms. II Period is not mentioned in this sloka. yet I, thou, the kings in this battle field are present in the world in visible forms can be taken as II Period; and no one of us will hereafter cease to exist. III Period - visible forms.

This is the middle and common period and common state of mankind respectively. "*I, Thou, The kings in battle field (here represents to all mankind of all times living on earth)*" 2:12 "... *Their middle seen...*" (2:28).

This middle or second state of both the slokas, is ephemeral just given for the performance of Karma on earth. As soon as this term of life is completed, man dies and goes back to prakriti from where he comes. Thus he remains again in an invisible state. (Third state of 2:28 and second interval between 2nd and 3rd periods, of 2:12).

THIRD PERIOD- VISIBLE IN BODIES TO REAP THE CONSEQUENCES OF KARMA

(after PRALAYA)

Then after PRALAYA, again on the day of Resurrection (KALPAADI) all mankind will be resuscitated and raised from the earth (Prakriti). Thus mankind will appear again on earth. (This is the third period of sloka 2:12).

Three different periods of man's existence have been described in this sloka (2:12). In all the three periods man's existence in one's own individual capacity with individual identity is evident from this sloka.

Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these kings in the battle field; and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist.

-Gita 2:12

Thus it is made clear that on the day of Resurrection (Kalpadi) all mankind will be gathered and assembled in their respective bodies with which they appeared on earth and did Karma.

Q. A curious question is that why this assembly is appointed?

Ans: To award Moksha.

Q. What is Moksha? (and)

What will happen to them that do not get Moksha?

What does Moksha mean?

Before discussing on the point that what Moksha is, let us know the literal meaning of Moksha.

According to Sankar Narayana Dictionary the following meanings are given for the word Moksha.

1. Liberation 2. Emancipation 3. Deliverance 4. Release 5. Release from worldly existence 6. Final emancipation 7. Exemption from further birth or transmigration 8. Beatitude 9. Eternal bliss or happiness 10. Discharging (as an arrow) 11. Liberation of the eclipsed sun or moon.

The above literal meanings of Moksha can be classified under four (4) categories according as its usage and conveyance of the meanings basing on the context.

1. Liberation, emancipation, deliverance, release...

all these words carry (more or less) the same meaning as Liberation.

2. Release from worldly existence, final emancipation or exemption from further birth or transmigration. "Release from worldly existence" - is not descriptive for death; but expressive of final emancipation" or "exemption from further birth" or "exemption from transmigration of soul to another body". So all these meanings refer to the Doctrine of Janma after Janma. (The doctrine of transmigration of soul

from one body to so many other bodies after the death of each of such bodies - until the soul merges in God). In our former chapter, according as to sloka 2:28, it is proved that after death, man (Body+Soul) goes into the state of imperceptibility until as the kalpadi takes place on which day all beings will be resuscitated (9:7) and appear again in their former bodies with which they performed Karma in this world (2:12); thus there is no transmigration of Soul.

So this second category (of meanings deprives of consideration in the discussion of Moksha.

3. Beatitude, eternal bliss or happiness. This state of being happy is possible only after one is liberated.

4. Discharging (as an arrow); liberation of the eclipsed sun or moon. However this fourth category also becomes irrelevant to our present arguments.

Hence - We arrived at as;

Moksha = Liberation

We have "Mukti or Vimukti" another word in Gita used in par with the word Moksha. So according to Gita and in literal aspect as well Mukti- Vimukti and Moksha convey the same meaning for liberation.

In addition to above we have so many words and phrases (clauses) in Sanscrit text substituted as synonyms for Mukti or Moksha which have frequently been used in Gita such as:

Some synonyms for Moksha:

1. PARAM GATHIM (Supreme Goal) 16:23, 3:29, 8:12-13

2. PARAM (Supreme)	3:19
3. SIDHAM (or) SAM SIDHAM (Success-triumph)	3:4, 3:20, 8:15
4. SREYASKARA (Beneficial)	5:2
5. BRAHMANIRVANAM (Beatitude-Heavenly bliss)	2:72
6. JARA MARANA MOKSHAYA (old age) (death) (deliverance)	7:29
7. AMRUTA TVAYAH (eternal or imperishable)	2:15
8. SASVATAM PADAM or STHANAM (eternal abode)	18:56, 18:62
9. MAM YANTI or MAM ETI (attains Me - reaches Me)	4:9, 11:55, 7:23, 9:25

Thus from the above referred slokas of Gita, it is made known that a series of words and phrases (clauses) whether they be of descriptive or figurative in nature, have been used as synonyms for the place attainable after one gets Moksha or Mukti-liberation.

Moksha is mistaken for cessation of re-birth

Now a curious, yet pertinent question is -

What is (Liberation) Moksha or Mukti?

Taking the literal meanings of some figurative or descriptive words used as synonyms for Moksha such as have been referred above

and some other phrases which we will discuss in coming pages, a very peculiar doctrine of Moksha - as cessation of soul's transmigration into another body and thus one who is liberated from further birth merges in God, became more popular than what actual Moksha is.

This doctrine is the outcome of the speculation derived by taking the wrong interpretations of some slokas, that man, nay the soul goes on getting Janma after Janma till it attains Moksha, that is liberation from further birth or cessation of the cycle of birth and death and rebirth.

If this doctrine is accepted - man goes on getting Janma after Janma and thus remains in one form or the other in this world, till he merges in God. Thus there are only two alternatives for the departed souls - either they attain some other form in new Janma or merge in God. Thus there is no chance for a third place.

So, in the light of this logic, let us examine that how far this doctrine can withstand in the noble teachings of Sri Paramatma as recorded in Gita.

No Moksha - yet pitrus have not attained re-birth... why?

Read the following sloka.

Those who worship Devatas will attain Devatas; Those that worship the ancestors will attain the ancestors, those who worship the evil spirits will attain the evil spirits; those that worship me will attain me. -Gita 9:25

In the above sloka it is warned that if anybody worships any other being whether it be a Devata or an Evil Spirit leaving God alone or along with Him just following in the foot steps of one's own ancestors, will attain the place where his ancestors are. But if, one worships the Lord, he will surely attain the place - a lofty place where one can

have the meeting with his Lord. In this sloka the worship of pitrus (ancestors) means following in their foot steps. They have set an example of worshipping devatas and evil spirits and left behind them a very bad path on which a great majority of people are blindly following. If the Pitrus (ancestors) of this sloka were really the virtuous ones, should they have not gone to a transcendental place - the place where one gets the bliss and beatitude? But instead they have been allotted an evil place where they are awaiting to welcome (receive) their followers too.

According to this sloka, though not the place of ancestors is specifically mentioned as evil, it is evident from the disgusting speech expressed, saying as "Those that worship the Pitrus (ancestors) attain the place of ancestors and the worshippers of Me attain Me". Thus a distinction between the two places is also disclosed. The former is an infernal one while the latter is a blissful and transcendental one.

Let us now go back to our arguments to know whether there is really transmigration of soul to another body if it were not eligible to merge in God. If this doctrine were to be a truth, could the pitrus (ancestors) have not attained a rebirth where they move along with their succeeding generations in some new forms unnoticed by them as their ancestors? However this sloka makes it clear that an evil abode is reserved for the ancestors where their succeeding generations (followers) following in their foot steps will reach them. Whatever be the fate of the ancestors or their followers - what we know from this sloka is that neither the pitrus (ancestors) attained rebirth in this world, nor their followers will get rebirth but go and join the place where their pitrus are. Thus there is no Janma after Janma.

If God's saying "Yanti Mam" (attains Me) is taken to mean as merging into God according to prevailing Moksha doctrine, what wrong is there if any one interpret, under the authority of this sloka (9:25) that those who worship Deatas will be merged into Devatas,

and those that worship Bhutas (any existing being, animated or inanimated, other than Devatas) will be merged into Bhutas and those that worship their Pitrus (ancestors) will be merged into the ancestors? Are Devatas and Bhutas competent enough to allow their bhaktas (worshippers) to merge into themselves allowing not them to take another birth, in this world, if the doctrine were true? And how and why were the ancestors not given rebirth but left in a special place allotted for them in their own individuality as the ancestors? As according to this doctrine either man should merge in God or go on taking birth after birth. But here the case is quite contrary. So from all these angles, in the light of this sloka (9:25) the doctrine is proved to be ridiculous.

Expecting to merge in God for Moksha?

Just for argument's sake, if some clauses such as "mam-eti" and "Yanti Mam" (attains Me) were to be taken to mean as saying that man merges in God is accepted, I would like to ask (that) are not we at present living in God-Himself? Then what more merging is necessary if the doctrine were true?

Observe what Gita says in this regard

1. *Know that highest purusha, O son of Pritha, within whom all beings dwell, by whom all this is pervaded is attainable by exclusive devotion -8:22*
2. *There is naught else higher than I, O Dhananjaya: in Me all this is woven as clusters of gems on a string -7:7*
3. *By Me all this World is pervaded, my form unmanifested. All beings dwell in Me, and I do not dwell in them -9:4*

In all the above three slokas it is made clear that (1) All beings dwell in God and (2) that God is all pervading. The literal meaning of these two clauses explicitly points out that every being is dwelling in

God Himself which point rules out the further necessity of merging into God; and as God is all pervading the question of attaining (reaching) Him again to get Moksha as a necessary means becomes meaningless. Does this point not disqualify the doctrine of Moksha - as merging into God?

It may be noted that the above three slokas, as a matter of fact figurative, which we will discuss else where. We have taken up these three just to show that how the literal meaning of any figurative speech contradicts the other speculations formed by the same process.

From the fore going arguments it is made clear that Moksha does not mean the liberation from rebirth or cessation from the transmigration of soul to another body, nor does it mean the merging of soul into the supreme personality of God. Then what does Moksha mean?

One who is not liable for hell, is eligible for Moksha

A well known fact is that to attain eternal bliss one should get Moksha (Liberation). This implies the fact that man must be liberated. So from what one should be liberated? From the burden of sins. One must be forgiven of his sins. This is emancipation.

He who knows me as unborn and beginningless, as the great Lord of the Worlds, he among mortals is undeluded, he is liberated from all sins. -Gita 10:3

In this sloka, a remedy to get oneself liberated from all his sins is shown. That is that one should believe God as unborn, and beginningless (eternal) and as the Lord of all the worlds. The majority of commentators have the false notion that each world is being ruled by its own Lord, for example world of sun by sun-god, world of Brahma (Brahmaloka) by Brahma as its Lord, Indraloka by Indra and so on. It is condemned here by God saying (I am) the Great Lord of Worlds.

So the Lordship of all the worlds exclusively belongs to God alone. (There is naught else higher than I... (7:7). Thus with explicit faith on God man becomes pure- free from all his past sins which he did before believing God, with His specific attributes as pointed out in this sloka - as unborn (Not begotten) and eternal and great Lord of all worlds. "Say- He is Allah, the One; He begets not nor is he begotten and there is none like unto him" (Qur'an 112:1,3,4). Thus this faith is the first condition that God has laid down for the forgiveness of the sins. So this point also discloses the fact that a sinful man cannot attain the blissful place. So one must become pure- forgiven of his sins (first Point to attain bliss).

And again one must guard himself from committing sins, thereafter as far as possible.

KAMAH = Lust or desire (unlawful desires)

KRODHAH = Anger

LOBHAH = Miserliness or greed

These three qualities are described as three gates to Hell (Narakah). Any of the three makes a man blind and mad. These three or any one of them is conducive in prompting the perpetrator to commit any kind of unlawful deed (sin) with no distinction whatever.

We read in Gita.

There are three (Gunaas) which lead to the gate of Hell (Narakah), destructive of the soul: lust, anger and miserliness (or greed). Therefore, these three one should abandon.

-Gita 16:21

Three Gunas (Qualities) which lead man to Hell are described. They are destructive of the Soul. As a matter of fact there is no destruction to soul (2:23) whatever torments may be given to it either in

Hell or anywhere. Then to whom the destruction is? To the man who will be raised to life again on the day of Kalpadi (9:7) with the same former body with which he perpetrated the unlawful acts (Karmas) under the impulse of these three gunas (qualities) while he was living on the earth (2:12). However this argument needs a comprehensive discussion for which a complete chapter is allotted which can be seen elsewhere in coming pages. Some have interpreted the word "Lobhah" as greed and others as miserliness. According to dictionary both meanings can be applied. So either greed or miserliness or both can be taken for granted because, as according to me, meanings may literally differ, but the result of both the words is one and the same. If "greed" is an object its image is miserliness. If miserliness is taken as object, its image is greed. Thus in the mirror of logic the one word may be object and the other may be image and vice versa.

Now let us take note of what message this sloka gives-

"Therefore, these three, one should abandon"

Why should one abandon these three?

"These three lead to the gate of Hell, a place of destruction"

Now examine its successive sloka

A man who is released from these three gates to Hell, O Son of Kunti, does good to the self and thereby reaches the supreme goal (attains Moksha) -Gita 16:22

A MAN WHO IS RELEASED FROM THESE THREE GATES TO HELL- means "one who is protected (saved) from Hell or, one who is escaped from entering into Hell" (II point to attain Moksha)

DOES GOOD TO THE SELF - (means) " is most fortunate one"

(Why fortunate?)

THEREBY REACHES THE SUPREME GOAL- (means) by escaping from Hell, the fortunate one attains the supreme goal (Moksha).

In this sloka, it is made clear that one who is not liable for Hell is eligible for Moksha. Paradoxically, one who is not eligible for Moksha, is liable for Hell. This implies the fact that the man who does not attain Moksha will be cast into foul Hell, but does not take rebirth. Thus there is no Janma after Janma.

Not merging in God - but attaining Swarga is Moksha

Thus we came to know that liberation from Narakah (Hell) itself is Moksha or Mukti (Liberation). Thus liberated one attains the Param Gatim (Supreme Goal). Thus attaining of supreme goal can be termed as Moksha in the religious terminology.

Now we have to find out what that param gatim (supreme goal) is- is it really merging in God, as many think or profess?

Let us examine Gita

1. *And whoso, at the time of death, thinking of Me alone, leaves the body and goes forth, He reaches Me. There is no doubt in this. -Gita 8:5*
2. *Therefore at all times do thou meditate on me and fight: with mind and reason fixed on me, thou shalt doubtless come to me alone. -Gita 8:7*

The former sloka (8:5) does not mean that one should remember God, - only at the time of one's own death, but that infers to mean that one should constantly remember God and constantly engaged in the performance of the Karma enjoined upon by God, until one's own death. (This meaning can be derived by reading together with its successive sloka 8:7).

Thinking of me alone: This does not mean that one should restrain himself from the memory of any other thing. But what it explains is - that one should not think of any body in the capacity or status of God. That means one should not worship any other being whether living or dead; great or small, Devata or Evil spirit - None, because "There is naught else higher than I..."(7:7)

In this way it is made clear that if any one wants- TO REACH GOD that he should be a devotee of God alone, performing the Nish Kama Karma as long as one lives in this world.

In the latter sloka 8:7 fighting with enemy has been enjoined upon believers to protect Dharma or in the cause of Dharma. (I shall discuss about Dharma and Battle for Dharma elsewhere). This battle is as devout and pious as any other YOGA- YAGNA- SACRIFICE, nay- it is even greater because, in this battle one comes forward even to give his life in sacrifice for the protection of Dharma. Thus there can be no greater sacrifice than one's own participation in the Devine Battles. And therefore the reward for such warriors is also greater.

For them the gates of Swarga (Heaven) are wide open.

Killed, thou wilt reach heaven (Swarga): victorious thou wilt enjoy the earth. Wherefore O son of Kunti, arise, resolved to fight. -Gita 2:37

As per sloka 8:7 it is proved that those who meditate on God and fight in the service of God would attain God. And further, through

sloka 2:37 it became evident that those that die in the field of battle while fighting with enemy for the protection of Dharma would attain Swarga (Heaven). The reward declared for Self Sacrifice Yagna is Swarga (Heaven). Hence, attaining God is attaining Swarga where a devotee can have meeting with his Lord. However these points conclusively affirm that merging in God is not Moksha but attaining Swarga is Moksha.

Term of life given for performance of Karma is transitory

In continuation to our arguments that man does not take rebirth if he were not eligible for Moksha; and Moksha is not merging into God; but attaining Swarga, we would like to forward our arguments in another way as follows :

Your attention is invited towards the second verse of the sloka 9:33.

...Having attained this transient and joyless world, do thou worship me. -Gita 9:33

In this verse the nature of this world is described. It is (1) Transient and (2) Joyless. And at the same time an ordinance of God, that one should worship Him is stressed.

However this verse means as saying, that man who has been given this transitory and joyless world, should worship God, being in it. And again tolerance which is the highest virtue which helps one to acquire God's mercy and forgiveness is indirectly taught by pointing out on the nature of this world as joyless. Joyless world means comfortless and unhappy with full of miseries which are inducive to reactionary attitude in man by nature where man must need become more patient. Then how long all these one should endure? Here God consoles His Bhaktas by saying that they have to endure this joyless

world for a very short period by stressing on the point- "the world is transient".

Now the question is- is this world really transient as mentioned in this sloka? No- This world was created even before the creation of mankind, and so many YUGAS have been passed away ever since it has been brought into existence, and so many YUGAS (God knows) have yet to pass, and it will remain until the Dooms-Day (Kalpakshaya) and even upto the Day of Resurrection (Kalpadi). And if this be the fact with the duration (longevity of the world) how can it be transient?

Then is the existence of man transient? No- Man has been created with eternity conferred upon him (2:12). Death is not an end of the existence of man, but only an interval (in invisibility 2:28) between the worldly life and the life to come after resurrection on Kalpadi (9:7). These points have been discussed in our previous chapter, which need no repetition.

Hence it is made clear that neither the world nor the man's existence is transient. Then what is it that is transient of this sloka? If we study Gita keeping in view of this verse, it can be disclosed that the life given to man on earth for the performance of Karma- is transient (*Do thou worship Me* 9:33).

Thus it is made clear that the TERM OF LIFE granted for man for the PERFORMANCE of Karma is transitory but not the longevity of man. Does this point not prove that there shall be no RENEWAL of term of life for the performance of Karma again as it is confined by the word TRANSIENT. To say in clear terms that there shall be no further chance for the performance of Karma when once this transient term is slipped off from our hands.

Act - Act in the living present

Do all these points not prove conclusively that man should strive hard to attain Moksha while yet living in this world only? Does this not stressingly point out that one should make oneself eligible for Moksha even before the expiry of the term granted?

Examine the following sloka of Gita that how it corroborates with our above views.

He that is able, while still here, to withstand, before liberation from the body, the impulse of Kama (unlawful desires) and Krodha (anger) He is Yogin, He is happy man. -Gita 5:23

In this sloka that how a man can become Yogi and happy is stated. To become Yogi or happy man, one should be able to withstand the impulse of Kama (unlawful desires) and Krodha (anger). According to slokas 16:21-22¹ Kama and Krodha are stated to be the gates leading to Hell. So one who is able to control these two can easily be saved from Hell (Narakah). So this sloka indirectly warns that one should desist himself from committing any such sin as is enticed by the impulse of these two (Kama and Krodha), so as to attain Moksha.

Here, in this sloka the significance and importance of this transient period is also described. To become a Yogi or happy man (i.e.) to acquire eligibility for Moksha, one should strive "while still here" (means while yet in this world) and again in clear terms it is further stressed as saying- "Before liberation from the body" (meaning before reaching to the end of the term given for the performance of Karma). The sum and substance of this sloka 5:23 is that one should strive to be saved from Narakah (Hell) and to get eligibility for Moksha by

1. There are three (Gunaas) which lead to the gate of Hell (Narakeh) destructive of the soul: lust anger and miserliness (or greed). Therefore, thee three one should abandon. -Gita 16:21

A man who is released from these three gates to Hell, O son of Kunti, does good to the self and there by reaches the supreme goal (attains Moksha)

-Gita 16:22

desisting oneself from committing the sins which are the products of Kama and Krodha even before one's own death.

Some clauses of the sloka 5:23

1. "While still here..." While in this world-
2. "Before liberation from the body" - before one's own death.

Do these two clauses not emphatically establish that there will be no chance to perform Karma, after passing away from here? And does this point not rule out the doctrine of Janma after Janma till Moksha?

3. "He is Yogin" - Yogi is he- the one that has been granted eligibility for Moksha.

4. "(and hence) he is happy man- man cannot be happy here in this world, because it is joyless (9:33). So this assurance for his happiness is not related to this world but of the life to come after resurrection on Kalpadi. To say in clear terms that one can be happy only after attaining Moksha.

Let us examine in another way.

Beings of past, present and future, are not one and the same-

disproves man's revolving in Janma after Janma until Moksha.

In our previous chapter it is made clear that the whole mankind was created in the beginning (3:10)¹ all at once and dissolved into the prakriti where from they are being sent into the world group after group (9:8)² with an appointed term of life for the performance of

1. Having created mankind before... -3:10 2. ... I send forth all beings (Which are) helplessly put under the control of prakriti... (9:8)

karma (9:33)¹. Thus after the completion of their term, beings die and again merge into prakriti where they remain in invisibility until the day of resurrection (kalpadi) (2:28)². And on the dooms day (kalpakshaya) the last group of people also die and merge into prakriti. Thus the whole mankind which had been created in the beginning appears on earth groups-wise and after the completion of the term of life die and disappear until the day of resurrection kalpadi (2:28)². And on that day of resurrection (kalpadi) that whole mankind will be resuscitated and brought forth for the judgement (2:12)³.

What we like to pin point from the above reminder is that the one who once came and departed will never appear again on the earth until Kalpadi. Therefore we can classify the people which are being sent right from the day of creation and will continue to be sent until the day of Kalpakshaya into three categories.

1. Those that came and departed: These people come under the PAST group.
2. Those that came, but not yet departed: These people come under the PRESENT group.
3. Those that have not yet come: but expected to come in future: These people come under FUTURE group.

Now examine the following sloka of Gita.

Know, O Arjuna, the past and the present and the future beings, but Me nobody knows. -Gita 7:26

-
1. ...Having attained this transient and joyless world do thou worship me. -9:33
 2. Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen and their end unseen again... -2:28
 3. Never did I not exist, nor thou nor these rulers of men; and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist. -2:12

In this sloka God says that He knows all beings- beings of past, present and future. Attention is invited. From this point it is perceivable that beings of all these three periods are not one and the same group of people. All these beings are different. The group of beings of PAST is different from those that are PRESENT. And so also this present group of people has nothing to do with the FUTURE group of beings. If were the one group or some groups of people right from the beginning, revolve in the life cycle of birth and death and rebirth, and thus go on getting Janma after Janma constantly, could God ever have distinguished the beings such as of past, present and future? Not at all. Does this only logic not enough to prove the doctrine of Janma after Janma - is an outcome of the misconception of some slokas?

Sloka 9:33 dampens the doctrine of transmigration of soul to various bodies

Yet let us discuss these points in an other way:

According to sloka 9:33, it is said in an unequivocal term that this world is TRANSIENT. If the transmigration of soul were to be a truth, the soul such as undeserved for Moksha, goes on taking Janma after Janma endlessly until it attains Moksha. But, as a matter of fact, its attaining moksha is as impossible for one as to fetch water from the mirage. Because according as to the doctrine of transmigration of soul, if one is given this life (Janma) as a result of his evil Karma of the past Janma, he will have to attain another Janma also for the evil Karma of this Janma. Thus he attains Janma after Janma endlessly. And there will be no cessation of this process of transmigration. And this is what exactly the doctrine means to explain too. If this were to be a fact, man remains in this world in one form or the other endlessly for ever and ever. Thus, under this process, man's remaining in the world itself for ever, contradicts God's saying this world as TRANSIENT. If God's saying this world as transient is taken to be granted the doctrine of

Janma after Janma is ruled out. If the doctrine is taken to be a truth, the word of God saying this world as transient becomes VAGUE.

Let us discuss this in another way:

On seeing any unfortunate or fortunate man, we often hear people say - in the former one's case, as his Purva Janma Dushkrutham, and in the latter one's case, as his Purva Janma Sukrutham. If it were true, in former one's case, the punishment (being unfortunate in this world) given to him for his past Janma Dushkrutham, is as insufficient as the punishment to any murderer who is sentenced of rigorous imprisonment for just a few hours. This is comparatively so because the world is TRANSIENT and so the punishment (being unfortunate man in this Janma) given for the purva Janma Dushkrutham can in no way be more than a few hours of Rigorous imprisonment for a murderer. And in latter one's case (being fortunate in this world) awarding some fortunes as gift in this life for his Purva Janma Sukrutham, can in no way be better than rewarding once in a while of any pleasant thing that one likes while he is undergoing life term imprisonment. Why because this world is joyless for any person just as a prison is joyless for any prisoner. So the fortunes however great they may be, cannot be a source of happiness for his past Janma Sukrutham; as this world is joyless. For argument's sake, even if it is admitted that this world is a happy place for any one's particular case, it cannot be an enjoyable place for his past Janma Sukrutham, because it is just TRANSIENT.

Keeping in view of Justice, it can be well pronounced that this Janma is not given as a punishment for the sins of past Janma (if one were to be unfortunate) nor as a reward for the virtues of past Janma (if one were to be fortunate). So in consideration of these facts the doctrine of Janma after Janma (i.e.) transmigration of soul remains ridiculous.

Soul is such as cannot act - Neither can enjoy nor

suffer - in the light of these facts - The doctrine is re-examined

Now let us examine this doctrine in another way:

A known fact is that man is body plus soul. Without the association of these two (together) with each other, there is no existence for man. Without soul body is said to be a corpse, while without body there is no recognition for the soul as an entity existing. The relationship between these two is interlinked and interdependent just as an electricity and apparatus. Just as mere electricity without any apparatus becomes useless, so also without body mere soul goes unnoticed and vice versa. In the very same manner the soul plus body joined together becomes a living being.

Now the question is that who is the perpetrator and that who is the enjoyer or sufferer - Body or Soul.

Let us pay heed to that what Gita explicitly points out about this.

Whoever looks upon soul as the slayer, and whoever looks upon soul as the slain, both these know not aright. Soul slays not, nor is it slain. -Gita 2:19

The foregoing sloka emphatically says that (1) the soul does not kill and that (2) it cannot be killed.

1. "The soul does not kill..." to mean as saying that soul cannot act, the soul cannot perpetrate any thing. So it cannot be held responsible for any action (karma) done whether it be good or bad, lawful or unlawful whatever.
2. "The soul cannot be killed..." means as saying that the soul neither can enjoy nor can suffer any thing whatever. As regards to this we have other corroborative slokas of Gita which read as follows:

Weapons cannot cut the soul and fire cannot burn it; and to it water wets not and the wind dries not. -Gita 2:23

And again

*Soul cannot be cut, nor burnt, nor wetted, nor dried up...
-Gita 2:24*

From the above slokas it is proved beyond doubt that the soul is neither perpetrator nor the enjoyer nor the sufferer.

If soul is not at all a perpetrator, how can it be held responsible for the acts (Karma) done by man (Body)? Not at all. The soul is not perpetrator and so it is not at all responsible for the Karma: then does it not seem humorous to merge it into the personality of God as Moksha or sending it to another body (transmigration of soul) as a punishment in another Janma?

And what more peculiar is that soul cannot enjoy or suffer any kind of pleasure or torment whatever. If this be the nature of soul does it make any difference whether it be migrated to some other body as punishment for the Karma done by the past body or merged in God's personality as Moksha? Does it make any difference whether it be cast in Hell or Heaven? In view of these facts does the doctrine of transmigration of soul not seem to be mere conjecture?

This doctrine of transmigration of soul is the basis for the existing so called Hinduism (Sanatana Dharma). As regards to this we have discussed in detail and comprehensive manner in the coming chapters. However we have taken up here some of the points which are relevant to the present arguments.

Those that profess this doctrine of transmigration of soul, regard soul as only entity responsible or deserved for Moksha or to enjoy either heavenly pleasures or to suffer hell torments. They regard this

soul as the real 'I' of every individual. So this soul has to attain Moksha if it is so deserved. Otherwise it has to go on transmigration to so many other bodies (Janmas), until it attains Moksha. And at the same time they also say, even if this soul attains Swarga, or Narkah - those places (worlds) are meant for tentative abodes only, where from they come back again to this world and take another body (Janma). This doctrine is however an outcome of speculation formed basing on some slokas which we will discuss in our coming pages.

Doctrines formed on mere speculations cannot offer any decisive and firm stand -but go on Jogging.

So far we have pointed out so many scriptural facts which all disprove this doctrine of transmigration of soul. Yet let us examine in an another way also.

From the foregoing argument it is made clear that soul is not at all a perpetrator. And hence it cannot be held responsible for the Karmas done, and so it is meaningless to award it Moksha or to cause it (soul) to transmigrate into another body. And at the same time, it is also made clear that, as the soul is an entity which cannot either suffer or enjoy, it makes no difference whether Moksha is awarded to it or not.

Now the question is (that) who is the perpetrator? And (that) who is the enjoyer or sufferer?

IT IS BODY

Therefore at all times do thou meditate on me and fight... thou shalt doubtless come to me. -Gita 8:7

In the above sloka, Karma of meditation and Karma of fighting in the battle are enjoined with an assurance of giving Moksha.

Note: Soul cannot meditate and soul cannot fight (2:19)

So it is body that can mediate and fight.

And again

Killed thou wilt reach Heaven; victorious thou wilt enjoy the earth, wherefore, O Arjuna, arise, resolved to fight. -Gita 2:37

In this sloka also Karma of fighting is stressed; and promised that if he were killed while fighting - would attain Swarga (Heaven).

Note: Soul cannot fight (cannot kill) and cannot be killed and cannot enjoy the heaven (2:19, 2:23-24) and so it is body that can fight (kill) and enjoy the heaven, just as it can enjoy the earth if he were to come out victorious (*victorious, thou shalt enjoy the earth 2:37*).

Body without soul becomes a corpse which can neither perpetrate nor can enjoy and nor can suffer anything. Just like for mere soul, it makes no difference, so is the case of a corpse too whether it is cast into hell or rewarded heaven.

So it may be noted that man (body plus soul together) is the real perpetrator who is either liable for punishment in hell or eligible for reward in heaven.

A good inference can be drawn from "killed thou wilt reach heaven; victorious thou wilt enjoy the earth (2:37)" If a man returns victorious from battle field, he will enjoy the earth. Who is it that will enjoy the earth? It is man. Man means a living man possessed of his soul. So also if he is killed in the battle field he will reach Heaven. This infers neither his soul nor his corpse will reach Heaven but the man with his body possessed of his soul just as the victorious man enjoys the earth together with body and soul.

After death man goes into invisibility (2:28). Body decays (vanishes) by means of either cremation or burial. "Dust thou art to dust returnest" (H.W. Long fellow). Thus we are brought forth from Prakriti and go back to Prakriti. And again on the Day of Resurrection (Kalpadi) all dead shall be raised from Prakriti 9:7)¹. Everyone of us will be raised with these same physical bodies with same senses in our own individual capacity and personality as "I, Thou, The Kings of earth" (2:12)²

As a matter of fact, this is a vast subject which we have discussed in our coming chapters. But we have discussed these few points here to show that how this "Doctrine of Transmigration of soul" makes one to run after the soul leaving the body behind, to attain the goal just like a Hockey player who runs towards goal just only with the stick(bat) leaving the ball behind.

BATTLE OF KURUKSHETRA (DHARAM YUDH)

Fought between Dhritarashtrians and Pandavas:

If you ask any person that between whom the battle of Kurukshetra was taken place, the immediate answer you get is- that it was between Kowravas and Pandavas. (this is because, people are taught so).

This answer seems to be ridiculous to any reader of Bhagwad Gita. Study of Gita reveals the fact that it is not correct to say that the Kurukshetra battle was fought between Kowravas and Pandavas, but it was in between two groups of Kowravas themselves. And to say in clearer terms, that it was between the sons of Dharitarashtra and the sons of Pandu. Thus there were two parties engaged in the battle. On

1. O Arjuna! All beings at the end of kalpa (kalpakshya) go into my prakriti; and I create them [bring them forth] again at the beginning of the kalpa (kalpadi). -Gita 9:7
2. Never did I not exist, nor thou nor these rulers of men; and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist. -2:12

any particular reason, if anyone specifically points out as pandavas to one party, the other party is not justified to be called as Kowravas, but it is proper to call them as Dhritarashtrians as the former one was called Pandavas being the sons of Pandu. Why because these two parties came from one progeny. They were co-related to each other. Their progenitor was King Kuru. Thus his progeny was called after his name as Kuru dynasty. Thus the battle was between cousins of one and the same dynasty. Now the question is, if this be the fact that how can it be justifiable to call the sons of Dhritarashtra specifically as Kowravas as if the Pandavas had lost their inheritance of Kuru dynasty?

Both parties - Kowravas themselves

So both the parties were Kowravas. This was the reason that why Arjuna (the son of Pandu) was addressed by Sri Krishna as follows in Gita.

1. Kurusattama = best among the Kurus (4:31)
2. Kurusreshta = best of the Kurus (10:19)
3. Kuru Praveera = best of the Kurus (11:48)
4. Kurunandana = descendant of Kuru or son of Kuru (14:13)

And at the same time Gita proclaimed Bhishma as "Kuru vridha" (Grand father of Kowravas 1:12).

Then do these titles given to the heads of the two parties not prove that both parties were Kowravas only? Then is it not objectionable to call one party as Kowravas and the other as Pandavas which point deprives the Pandavas of the inheritance of Kuru dynasty?

And again what note worthy is that in Gita Dhritarashtra was

addressed as "Bharata" (descendant from Bharata progeny or it may be symbolic for his Indian nationality; of which the latter appears to be very apt) (1:24, 2:10). And the same title was also given to Arjuna (2:28, 2:30) and also as BHARATARSHABHA chief of the Bharatas (3:41, 7:11) and also as BHARATASATTAMA - best of the Baratas (18:4). Thus the nationality and posterity of Kuru had equally been preserved for both the parties (sons of Dhritarashtra and the Sons of Pandu).

Calling Dhritarashtrians as Kowravas, highly objectionable:

Did anywhere in Gita, Dhritarashtra proclaim his sons as Kowravas? No. But he enquired Sanjaya that what his sons (Dhritarashtra's sons) and the sons of Pandu were doing in the battle field (1:1). Here "my sons" does not mean Kowravas but Dhritarashtrians just as the sons of Pandu, the Pandavas. And again Arjuna himself also described his rivals as "Sons of Dhritarashtra" but not as Kowravas (1:46, 11:26). And further we cannot find anywhere in the whole Gita, describing the sons of Dhritarashtra as Kowravas excepting in one place, where Paramatma showing the sons of Dhritarashtra said to Arjuna in a friendly joking manner or in derisive manner "... O Partha, look at these assembled Kowravas" (1:25) to mean as saying - "O Arjuna, see your own men, see your own kinsmen who assembled here to fight and kill you". In the text of Gita, distinction between these two groups has been marked by stating as- (army of Pandavas 1:2) (army of the sons of Pandu 1:3) (son of Pandu or Pandava - 1:14, 4:35, 11:55). And Dhritarashtra's Party 1:19-20 (sons of Dhritarashtra 1:23, 36, 37, 46) (Sons of Dhritarashtra 2:6, 11:26). It may be noted that Gita nowhere makes mention as Kowravas and Pandavas as do our commentators. In clear terms what my contention is that as both the parties were Kowravas by birth,

calling particularly the sons of Dhritarashtra as Kouravas is highly objectionable.

Battle of Kurukshetra - A dispute not for land

And again, what was the reason for the dispute between them who were of one nation and posterity and near kinsmen? And why was the battle of Kurukshetra taken place?

For these questions the reading of the Various commentaries on Gita provides the answer as the quest of kingdom and power of ruling which is outrightly contradicted by Gita. No doubt that some slokas suggest that it was a political struggle. But analytical study of Gita reveals that the battle of Kurukshetra was only a religious battle (JIHAD according to Arabic Term) which was fought for the protection of the religion but not for the acquisition of one's own right or land or kingdom as made mention in the commentaries of Gita. Thus the commentaries and the text are contradicted by each other.

According as to the various commentaries on Gita, if Arjuna and his party (Pandavas) were really particular to regain their right of kingdom which was detained under the unlawful possession of Dhritrashtra, depriving the Pandavas of their right - could ever Arjuna have showed his reluctance to fight?

... *I shall not fight* (and remained silent) -2:9

And again Arjuna expressed -

It would be better for me, if the sons of Dhritarashtra, with arms in hand, should slay me unarmed and unresistingly in the battle (rather than fight with them) -Gita 1:46

If this battle were to be fought for the acquisition of kingdom, could ever Arjuna have said like this and expressed his reluctance to

fight even if he were attacked unarmed and killed? Then does it not prove that the battle was not for the kingdom, but for something else?

And again-

I desire not victory, O Krishna, nor kingdom nor pleasures. Of what avail is dominion to us, O Govinda? of what avail are pleasures and even life? -Gita 1:32

I desire not victory nor kingdom nor pleasures (1:32) Does this point not prove that the battle was not at all for the kingdom?

And again-

I do not wish to kill them though they kill Me. (And I do not kill them) even for the sake of dominion over three worlds; How much less for the sake of the Earth! -Gita 1:35

Though the last clause of this sloka- "How much less for the sake of the earth suggests the idea that the kurukshetra Battle was fought for earth, the first two clauses rule out its an then ficity. This point can be disclosed convincingly from our further arguments. This clause originally might have been recorded in the fortnot commentary which later might have erept into the original sloka- (or) a wantou interpatation subsequently made to divert the minds of the readers from conceiving the real cause for the battle.

Had the battle been fought merely to restore the right of dominion, could ever Arjuna have thought of restraining himself from fighting with a firm decision that he would not fight even if he were to be given three worlds? (here three worlds signify to the wealth and dominion in multiplied many more times than what one can expect to the best of his ability).

From the foregoing slokas, what more curious fact that can be

ascertained is that one known as Paramatma was inducing for war and the other Arjuna was refusing. Paramatma stood by Arjuna's side to help his party in every possible way. But he was not willing to fight.

Generally battles take place while one invades on the other; invader tries to capture the other's kingdom while the other party tries to protect itself and its kingdom by means of defensive war. Some times invasions also take place to recapture or regain that which is once lost. However in these battles there will be no discrimination such as friend or foe, kinsmen or others, son or father - but the objective of the either party is to win the battle by any means. But here the case is not like that. Arjuna, the chief of the army of one side, seeing his own kinsmen engaged to fight against him (against each other) in both the armies, began to grieve and declared to his benefactor Paramatma saying as-

"I desire not victory, nor dominion (1:32) and again, resolved with determination not to fight declaring as- " I do not wish to kill these, even for the sake of dominion over three worlds (1:35)". His reluctance to fight with the words such as these makes it clear that he never came there to fight to regain his right of dominion. THEN WHAT WAS THE BATTLE FOR?

Battle - not pre-fixed by Pandavas

Were it to be fought to regain the kingdom and to restore the dominion it would have been in the knowledge of Arjuna with whom he had to fight, and hence, he would not have asked Paramatma to show the people with whom he had to fight.

O Atchuta (immortal), place my chariot between the two armies, that I may just see those who stand here desirous to fight, and know with whom I must fight in this strife of battle.
-Gita 1:21-22

And again

I will observe those who are assembled here and are about to engage in battle desirous to do service in war to the evil-minded son of Dhritarashtra. -Gita 1:23

These two slokas bear a clear testimony that this battle was not pre-scheduled by Pandavas to fight to regain their right of dominion from the king Dhritarashtra, but it was a sudden attack on the handful followers of Arjuna by the prince Duryodhana with great army to suppress the people of Arjuna and his divine mission. It was so well planned that the rival party altogether assembled in huge numbers, unawares of Arjuna's party, where leave alone the point of fighting, but the question of even defence of their own souls became a great problem. Situation being this Arjuna was commanded by God, to fight the enemy for the protection of the Religion (DHARMA).

Divine revelation to fight

O Arjuna! Therefore at all times do thou meditate on me and fight... -Gita 8:7

Fight them, that Allah may punish them at your hands, and humiliate them and help you over them, and relieve the minds of a people who believe. -Qur'an 9:14

When prophet Mohammed and his followers reached Medina, having been driven out of Mecca, the enemy QURAISH about 1000 people attacked again, to drive them out of Medina also. Then God revealed the above verse. The followers of Prophet Mohammad were hardly 313 who met the same critical situation such as this of Arjuna and his followers.

Flashback

Keeping in view of the sum and substance of the whole battle field dialogues and relevant teachings of Paramatma, what one can easily understand is that Paramatma appeared in human form before

Arjuna and revealed or taught Bhagavad-Gita.

Arjuna was prophet for revivalism of the then corrupt Sanatana Dharma:

Here we must bear in mind that God not only has created the man, but also for his guidance towards Moksha, He has raised His prophets from among the mankind. And accordingly Arjuna was selected as a prophet of God for Bharat (India). By that time, the so called Sanatana Dharma (Hinduism) got corrupted and lost its real spirit. Arjuna started his ministry of propagation and a handful of his own men came into his influence and embraced the reformations thus introduced by Arjuna under the instructions of Paramatma from time to time. Thus a very few people became the real believers of Sanatana Dharma. But a great majority of people did not agree and on the other hand opposed. However the mission of Arjuna was being continued and flourished under the guidance and teachings of Paramatma from time to time according as to the necessity of time and demand of the occasion. Thus the number of believers was increasing day by day which became an eyesore to the enemy (non believers). The more the propagation continued the more was the process of oppression by the non-believers. But poor Arjuna and his followers endured all the tortures given, with patience and faith on God. (... *Having reached this transient and joyless world, do thou worship Me* -9:33). But the opposition did not stop here, but went so far as to plan to make an end of Arjuna and his followers and his mission. Thus those who believed on Arjuna as a prophet of God who sent His divine guidance through Paramatma on him, following which leads to Moksha, became believers (Bhaktas), Muslims according to Qur'anic term, and those that did not believe and opposed became non believers, Kaffers according to Arabic term. So they assembled in great majority to crush away and to put an end to the teachings of Arjuna revealed by God through paramatma. Thus there was a battle- a ceaseless struggle by non believers to extinguish the glorious teachings of God.

Just as Qur'an, Bhagavad Gita also revealed in piecemeal

Here let us bear in mind that just as Qur'an, the Bhagvad Gita was also revealed in piecemeal according as to the necessity of time and the demand of the occasion, which was latter compiled as one edition and preserved.

Dhritarashtra was the ringleader of non believers and the opponents of the Sanatana Dharma (the religion) which was being reformed or re-established. As a matter of fact Sanatana Dharma needs no reformations, but what we mean here is that the people of Sanatana Dharma were to be reformed and thus it was to be re-established.

Just as the early followers of prophet Mohammad and prophet Jesus were persecuted, Arjuna and his followers too were oppressed. Yet they did not lose heart, nor did stop their mission but continued with greater zeal and fervour and firm faith on God and His help. But on the other hand, to make an end of Arjuna's mission, as a final resort, by the instigation of Dhritarashtra who was a king by himself, prince Duryodhana, assembled there to fight and crush the glory of Devine message.

Paramatma descended in human form with a message to fight

Situation being thus, Paramatma descended and appeared in human form and revealed the command of God to counter attack the enemy.

Therefore at all times do thou meditate on me and fight
-Gita 8:7

Do thou perform thy bounden duty... -Gita 3:8

Renouncing all action in me, with thy thought resting on the self, being free from hope, free from selfishness, devoid of fever, do thou fight -Gita 3:30

Exactly in the very same manner prophet Mohammed was also commanded to attack the opponents of the religion

Will you not fight a people who have broken their oaths, and who plotted to turn out the prophet, and they were the first to commence hostilities against you? Do you fear them? Nay, Allah is most worthy that you should fear Him, if you are believers -Qur'an 9:13

Strategy was plotted to suppress the revivalism

Till then the opponents' silly and jealous acts against Arjuna's followers were confined to the extent of just teasing, harrasing, deriding and at the most-of manhandling and torturing. And there were some sudden group encounters too in which Arjuna and his followers successfully repelled the attacks of the enemy. But now, the enemy declared war against the believers in which not only the people of that place, but people from all surrounding places joined hands to suppress the believers and their divine mission (1:23).

The strategic plot of the enemy is note worthy. In this War almost all the kinsmen of every follower of Arjuna were involved and arrayed in forefront lines. Thus it was planned with an evil thought to yield the believers by stirring up sympathy and affection over the affinity of relations and thus to make the believers restrain from taking a retributive attack. Thus Duryodhana marshalled a war strategy to weaken the rival party (Arjuna's party) which worked like a magic wand in the beginning but later disappeared like a witchcraft.

That is (what happened) and (know) that Allah is he who weakens the design of the disbelievers -Qur'an 8:18

It was religious battle - Yet only defensive

So an inquistive curiosity sprang in the mind of Arjuna and asked Sri Paramatma to place his chariot in the place where from he could see well those that had joined hands to make an end of himself and his devine mission (1:22).

O Atchuta! Place my chariot between the two armies that I may just see those who stand here desirous to fight and I may know with whom I must fight in this strife of battle. -Gita 1:22

This implies the fact that an ordinance of God was made to fight the battle only after the enemy came with FULL sway upon them.

AND AGAIN

I will observe those who are assembled here and are about to engage in the battle desirous to do service in war to the evil minded son of Dhritarastra -Gita 1:23

Were this a battle for the restoration of kingdom, could Arjuna have not known with whom he had to fight being a claimant by himself? Does this point not convincingly prove that it was a religious battle for the protection of religion but not for acquisition of kingdom?

The first sloka of the above, speaks that Arjuna wanted to see those with whom he had to fight in the battle while the second sloka clarifies that he wanted to know those that had assembled to strengthen the hands of the evil minded Duryodhana.

These two slokas, though apparently contradictory, altogether disclose the fact that Arjuna was aware of the fact that he had to fight with Duryodhana the evil minded one who was the ringleader of the opponents of the religion that he was propagating. But a plot and conspiracy was made by the enemy and a huge number of Army and man power from all surrounding parts were made to assemble there un-

awares of Arjuna and his followers. On seeing this ocean like huge assembly a curious thought crept in the mind of Arjuna to know with whom he had to fight. Thus he wanted to know those that had joined hands with Duryodhana. Though this point contradict to our contention that - Had it been for the regain of dominion, could Arjuna have not known with whom he had to fight being a claimant, the further points make it clear that the battle was only for the sake of religion but not for dominion.

Close similarities between battle of Badar by Prophet Mohammad and battle of Kurukshetra by Prophet Arjuna

On Arjuna's request, Sri Paramatma led the chariot and placed it between the arrays of the two armies. Then Arjuna carefully observed the people assembled in the two armies desirous to fight. Those that were in the rival party were no other people than the kinsmen, near and dear of every one that was in his own party. Thus in both the sides his (their) own people engaged in the battle.

Thus we read in Gita

Then the son of Pritha saw arrayed there in both the armies fathers, and grandfathers, teachers, maternal uncles, brothers, sons, grandsons and comrades, fathers -in-law, and friends.
-Gita 1:26-27

Arjuna saw Pithrun- fathers and all relations such as maternal uncles and sons etc. in both the armies. These slokas disclose the fact that in both sides, the people who correlated to each other were found. If son was in this party, his father stood in other party. If a maternal uncle was in the other party, his nephew was in this party. In this way every man of the either party was a near kinsman with his rival party. This was the exact scene of the battle of Badar of the times of Prophet Mohammad. Just as the Kuru dynasty, the Quraish was engaged in

the battle of Badar under two groups, one being with prophet Mohammad and other being its rival party. Both sides were Quraish people correlated with each other.

When the son of Kunti saw all the kinsmen standing, he was overcome with deepest pity and said thus in sorrow-
-Gita 1:27-28

Seeing these kinsmen, O Krishna, arrayed and desirous to fight, my limbs droop down, and my mouth is dried up. A tremor comes on my body and my hairs stand on end. -Gita 1:28-29

The Gandiva slips from my hand and my skin is intensely burning. I am also unable to stand and my mind is whirling round as it were. -Gita 1:30

Observation of the above three slokas reveals the fact that Arjuna began to tremble and his Gandiva (Bow) slipped from his hand, and that he helplessly sat down on the chariot with a firm determination not to fight. And his eyes were full of tears (2:1).

... Arjuna sorrow stricken in mind cast aside his bow and arrows in the midst of the battle and sat down in the chariot.
-Gita 1:47

Despondency of Arjuna, and abstaining from fighting

Now the question is that what was the reason for Arjuna for such an affliction.

Was he really a coward and timid who could not see the blood and turned back on his heels from the battle field?

Was Arjuna a coward?

No, according as to the titles given in various places by Sri

Paramatma, as Parantapa meaning the subduer of the enemy; it can be well inferred that Arjuna was not a coward but was a ferocious warrior who never knew defeat.

Arjuna was incomparably greater warrior than anyone else of his times. He knew no defeat in the hands of his enemy. In all his previous encounters he came out all successful and victorious. But now the case of Kurukshetra battle was quite different. He was trembling, his mouth dried up. His hair stood on its end. His skin was intensely burning. He was almost unable to stand because his mind was whirling round (as it were). And his eyes were full of tears. His Gandiva (Bow) slipped from his hands. And he threw away the arrows too. And he sat down in the chariot determined not to fight... Why? what was the reason? was it because he pitied on the enemy?

Was pity on enemy the main reason?

No, there was no question of mercy on the enemy. He was a chastiser of the enemy- He was a tormentor of the enemy- He was subduer of the enemy- He was parantapa and Mahabaho; Thus was he praised by Paramatma many a time in Bhagwad Gita.

Then was it because that many of his kinsmen joined the army of the enemy? yes- ofcourse, this is one of the two main reasons which made him resolve not to fight.

In his previous encounters (might be), there was no problem of kinsmen. But this time, the strategy of the enemy by involving all the kinsmen in the battle field however yielded a ferocious warrior Arjuna to bend towards nepotism.

No doubt, that, at the first instance he pitied on the kinsmen that were in the enemy side, and expressed his affection towards them as here under.

O Janardhana, what delight shall be ours after killing the sons of Dhritarashtra? On killing these felons, sin only will take hold of us. -Gita 1:36

We had then better not slay our own kinsmen, the sons of Dhritarashtra; for how can we be happy, O Madhava, after slaying our own people? -Gita 1:37

And O Kesava, I see foreboding evil. Nor do I see any good from killing my kinsmen in battle -Gita 1:31

O Slayer of Madhu, how shall I assail in battle with arrows Bhishma and Drona, who are worthy of worship O Slayer of enemies? -Gita 2:4

Arjuna was so terribly shocked, seeing his own men arrayed in forefront lines to fight against his mission, perplexed in mind, that he could not find a way out of the situation. On one hand the affection on affinity and on the other the fear of disobedience to God's command to attack the enemy, almost made him mad and confounded.

I do not indeed see what can dispel the grief which burns up my senses... -Gita 2:8

Why? Because he never expected some of his own people like Bhishma and Drona whom he revered very greatly would also join with the enemy to root out his divine mission (2:4).

For the living and for the dead, the wise grieve not

WHO ARE *The dead* AND WHO ARE *The living*?

AND WHY NOT THE WISE GRIEVE FOR THEM?

Sri Paramatma explains as here under

For those who deserve no grief thou hast grieved, and words of wisdom thou speakest. For the living and for the dead the wise

grieve not -Gita 2:11

Here Paramatma consoles the grieving Arjuna saying- "*For the living and for the dead the wise grieve not*"

To know its correct meaning a careful study of Gita is most necessary. Irrelevant commentaries prevail only when the figurative words are taken to mean in the literal aspect and vice versa. Some times some words give both figurative as well as literal meanings.

Example 1:

Jesus said unto him, Follow me and let the dead bury their dead -Matthew 8:22

In this verse, the ONE word 'dead' is used twice. The former dead is used to mean figuratively as "the spiritually dead meaning - Non Believers". The latter 'dead' is used in literal sense to mean as "the physically dead (deceased)".

Some times some words may be synonyms to represent some other words.

Example 2: Jesus said -

And call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your father which is in heaven -Matthew 23:9

In this verse, the ONE word FATHER is used twice. In both times the word is used as synonym for God.

Unlike in the above two examples, we have some words which carry both literal and figurative meanings as well, with only one word used only once with no repetition. The best example of this type we have in this sloka under discussion. In cases such as these, it is more difficult to arrive at its correct meaning than those that are mentioned in our above two examples.

So let us make a close observation to arrive at its correct interpretation. Here in this sloka it is explained that the wise should not grieve for the living and for the dead. Here there are two groups of people distinctly pointed out. They are...

1. Living and 2. Dead

According to context, who were they that deserve no grief?

They were sons of Dhritarashtra, Bhishma and Drona and many other near and dear kinsmen who joined the rival party.

Why were they not deserved for mercy and pity?

Because they were dead. "They were dead" to mean as saying in the literal sense "Their death is predestined and it was decreed that they should be slain in this battle"

...Even without thee, none of the warriors arrayed in hostile armies shalt live. -Gita 11:32

...By myself have they been already slain; be thou a mere instrument, O Savya Sachi. -Gita 11:33

Drona and Bhishma, Jayadratha and Karna and other brave warriors- these, killed by Me, do thou kill; fear not, fight, thou shalt conquer the enemies -Gita 11:34

*So you killed them not, but it was Allah who killed them...
-Qur'an 8:17*

When prophet Mohammad and his followers came out successful from the battle of Badr, it was revealed by God as above, to mean as saying that they were only instrumental in the battle field: while the enemy was already killed by Him.

Thus "your grieving to kill them that had already been killed by

Me is mere useless". Thus your grieving for the dead is meaningless. (Thus the DEAD are compared to be really dead in the literal sense, can be established).

And again:

'THEY ARE DEAD' to mean as saying figuratively- "They are non-believers and adversaries of the Religion that is being preached and reformed by you, and hence their destiny is Hell". These two meanings (literal and figurative) are equally and very aptly applicable to all those people who joined the Dhritarashtrian party. Hence you should not grieve for such people as those who oppose "The Religion".

In Qur'an also we have these words 'Living and Dead' frequently used in figurative sense to mean as "Living- whose spiritual conscience is alive and are capable of receiving the truth. And they make use of their faculties endowed, - they hear the truth and accept it, they see the truth and accept it, they make use of their senses and ponder over the signs of God and accept the truth. Thus the true believers are said to be as living" : While the "dead - are they who are spiritually dead and whose faculties such as of seeing, hearing and reasoning all become dead. They have eyes but cannot see the truth hence they are blind. They have ears but cannot hear the truth and hence they are deaf. They have hearts and minds- yet dare not to accept the truth. Thus the non-believers are said to be as DEAD.

We read in Qur'an

And the blind and the seeing are not alike, nor the darkness and light nor the shade and heat, nor alike are the living and the dead. Surely, Allah causes him to hear whom he pleases; and thou canst not make those to hear who are in the graves.
-Qur'an 35:19-22

And again

And thou canst not make the dead to hear, nor canst thou make the deaf to hear the call when they turn away showing their backs. Nor canst thou guide the blind out of their error thou canst make only those to hear who would believe in our signs and they submit. -Qur'an 30:52-53

Jesus also described the non-believers of his times whose destiny was Hell as 'DEAD'.

Let the dead bury their dead -Matthew 8:22

In Qur'an also God commanded prophet Mohammad and his followers to fight against their own kinsmen (Quraish) who had attacked them and opposed the religion.

O ye who believe, fight such of the disbelievers as are near to you and let them find hardness in you; and know that Allah is with the righteous. - Qur'an 9:123

And if they break their oaths after their covenant, and attack your religion, then fight these leaders of disbelief - surely they have no regard for their oaths - that they may desist.
-Qur'an 9:12

Will you not fight a people who have broken their oaths and who plotted to turn out the messenger, and they were the first to commence (hostilities) against you? Do you fear them? Nay, Allah is most worthy that you should fear him, if you are believers
-Qur'an 9:13

Fight them, that Allah may punish them at your hands, and humiliate them and help you to victory over them, and relieve the minds of a people who believe. -Qur'an 9:14

Non - believers' destiny is Hell and it was shown in the vision of Arjuna.

As moths hurriedly rush into a blazing fire for destruction, just so do these creatures also hurriedly rush into thy mouths for

destruction. - Gita 11:29

So far we have discussed that how the word "dead" has been used to mean in both literal and figurative senses as "physically dead" and as "spiritually dead- means non-believers" respectively.

Now let us know about the word "Living".

Q: Further about whom also Arjuna afflicted as according to context?

Ans: About his kinsmen who were by his side, being his followers and staunch believers in Sanatana Dharma.

Paramatma in this sloka under discussion consoles Arjuna describing those believing people as living. Living- those whose conscience is alive and that whose life is filled with spiritual awareness.

Figuratively, they are living because, attaining of the transcendental place and beatitude is the real life. So it is foretold about his followers- "If they die in this battle, they will attain Heaven". Then why should one- the wise grieve for such people as those who are going to be awarded both worldly and Heavenly rewards?

Thus under this sloka (2:11) Paramatma discriminated the two groups of army-

1. The rival one as "Dead"- Spiritually dead for not believing the message of Paramatma and that who had already been killed by God Himself.

And the other group

2. The living: Believers in Paramatma's message who were fighting in the cause of God and whose life is a life indeed, because they enjoy the worldly pleasures and their death is also a life because they

enter the Heaven, where they will enjoy the eternal happiness.

Killed, thou wilt reach Heaven, victorious, thou wilt enjoy the earth... -Gita 2:37

And if you are slain in the cause of Allah or you die, surely forgiveness from Allah and mercy shall be better than what they hoard. -Qur'an 3:159

So Allah gave them the reward of this world, as also an excellent reward of the next; and Allah loves those who do good -Qur'an 3:148

Think not of those, who have been slain in the cause of Allah, as dead. Nay they are living, in the presence of their Lord, and are granted gifts from Him. -Qur'an 3:169

Here one may object by saying that Arjuna did not grieve for them who were in his side; and hence the commentary made by us, as above, for the word 'living' of the verse under discussion in no way be applicable to the people of Arjuna's party. This objection cannot sustain, though there is no such specific sloka showing as he had grieved. But logic overrules this objection pointing out on the fact that he who had pitied the kinsmen of the enemy side, could not have remained not grieving for the kinsmen who sincerely followed him and stood by his side to sacrifice even their lives. And another point is that only after seeing the kinsmen arrayed in battle field in both the armies, he began to tremble and grieve (1:22-30). This goes to prove that Arjuna had pitied the people of his army too. And we have another more important point to prove that Arjuna had greater compassion and affection on his kinsmen of his side than of those of the rival party. In this connection I invite your attention on the following.

Arjuna sought for better alternative

And we know not which is the better alternative for us; nor do we know whether we shall conquer them or they will conquer

us ... -Gita 2:6

**"AND WE KNOW NOT WHICH IS THE BETTER
ALTERNATIVE FOR US" (2:6)**

This clause speaks clearly that Arjuna sought for the better alternative if "not fighting" were better- I "will not fight".

And

If "fighting" were better- I "will fight"

And again

**NOR DO WE KNOW WHETHER WE SHALL CONQUER
THEM OR THEY WILL CONQUER US (2:6)**

The above clause discloses two important points:

1. That though Arjuna expressed at the outset some affection on the kinsmen of the rival party, he was not totally wishful to avoid the battle mere on this plea (the affection) but had there been a favourable chance he would not have had it gone unutilized.

2. And that he had more affection on the kinsmen of his party than those of the rival party- of course this is but natural.

Does this clause not disclose that Arjuna wanted to conquer the enemy? Yet he was doubtful whether it was possible for him with handful of his army. And this fear was the second important reason which made Arjuna to resolve not to fight.

Arjuna dreaded the great army

There was heavens of difference between the previous encounters in which he was proved Parantapa (Tormentor of the enemy) and

this Kurukshetra battle. The battles of his previous times were fought with enemies who were more or less in equal strength. But now he had to face with a very great army.

Though this point is no where recorded in Gita, it can be well inferred by keeping in view of the situation and his reluctance to fight, and the titles given to him by Paramatma, as Parantapa and Mahabaho, that as we said above, so many encounters might have taken place prior to this.

However, the following sloka speaks clearly that the enemy was many times more in number than the army of Arjuna.

The following sloka is stated to have been spoken by Duryodhana to Drona as regards to the strength of his army.

Our strength is immeasurable, and we are perfectly protected by grand father Bhishma, whereas the strength of the Pandavas, carefully protected by Bhima is limited. -1:10 (Gita as it is)

There is difference of opinion among the different commentators on this sloka. Some have interpreted as above while some others have translated contrary to the above. We will discuss about this in the coming pages. Meanwhile let me conclude here, that, whatever might be the other reasons, the fear of the enemy was a major cause for Arjuna which yielded him to resolve not to fight. This was the reason why God in so many places commanded him saying as...

O Arjuna fear not, fight... (Gita 3:30)

O Arjuna, fear not, thou wilt conquer (Gita 11:34)

The material body of the indistrictible, immeasurable and eternal living entity is sure to come to an end; therefore fight O descendant of Bharata. -Geta As it is 2:18

O son of Pritha, do not yield to this degrading impotence. It does not become you. Give up such petty weakness of heart and arise, O chastiser of the enemy. -Gita As it is 2:3

Difference of opinion among interpreters

The arguments made in the foregoing chapter not only disclosed that Kurukshetra was a religious battle which was fought between the believers and the non-believers, but also proved that the another more important reason for Arjuna's reluctance, at the first instance, not to fight the battle, was due to the fear of enemy being more powerful. Now let us examine whether the strength of the enemy was greater as we point out, and what do scriptures say in this regard.

Let us discuss about sloka 1:10

ACCORDING TO SOME THE DHRITARASTRIAN PARTY WAS GREATER

Duryodhana says with Drona...

Our strength is immeasurable, and we are perfectly protected by grand father Bhishma, whereas the strength of the Pandavas carefully protected by Bhima is limited. -Gita 1:10

The above is the translation from "Bhagavad Gita as it is" by Sri A.C. Bhaktivedanta.

ACCORDING TO SOME OTHERS - THE PANDAVA'S PARTY WAS GREATER

Now examine the other translation of this sloka by Sri Alladi mahadeva Sastry...

This army of ours protected by Bhishma is inadequate, whereas that army of theirs which is under the protection of Bhima is adequate...

And at the foot note - the commentary of Sri Sankaracharya on this sloka, is quoted which reads as here under.

This sloka is differently interpreted by different commentators. Anandagiri's gloss suggests various interpretations which all go to make Duryodhana to mean that his army larger and led by an abler leader than the enemy's is more likely to win the battle.

Yet, there is no contradiction

A grave contradiction is obvious from the above two different interpretations. But in our opinion it is not a contradiction, but only a difference of opinion among the different interpreters. Now the question is that why this difference of opinion on some slokas of the Devine Book like Gita?

For this Qur'an provides the answer. Please read the following verse of Qur'an.

He it is who has sent down to thee the book (Qur'an), in it there are verses that are decisive in meaning. They are the basis of the book - and there are others that are susceptible of different interpretations. But those in whose hearts is perversity pursue such thereof as are susceptible of different interpretations, seeking discord and seeking (wrong) interpretation of it. And none knows its (right) interpretation except Allah; and those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say, we believe in it, the whole is from our Lord. And none heed except those gifted with understanding
-Qur'an 3:7

In the light of the above verse of the Qur'an, let us concede that both the interpretations as quoted above of the sloka 1:10 of Gita are correct regarding it to be of such nature as that renders susceptible of different interpretations. This is another similarity that Gita bears with Qur'an. In coming pages we will point out some other slokas of this type.

But both parties cannot be greater - at one and the same time

According to one interpretation the Dhritarashtriyans party was greater in strength. But according to another interpretation the Arjuna's party was greater in strength. And again we have another decisive sloka which however contradicts our view that the enemy was greater.

O Teacher, look at this grand army of the sons of Pandu, marshalled by the talented pupil, the son of Drupada
-Gita 1:3

Thus this sloka goes to prove that the army of Pandavas was very great in number and mightier than the enemy. But as a matter of fact the army of Dhritarashtra was very great in number which fact can be well predicted from the assurances of God made to trembling Arjuna, saying as- "Fear not fight, thou shalt conquer the enemy" (Gita 11:34)

However in the light of these arguments one cannot decisively say whether the army of the enemy was greater or the army of Arjuna. But what certain is that both parties cannot at one and the same time be greater than each other. Thus the key point turned into a mystery which Qur'an unravels. Please go through the following two verses of Qur'an.

Qur'an unravels the mystery

When Allah showed them (the enemy) to thee (prophet Mohammed) in thy dream as few; and if he had shown them as many, you would have surely faltered and would have disagreed with one another about the matter; but Allah saved you. Surely He has full knowledge of what is in your breasts. -Qur'an 8:43

The enemy was great in number. But God showed them as few

in the dream of prophet Mohammed.

and again.

And when at the time of your encounter he made them appear to you as few in your eyes, and made you appear as few in their eyes, that Allah might bring about the thing that was decreed. And to Allah are affairs referred (for final decision).

-Qur'an 8:44

From the above two verses of Qur'an it is evident that how God conferred His favour upon believers showing them as few in the sight of enemy, and showing the enemy as few in the sight of the believers. In this very same way God might have showed Arjuna and his party as great in the sight of enemy (1:3) and at the time of actual encounter the enemy (Dhritarashtriyans party) might have been shown as few in the sight of Arjuna's party so as to make them firm in the battle - field, which fact might have been revealed later by Paramatma in only one sloka (1:10) which became ambiguous for interpreters, yet as a matter of fact in the light of these Qur'anic verses, both interpretations can be taken as correct. This was how God conferred His favour upon the then believers just as He conferred His favour upon Prophet Mohammed and his followers.

Why? Because-

Allah might bring about the thing that was decreed
-Qur'an 8:44

What is it that was decreed?

Gita provides its answer:

...By myself have they (enemy) been already slain, be thou (O Arjuna) mere instrument, Drona and Bhishma, Jayadratha, Karna and other brave warriors these killed by me; do thou kill, fear not, fight, thou shalt conquer the enemies.

-Gita 11:33-34

Exactly in the same way God assured prophet Mohammad saying as

Fight them that Allah may punish them at your hands and humiliate them (enemy) and help you (to victory) over them, and relieve the minds of a people who believe. -Qur'an 9:14

In Bible too...

Ye shall not need to fight in this battle; set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; tomorrow go out against them; for the Lord will be with you -II Chronicles 20:17

Thus the interference of God as discussed above is another strong testimony to prove that Kurukshetra battle was a religious battle fought for the protection of the religion.

Kurukshetra battle given clour of lawful political battle

Now let us examine some other slokas of Gita revealed in connection of the Kurukshetra battle so as to know its correct nature: whether it was lawful political battle or a Religious battle.

Take note of the fact that under sloka 2:11 it is made clear that Paramatma discriminated the two groups of army which were fighting in the kurukshetra battle- one as 'living' (Believers) and the other as 'dead' (Non believers). Therefore it is proved that Kurukshetra battle was fought between non-believers who were firm to destroy the religion, and the believers who were defending for the protection of the religion (2:11). And hence it was a religious battle, according to sanscrit term it is known as "Dharm Yuddh" and "Jihad" as according to Arabic term. But those that protest the Jihad of Islam and misuse it as a means and weapon to defame Islam, dare not to give religious sanctity and sanction for the Kurukshetra battle as a religious war, merely fought

for the protection of the religion (i.e., the Sanatana Dharma).

And many a prophet there has been beside whom fought numerous companies of their followers. They slackened not for aught that befell them in the way of Allah, nor did they weaken, nor did they humiliate themselves before the enemy. And Allah loves the steadfast -Qur'an 3:146

Thus Qur'an makes clear, that even before Jihad by prophet Mohammad, similar battles were fought by many a prophet for the protection of the religion.

What does Dharm yudh mean - lawful battle or religious battle?

If the word "Dharm" associated with or followed by "Yudh", were to mean as "Lawful Battle", one has every reason to accept that every battle is a 'Lawful battle' for one group of people, while at the same time, the same battle is an 'Unlawful battle' for another group of people depending on the side that one takes for himself. This is because, as we said earlier that every battle is fought either to defend oneself from the aggression of the invader or by aggressing on other to recapture or regain that which was once lost (which also come under the term of defence). What ever be the reason for the battle- generally and most commonly the battle fields consist of two groups of people.

One aggressor	-	the other defender
	(with a motive of)	
Seizure	-	defence
	(action)	
Attack	-	repel

Thus the battle can be classified as "Unlawful battle (Adharm Yuddh)" in former one's case and as "Lawful battle (Dharm Yuddh)" in latter one's case. Keeping in view of these points let us examine the case of Arjuna's party and his battle whether it comes under the category of "Dharm Yuddh" to mean as LAWFUL BATTLE or RELIGIOUS BATTLE.

ARJUNA WAS NOT KING: HENCE THERE WAS NO KINGDOM. THEN WHAT FOR THE ATTACK ON HIM WERE IT NOT ON RELIGIOUS GROUNDS?

Did Arjuna possess under his control any kingdom which was to be invaded by Dhritarastra?

What the obvious fact is that Arjuna was not at all a king. And therefore the question of possessing kingdom is just as humourous as procuring waters from the mirages.

So this goes to prove that the aggression of Dhritarashtra on Arjuna was NOT ON POLITICAL GROUNDS, but for some thing else.

Had Dhritarastra assembled his army to seize the kingdom of Arjuna, and if Arjuna were to defend his kingdom, we have no reason not to regard that Arjuna's was the DHARM YUDDH to mean as LAWFUL BATTLE.

Generally battles are fought for the acquisition of kingdoms for which one invades on the other, and the other defends and tries to repel the aggression, which facts are known to all. But here in the case of 'Kurukshetra battle' no such thing is found. So the word "Dharm Yuddh" as proclaimed by Gita should be interpreted to mean as RELIGIOUS BATTLE as we advocate. Then only the aggression of Dhritarastra and urging of God to Arjuna to fight remain meaningful. Contrary to this any other interpretation turn out the fact into fiction

and makes the Kurukshetra battle to reflect as the "Battle for airy castles of the fairy tales" for children.

did Arjuna pre-plan to attack Dhritarashtra?

Let us examine from the other end too:

Did Arjuna assemble his party? or did he conspire to attack the king Dhritarastra to acquire his right (if any), where Dhritarastra had been compelled to counter attack or repel the attack of Arjuna? No. Arjuna was innocent and unaware of the battle which however came upon unsought by him.

Yaadiccho - papannam -Gita 2:32

(The battle of Kurukshetra) came upon the party of Arjuna by its own accord unsought (by them). Keeping in view of all these truths, we find no other cause and reason for the battle of Kurukshetra except the RELIGION as its main target. One party was trying to outroot it, while the other was guarding it.

Certainly there was for you a Sign in the two armies that encountered each other, one party fighting in the cause of Allah and the other disbelieving... -Qur'an 3:13

Those that participate - attain heaven

To arrive at the exact meaning of the word DHARM YUDDH as has been forwarded by Gita to mean as RELIGIOUS WAR let us examine carefully the following slokas of Gita consecutively.

Sanskrit text of the slokas is omitted, but its word to word meaning (paraphrase) has been placed here so as to enable the readers to pass through a diligent comparison with the meanings of the text and the interpretation (translation) of the text by various interpreters.

Ref: Gita 2:32

Yaadrichaya = by its won accord
 cha = also
 Upapannam = arrived at
 Swarga = heavenly planet
 Dvaram = door
 Apavritam = wide open
 Sukhina = very happy
 Kshatriya = The members of the royal order
 Partha = O son of Pritha
 Labhante = do achieve
 Yuddham = war; Idrisam = like this

O Partha! Happy are the Kshatriyas to whom such fighting opportunities come unsought, opening for them the doors of the heavenly planets. (Gita as it is- by Sri A.C. Bhakti vedanta)

Another translation

Happy Kshatriyas, O son of Pritha, find such a battle as this, come of itself, an open door to heaven (The Bhagvad Gita, By sri Alladi Mohadeva Sastry)

Now let us examine some phrases or clauses from the above sloka

- I. Yuddham = war
 Idrisam = like this
 Yuddham idrisam = war such as this; war like this

The above phrase draws out a distinction between all other battles and the Kurukshetra battle, stressing on the point saying as "War such this - Yuddham idrisam"

Now the question is - what is the speciality in this battle to distin-

guish this from other battles, specifically saying as - "War such as this?"

For answer see second phrase.

II. "sukhinah kshatriyah labhante"

Kshatriyah = kings (Here according to context, the participants who got an opportunity of fighting in the battle such as this)

Sukhina = very happy. Very happy are the participants who achieved the opportunity of fighting in the battle such as this (Kurukshetra)

Question : Why are they happy?

Answer is given in the third phrase

III. "swarga dvaram apavritam"

(For them) the doors of heaven (SWARGA) are wide open.

Aggressions- counter attacks, deaths and killings are very common in all battles. Without all these, the battles cannot be known as battles at all. But specifically stressing on the point that those that participate in the battle...

1. such as this
2. happy (because of their participation in this battle)
3. for them the doors of heaven are wide open

Thus discriminating this battle from all other battles leads to conclude that Kurukshetra was a religious battle unlike any other general battle.

If one cannot agree with us, the speciality with this battle, in discriminating this battle from all other battles stressing on the point saying as "yuddhamidrisam" may be explained to us.

Abstaining from fighting - leads to hell

Now let us see another sloka 2:33

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. atha = therefore | 2. chet = if |
| 3. tvam = you | 4. imam = this |
| 5. dharmyam = religious duty | 6. sangramam = fighting |
| 7. na = do not | 8. karishyasi = perform |
| 9. tatah = then | |
| 10. swadharmam = your religious duty | |
| 11. kirtim = reputation | |
| 12. cha = also | |
| 13. hitva = losing | |
| 14. papam = sinful reaction | |
| 15. avapsyasi = do gain | |

*If, however, you do **not perform your this religious duty of fighting**, then you **will certainly incur sins** for neglecting your duties and thus lose your reputation as a fighter. (Gita As it is by Sri A.C. Bhaktivedanta) -2:33*

Another translation:

Now if thou wouldst not fight this lawful battle, then, having abandoned thine own duty and fame, thou shalt incur sin (The Bhagvad Gita by Alladi Mahadeva Sastry)¹. -2:33

In the former sloka (2:32) it is said that those that participate in the battle such as this are fortunate because for them the doors of heaven are wide open.

1. On the sloka 2:33 we have quoted interpretations of two familiar commentators of Gita. For uner one suggests that Kurukshetra Battle was 'enjoined religions duty,' while according to latter it was 'enjoined lawful battle'.

And again in the latter sloka (2:33) it is warned that if they do not fight the religious battle that they would incur sin (which ultimately leads to hell).

Sin and virtue, hell and heaven are the words that deal with religious terminology, while they are very strange and unknown to political language. Hence on this ground also it can be said that the Kurukshetra battle was purely a religious battle which was fought for the protection of the religion.

Were it not a religious battle, could God ever have given them the good news of heaven if they participated in the fighting of the Kurukshetra battle and contrary to this if they did not fight, warned them of the evil consequences of not fighting, that they would incur sin (which ultimately leads to hell)?

1. *O ye who believe! What is the matter with you that, when it is said to you go forth in the way of Allah you sink heavily towards the earth? Would you be contented with the present life in preference to the hereafter? But the enjoyment of the present life is but little, as compared with the hereafter. -Qur'an 9:38*
2. *If you do not go forth to fight, he will punish you with a painful punishment, and will choose in your stead a people other than you, and you shall do Him no harm at all and Allah has full power over all things. -Qur'an 9:39*
3. *Go forth, light and heavy, and strive with your property and your persons in the cause of Allah. That is better for you, if only you knew -Qur'an 9:41*

Uncertainty of Arjuna whether to fight or not

Let us examine in an another way to know whether it was a religious battle or a lawful battle.

1. *One side affection on affinity and the other side majority of the enemy (1:10).*

2. *One side the fear of enemy and the other side God's command to fight (3:30).*
3. *One side the uncertainty whether they could conquer the enemy or not (2:6). And on the other side the fear of the ill-omens (1:31).*
4. *One side the fear of intermingling of the religion with the irreligion as a result of which there was a threat of women becoming corrupt (1:41)¹.*
5. *One side the fear of committing the sin by killing the kinsmen (1:36). And on the other side the fear of reaping its evil consequences by attaining everlasting hell (1:44).*
6. *One side unavoidable situation of the war and on the other hand the uncertainty whether they could remain happy by killing the kinsmen (enemy) (1:37).*

Arjuna prefers Hijarah to Jihaad

Thus being caught up in perplexity which was then predominant as a result of his unfledged knowledge about the religion "Dharma sammudhachetah (2:7)" Arjuna suggested Paramatma that it would be better for them to migrate and live there even on alms (beggary) where they could preach, than to fight and kill the gurus of high reverence.

We wish to remind you that Arjuna was not at all a king and so he did not possess any kingdom. Therefore the attack of Dhritarastra was not for land. And again Arjuna never assembled his army to invade on Dhritarastrian's kingdom to acquire or to claim his right (if any). As regards to the battle of Kurukshetra, Gita admits that Arjuna and his party were innocent people who never planned to attack the Dhritarashtra's army, but on the other hand the rival party came upon

1. As many as I referred all have interpreted as intermingling of CASTES instead of intermingling of RELIGIONS: which of the two points is correct according to text will be disclosed in the arguments made in the coming pages.

Arjuna by its own accord unsought by Arjuna (2:32)¹. This goes to prove convincingly that Arjuna's party was attacked on mere religious grounds by the enemy at the place where they were preaching their religion. So there were only two alternatives before Arjuna. Those are,

1. either they must counter attack the enemy and repel the attack; (or)
2. in case if they do not like to fight, that they (Arjuna's party) should run themselves away from that place and migrate to any other place where they can preach their religion freely.

The former one of the above is Dharm Yuddh (Jihad) and the latter one is known as 'Migration' which is in Islamic terminology known as 'Hijarah'. Prophet Mohammed and his followers being very few in number migrated from Mecca where they were utterly persecuted and took shelter at Madina.

All these then prevailing situations as discussed so far agree that it was the early period of Arjuna's prophet-hood and his preaching of the religion just as of prophet Mohammad's and his followers' early period before the migration (i.e., before Hijarah).

So it can be well presumed that Arjuna was not yet full-fledged in religious matters (Dharma sammudha- 2:7). So Arjuna (might have thought that it was merely useless to kill the kinsmen who were not paying heed to the religion which was being preached by them. His aim was to preach the religion. Further he (might have) also thought that after killing the kinsmen the purpose of their mission would still remain unsuccessful and would be of no use at all except as of receiv-

1. O Partha! Happy are the kshatriyas to whom such fighting opportunities come unsought, opening for them the doors of the heavenly planets.

ing an additional grief which would disrupt the peace whenever the memory of those kinsmen who were killed by them crossed in their minds (1:37)¹. So he thought that it would be better for them to migrate and carry out the mission in some other place- and this proposal was put before Paramatma for consideration in the following sloka.

It would be better to live in this world by begging than to live at the cost of the lives of great souls who are my teachers. Even though desiring worldly gain, they are superiors. If they are killed, every thing we enjoy will be tainted with blood (2:5). (Bhagvad Gita as it is - by Sri A.C.B. Vedanta)

Another translation:

Better indeed in this world to live even upon alms than to slay the teachers of high honour. But were I to slay these teachers, I should only in this world enjoy the pleasures of wealth, delights stained with blood -2:5 (The Bhagvad Gita by Sri A. Mahadeva Sastry).

I invite your attention towards the following points which can be well inferred from this sloka.

Comparison is made between two things. Of them the one is living in this world on even alms and beggary (Migration) and the second is killing the teachers of high honour (to fight the enemy). This speaks clearly that there was no other (third) choice. And again he was not certain that they could conquer the enemy. "... *Nor do we know whether we shall conquer them or they will conquer us*" (2:6)- to mean as saying "We know not whether we shall be able to kill them or that we ourselves will be killed by them". And again keeping in view of the importance of the responsibility of preaching laid on his shoulders, Arjuna might have thought that after killing the enemy the purpose of

1. Sin will overcome us if we slay such aggressors. Therefore it is not proper for us to kill the sons of Dhritarastra and our friends. what should we gain and how could we be happy killing our own kinsmen? -1:37

his mission of preaching would remain unsuccessful as there would be none to whom they should preach; contrary to this, that if they themselves were killed by the enemy even then his mission would achieve nothing as after the handful of his followers having been killed by the enemy, there would remain none from his party to carry out his mission.

Not only he expressed his opinion of migration (Hijarah) but also at the same time revealed his doubt whether it was better for them to migrate or whether it was better to fight the enemy, "... *And we know not which is the better alternative for us...*" (2:6)

Arjuna thought that it was great sin to fight on religious grounds

Arjuna also thought that it was not proper to fight the battle and kill the enemy mere on the basis of religion. He might have thought that blood-shed was in no way concerned with the religion and hence regarded that it was a sinful deed.

Papam evasrayed asman hatvaitan atatayinah

On killing these felons (atatayinah) sin only will take hold of us -1:36

and again,

... We have resolved to commit a great sin... -1:45

Not knowing the importance of the religious wars (fought in defence), and having been caught in a state of perplexity Arjuna hesitated to fight. So there is some meaning in Arjuna's regarding such battles as these that were fought for religious purpose as sinful, and profaning of the religion. For this there was some excuse for Arjuna as he was not yet then taught by Paramatma. But despite so many clear

slokas of Gita which show a clear picture that Kurukshetra was a religious battle fought for the protection of the religion, the reason for wavering for not accepting its real nature and on the other hand the trials and efforts made by the commentators and interpreters in keeping the readers away from approaching to its real meaning seems to be a matter of no excuse.

The interpretations and commentaries as made out popular- are made in such a way as to create confusion which however are not helpful to enable the reader to arrive at what actually does the word 'Dharm' convey to mean whether as 'Law or Lawful' (or) Religion or Religious'. Especially as regards to the word 'Dharm' associated with Yuddh (Battle), the meanings, translations, and commentaries of various authors as compared, however not only are contradictory with each other, but also not clear as to what does exactly the word 'Dharm Yuddh' carry to mean as. A meticulous study and a diligent comparison with our arguments made basing on the scriptural facts however not only reveal that it means 'The religious battle', but at the same time, also disclose the persistent attempts which are being done to hide its real meaning. Some interpreters lead the readers towards to understand it as a 'lawful battle' while others make readers to think as a 'religious duty' ordained only to a particular Kshatriya community.

Some doubts expressed, if were his party killed

Further Arjuna expressed his deep anguish and dread of disappear of the 'Sanatana Dharma' if his handful followers were killed as he was not sure whether they could conquer the enemy.

...Nor do we know whether we shall conquer them or they will conquer us -2:6

And also expressed the fear of women, getting corrupted on prevalence of Adharma (irreligion).

And also expressed the doubt of intermingling of the religion with irreligion, which would lead the forefathers of that family deprived of the offerings of (pindodaka kriya) pinda and water. And there was in his mind an apprehension of suffering everlasting punishment in hell for those whose family dharma (religion) is subverted.

All the above points can be noticed from the study of the following slokas consecutively.

Vanish of Sanatana Dharma apprehended

1. On the extinction of a family, the immemorial dharmas of that family disappear. When the Dharma disappear impiety (adharm) overtakes the whole family -Gita 1:40

Basing on the successive slokas, the meaning of the first clause of this sloka- "on the extinction of a family" is not the extinction of the whole family but- "(as a result of) the death of the male members of the family".

(The fate of the family is described in its successive clause)

"The immemorial dharmas of that family disappear".

Now the question is whether they were really the immemorial dharmas of that family as has been interpreted or the Sanathana Dharma of that family that was apprehended to be disappeared.

In sanscrit text we have the words- "Dharmassanatana"

Sanatana (adj) continual, ancient; Dharma (n) Religion.

When the word "Sanatana" associated with or followed by 'Dharma' according as to its context it may be either 'Abstract-Noun' or 'Proper Noun'. So the interpreters must be very careful while translating such words as these. If it represents to Abstract- Noun then it

can be translated as 'continual' or 'ancient' or 'immemorial dharma'. But if it represents to proper noun, it should not be translated, but transliterated as 'SANATANADHARMA' is a well known fact¹. This Sanatana Dharma represents to the religion that was being revived by Sri Paramatma by that time and that which was adopted by that family.

As regards to the point at issue, in brief, what our contention is that it is not correct to translate as "The immemorial dharmas of that family" but it must be transliterated to read as "The sanatana dharma of that family".

And again in its second verse a stress is made upon saying as- "When the dharmas disappear impiety (adharm) overtakes the whole family".

Then therefore the whole sloka (1:40) goes to mean as saying- "On the death of the male members of the family, the family may be subdued by the rival party whose irreligion (adharm) overtakes the sanatana dharma (The religion) which is likely to disappear ultimately.

Intermingling of Dharma with Adharma apprehended

2. "By the prevalence of impiety (Adharma) (1) O Krishna, the women of the family become corrupt. Women corrupted, there will be intermingling of castes (varna samkara) (2) O descendant of vrishnis" (Gita 1:41)

The word impiety as underlined above under mark No. 1 is the meaning as given by the interpreter for the original sanscrit word 'Adharma'. But according to context 'Adharma' means (Irreligion).

1. Brahma Sanatana = Brahma eternal (4:31) As abstract noun.

Dharmas sanatana = Sanatana Dharma (1:40) As proper noun

Therefore the first verse of the sloka means to read as- "By the prevalence of irreligion O Krishna, the women of the family become corrupt".

Further the words "intermingling of castes (varna samkara)" as underlined under mark No. 2 seem to be incorrect when compared with the facts and events of the Kurukshetra battle, which can be seen from the dialogues incorporated in Gita. In clear terms what we would like to point out is that in the place of these words- "intermingling of religion (Dharma Samkara)" might have originally been stated. That means intermingling of irreligion with religion was apprehended, but not the intermingling of castes (varna samkara) as has been recorded.

Therefore the sloka 1:41 actually means to read as-

By the prevalence of irreligion (Adharm) O Krishna, the women of the family become corrupt. Women corrupted, there will be intermingling of religions (Dharma Samkara) O descendant of vrishnis

No casteism - No political rivalry. But a battle between Dharm and Adharm

3. *Confusion of castes leads the family of these destroyers of families also to hell; for their forefathers fall (down to hell) deprived of the offerings of pinda and water -Gita 1:42*

The sloka begins with saying as - 'Confusion of castes...'

It may be noted that it was the early period of revivalism of sanatana dharma. As we say right from the beginning, dharma (Religion) was being revived.

Whenever there is a decay of religion and an ascendancy of irreligion, then I manifest myself -Gita 4:7

...for the firm establishment of religion... -Gita 4:8

...Yet it was not completely re-established by the time it was attacked by the non-believers. Then therefore there was no question of casteism at all. Sects and sub-sects generally mushroom in long run, only after the religion is well established. So the apprehension of Arjuna was not about intermingling of castes, if were they defeated, but it was purely about intermingling of religions. And the established point is that Kurukshetra was a battle which was being fought between Dharma (Religion) and Adharma (Irreligion). According to here the religion (dharma) was the one that was being reformed and revived by Paramatma and that which was accepted by Arjuna and his followers; while irreligion (adharma) was that which went to the lot of those that opposed the reformations and remained in the old polluted sanatana dharma. Among them the rival party namely the Dhritarastrian party was in forefront. In this way the SANATANA DHARMA (the religion) which was coming down in succession from time to time, again divided into dharma (the religion) and adharma (irreligion). Any deviation what ever from the original SANATANA DHARMA is adharma (irreligion). Sri Paramatma stood by the side of dharma (the religion) and induced to fight against the non-believing opponants (Hostile group), who finally resorted to attack the believers and to destroy them as well as their religion. Thus it was a battle which was fought on the basis of dharma (religion) and adharma (irreligion) but not on casteism basis, nor on the political basis. The actual encounter was not yet started. Meanwhile Arjuna expressed so many doubts even before attacking the enemy; and while doing so he pointed out the apprehension from his rival party of intermingling of religions specifically saying as "Adharmabhi - bhavat - meaning, by the prevalence of irreligion (1:41) "Which is a literal proof that outrightly rebuts the castiesm doctrine and at the same time substantiates our argument that the Kurukshetra was a religious battle fought for the protection of the religion, and that there was no question of casteism at all by that time.

Now let us see in the logical way:

Despite all these points if anyone still hesitate to accept our argument, we would like to remind that both the parties that engaged in the Kurukshetra battle were: of one ancestry and of one dynasty correlated with each other with a marginal exception of one or two persons. If this be the fact 'where is the question for the apprehension of intermingling of castes, were it not the apprehension of intermingling of irreligion with the religion as we say? Does this point not prove that the casteism was the latter invention subsequently given place in sanatana dharma which act as a matter of fact is really adharma?

Religion is replaced by 'caste'

Therefore in the light of the foregoing arguments, the sloka (1:42) may be reproduced to read as follows, substituting the word- "The religions" for 'Castes'.

Confusion of the religions leads the family of these destroyers of families also to hell; for their forefathers fall (down to hell) deprived of the offerings of pinda and water. -Gita 1:42

There is difference of opinion among the exponents regarding the families that go to hell. According to some- "the families of destroyers", while according to some others- "the destroyed families". But according to very few interpreters- "both the families- the families of the destroyers and the destroyed as well; which seems to be more relevant to the context.

According to first category of interpreters- those that go to hell are the families of the destroyers: because they are the people belonging to adharma (irreligion).

According to the second category of interpreters- those that go to hell are the destroyed families.

In our earlier arguments, while discussing on the sloka 1:40¹, it is proved that- extinction of the family means- "on the death of the male members of the family".

Therefore on the death of the male members of the family, the females of the family may be subdued and taken back to their former religion (or) having no sufficient male members of their new faith (as it was the very early period of their (new) sanatana Dharma) the females of the destructed families may be tempted to the natural phenomenon of inevitable sexual intercourse which may ultimately yield them to take company with the male members of the rival party (this apprehension can be seen in sloka 1:41) as a result of which they may again be forced to go back to their former renounced (old) sanatana dharma, where they fail to offer pindodaka kriya (offering of pinda and water) depriving of which expiation the deceased (male members of the family) may go to hell (1:42). Thus the whole family go to hell. However the first two interpretations are correct to some extent. But the third one is most appropriate to the context which can be arrived at by clubbing together the first and the second expositions respectively.

It was only the prediction of Arjuna that if were his handful of army killed in the battle, the women might meet with a misfortune of intermingling of religions. But it was a practical misfortune of the followers of Prophet Mohammad, when at the time of 'battle of UHAD', they suffered a heavy loss of life leaving behind a number of orphans and widows. And possibly there was a threat likely to pose the danger of intermingling of religions to those widows and orphans. But God solved this likely problem by giving them the sanction for polygamy.

1. On the extinction of a family, the immemorial dharmas of the family disappear. When the Dharma disappear impiety (adharma) overtakes the whole family. (for commentary see pages 89+93)

And give to the orphans their property and exchange not the bad for the good, and devour not their property with your own. Surely it is a great sin.

And if you fear that you will not be fair in dealing with the orphans then marry of women as may be agreeable to you, two or three, or four and if you fear you will not deal justly, then marry only one or what your right hands possess. That is the nearest way for you to avoid injustice. -Qur'an 4:2-3

Further take note of the successive verse of the sloka 1:42

For their forefathers fall (down to hell) deprived of the offerings of pinda and water... -Gita 1:42

-is a clear evidence which differentiates the religious practices of the two groups that engaged in the Kurukshetra battle. Were it a battle fought for the kingdom (or) on mere castism basis, this kind of variation in the religious practice should not have been pointed out as a major factor to differentiate the two groups as both were the descendants from one Kuru progeny correlated with each other. Does this not disclose that it was a religious battle fought between two groups- one belonging to corrupt Sanatana Dharma (old) and another belonging to reformed Sanatana Dharma (new) as we say?

Propagation and protection of the religion - enjoined upon believers

As a matter of fact all religious battles of every time of every prophet were fought for the protection of the religion, that too only under the inevitable circumstances when the hostilities by the enemy (non-believers) to out-root the religion attained its extrimity.

The responsibility of both "protection" and propagation" of the religion is an obligatory duty (Vidhita Karma) enjoined upon every believer to be discharged according as to one's own ability of perfor-

mance- disobedience of which leads one to hell while discharging the duty whole- heartedly awards one the pleasures of the earth as well as the Heavenly pleasures (Moksha).

These two points can be well ascertained from the following two slokas of Gita:

A. *Whence in (this) perilous strait has come upon thee this weakness cherished by the unworthy, debaring from heaven and causing disgrace, O Arjuna? -Gita 2:2*

Thus in the above sloka- when Arjuna desisted from attacking the enemy in the battle with despondency, Sri Paramtma warned him that his inaction (not fighting) would prevent him from entering heaven.

B. *Killed thou wilt reach heaven. Victorious, thou wilt enjoy the earth. Wherefore, O son of Kunti, arise, resolved to fight -Gita 2:37*

Protection does not mean aggression- But only defence

These two acts- 'protection' and 'propagation' though quite different in nature and practice, lacking of either of them makes no sense for the other. If one cannot defend the religion, his mere, preaching of it avails no good at all. The former one is confined and restricted for its defence, only when an inescapable threat for its extinction is proved beyond doubt; while the latter is to be carried out merely by means of conveyance and preaching of the plain message wherein no force, no influence, no pressure and no incentive is recommended nor allowed.

1. And fight in the cause of Allah against those who fight against you; but do not transgress. Surely Allah loves not the transgressors -Qur'an 2:190

2. And kill them wherever you meet them and drive them out

from where they have driven you out; for persecution is worse than killing. And fight them not in, and near the sacred mosque until they fight you therein. But if they fight you, then fight them; such is the requital for the disbelievers -Qur'an 2:191

3. But if they desist, then surely Allah is most forgiving merciful -2:192

4. And fight them until there is no persecution; and religion is (freely professed) for Allah. But if they desist then (remember) that no hostility is allowed except against the aggressors -Qur'an 2:193

5. And if they incline towards peace, incline thou also towards it, and put thy trust in Allah. Surely it is He who is all hearing, all-knowing -Qur'an 8:61

6. And if they break their oaths after their covenant, and attack your religion, then fight these leaders of disbelief - surely they have no regard for their oaths - that they may desist -Qur'an 9:12

7. Will you not fight a people who have broken their oaths and who plotted to turn out the messenger and they were the first to commence hostilities against you? Do you fear them? Nay, Allah is most worthy that you should fear him, if you are believers -Qur'an 9:13

8. Fight them that Allah may punish them at your hands, and humiliate them, and help you to victory over them, and relieve the minds of a people who believe -Qur'an 9:14

The foregoing verses of Qur'an explain clearly that only under such critical situation as was faced by Arjuna which forced him to fight the Kurukshetra battle, Prophet Mohammad was ordained to attack the enemy just for the defence and protection of the religion; but not for the propagation purpose nor to launch campaigns of forcible conversions as have been accused to defame Islam.

To this effect we have a reference in Old Testament too.

And He said, Hearken Ye, all Judah and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou king Jehoshaphat, thus saith the Lord unto you, Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours' but God's

-II Chronicles 20:15

Jesus too ordains ...

...And he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one -Luke 22:36

Jesus clearly says which corroborates with the essence of events took place in the battle field of Kurukshetra. 'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it : and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. -Matthew 10:34-39

Now let us see Gita

I. I am the mighty world- destroying time; now engaged in destroying the worlds. Even without thee (O Arjuna) none of the warriors arrayed in hostile armies shalt live -Gita 11:32

II. Therefore do thou arise and obtain fame. Conquer the enemies and enjoy the unrivalled dominion. By myself have they been already slain; be thou a mere instrument O Savyasachi -Gita 11:33

III. Drona and Bhishma, Jayadratha, Karna and other brave warriors- these, killed by me, do thou kill, fear not, fight, thou shalt conquer the enemies -Gita 11:34

IV. He who is free from egoistic notion, whose mind is not tainted, though he kills these creatures, he kills not, he is not bound.

-Gita 18:17

The above slokas of Gita are very simple to understand even by a common man while the last (18:17) requires some clarification. So we offer our exposition as here under.

"He who is free from egoistic notion". He who is fighting in the cause of God should make himself free from egoistic notion, to say in clear terms that he should not feel proud of himself as a great warrior doing favour to God and His religion; but should be thankful to God for having been conferred with the favour of being a participant in the great service of God. God is independent of any thing and of anybody. He can protect His own religion even without none.

... Even without thee (O Arjuna) none of the warriors arrayed in hostile armies shalt live. -Gita 11:32

Therefore do thou arise and obtain fame. Conquer the enemies and enjoy the unrivalled dominion. By myself have they been already slain, be thou a mere instrument. O Savyashachin. -Gita 11:33

"Whose mind is not tainted" -(18:17). At the time of actual encounter with his rival party, one should keep his mind free from prejudiced tendencies such as, of relaxing and favouring his friends and relatives from the rival party out of love and affection and of exhibiting cruel attitude towards others out of one's own personal grudges. And should not entertain the expectations of worldly gains. But think that he is fighting in the cause of God in compliance to his command treating both friend and foe; loss and gain; success and defeat all alike with no discrimination at all. The participants in the religious wars must not violate the basic principles as described in Gita under sloka 18:17 the exposition of which as made out by us. If anyone is fighting and killing the enemy, violating these principles, it can be termed as though he is

fighting on his vested interests only, but not for the sake of God. Hence he incurs sin. Contrary to this those that fight under the strict observance of these principles, do not incur sin even if they kill the whole rival party. this is the exact meaning of the sloka 18:17.

Therefore at all times do thou meditate on me and fight: with mind and reason fixed on me thou shalt doubtless come to me alone -Gita 8:7

O ye who believe! when you encounter an army, remain firm, and remember Allah much that you may prosper -Qur'an 8:45

Then treating alike pleasure and pain, gain and loss, success and defeat, prepare for the battle and thus wilt thou not incur sin -Gita 2:38

Though he kills these creatures... -Gita 18:17

These creatures- All those that are present in the rival party.

He kills not- His killing of them is not credited to the account of Sins.

He is not bound- He is not answerable for their death.

Thus the whole sloka 18:17 goes to mean as saying- there will be no sin if one fights and kills the rival party just for the sake of God in His obedience with no prejudiced tendencies, and with no expectations of worldly rewards treating friend and foe, loss and gain, victory and defeat all alike. But if one acts contrary to these basic principles attains sin and is answerable for the perpetrations what ever.

despondency of Arjuna - out of ignorance in dharm

However after expressing so many doubts and forwarding his suggestions and opinions as have been discussed so far, Arjuna finally

admitted that he was unaware of what was actually right for him in Dharm (Religion).

Pruchhami twam dharma sammudha chetah -Gita 2:7

PRUCHHAMI =	(I am) asking
TWAM =	you
DHARM =	religion
SAMMUDHA =	perplexed, Bewildered
CHETA =	in mind

(As) I, perplexed in mind (about) the religion, am asking you...

(Further the cause for his perplexity is explained in the former verse which reads as here under)

Karpanya dohso pahata swabhawah... (meaning) on account of my ignorance in the religion (*Atma gnana or Devine revelation*)

I have taken the meaning of 'Karpanya doshah' as 'ignorance in the religious knowledge (Atmagnana or devine revelation) mainly basing on the question by Sri Paramatma, after explaining the importance and necessity of the battle, wherein Arjuna had been asked -

Has the delusion of ignorance been destroyed O Dhananjaya? -18:72

The meaning of the complete sloka (2:7) is as follows.

On account of my ignorance I am perplexed in mind about the religion and hence, I being a disciple who surrendered, am asking you to order me (to do) that which is absolutely the best for me -Gita 2:7

N.B: Translated by me basing on the paraphrase from Gita makarandam, Telugu version, by Sri Vidya Prakasa Nandagiri

of Srikalahasti.

Observe other translations too:

1. *Now I am confused about my duty and have lost all composure because of miserly weakness. In this condition I am asking you to tell me for certain what is best for me. Now I am your disciple, and a soul surrendered unto you. Please instruct me (2:7)*
(Bhagvad Gita As it is, by Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta)
2. *My heart contaminated by the taint of helplessness, my mind confounded about dharma. I ask thee: tell me what is absolutely good, I am thy pupil instruct me, who have sought thy grace*
(The Bhagvad Gita 2:7- by Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastry)

Paramatma explains as to what a bhakta should do for the protection of the religion

Now let us examine some of the revelations as given by God through Sri Paramatma, which reflect on the point that which is absolutely good for Arjuna, whether to fight the battle or desist.

Cast off mean weakness: the fear of death

1. *Yield not to unmanliness (klaibyam) O Son of Pritha. It does not become thee. Cast off this base weakness of heart and arise, O Tormentor of foes -Gita 2:3*

Klaibyam - impotency

This is to mean as saying...

O subduer of enemy! why have you been subdued by the mean weakness of your doubtful thought that your limited followers (army) would be destructed by the huge enemy? Cast off this mean weakness. It does not behove to your majesty. Get up and attack the enemy.

One cannot escape from death

2. Question: Why one should cast off this mean weakness?

Ans: Because death is an inevitable process through which every one has to pass. So one should not fear death, but fear God.

These bodies of the embodied (soul) who is eternal, indestructible and unknowable are said to have an end. Do fight, therefore O Descendant of Bharata. -Gita 2:18

This is to mean as saying.

O Arjuna! Even if you are firm in the battle field fighting the enemy in the cause of God, or escape from it, you cannot escape death because, "*These bodies are said to have an end*". Then why not one make an end of one's own body while in the obedience of God performing the greatest Yagna of Dharm yudh?

Timely act - as has been enjoined upon, is commendable

3. Hence, act - act according to what has been enjoined upon you.

Do thou perform thy enjoined duty; for action (performance of enjoined duty) is superior to inaction (non compliance of the enjoined duty). And even the maintenance of the body would not be possible for thee by inaction -Gita 3:8

4. So, not caring for the result whether you would defeat the enemy or that you would be defeated, act - act as has been enjoined.

Thus we read in Gita.

Thy concern is with action alone, never with results. Let not the fruit of action be thy motive, nor let thy attachment be for

inaction -Gita 2:47

5. Do not think- "I will fight only if there is chance of victory". This may lead you to inaction which is disobedience and there by you will incur sin which ultimately leads you to hell.

Then treating alike pleasure and pain, gain and loss, success and defeat, prepare for the battle and thus wilt thou not incur sin -Gita 2:38

This is to mean as saying

Obedience is the highest virtue. Be obedient in discharging your enjoined duty whatever be your state: whether it is favourable or unfavourable; be it pleasant or painful; because discharging the duty while only in prosperous and favourable condition and not doing it while in adverse and unfavourable condition - is hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is greater sin than disobedience. So if you go on discharging your duty, treating both fortunes and misfortunes alike, you will not incur sin - means you will be rewarded.

6. Now if you wouldst not fight this dharm yudh (religious battle) then having abandoned thine duty thou wilt be defamed and thou shalt incur sin -2:33

To mean as saying:

For the protection of the religion this battle has been ordained to you. Now it is your (vidhita karma) enjoined duty which you should discharge under any circumstances. If you do not fight this battle by neglecting God's commandment you shall incur sin which finally takes you to hell.

7. Renouncing all (fruits of) actions in me, with thy thought resting on the self (atmagnana) being free from hope, free from selfishness, devoid of fever, do thou fight -Gita 3:30

As regards to the above, the brief and precise commentary of Sri Sankaracharya is note worthy. He writes as follows...

"Surrender all actions with the wise thought that - I the agent, DO THIS for the Iswara's sake as His liege"

Say O Prophet... "My prayer and my sacrifice and my life and my death are all for Allah the Lord of the Worlds.

-Qur'an 6:162

However the sloka goes to mean as explaining that what ever (enjoined actions) you do, -do it for the pleasure of God. This is a divine battle for the protection of the religion (Dharm). So do fight purely for the sake of God without any place for selfish ends.

8. And again.

Having regard to thine own duty also, thou oughtst not to waver, for, to a Kshatriya, there is nothing more wholesome than a - Dharma yudh- [religious battle] -Gita 2:31

The caluse "*Having regard to thine own duty also*" of the above sloka has two fold meanings. This significantly represents to his (Arjuna's) being a Kshatriya, which means a member of the royal family only, but does not under any way represent to the Kshatriya caste, nor as a king by himself. O Arjuna, you have been appointed as a prophet of God for the protection of the religion. And hence it is your incumbent duty not only of preaching but also you have to protect the religion, just as every Kshatriya takes responsibility of protecting the kingdom as well as its subjects.

Further the above clause reflects upon the specific nature, of bravery of a kshatriya (any member from a royal family) who is well trained in battle activities. He is proved to be courageous in performing the adventures. He is a ferocious warrior in attacking the enemy

mercilessly for the defensive purposes. If this be the case of your natural attitude in defending the kingdoms - "O Arjuna, even by taking this fact for consideration, there appears no reason and meaning in your wavering to attack the enemy, in this way by some plea or the other".

Further Sri Paramatma makes mention as to why particularly a Kshatriya should not waver -

For, to a Kshatriya, there is nothing more wholesome than the dharm yudh [religious battle] -2:31

This is to mean as saying, O Arjuna, Kshatriyas are well-versed in battles, and defence is their main duty and so you might have fought several battles. But this is far superior to all such battles as had been fought for the protection of kingdoms. Because this is a religious battle where one fights and proves himself as one exclusively living for God and dying for God alone but for nothing else.

Here one should not misunderstand that the religious battles are enjoined only upon the Kshatriyas (members of royal families) and that other people are exempted. No. But it is an incumbent duty on every Bhakta to participate in the religious battles according as to one's own status or ability. But here as Arjuna was thus trying to escape the battle on one plea or the other, was reminded of his Kshatriya quality of being a courageous warrior, just to induce and prepare him for the battle.

To understand the above points in its perspective sense, please examine the following illustration.

Example: One fateful night a robber entered the house of a man and snatched away the golden ornament from his neck at the knife point and was running away. The man shouted for help and some of his neighbours came running for his rescue, but knowing that the thief

had a knife in his hand nobody dared to run after the thief to catch hold of him. Then the man requested a particular man from the gathering to help him in nabbing the thief. But he too dared not to comply with his requisition. Then the man told him-

"Yield not to unmanliness and cast off this weakness of heart (klaya). It does not become thee "O man of service in Army", and continued- "Having regard to thine own duty also, thou oughtst not to waver. For, to an army man, there is nothing more wholesome than helping a man in need".

The above words are spoken only in inductive sense stressing on the bravery of the Army people. So also Sri Paramatma stressed on the nature of bravery of the Kshatriya, but not on the point of casteism. Just as the man of our illustration has no specific identity as a man belonging to Army caste, so was the case with Kshatriya (community) of Arjuna.

Battle of Kurukshetra - not for worldly gains

Fightings- may be they single combats or group encounters, individual murder or human genocide whatever, are designed with strong motive of acquiring pleasures, gains, profits and ownership which are generally followed by the success after defeating one's own rival. And at the time of actual encounter with enemy, one plans strategy to be free from pain and loss keeping his objective ever to be protected from defeat and hoping for success. These are but natural phenomena of every one when he attacks his rival. In reality, engaging in fightings at the risk of one's own life with no expectations of such favours and fortunes as these makes no meaning at all, were it not merely a religious war where a bhakta engages in battles such as are fought for the protection of the religion, purely in obedience to God's command without hoping for any of such benefits as are generally expected of by the warriors.

Therefore at all times do thou meditate on me and fight: with mind and reason fixed on me, thou shalt doubtless come to me alone -Gita 8:7

Then treating alike pleasure and pain; gain and loss, success and defeat, prepare for the battle, and thus wilt thou not incur sin -Gita 2:38

Renouncing all actions in me, with thy thought resting on the self being free from hope, free from selfishness devoid of fever do thou fight -Gita 3:30

Thy concern is with action alone, never with results. Let not the fruit of action be thy motive, nor let thy attachment be for inaction -Gita 2:47

Battles fought basing on these principles are self explanatory that they are not fought for the worldly gains, except as to please God, for the protection of the religion, only with an aim of attaining Moksha.

Highest reward - Swarga

Now I would like to take you back to the subject of moksha. Keeping in view of all the points which have been discussed relating to the battle of Kurukshetra one can conceive that how horrible is the task of participating (fighting) in the religious battles (3:1)¹. One has to surpass all these hurdles such as have been discussed under the chapter Kurukshetra, merely to prove oneself to be obedient to God. To be very frank there is no any Karma may it be pertaining to devotional service or sacrificial act and however great may it be - can in no way be as virtuous as the participation in the religious battles (2:31). Unlike as in any other yagna one becomes himself a yagna pasuvu (an animal intended for sacrifice). In other yagnas one offers some animal or some kind of cash for sacrifice, but here in these battles one comes forward and offers himself in the sacrifice for the protection of religion.

1. (Arjuna said)... Why do you want to engage me in this ghastly warfare...? (Gita As it is 3:1)

Therefore the reward promised for such self sacrifice must also be greater than any other reward.

...Thou shalt doubtless come to me alone -Gita 8:7

And if you die or be slain surely unto Allah shall you be gathered together -Qur'an 3:158

Thus the moksha is promised for all those that pass away from the world being obedient in the service of God as has been ordained. What do the words "Come to Me" or in other words "attain Him" mean to? Do they really mean as merging into God as is being professed under the doctrine of Moksha?

To arrive at its correct interpretation, let us examine some other relevant slokas as have been enjoined while ordering to fight the religious battles.

Considering your specific duty as a Kshatriya, you should know that there is no better engagement for you than fighting on religious principles; and so there is no need for hesitation -Bhagavad Gita As it is 2:31

Why there is no better engagement than fighting this battle?

O Partha, happy are the kshatriyas to whom such fighting opportunities come unsought, opening for them the doors of Heaven (Swarga) -Gita 2:32

If you are slain in the cause of Allah or you die, surely forgiveness from Allah and Mercy shall be better than what they hoard -Qur'an 3:157

And again

Killed thou wilt reach Heaven (Swarga) victorious thou wilt enjoy the earth, wherefore, O Son of Kunti arise, resolved to fight -Gita 2:37

Thus it is made clear that "attaining of God" of the sloka 8:7 is not to mean as merging into God, but attaining Swarga. Thus it is made clear in unequivocal terms that Moksha is attaining swarga not being confined to Naraka.

Every soul shall taste of death. And you shall be paid in full your rewards only on the day of resurrection. So whosoever is removed away from the fire [Naraka] and is made to enter heaven [Swarga] has indeed attained his goal [Moksha]. And the life of this world is nothing but an illusory enjoyment.
-Qur'an 3:185

It is made clear that there is no greater devotional or sacrificial service in religion than of participating in the battles such as are fought for the protection of the religion, where a bhakata comes forward to offer his own life in sacrifice. For his such greatest service, the greatest reward is promised. That is the reward of heaven. Does this not prove that there is no any reward as great as the reward of Heaven? Does this point not rule out of merging into God - a Moksha?

Mankind divided under two groups - The divine and demonic - the former one for heaven and the latter one for hell.

In the religious aspect entire mankind has been classified as two categories, namely Divine and Demonic (16:6)¹. All God fearing and virtuous and obedient people come under the category of Divine lot and contrary to this, the un-godly, sinful, and disobedient people are termed as demonic. The former one is deemed for liberation (Moksha) while the latter one is liable for condemnation in Hell (16:5)²

1. O son of Pritha, in this world there are two kinds of created beings. One is called divine and the other demoniac... -Gita as it is 16:6

2. The transcendental qualities are conducive to liberation, whereas the demoniac qualities make for bondage. Do not worry, o son of Pandu for you are born with the divine qualities. -Gita As it is 16:5

And again this demonic nature is distinguished as follows under five groups -

1. Agnostic - 16:7-9

2. Polytheistic- (Asuchi vratah = Those that perform devotional services to others (16:10)

3. Sinful -16:11-13

4. Proclaimers of divinity- or those that proclaim themselves to be gods or incarnates of God. - 16:14

5. Hypocritical - 16:15

People belonging to above groups/group are destined for Hell punishment.

Bewildered by many a fancy, entangled in the snare of delusion, addicted to the gratification of lust, they fall into foul hell.
-Gita 16:16

Thus it is made clear that those who are of demonic habits and qualities go to hell.

Furthermore God warns people in general to be free from the main three qualities of demonic nature. These three- Lust, Wrath, and Greed are the parental source from which all kinds of demonic acts are evoked. Hence these three qualities are described as destructive of the soul; for they are the gateway to Hell(16:21)¹. And again stress is made on the point that whoever is released from Hell (one who is escaped from entering into Hell) by abandoning the deeds leading to Hell are recognized as fortunate ones as they are eligible for Moksha

1. There are three Gunas (qualities) which lead to the gate of Hell (Naraka) destructive of the soul. Lust anger and miserliness. Therefore these three one should abandon. -Gita 16:21

(16:22)¹. Thus the people of demonic activities are threatened with the Hell punishment but not with transmigration of soul to another body, in another Janma, the point of which is noteworthy.

Men of the three Vedas, the Soma drinkers, purified from sin, worshipping me by sacrifices, pray for the goal of heaven, they reach the holy world of the Lord of the Devas and enjoy in heaven the heavenly pleasures of the Devas -Gita 9:20

As according to slokas 16:6 and 5, it is learnt that entire mankind is divided as only two groups- Divine and Demonic whose goal is described as attaining of Moksha and falling into foul hell respectively. From it, in the logical aspect the word hell being just opposite of Heaven, the moksha, as has been assured for the divine lot must reasonably mean to say that they would be made enter into heaven. Thus moksha means- 'not merging into God', but attaining swarga (Heaven). And again keeping in view of this logic, the prayer of the people of divine lot of above sloka 9:20 for heaven and the assurance of God of giving them heaven represent only to moksha. Thus it is proved that attaining of swarga (heaven) is moksha but not merging into God. Now what the question is that contrary to this if moksha in the sense of merging into God were a greater privilege than attaining heaven, could ever those people who were not demonic but of divine lot- drinkers of soma juice with great scriptural knowledge of Vedas who ever worshipped God with sacrifices even after having been forgiven of all their sins, could ever have prayed for heaven instead of moksha, if moksha were to mean as merging into God, a greater privilege than attaining heaven?

In compliance to God's command if one engages in the religious wars, glad tidings of the entrance to heaven (Swarga dwaram apavrutam) is promised (2:32) and contrary to this, he who disobeys

1. A man who is released from these three gates to Hell, o son of Kunti, does good to the self and thereby reaches the supreme goal [attains Moksha].

-Gita 16:22

and does not fight, is threatened with the (evil) consequence of 'de-barring from heaven (ASWARGYAM)' means no entrance to heaven (2:2).

Thus the (entering into) heaven as the highest reward for those that die for God's religion- is obvious. Thus moksha is attaining of swarga but not merging into God.

Now we invite your attention towards the following sloka.

And the man also who hears (the teachings of Gita) full of faith and free from malice even he, liberated (Muktah), shall attain to the happy worlds (Subhan lokan) of the righteous -Gita 18:71

Here in this sloka, it is clearly admitted that man after liberation (Mukti) attains the happy worlds or heavenly planets where righteous people dwell. Thus it is made clear that man does not merge in God nor transmigrates into another body.

If no expiation offered, forefathers fall into hell - a clear testimony that there is no transmigration of soul to another body

...Their forefathers fall down to hell deprived of the offerings of pinda and water -Gita 1:42

This sloka suggests offering of pinda and water as an expiation for the sins of one's own forefathers. Why? Because they are not in the world. Offering of any thing such as expiation on behalf of any person is acceptable only when he is not existing in the world which is the only place (KARAMANUSHTANA LOKA) where performance of Karma is possible. Thus this sloka discloses the very fact that the pithrus (forefathers), to say in clear terms that every departed soul is suspended to such a state in which performance of Karma to get moksha is not possible.

Have the forefathers already been cast into foul Hell? No but only their falling is apprehended if their sins are not substituted by the expiations. Thus they are neither in this world being able to perform Karma nor in the Hell, but as according to sloka 2:28¹ they have attained a state of imperceptibility (AVYAKTA -or- invisible) where they remain in such state till kalpadi (Day of resurrection) which is to be followed after pralaya (9:7)². However what all these points make clear is that there is no chance for the departed souls to move in this world with ability of performance of Karma which point refutes the doctrine of transmigration of soul.

What become of men after death?

What happens to man after his death? Physical body merges into prakriti either by means of cremation or burial and remains there until kalpadi (Resurrection 9:7). The soul (Atma) goes back to the place from where it had first entered into the body (7:5). Thus man becomes AVYAKTA (invisible) and remains in that state till kalpadi (2:28). Now the question is- when does the attaining of either swarga or falling down into foul hell take place?

As regards to this even though there is no specific sloka it can be well presumed from the following sloka that only on the Day of Resurrection, the whole mankind right from the first dead man to the last group of people of the day of pralaya (Kalpakshaya/ Doooms day) will be raised and gathered before God for judgment on which day (after judgment) the righteous will be awarded swarga (heaven) and the wicked will be thrown into the foul Hell (Narakah).

All beings, O Son of Kunti, go into my prakriti (nature) at the kalpakshaya (pralaya). I create them again at the kalpadi

1. Beings have their beginning unseen, their middle seen, and their end unseen again... 2:28
2. All beings at the end of Kalpa (kalpakshaye) go into my prakriti; and create them (bring them forth) again at the beginning of the kalpa. (kalpadi) 9:7

[resurrection day] -Gita 9:7

Sarvabhootani - All beings (Every thing that has been created. All beings both animated and inanimated).

Thus Sarvabhootani go into the prakriti means- every thing that has been created for man including the multitude of human beings then existing, will be destroyed. This day is known as Kalpakshaya, Doooms Day or the Day of Destruction. Thus after the destruction (death), all beings merge into the nature where they remain AVYAKTA (in the state of invisibility) till the Day of Resurrection or Kalpadi. Thus the whole surface of earth becomes plain (purely plain) with no existence of any thing. Thus whole mankind becomes AVYAKTA and remains in the same state of invisibility till the day of Resurrection (Kalpadi).

The relevant sloka 2:28 helps a lot in disclosing that what happens to the mankind in general after its death.

Beings have their beginning unseen (avyakta), their middle seen (vyakta) and after their death unseen again, why any lamentation regarding them? -Gita 2:28

1. Before birth beings were AVYAKTA or unmanifested
2. Their middle (after birth) VYAKTA or manifested
3. After their death (Nidhanani) AVYAKTA or unmanifested

This sloka has been discussed in detail in our previous chapter. Now I would like to pinpoint in brief on the point at issue keeping in view of the theory of transmigration of soul. This only sloka is enough to dampen the theory of Janma after Janma. Three main states of man are described. Except in the middle, both before his birth and after his death, man remains in invisible or unmanifested state. Does this not prove that man takes his Janma (manifests himself in visible form only once) with an appointed term of life, to perform Karma?

And again does the point of his being in unseen or unmanifested state before his birth not bear testimony that this present life (of his) is not given either as a reward or punishment for the Karmas of his past Janma, as he was not at all manifested on the surface of earth? And does this not prove that this present janma is not a successive janma of somany past janmas as is being professed?

And again, does man after his death go on taking other forms? No, but remains in unseen or unmanifested state. Thus man, neither before his birth nor after his death ever manifested (nor is to be manifested till Kalpadi) in any form with the ability of performing Karma, except as only once in the life term - from his birth to his death, is evident from the above points.

Thus every man gets janma (to perform karma) only once and dies after the completion of his life term and remains in unmanifested state until kalpadi.

TWO WORLDS - IHALOKA (Karmanusthana loka) and PARALOKA (Karmaphalanubhava loka)

Now let us examine some other slokas:

A. Any thing done as sacrifice, charity or penance (tapah) without faith is called - asat - and is useless both in this life and hereafter -Gita 17:28

In this sloka 'ASAT' acts are described to be fruitless both in this life and in the life to come herefter. By saying - both in this life (Iha) and after death (pretya), two lives are distinctly pointed out. One belonging to this world (Iham) and the other (Pretya) after death (of parah).

Pretya = after death

B. O Partha, neither in this world nor in the hereafter is there any destruction for him; none verily who does good, my son ever comes to grief -Gita 6:40

Here assurance is given to those that do good. They never come to grief. And there will be no destruction either in this world (iha) nor in the life to come (amutra) hereafter. In this sloka also, it is specifically pointed out about two lives of which, one of this world and the other - of life to come hereafter.

C. Eating of embrosia, the remnant of the sacrifice, they go to eternal Brahma. This world is not for the nonsacrificer, whence the other? - O best of Kurus. -Gita 4:31

In this sloka, a non-sacrificer is warned that for him there is no happiness in this world and interrogatively asking- "where is the happiness for him in the other world?" to mean as saying that for such man there is no happiness either in this world or in the world to come.

NA AYAM LOKAH ... KUTAH ANYAH?

Not in this world ... where (is in) another (world)?

And at the same time the sacrificer (eater of the remnant of the sacrifice) is given glad tidings of reaching eternal Brahma.

YANTI BRAHMA SANATANA = Reach Brahma eternal.

Thus the words 'Reach eternal Brahma' should not be taken to mean as saying those that are liberated by performing sacrifices merge into eternal Brahma but they will reach to a world full of bliss and happiness where they can have meetings (Darshanas) with eternal Brahma, contrary to the unhappy world as threatened with to the non-sacrificer. Thus in this sloka two places (worlds) are mentioned - one is happy and the other is unhappy - to be allotted to every one after his death according as to one's own deeds. Now the question is whether

my interpretation to the clause 'reach eternal Brahma' as to 'reach Swarga' is correct or not.

In this regard it may be noted that in this sloka, it is made clear that the non-sacrificer will attain an unhappy world while the sacrificer will go to the eternal Brahma. Thus a stress on the condition of performing of sacrifices, obedience of which leads one to eternal Brahma and the disobedience to unhappy world is obvious. In this connection we have in Gita another sloka which ratify our view that reaching of Brahma by way of performing sacrifices does not really mean to merge in Brahma, but to reach swarga (heaven) where one can have darshanah (meeting) with Brahma. As regards to this, I would like to remind the following sloka, wherein, it is made clear that those people who perform sacrifices go to swarga.

Men of three Vedas, the soma drinkers, purified from sins, worshipping me by sacrifices pray for the goal of heaven, they reach the holy world of the lord of the Devatas and enjoy in heaven the heavenly pleasures -Gita 9:20

So in the light of this sloka (9:20) attaining of eternal Brahma of sloka 4:31¹- means attaining of eternal swarga is disclosed. Thus moksha is not merging into God, but attaining of swarga.

D. The ignorant person, the faithless one and a doubting person is ruined. For a doubting person there is no happiness either in this world nor in the next world (Paraloka) -Gita 4:40

In this sloka also we have the mention of another world (prah loka) and this world (ihaloka)

Na ayam lokah... na parah. = Neither in this world ... Nor (in) another.

1. Eating of embrosia, the remnant of the sacrifice, they o to eternal Brchma...
-Gita 4:31

The central point of this sloka to focuss upon, the fact is that the ignorant person, the faithless one and a doubting person is ruined.

How is he ruined?

For him there is no happiness either in this world (Ayam lokah) nor in the next world (parah). Now what our point of argument is that were it true that man attains janma after janma endlessly until he merges into God, could there have been a place for a specific mention such as parah loka, where, as according to all above slokas, man either suffers unhappiness or enjoys happiness after one's own death? Does this not mean that this world (iha loka) is given for man as karmanushthana loka which is the only place where man can perform karma and that parahloka as a place of "karmaphalanubhava loka" where one suffers or enjoys as according to his own deeds of this world?

Sri Paramatma revives dharm but man revives adharm

Basing on a number of decisive slokas the doctrine of transmigration of soul to a number of bodies of various janmas until as one merges in God as moksha is rebutted. False doctrines generally prevail owing to notions. Wrong interpretation or misconception of any figurative or descriptive sloka (statement) is the main gate for notions. And thus these two- the notions and the doctrines interdepending on each other compel for interpolations in the scriptures. Such interpolations as are added in the scripture to justify the invented dogmas invariably contradict the original scripture. Thus contradictions exist in the text. And thus the scripture (Book) becomes ambiguous. Ambiguity leads to perplexity. scriptures consisting of discrepancies is self explanatory to the fact that it has been rendered to human interference.

However, this doctrine of souls' transmigration is not newly invented by the existing Hinduism of post- Gita period, but it was existing in the Hinduism of pre-Gita period also. This doctrine had been one of the corruptions along with so many which altogether had eroded the Sanatana Dharma of pre-Gita period necessitating Sri paramatma again to descend and revive it.

After explaining the nature of soul and body, and the states and periods through which man after having been created - transformed to and passed through respectively before manifesting himself as man on earth and after his death the state into which he transforms and remains until as kalpadi (second creation) takes place etc. which all points have been discussed by us in detail so far, Sri paramatma while consoling the grieving Arjuna, further says as-

But even if thou thinks of Atma as ever being born and ever dying... -Gita 2:26

Does this mean that atma (soul) is constantly being born again, and again dying? This only clause disprove the doctrine of transmigration of soul.

Now what most pitiable thing is that despite all such revivalistic teachings as paramatma made to root-out this doctrine (after a long lapse of time) the followers of revived Sanatana Dharma again erected the same doctrines which had been demolished.

Now let us examine some popular slokas that are found in Gita which contradict the well-established argument that man gets life on this planet only once for the performance of Karma and after his death remains in invisible (AVYAKTA) state after having been dissolved into prakriti until kalpadi (second creation) and then (after judgement) one attains either swarga or narakah according as to one's own karma done while living in this loka (world).

Contradiction - A proof for interpolation

The following is the question of Arjuna to Paramatma to explain that what does become of the man who is having faith, yet fails to get perfection in the performance of Yoga.

He who strives not, but who is possessed of faith, whose mind wanders away from yoga, having failed to attain perfection in yoga what end, O Krishna, does he meet? -Gita 6:37

The main part of his question is...

'kam gatim gacchati?' 'which destiny does he obtain?'

(to mean as asking - whether he attains hell - or heaven)

And again in continuation to his above question, he further, in a suggestive manner expresses his conjecture (doubt) that such a man perishes - opining as here under...

Having failed in both, does he not perish like a riven cloud, supportless, O Mighty- armed, and perplexed in the path to Brahma? -Gita 6:38

As a reply to his above question and opinion regarding the man who passed away without attaining perfection in yoga, Sri Paramatma says as here under.

O Partha, neither in this world nor in the next is there destruction for him, none verily who does good, my son, ever comes to grief -Gita 6:40

And in another sloka we read...

There is no loss of effort here, there is no harm. Even a little of this devotion delivers one from great fear -Gita 2:40

This is to mean as saying...

O Arjuna, as you think, the man who passed away even without attaining perfection in yoga, does not go to destruction (Durgatim) and as such there is no grief for him. So it is understood that such a man attains (Param gatim) the highest blissful place called Heaven. Thus there ended the relevant answer to the question of Arjuna. But surprisingly enough, we find some subjunctive slokas presumably arranged (consecutively) for the antithesis of the above answer.

The following subjunctive slokas are specimen to show that how interpolations not only contradict the original scriptures but also some times render self contradiction within the self same sloka; and what more humorous is that interpolations go to such an extent as to create disharmony and inconsistency among such interpolated slokas themselves while disagreeing with each other.

- a. *Having attained to the worlds of the righteous (swarga) and having dwelt there for eternal years, he who failed in yoga is reborn in a house of the pure and wealthy -Gita 6:41*
- b. *Else, he is born in a family of wise yogins only. This, verily a birth like this, is very hard to obtain in this world -Gita 6:42*
- c. *There he gains touch with the knowledge that was acquired in the former body and strives more than before for perfection O son of the Kurus -Gita 6:43*
- d. *By that former very practice is he born on, though unwillingly. Even he who merely wishes to know of yoga rises superior to the world of Brahma -Gita 6:44*
- e. *Verily a yogin who strives with assiduity, purified from sins, and perfected in the course of many births, then reaches the supreme goal -Gita 6:45*

Inconsistency - Discloses perversion

Let us bear in mind that the question of Arjuna was not about one that never knew what yoga was; but only about one that failed to attain perfection in yoga. That means he started the performance of yoga, but could not attain perfection (6:37,38).

And let us also bear in mind that Sri Paramatma gave a perfect answer to the question of Arjuna, about the destiny of the man who failed to attain perfection in yoga, saying as that for him there is no durgatim (destruction) either in this world or in the paralokah (6:40) to mean as saying that the man lives in peace as long as he lives in this world and after passing away from here, he shall attain a transcendental place where from none desires to come back (15:6)¹ nor is any one driven out of it because it is an eternal abode (18:56).

Now keeping these points in view, let us examine the following slokas Gita 6:41 and 6:42.

In sloka 6:41 it is told, that ...

1. he who fails to attain perfection reaches to swarga where he dwells for eternal years. And again in the self same sloka it is further told, that ...

2. he takes his rebirth in a house of pure and wealthy.

As regards to the words of sanscrit text "SASWATIḤ SAMAH" some have interpreted as "many years" while some others as 'eternal years'. Thus difference of opinion among different interpreters is seen. However the word 'many' represents to limited years, while 'eternal' (SASWATIḤ OR SASWATAM) signifies to endless years, which point is an authentic proof that he who reaches heaven dwells there for ever and ever endlessly. But the consecutive line of he same sloka says that

1. That supreme abode of Mine is not illumined by the sun or moon, or by fire or electricity. Those who reach it never the turn to thus material world. -15:6

he takes his rebirth in a house of pure and wealthy after dwelling in heaven for eternal years. Thus this sloka is subjected to self contradiction. Now the question is whether one is given heaven for eternal dwelling or only as an intermediary tentative dwelling place. World is not a happy place to be preferred to heaven (9:33). So if he is sent out of the heaven to take his rebirth in pure and wealthy family means he is subjected to destruction (durgatim) but in no way favoured however great and pure the family may it be in which he is going to take his rebirth. Sri Paramatma says there is no destruction (durgatim) for him nor he attains grief (6:40). This point also rules out the theory of attainment of rebirth in pure and wealthy family or in the family of wise yogins as made mention in slokas 6:41, 42.

Now there comes another query that if it were true, what for does he take his rebirth in the family of yogins or pure and wealthy. The answer is given in its consecutive sloka -6:43.

There he gains touch with the knowledge that was acquired in the former body and strives more than before for perfection, O son of the Kurus. -Gita 6:43

Thus according to slokas 6:43¹ and 6:45¹ it is explained that the man who passed away without attaining perfection in the performance of yoga, takes rebirth in many janmas and strives for perfection. Thus attainment of eternal world of Brahma is conditioned by the act of perfection of yoga as a necessary means for the attainment of eternal abode, while this basic condition is condemned by another sloka 6:44 wherein leave alone the question of performance or perfection of yoga, but a stress is given on saying as even a wish to know of yoga is enough to make one eligible to go to the superior world of Brahma which is eternal (4:31). This point outrightly condemns the necessity of

1.A. There he gains touch with the knowledge that was acquired in the former body and strives more than before for perfection O son of the Kurus -Gita 6:43

B. Verily a yogin who strives with assiduity, purified from sins, and perfected in the course of many births, then reaches the supreme goal -Gita 6:45

taking a number of rebirths in various janmas as a necessary means to get moksha. And this was the exact opinion of Sri Paramatma conveyed in the answer (6:40)¹, to the question of Arjuna, saying as, when yoga is started with good intent and even if it is not perfected for any reason, that man attains param gatim (Heaven) released of great fear 2:40².

Is God unjust?

We have another sloka that explains the reason of man's return from heaven, which reads as here under.

They having enjoyed that spacious world of swarga, their merit (punya) exhausted, enter the world of the mortals; thus following the Dharma of the triad desiring (objects of) desires, they attain to the state of going and returning. -Gita 9:21

From the above sloka it is made clear that man who gets swarga quits it in due course, and comes back to this world again, having his punyas (fruit of good karmas) been exhausted in barter of enjoying the heavenly pleasures. Thus the record of karmas of punyatma (virtuous man) becomes blank with no merit (punya) left over there in. If this be the reason for coming out of the swarga to take rebirth in the mortal world, now the question is that what extra virtue yet there remains with the man (of sloka 6:40) to confer a special favour of enabling him of attaining his rebirth in the family of a pure and wealthy (6:41) or in the family of wise yogins (6:42), were the doctrine of transmigration of soul a truth?

Keeping in view of all these points - a sinner (Papi) has also every right and reason to claim logically, a favour to be conferred

1. C. O Partha, neither in this world nor in the next is there destruction for him, none verily who does good, my son, ever comes to grief -Gita 6:40

D. There is no loss of effort here, there is no harm. Even a little of this devotion delivers one from great fear -Gita 2:40

upon him enabling him too, to take his rebirth in the wombs of the wise yogins or pure and wealthy families just as his counter part i.e., the man returned from heaven has been blessed with.

In this regard what the logic is- punyatma comes out of the heaven after having enjoyed the heavenly pleasures in exchange of his merits (punyas). So also a papi after having suffered the narakah (Hell) as punishment for his sins and thus having his sins been expiated, comes out of hell with a blank sheet of his record of karma effaced of his sins. Thus the karma records of both punyatma (virtuous man) and papi (sinner) of previous births become blank and clean with no entries of credits and debits of their karmas - one having his virtues been extinguished in exchange of his heavenly enjoyments and the other having his sins been effaced by means of suffering in Hell.

In this connection what we like to point out is that the former one is provided a chance of the observance of religious rites and rituals by taking his rebirth in the families of yogins etc, as the process of which ultimately leads him to moksha. But the case of the latter one is quite different. The following slokas reveal his fate.

a. These cruel haters worst of men, I hurl these evil- doers for ever in the worlds into the wombs of the demons only. -Gita 6:19

b. Entering into demonic wombs, the deluded ones, in birth after birth without ever reaching me, O son of Kunti, pass into a condition still lower than that. -Gita 16:20

Now let us examine these points in an another way.

Logic rules out notions

Soul of the man

1. Does not slay nor is it slain (2:19) (NOT A DOER - HENCE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEEDS OF MAN)

2. Cannot be cut nor be burnt (2:23, 24) (FREE FROM THE NATURE OF SUFFERING OR ENJOYING)

3. Is not born, nor does it ever die (2:20) (DOES NOT TAKE NUMBER OF BIRTHS AND HENCE DOES NOT UNDERGO NUMBER OF DEATHS)

Keeping in view of the nature of soul as mentioned in the above slokas, it can easily be perceived that...

A. the soul is an entity which cannot act - hence, being not a doer of any karma (deed) legality of requital either for punishment or reward does not attract. Fact being thus how far is it reasonable to award swarga and then rebirth in the family of wise yogins to the souls of the righteous people (6:41-45) or to hurl the souls of wicked to demonic wombs (16:19,20) since the souls are not at all responsible for the deeds of man?

B. And moreover the faculty of soul is such as it makes no difference whether it be cast into Hell or Heaven, being free from the nature of either suffering tortures or enjoying pleasures. Contrary to this basic nature of soul, how far is it justifiable to say concerning the souls of righteous ones as...

They having enjoyed that spacious world of swarga, their merit (punyas) exhausted, enter the world of the mortals...

-Gita 9:21

Does this not seem more ridiculous to accept that their punyas have been exhausted in the barter of heavenly pleasures, than of accepting the impossible thing such as of drinking of water from mirages? Because, for a soul swarga is as useless as a mirage for any

thirsty man. And again snatching away of the punyas for NO ENJOYMENT at all, (for soul does not enjoy nor does it suffer) is an unjust act on the part of God.

C. And again, in very clear terms, as soul is eternal there is no question of death and hence it goes without saying that there is no probability of rebirth either in the wombs of yogins for the righteous souls or in the demonic wombs for the wicked souls.

Narakam nityam - Swargam sasvatam

Now I would like to invite your attention on the following sloka of Gita as translated by Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastry.

We have heard, O Janardhana, that necessary is the dwelling in hell of the men whose family dharmas are subverted
-Gita 1:44

The above translation just makes mention that such people (as are mentioned in the sloka) necessarily dwell in Hell. But the duration of their Hell punishment is not pointed out. But the examination of the Sanscrit text reveals that the dwelling in Hell is NIYATAM means always or permanent.

Narakam niyatam vaso -1:44

Sri A.C Bhakti Vedanta in his translation for this sloka, in Bhagavad Gita As It is, presents as here under.

O Krishna, O Maintainer of the people, I have heard by disciplic sucession that those who destroys family traditions dwell always in hell - 1:43

Thus hell is proved to be a place of eternal punishment.

And again as regards to the dwelling in Heaven, Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta translates the relevant sloka as here under.

The unsuccessful yogi, after many many years of enjoyment on the planets of pious living entitiels... -Gita 6:41

Thus the dwelling in Heaven is restricted to limited years by translating SASWATI SAMAH to mean as many many years. While Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastry presents his translation as here under.

Having attained to the worlds of the righteous and having dwelt there for eternal years... -Gita 6:41

Thus the dwelling in Heaven is not restricted to 'many many years' but it is disclosed that it is an everlasting, endless and eternal abode.

Whatever be the irregularities in the translations, but basing on the Sanscrit text the fact is made vivid that.

1. dwelling in Swarga is Saswatam (Permanent) - SASWATI SAMAH (6:41) and that

2. dwelling in Narakah is niyatam (always) permanent - NARAKE NIYATAM VASO -1:43,44

Blasphemy - Disguised

Your attention is invited on the following slokas

Men of small knowledge are very much attached to the flowery words of the Vedas, which recommend various fruitive activities for elevation to heavenly planets, resultant good birth, power and soforth, being desirous of sense gratification and opulent life, they say that there is nothing more than this
- Bhagavad Gita As It is 2:42-43

It is said in the above slokas that the Vedas contain flowery words. These flowery words recommend fruitive activities. By performing these fruitive activities, one attains swarga. Being desirous of sense gratification and opulent life they (men of small knowledge) say that there is

nothing more than this - swarga the place where one can enjoy all pleasures. (or) They (the men of small knowledge) say that there is no more than this portion of the vedas which recommend fruitive activities by the performance of which one attains swarga.

The sum and substance of the above two slokas is that the unwise (foolish) people long to have swarga as their final abode for the gratification of their desires by enjoying heavenly pleasures, just taking the flowery words of the Vedas which recommend various fruitive activities for elevation to heavenly planets.

And this is the exact opinion of Sri Sankaracharya, which he expresses in his commentary on these slokas, as here under...

'They are unwise... they say that there is nothing else besides words which are the means of attaining swarga, cattle, and other such objects of desires. They are full of desires and are ever in pursuit of them. Their chief and final goal is swarga...'

Thus it is made clear that those parts of Vedas which recommend such activities as are useful for one to attain eligibility for the reward of swarga- are flowery words, and those that long heavenly pleasures are foolish, (May God forbid). Keeping in view of the sum and substance of the Gita teachings, one has every reason to question the authenticity of these slokas (2:42-43). Were they authentic, could ever Sri Paramatma had induced Arjuna to fight the battle assuring him of the reward of Swarga?

We read as follows:

*A. Whence in this perilous strait has come upon thee this weakness cherished by the unworthy, **DEBARRING FROM HEAVEN** and causing disgrace O Arjuna? -Gita 2:2*

*B. Happy Kshatriyas, O son of Pritha, find such a battle as this, come of itself **AN OPEN DOOR TO HEAVEN** -Gita 2:32*

*C. **Killed, thou WILT REACH HEAVEN**, victorious, thou will enjoy the earth. Wherefore, O son of Kunti, arise, resolved to fight -Gita 2:37*

*D. Men of the three Vedas, the soma drinkers, purified from sin, worshipping ME by sacrifices **PRAY FOR THE GOAL OF HEAVEN**; they reach the holy world of the lord of the gods and ENJOY IN HEAVEN the HEAVENLY PLEASURES of the Gods -Gita 9:20*

A careful study and observation of the foregoing arguments made basing on the contradictions and inconsistent slokas propounded in Gita to justify the theory of merging into God is Moksha- and one who fails to attain Moksha, revolve in the cycle of birth and death (i.e) transmigration of soul, give a considerable amount of reason to believe that these are nothing but mere interpolations subsequently added.

Resurrection

As according to sloka 2:28¹ we came to know that man gets life on earth for only once, for the performance of Karma and after his death remains in invisible state.

Now the question is that how long does this state of man of invisibility continue - for this Gita provides the answer as follows:

O son of Kunti on the day of Kalpakshaya (dooms day or day of destruction) all beings enter into my prakriti and on the day of Kalpadi (resurrection) I create them again -Gita 9:7

Thus it is made clear that all beings (Sarva Bhootani)² will be raised up to life again where they take their former bodies in which

1. Beings have their beginning unseen [before birth- not seen, their middle seen after birth- visible (seen)] and their end unseen again- [after death man becomes unseen (not visible) just as he was before his birth] so both before his birth and after death, he remains in invisible states which point makes clear that man takes janma only once to perform karma.

2. All beings (sarva Bhootani) here, particularly refer to whole mankind

they lived in this world (for the judgement of the karmas they did while living in this world). Sarva Bhootani (all beings) die and will be created means, all beings who died will be raised from the earth, but does not convey to mean as that they will be conceived and begotten in the form of a new babe by any one else, as there remains none, since all beings will have been destructed on the former part of kalpa i.e., KALPAKSHAYA. This speaks clearly that we shall be raised only with our former bodies.

Thus we read

Never did I not exist, nor thou nor these rulers of men and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist -Gita 2:12

Identification of beings as 'I' 'You' "The rules of men" is possible only when I - You - and all others are made to appear with visible bodies in our individual present form and capacity as, I - You - They etc. Such raising up of all the dead is called the resurrection which will take effect on the latter part of kalpa i. e., KALPADI. Thus this makes clear that the dead bodies will be reaised. However this well established fact became rather confounded, by taking the incorrect commentaries on some slokas of Gita, which needs a close examination.

Let us examine the following sloka.

Just as in this body the soul passes into childhood and youth and old age, so does it pass into another body. There the wise man is not distressed -Gita 2:13

In this sloka it is said that the soul attains another body (Dehantaraprapti). This speaks clearly that the soul, after the death of the man, takes another body. Another body means - not the old one but a new one. When does it take a new one? Not immediately after the death of the man but only on kalpadi, as until then it has to remain in unmanifest (AVYAKTA) state (2:28).

We find an another sloka which has a close similarity in confirming that the soul attains a new body. It is allegorically described as follows...

Soul casts of worn out bodies

Just as man casts of his worn- out clothes and puts on others which are new, so the soul casts- off worn- out bodies and enters others which are new -Gita 2:22

Man casts off the worn out clothes only when they become quite useless to wear. So also the soul casts- off its worn out bodies. This simile can be well attributed to the people who die in their old age, but in case of those that die in their youth or boyhood, this simile does not in any way attract. So in view of this logic, we have to see, in general, whether the souls attain new bodies or the old bodies themselves renewed as new ones.

...and on the day of kalpadi I create them again -Gita 9:7

I create them again - whom? Whom does God create - whether SOULS or BODIES?

NOT SOULS: Because they are eternal and indestructible and unknowable (Gita 2:18)

AND

SOULS are not born nor do ever die... (Gita 2:20)

Souls enter new bodies?

Hence, 'I create them again' do not in any way applicable to souls. So most evidently they are bodies whom God create on that day (9:7).

Now the question is whether God creates the new bodies or the very same old bodies will be renewed; whether soul passes into another NEW BODY or into the RENEWED OLD BODY. As regards to this Gita leaves no ambiguity by saying stressingly on the point that He creates them that are dead i.e., the same dead bodies will be created, which point further expresses that the worn out bodies will be renewed into which their respective souls pass. Further in conformity with these points Gita furnishes as here under.

For certain is death for the born and certain is birth for the dead -Gita 2:27

Opinions differed - but not scriptures

Qur'an also makes mention as 'New creation' about those that shall be raised on the Kalpadi.

And they say, when we shall have become bones and broken particles, shall we really be raised up as a new creation?
-Qur'an 17:49

The subject 'We' of the last clause of the above verse represents to the old bodies. Hence their new creation here to mean as transformation of the old worn-out bodies (bones and broken particles) into renewed bodies. Thus the former old bodies will be renewed but no new creation will be brought into existence. To understand this a careful examination of the scriptural facts is necessary.

We have a similar verse in Bible- Job 14:14 too:

"If a man dieth, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come".

From the last clause of the above verse the words "till my change

come" the word change is used just in sense of "enters others which are new" of Gita 2:22 and passes into "another body of Gita 2:13 and a 'new creation' of Qur'an 17:49 respectively signify to the phenomenon of dead bodies transforming into NEW BODIES. That is- the same old bodies will be RENEWED AS NEW ONES, but souls do not enter into NEW BODIES.

a. From it (earth) have We created you, and into it shall We cause you to return, and from it shall We bring you forth once more
-Qur'an 20:55

b. He (God) said, 'therein (earth) shall you live, and therein shall you die, and therefrom shall you be brought forth -Qur'an 7:25

From the above verses the following points came into light.

1. Man has been created out of dust (earth)... BIRTH.
2. Man dies and returns to dust... DEATH.
3. After death of man, when he became dust, God once again gives life to the dead (dust) and brings forth once again from the dust (earth).

Resurrection

Of the above three points, we need not break our heads to explain the second point i.e., that man dies and returns to dust, as everyone of us, even from one's own childhood has been daily witnessing so many people dying and returning to dust either by means of cremation or burial. But the other two points (viz) whether the birth of man has really been made out of dust, and after his death (after becoming dust) shall he really be raised up again... are very critical points which cannot be explained either by means of scientific facts or by logic or reasoning except by the help of scriptures. Even then these points

remain confounded, unless there is a staunch belief in the scriptures, because these are the points beyond to human comprehension. Therefore let us take Qur'an, Bible and Bhagwad Gita for the minute examination of the issue at hand.

Man has been created from earth

According to Qur'an...

- a. *And one of His signs is this, that He created you from dust, then behold, you are men who move about on the face of the earth*
-Qur'an 30:20
- b. *... Who has made perfect every thing He has created. And He began the creation of man from clay. Then He made his progeny from an extract of an insignificant fluid. Then He fashioned him and breathed into him of His spirit...* -Qur'an 32:7-8

According Bible...

And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils of the breath of life, and man became a living being. -Genesis 2:7

According to Gita...

- a. *Beings are born of food; food is produced from rain, rain arises from yagna, yagna is born of action...* -Gita 3:14-15

It is learnt from the above sloka that beings are born of food. And it again teaches that food is produced from rain. Though it is not mentioned that beings are born from earth, it is implied that Gita maintains that man has been created out of clay or dust of the earth. Because in this sloka it is agreed that beings are born of food and the food is produced from rain. It is a known fact that from mere rain without earth, no food can be produced. So rain must fall on the earth

and therefore food is produced. And from food beings are born. That means Gita indirectly teaches and holds the same opinion as that of Qur'an and Bible, that mankind is born of clay of the earth (Dust).

- b. *O Arjuna, the great mula prakriti is my field of origin, In it, I place the seed of life and thence occurs the birth of all beings*
-Gita 14:3

Man returns to earth

Man do not survive on earth for ever and ever. Every man that is born in this world, has to taste of death.

Qur'an declares:

- a. *From earth have we created you, and into it shall we cause you to return, and from it shall we bring you forth once more*
-30:40
- b. *Say, it is Allah who gives you life then cause you to die...* -45:26

Bible agrees:

... for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return
-Genesis 3:19

What Gita says?

- a. *These bodies which belong to the real imperishable, unknowable soul are said to be subject to end...* -Gita 2:18

In this sloka, it is mentioned that bodies are subject to end, which gives rise to the false annotation that these bodies will be perished and thus the matter comes to an end. If it were really so, there would have been no problem at all. But the thing is not so. And this is what is being discussed all about. But what actually "subject to end" here means... 'subject to die'.

b. For certain is death for the born and certain is birth for the dead... -Gita 2:27

And every one knows that the dead will be cremated or buried as a result of which he being dust returns to dust again. Thus man comes from prakriti and goes back to prakriti again.

The above are a few verses and slokas from scriptures which all go to point out on the inevitable process of death, through which every man has to pass.

The progress made in the scientific and technological fields has crossed a surprising limit, providing all that what had once been beyond to human expectations. Man has conquered in many fields, achieved many things for him and so many things may be achieved in future too, where there is no need for surprise¹. Yet he kneels down helplessly before the paws of death. No one has ever conquered death nor can it be expected in future. Leave alone the question of conquering death, but can anybody come forward to meet the challenge as made out in Gita and Qur'an in preventing from the natural process of transformation of boyhood to youth, and from youth to old (and from old to tomb) an inevitable process appointed by God through which every living being has to pass?

Just as in this body the soul (man) passes into childhood and youth and old age... -Gita 2:13

*That you shall assuredly pass on from one stage to another
-Qur'an 84:19*

Dead shall be raised from earth

The dead shall be brought forth to life again.

1. ...And He will create that which you do not yet know -Qur'an 16:8
...And shew the great and mighty things, which thou knowest not
-Bible -Jeremiah 33:3

According to Qur'an:

- A. *And He it is who originates the creation, then repeats it; and it is most easy for Him. His is the most exalted state in the heavens and the earth; and He is the mighty and the wise -30:27*
- B. *And they swear by Allah their strongest oaths, that Allah will not raise up those who die. Nay He will certainly raise them up- a promise He has made binding on Himself, but most people know not. He will raise them up that He may make clear to them that wherein they differed, and those who disbelieved may know that they were liars -16:38-39*
- C. *And says man, what! when I am dead shall I be brought forth alive? Does not man remember that We created him before, when he was naught? And by the Lord, We shall assuredly gather them together and the satans too; then He shall bring them on their knees around Hell -19:66-68*
- D. *And they say, when we shall have become bones and broken particles, shall we be really raised up as a new creation? Say, 'Be ye stones or iron or created matter of any kind which appears hardest in your minds, even then shall you be raised up.' Then will they ask, 'who shall restore us to life?' ... Say, 'He who created you the first time'. They will then shake their heads at thee (prophet) and say, 'When will it be?' say 'may be it is nigh. It will be on the day when He will call you, then will you respond praising Him and you will think that you have tarried (in the world) but a little while' -17:49-52*
- E. *That is because, Allah is the Truth (SATT) and that it is He who brings the dead to life; and that He has power over all things. And because the Hour (kalpa) will certainly come, there is no doubt about it; and because Allah will raise up those who are in the graves. -22:6-7*
- F. *Say... 'It is Allah who gives you life, then causes you to die, then He will gather you together unto the day of Resurrection about which there is no doubt, But most men know not. -45:26*

According to Bible:

- a. *Your dead shall live together with my dead body shalt They arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in dust, for your dew is like the dew of herbs; and the earth shall cast out the dead*
-Isaiah 26:19
- b. *Do not marvel at this, for the hour [kalpa] is coming in the which all who are in the graves will hear His voice and come forth - those that have done good to the resurrection of life and those who have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation*
-John 5:28-29

According to Gita:

- a. *All beings, O son of Kunti, go into My prakriti at the end of kalpa. I send them forth again at the beginning of kalpa* -9:7

Why? It is a promise made binding on Him¹.

- b. *for certain is death for the born, and certain is birth for the dead...* 2:27

Soul enters new body (or) old body?

Now the question is whether the soul of a man takes a new body or takes its own old body which will have been transformed as a new body i.e., renewed body. To understand the arguments let us keep in mind the nature of 1. Soul and 2. Body.

SOUL: What is this soul (Atma) and where has it come from?

The answer is provided as follows:

According to Gita:

1. ...a promise He has made binding on Himself... Qur'an 16:38-39

Only a portion of Myself has become the soul (Jiva) in the world of livings... -15:7

According to Bible:

And the Lord God formed the man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life -Genesis 2:7

God breathed means, the breath of life proceeded from God's mouth. That means God breathed His breath of life.

According to Qur'an:

There he fashioned him (man) and breathed into him of His spirit... -32:7-10

These three books agree that the mankind is possessing the breath of God's spirit. Breath as it is, Gita gives a concise description of soul as follows which is acceptable.

This Atma (soul) cannot be cut, cannot be burnt, cannot be wetted, and also cannot be dried up. It is eternal, all pervading, immortal and ancient -Gita 2:24

Soul - Not universally pervaded but pervaded all-over body

In sloka (2:24) it is said that the soul is all pervading. Now the question is whether it is all pervading, to mean as universally pervaded as many think-or pervaded all over one's own body. The soul spoken of here is the one which belongs to every individual body (man). So there is nothing to do with another's body at all, which point contradicts the likeliness of universal pervasiveness. Another point is that if it is really universally pervaded there comes no question of its dissociation from the body causing death to it. This logic is another reason to say that the soul of an individual man is not pervading all over the

universe, but it is all pervading within its own respective body (Gita 13:33)¹. And at the same time, it is made clear that every BODY has its own soul and every soul has its own respective body (13:29). Thus the soul of one body has no concern with the soul of another's body.

As regards to the nature of Atma (soul) as described in Gita, The Bible also confirms as here under.

And fear not them which kill the body, But are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him (God) which is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell. -Matthew 10:28

In the above verse of the Bible it is stressed on saying that no-body can do any thing to soul. Inference is there that when this body (perishable body) is put to atrocities and tortures, it may ultimately meet the death. But nothing can be done to soul and nothing will happen to soul. Further this verse warns to fear God who is capable of punishing the soul as well as body in Hell, meaning when man is put in Hell, he will have a body (transformed as imperishable one), where however great punishments may be given to man, the question of dissociation of soul from body (i.e., death) does not arise.

Qur'an also agrees:

But the reprobate will turn aside from it (Qur'an), who is to enter the great fire. Then he will neither die therein nor live -87:11-13

Torments given in Hell are so atrocious as one cannot live therein. He longs to die. But cannot die. Thus he can neither die therein nor live. However the nature of soul as eternal and indestructible and immutable as described in Gita, has also been vis-a-vis agreed in other scriptures such as Bible and Qur'an.

1. Sarvatra=everywhere; avisthita=situated; dehe=in the body; atma=atma
Atma situated everywhere in the body.

Unlike soul - Body is perishable

BODY : The nature of body is quite different to that of soul. Body is perishable and mutable. This fact needs not be supported by any scripture, as is known to everyone.

And again Gita stresses on the point that Atma (soul) is not subject to birth and death.

Atma is not born, nor does it ever die. After having been it does not cease to be unborn, eternal, changeless and ancient, it is not killed when the body is destroyed -Gita 2:20

Thus it is made known that body is subjected to take birth and death while soul is free from all such things as are made incumbent for the body to pass through.

Having explained in sloka 2:20 that soul does not take birth nor does it ever die, it is explained in the sloka 2:26 that even if one thinks that the Atma (soul) takes birth and death, it is further explained in sloka 2:27 that one should know that whatever takes birth, must die and whatsoever dies must take another birth. It obviously speaks the fact, that as a matter of fact that soul never takes birth and never dies, as the body does. That infers the fact that all bodies or forms which once take birth with association of their respective souls must die; and the dead people must take birth means they should be raised up again taking the association of their respective souls. But contrary to this scriptural fact a dogma has been well popularized that after the death of a man (body) his respective soul pass into another new body.

Some slokas mistaken:

Now let us examine the following slokas:

a. Just as in this body the soul passes into childhood, and youth and old age, so does it pass into another body. There the wise man is not distressed -Gita 2:13

b. Just as man casts off worn-out clothes, and puts on others which are new, so the embodied (soul) casts off worn-out bodies, and enters others which are new -Gita 2:22

Examine the sloka which begins with...

Even if you think that Atma (soul) is constantly born and constantly dies... -2:26

This is to mean as saying that atma (soul) is not such as you think that it is repeatedly born and repeatedly dies, it is birthless and deathless, it is firm and immovable and eternal.

The nature of body is explained in former slokas as having birth and death.

Therefore what this goes to prove is that the bodies which take birth and survive in association with soul together- must die; and those who die must take birth means the dead must be raised up and must possess again their respective souls (the life giving object) so as to survive again with life.

According to Gita 15:7 the living (bodies) possess the soul (Jiva) but the soul does not possess the body which point is noteworthy.

However to know the arguments in its perspicuous terms, one must always bear in mind the following points.

As regards to man

1. Mankind: We have been created by God and sent into this world (on the earth) as a trial (to see whether we obey and worship Him) for an appointed term of life (9:33). This term of life varies from man to man. For example one may live upto 40 years and the other may upto 60 years, while some may die even in their childhood. Thus after the completion of the appointed term of life man dies.

2. Life and death: Body possessing of life (atma or soul) is called a man (living). Body not possessing of life is called corpse (dead). Who or which is it that is possessing of life (soul) while living and who is it that is not possessing of life when man becomes dead? Inevitably the answer is Body.

Then what is the role of soul? As long as it remains in the body, the body is said to be living and no sooner does it leave the body, than the body is said to be dead. Thus atma can be termed as LIFE or in other words the life giving object to the man. So a real man in nature is- the body possessed of soul.

3. Dead and living: Can dead do anything - wrong or right as has been forbidden and enjoined upon, man doing of the former takes him to Hell and the latter to Heaven? No; the dead cannot do either.

Can dead suffer or enjoy? No, for dead it makes no difference whether he (the dead body) is put in Heaven or Hell. Then who is the real actor (doer) and enjoyer or sufferer? The answer is no more than - the man, not dead but the living one. Living man means, his body associated together with his atma the life giving object, without which the body (man) becomes dead.

Judgement appointed

These points very clearly explain that man, who did his deeds (whether bad or good) while he was living in this world must be judged and accordingly he must either be punished or rewarded. For this he (man) must have his body possessed of his soul. Therefore only soul without its body or only body without its soul can in no way be either punished or rewarded. So also the soul with some other new body, which is as a matter of fact not at all the old perpetrator (doer) should not be either punished or rewarded. This logic leads to conclude that the dead must be raised, and their respective souls must reassociate

with the former old bodies (which will have been transformed to imperishable state on that day). This point discloses the fact that the soul does not enter into a new body but re-associates with its old body.

Let us see about the following sloka...

Soul must have a body

Just as man casts off his worn-out clothes, and puts on new ones, so also the Atma (soul) throws away its worn-out bodies and takes other fresh bodies -Gita 2:22

In this sloka it is explained allegorically that just as man throws off his worn-out clothes and puts on new ones, so also the self (soul or Atma) throws away its worn-out body and takes other fresh body.

In this sloka the importance of clothes to cover up the nakedness of man is pointed out. According to sloka without the clothes man becomes imperfect. So also the clothes become useless in the absence of man who wears them. Though these points are not directly pointed out, as according to allegory as pointed out in this sloka, "just as man casts off his worn-out clothes, and takes fresh ones- the essentiality of the combination of clothes and body together is disclosed. However this is a simile given to express relatively the inevitable process of the soul possessing of its body (re-union of soul and body). This points out the fact that soul without body deprives of its identity just as a man without clothes. So to keep up perfection, just as man takes up new clothes after the old ones become useless to wear, so also the soul takes up new body after leaving its worn-out body. From this what certain is that soul must have a body without which the soul becomes like a thing unnoticeable and useless.

Decayed body renewed

As a matter of fact this sloka (2:22) is revealed as an exegesis to the sloka 2:18¹, wherein it is said that these bodies are said to be

"subject to end". People began to misunderstand that in this way there will be an end to the body and thus the matter comes to an end. Just to erase this false notion, it is explained in this sloka allegorically that there will be no end to the body as you think merely because it is decayed by means of cremation or burial-but, "... to that which is dead birth is certain ..." 2:27² to mean as saying that the dead will be raised by means of re-association of soul with body. Thus the body will be renewed which will appear altogether like a new body with extra virtues bestowed upon. The nature of the former old body was (is) subject to take its birth from the womb of a woman, but the renewed (raised) body is to be raised directly from the nature (earth). The former old one was (is) subject to the natural changes such as from boy-hood to youth etc; while the resurrected new body does not undergo such changes. The former body was (is) given just as a temporary life term for the performance of Karma, while the renewed body will be given to remain endlessly to reap the consequences or enjoy the fruits of karma of the old body.

Here one may mistake old body and new body for two separate persons of whom the former one was destroyed and a new person is (will be) brought into existence. But what most note worthy is that there can be no two separate persons (for one soul), but only one person (the old body) transformed/transforms to new body with virtues quite contrary in nature to that of old body. And this is the reason that why it is termed as new body. But as a matter of fact it is not at all a new body, but the very same old body raised with new virtue. In this regard Qur'an confirms as follows:

We have decreed death to be your common lot, and We are not to be frustrated from changing your forms and creating you (again) in (forms) that ye know not -Qur'an 56:60-61

-
1. These bodies which belong to the real imperishable, unknowable soul are said to be subject to end... -2:18
 2. For certain is death for the born and certain is birth for the dead... -2:27

As the waters fall from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; So man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. O that thou wouldst hide me in the grave, that thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldst appoint me a set time and remember me! If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. - (Bible) Job 14:11-14

Let us discuss this sloka 2:22 of Gita in another way.

A cursory reading of the sloka undoubtedly leads to take the interpretation as is being professed (by Hindu scholars) that this soul after the death of the body, enters into some other new body which is altogether another body which has no connection at all with the old body.

Dead must be transformed to eternity

According to sloka, a simile is given. Just as man throws off his worn-out clothes and puts on new ones... so also the soul throws away the old dead body and takes the another body. When does man throw out his clothes? Only when they become useless and unfit to wear. Then he puts on new ones. Therefore the chapter of the old (worn-out) clothes comes to an end. They are destroyed for ever. Question of renewing does not come when new ones are put on. I would like to ask whether there is any meaning in giving this simile to the bodies (men) which are answerable for their deeds, and after the judgement will have to enjoy the Heaven or suffer the Hell torments. If the matter of both wicked and righteous is equally put an end to just like the worn-out clothes, then where is justice in God Almighty? If as is advocated by the Hindu scholars- the soul of righteous merges in God and the soul of wicked re-enters into another body leaving the old one just like man puts off his worn-out clothes and puts on new ones, for an endless process until he attains moksha, then for whom is Heaven and Hell? New clothes means new bodies which have no

connection at all with the old ones-then how can these new bodies be held responsible for the perpetrations (deeds) of the old bodies? Keeping in mind, the nature of body and soul, and the points pertaining to the subject at issue, as have been put forth for consideration - if one goes through a diligent study of the sloka, it is sure he would arrive at the purport as given below:

"This soul after leaving the old body which became dead and perishable, will take the very same body which will be transformed into a state such as imperishable one".

There are two clauses in the sloka-

- 1. Just as man in this body passes through various stages of boyhood and youth and old age...*
- 2. Like so the soul passes into another body after death.*
(Gita 2:13)

We can find a similar verse from Qur'an: *"That you shall assuredly pass on from one stage to another" (Qur'an 84:19)*

What most important point to be borne in mind is, that unless there is the association of soul with body, there can be no various changes to the body such as boyhood, youth and old age. For example if soul passes away from the body even at the stage of boyhood, the boyhood cannot take the change of youth. And if the soul happens to depart from the body at the stage of youth, there can be no change from youth to old age. That is to say that as soon as the soul dissociates from the body at any stage and at any moment the body is subject to perish.

Hence as long as the process of changing of body into various stages continues it is implied that the body with soul together go on changes, though the soul is firm and changeless. Without soul no changes will take place to body independently, but on the other hand it decays.

If we carefully examine the above two clauses we can find the continuity in the changing process of new body. A living man is a compound matter inseparable from soul. Therefore man is soul plus body united together. Various changes in man do not take place instantly one after another but needs a gap of particular periods between one stage to another. For instance man attains his youth after a gap of 20 years period from his boyhood, and so also he goes to old age after a gap of 30-40 years period after his youth. After passing through all these stages, there comes the final change of man. Unlike the changes as stated above by mere gaps of certain periods, but by a new phenomenon namely DEATH (after death) this body gets the final change after which there will be no any kind of further change.

As according to sloka, in every change of the body- the body goes on changes only if there is association of soul with it. Without soul no change to body is possible except as decaying. So this goes to prove that as long as body goes on changes, the soul is associated together with body. So in every state of change, the body and soul are together pass through changes. So the continuity process of changes to man is common with body and soul. That is to say just as the body of the first clause goes on changes from boyhood to old age, in the very same manner it ultimately becomes itself (transforms into) to an another body of the second clause with reassociation of soul. That means the link of changing process is continued until the childhood body (of the first clause) which is subject to perish, is transformed into another body (of second clause) which is immortal. That means the perishable body becomes imperishable. Thus the soul dwells again in the same old body which now (on kalpadi) transformed into eternity.

As according to the first clause, the changes of body from boyhood to old age take place WHILE LIVING.

The second clause makes it clear that the transformation of the old body into new body will take place AFTER DEATH.

So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: It is sown in weakness it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body: it is raised in a spiritual [immortal] body...

-(Bible) I Corinthean 15:42:44

What is death? It is nothing but separation of soul from body and an interval until the perishable body is changed and raised up again as transformed into immortal new body. Death is an inevitable process through which every one's body has to pass, to get transformed into eternal new body.

We read in Gita

The bodies which belong to the real imperishable, unknowable atma (soul) are said to be subject to end... -Gita 2:18

Thus death is sure for man (body) and as soul is imperishable, it gets separated from the body.

And again.

Atma (soul) is not born, nor does it ever die; after having been it does not cease to be unborn, eternal, changeless and ancient, it is not killed when the body is destroyed -Gita 2:20

When once it is agreed that man is a being of a compound matter or body plus soul (Atma) united together, we must admit that one soul shall possess one particular body of its own (13:29). It cannot enter into the another's body. Because a particular body belongs to a particular soul only. This fact is self explanatory in the foregoing sloka 2:18.

The soul existing in the body of all beings is never slain -Gita 2:30

The above sloka gives an irrefutable fact that soul is not at all a

living being with its special identity but only an unknowable thing which exists in all living beings. Thus soul is an unknowable thing (matter) which keeps the body alive as long as it remains in the body.

Former old-body renewed - but not new-body created- why?

However the word 'another' or 'fresh' followed by the body, certainly gives a wrong interpretation that the soul of the body, after its death enter into a new body. This is where and how many people are likely to err to understand the real meaning of the sloka. But what actually the sloka means is - this perishable body after passing through the various stages of boyhood, youth and old age, (after death) it will be again raised up bestowed with an extra virtue (characteristic) of being eternal. In this stage there will be no death to man. Because as the soul is eternal, the body must also be eternal.

Thus 'this body' of the first clause and 'another body' of the second clause can be classified as the former one subject to end (perish) and the later one as the resurrected body by the extra virtue of eternity bestowed upon. Thus the same old body of the soul will be transformed into another eternal body after its resurrection. Why? Because man has to enjoy the Heavenly pleasures if he were a good man who had led his life according to sastras, as otherwise he has to suffer the torments of the foul Hell. If this kind of transformation of the body from perishable state to imperishable state is not made, he can neither enjoy the pleasures of Heaven, nor can he suffer the torments in Hell. Without this transformation, the body goes on changing from boyhood to old age and ultimately meets the death. So heavenly pleasures cannot be enjoyed for ever as promised to righteous ones. Therefore one who enters the Heaven, must have an immutable, firm and eternal body. In the same manner the torments of Hell kill the body instantly and therefore, even if the wicked ones are thrown into foul Hell as punishment, they cannot suffer any longer as the Hell immediately causes

death. Therefore the perishable body must be transformed into imperishable state. Thus the body also becomes firm, changeless and eternal just as its soul. This logic evidently proves that man after his death (decay) must obtain an eternal body. This is what actually the word "another body" means. In this stage, the soul which is eternal, reassociates the transformed body as eternal, so as to remain for ever either to enjoy the Heavenly pleasures or to suffer in foul Hell. This is what actually the verse- "the soul casts off the worn-out body and enters fresh body" means too.

The wise know this fact

It is easy to make one believe that after ones own death, his soul will be transferred to another body just as the air passes from one man's nose to another, and coming out from him, may enter into another's (like in respiration). But it is very difficult to make understand that the body when it has become dust, will be resurrected and possesses again its soul. That is why the last line of the sloka (2:13) clearly says that- "*the wise know it and are not deluded*", which means, though a common man may not or cannot believe in this process which has been discussed above, but the wise who are blessed with wisdom and knowledge of Vedas (scriptures) know it and they are not deluded.

Thus after kalpadi all beings (Sarva Bhootani) will be resurrected from the earth (9:7)¹ who become manifest in their former bodies (2:12)² and after judgment they will attain Heaven (Swarga) if they were righ-

1. O Arjuna! All beings at the end of kalpa (kalpa-kshaya) go into my prakriti and I create them [bring them forth] again at the beginning of the kalpa (kalpadi).

2. Never did I not exist, nor thou, nor these rulers of men: and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist.

teous (9:20)³ as otherwise goto Hell (16:13-16)⁴.

Gita ordains monotheism

Who is a Gnani (wise)? - Gnani is he who is possessed of faith and belief on God Almighty.

God-uttama purusha

What is Gnana (Wisdom)?- In religious terminology, believing God with all His attributes as Almighty and as the most superior being is wisdom (Gnana).

With no doubt in mind, he who knows Me as the Highest person (Purushottama), he knowing all, worships Me with his whole being. -Gita 15:19

Qur'an attests this view

Allah bears witness that there is no God but He- and also do the angels (Devatas) and those possessed of Knowledge- Maintainer of justice; there is no God but He the mighty, the wise.
-Qur'an 3:18

From the above it is clear that believing or knowing God Almighty as the Highest person (Purushottama)- is gnana or in other words 'BELIEF' or FAITH. So this faith or belief is the first and the foremost commandment of God without which, however great works (karma) one does, all become waste.

3. Men of three vedas, the soma drinkers, purified from sin, worshipping me by sacrifices, pray for the goal of heaven, they reach the holy world of the Lord of Devatas and enjoy in heaven the heavenly pleasures of the Devatas.

4. ... Thus perplexed by various anxieties and bound by a network of illusions, they become too strongly attached to sense enjoyment and fall down into Hell.

Whatever is sacrificed, given or done and whatever austerity is practised, without faith, it is called - asat - O Partha! it is naught here or hereafter. -Gita 17:28

Thus we know from Qur'an also

Those are they who disbelieve in the signs of their Lord and in the meeting with Him, so their works are vain and on the Day of Resurrection We shall give them no weight. -Qur'an 18:105

And again

So whoever does good works and is a believer, his efforts will not be disregarded and we shall surely record it. -Qur'an 21:94

Gnani worships none, but God Almighty

By what means does a man become a gnani? One becomes gnani by means of worshipping God Almighty with love and ever devout to Him.

To those ever devout, worshipping Me with love, I give that devotion of knowledge by which they come to me...
-Gita 10:10

In Qur'an also

He grants wisdom to whom He pleases, and whoever is granted wisdom has indeed been granted abundant good; and none would be reminded except those endowed with understanding.
-Qur'an 2:269

In the above sloka (10:10) it is implied that God Almighty confers His favour of wisdom, and show the path through which they can attain Him- to those that do not worship any other being. To be blessed with that path, the enjoined condition is, that one should worship God Almighty and none else.

Thee alone do we worship and thee alone do we implore for help; guide us in the right path... -Qur'an 1:4-5

Further God Almighty declares that He makes dear the wise- because of his good quality of worshipping Him alone and regarding Him as his only refuge.

Of them the wise man, ever steadfast devoted to the ONE, excels; for excessively dear am I to the wise, and he is dear to me. -Gita 7:17

This implies the fact that those who worship others leaving God Almighty or along with Him, deprive of the favour of attaining the nearness of God.

and again

Noble indeed are all these, but the wise man I deem, is the very self; for steadfast in mind, he resorts to me alone as the unsurpassed goal. -Gita 7:18

In the above slokas the wise men are highly regarded for the virtue of their being devotees of God Almighty alone.

None is competent for worship

Why should one worship God Almighty alone and seek refuge only in Him?

God narrates as here under the reason as to why one should worship him alone.

There is none else superior to Me -Gita 7:7

Say, Surely it has been revealed to me that your God is but one God, will you then submit? -Qur'an 21:108

I am the source of all: from Me every thing evolves. The wise

perfectly knowing this worship Me alone with all their understanding. -Gita 10:8

This is to mean as saying in unequivocal terms that worship of different persons other than God, may be they from among men or devatas, for the fulfilment of different desires and wants and purposes is foolishness. Because every thing evolves from Him. There is none competent to provide anything to anybody. Knowing this fact the wise (Gnanis) worship Him alone with all their understanding.

The light of the Sun which illumines this whole world comes from Me and the splendor of the moon and the splendor of fire are also from Me. -Gita 15:12

In this sloka, there is a lesson for those that worship Sun and Moon and Jyothi. They are such weak and helpless bodies as are incapable of possessing even self luminary power. The light and heat and what all they possess are given by Him for the benefit of mankind. If this be their fate of dependence on His Mercy for their mere existence, what is it that one is sure about of getting from them?

God seeks exclusive devotion

But those who worship Me, renouncing all actions in Me, regarding Me supreme, meditating on Me with exclusive devotion, for them whose thought is fixed on me, I become ere long, O son of Pritha, the deliverer out of the ocean of this mortal samasara. -Gita 12:6-7

God wants His bhaktas to:

1. Worship Him - meaning should not worship any other
2. Sacrifice all actions to Him: meaning no sacrifice of even a least thing to be offered to any other with devotion.

3. Regard Him as the supreme.

4. He seeks exclusive devotion- meaning undiluted or unmixed devotion. Even if a negligible amount of water is added to pure milk, its purity is gone, and having been unified with water it became a diluted matter. So also exclusive devotion remains no more if one associates others in the worship of God. One should not attribute partners to God. One should not see any other being with a devotional sight or thought expecting favours or fortunes, but ever fix his mind on God. This is exclusive devotion.

Be steadfast in the worship of God

And whoso at the time of death, thinking of Me alone, leaves the body and goes forth, he reaches my being. There is no doubt in it -Gita 8:5

This sloka does not mean to convey that if one simply remembers God at the time of his death, even if he had neglected the worship of God in his whole life period, would attain Moksha. But what it means to say is that man should always-right from his youth till death adore to God and worship Him alone. As a matter of fact a bhakta who had ever been devoted to God, once again in this sloka, is reminded to be steadfast in the worship of God even at the time of his death; because the satanic temptations (Maya) which failed to mislead him from the worship of God in all his life time, may finally attack him with all its power of Maya as its final resort, where a bhakta at the time of his death, while fighting the death pangs is likely to be defeated by Maya having been insinuated a rancour of doubt about God and His mercy and help - and thus resulting in his yielding towards to seek the help of any other than God. Thus he may be failed and misled from the right path, in the last moment. So God gives here a particular caution that one should be devoted to God thinking of Him alone even at the time of one's own death.

Fix thy heart ever on him...

Mentally resigning all deeds to Me, regarding Me as the Supreme resorting to mental consecration do thou ever fix thy heart in me. -Gita 18:57

Ever fix thy heart in Me - this is to mean as saying that one should not expect fortunes from - or entertain a tendency of fear of being put to misfortunes by any other, treating him or them as capable of conferring fortunes if they are pleased as otherwise of cursing resulting in misfortunes if they are displeased regarding them as deities. Thus this sloka warns and exhorts that one should never fix one's own heart on any other being, in the capacity of God Himself or as a co-equal god ascribing the capabilities of God in him, or them.

He who does good works for Me, who looks on Me as the Supreme, who is devoted to me, who is free from attachment, who is without hatred for any being, he comes to Me, O Pandava -Gita 11:55

Self Introspection invited

Fix thy mind on Me, be devoted to Me, Sacrifice to Me, bow down to Me, Thus steadfast with Me as thy supreme goal, thou shalt reach Myself, the self -Gita 9:34

In all the above quoted slokas, we have some specific words or phrases such as...

1. I am the source of all
2. From Me every thing evolves
3. The wise worship Me alone
4. The light of the sun, Moon, Fire comes from Me; etc.

In these- the personal pronouns such as 'I', 'ME' are frequently used corresponding to ONE SUPREME BEING. And exclusive devotion to Him ordained. Now it is our duty to conduct a serious self introspection to know whether we are pure and sincere in devotion to Him alone as is ordained in the scriptures or running after other beings.

Polytheism in the mask of monotheism

Such clear exhortations as these pointed out above which ordains Monotheism are found in every scripture. Yet a great majority of people from all communities with no exception has been perverted from the right path and tempted towards polytheism. Why?

The answer is given in Gita as here under...

They who long after success in actions, sacrifice here to the demigods (Devatas)... -Gita 4:12

Here Gita points out the main reason that why people are being tempted towards the worship of other beings - saying as 'they worship devatas by sacrifice for the fulfilment of their desires'

Observe some opinions of Gita commentators...

They who long after success in action sacrifice to the gods, such as Indra and Agni. The Sruti says... "He who on the other hand worships a separate god, thinking" He is separate from me and I am separate from Him- he knows not. He is to Devas as cattle (to men) for, quickly is the fruit of action reaped in this world of men by those who, with selfish ends in view, sacrifice to external gods, performing the works enjoined on them according to their caste (Varna) and order (asram). It is for this world of men that Vedic injunctions, are meant"

(Sri Sankaracharya from commentary on 4:12 - English translation by Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastri)

There is a great misconception about the gods or demigods of

this material world, and men of less intelligence, although passing as great scholars, take these demigods to be various forms of God, but they are god's different parts and parcels, God one, and the parts and parcels are many. The Vedas say, Nitya nityanam: God is one, Iswara Parama Krishna. The supreme God is one- Krishna - and demigods are delegated with powers to manage this material world. These demigods are all living entities (nityanam) with different grades of material power. They cannot be equal to supreme God - Narayana - Vishnu or Krishna. Any one who thinks that God and the demigods are on the same level is called an atheist or prashandi...

(Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta- from commentary of Sloka 4:12- Bhagavadgita As It is)

Further God makes clear in the following sloka that the desires of men make them blind and foolish as a result of which they worship Devatas

Those whose intelligence (Gnana) has been stolen by material desires, surrender unto demigods (Devatas) and follow the particular rules and regulations of worship according to their own nature (Bhagavadgita As it is 7:20)

The following is the commentary (on this sloka) of Sri Sankarachrya.

Their desires for progeny, cattle, svarga and the like deprive them of their power of discrimination and they resort to other gods (devatas), other than Vasudeva the self. They engage in rites peculiar to the worship of these gods; they being constrained to do so by their own nature (Prakriti) by that peculiar tendency (Samskara) which they acquired in the previous births. (Sri Sankaracharya)

Let us see the commentary of Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta...

... Less intelligent people who have lost their spiritual sense take shelter of demigods for immediate fulfilment of material desires. Generally, such people do not go to the supreme

personality of God head, because they are in the lower modes of nature (ignorance and passion) and therefore worship various demigods. Following the rules and regulations of worship, they are satisfied. The worshippers of demigods are motivated by small desires and do not know how to reach the supreme goal, but a devotee of the supreme Lord is not misguided. Because in Vedic literature there are recommendations for worshipping different gods for different purposes, (eg. a diseased man is recommended to worship the sun), those who are not devotees of the Lord think that for certain purposes demigods are better than the supreme Lord. But a pure devotee knows that the supreme Lord Krishna is the master of all. In the Chaitanya - Charitamruta (Adi 5:142) it is said... only the supreme personality of God head, Krishna, is master and all others are servants. Therefore a pure devotee never goes to demigods for satisfaction of his material needs. He depends on the supreme Lord. And the pure devotee is satisfied with whatever He gives. (Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta)

Men of sattvic nature worship demigods (Devatas) and men of Rajasic nature worship yakshas and Raskshasas and the men of Tamasic nature worship the pretas and bhutas. -Gita 17:4

Sri Sankaracharya writes in his commentary for this sloka as here under...

Thus by general principle laid down in the scripture Sattvic and other devotions have been determined through their respective effects. Now only one in a thousand is Sattvic and devoted to the worship of the gods (Devatas) while the Rajasic and Tamasic creatures form the majority

Let us see the commentary of Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta

In this verse (sloka) the supreme personality of godhead describes different kinds of worshippers according to their external activities. According to scriptural injunctions, only the supreme personality of godhead is worshipable, but those who are not very conversant with, or faithful to, the scriptural

injunctions worship different objects, according to their specific situations in the modes of material nature. Those who are situated in goodness generally worship the demigods (Devatas). The demigods include Brahma, Siva, and others such as Indra, Chandra and the Sun god. There are various demigods. Those in good nature worship a particular demigod for a particular purpose. Similarly those who are in the mode of passion worship the demons. We recall that during the second world-war a man in Calcutta worshipped Hitler because thanks to that war he had amassed a large amount of wealth by dealing in the black market. Similarly, those in the modes of passion and ignorance generally select a powerful man to be god. They think that any one can be worshipped as god and that the same results will be obtained.

Now it is clearly described here that those who are in the mode of passion worship and create such gods, and those who are in the mode of ignorance, in darkness, worship dead spirits. Some times people worship at the tomb of some dead man. Sexual service is also considered to be in the mode of darkness. Similarly, in remote villages in India there are worshippers of ghosts. We have seen that in India the lower-class people some times go to the forest and if they have knowledge that a ghost lives in a tree, they worship that tree and offer sacrifices. These different kinds of worship are not actually God worship. God worship is for persons who are transcendently situated in pure goodness. In the Srimad Bhagavatam (4:3:23) it is said, Sattvam Visudham Vasudeva Sabditam. "When a man is situated in pure goodness he worships Vasudeva". The purport is that those who are completely purified of the material modes of nature and who are transcendently situated can worship the supreme personality of god head.

The impersonalists are supposed to be situated in the mode of goodness, and they worship five kinds of demigods (Devatas). They worship the impersonal Vishnu form in the material world which is known as philosophized Vishnu. Vishnu is the expansion of the supreme personality of godhead, but the impersonalists, because they do not ultimately believe in the personality of godhead, imagine that the Vishnu form is just

another aspect of the impersonal Brahma; Similarly they imagine that Lord Brahma is the impersonal form in the material mode of passion. Thus they some times describe five kinds of gods that are worshipable, but because they think that the actual truth is impersonal Brahman, they dispose of all worshipable objects at the ultimate end. In conclusion the different qualities of the material modes of nature can be purified through association with persons who are of transcendental nature.

A careful attention of our readers is invited towards the purport of the above three slokas of Gita under Ref: 4:12, 7:20 and 17:4. In these slokas God Almighty forbids the worship of any other being - may it be a devata or whatever, other than God Almighty Himself. And this point is not incoceivable but very simple to understand at the very first glance of the slokas, even for a common man. Keeping in view of this fact, the opinions of Gita exponents may also be referred. We have given above commentaries of Sri Sankaracharya and Sri A.C. Bhaktivedanta on each of the slokas. As has been prohibited by God Almighty, the exponents of Gita should have openly criticised the worship of devatas. But they maintain a balanced negative attitude. Leave alone the question of condemning the worship of other beings and inviting the people towards the worship of only true God (SATT) but on the other hand their commentaries rather seem to be suggestive of devata worship - for they made mention of some statements such as...

1. ... enjoined on them according to their caste and order (Varnasrama). It is for this world of men that vedic injunctions are meant... (Sri Sankaracharya - under 4:12)
2. ... Because in vedic literature there are recommendations for the worship of different gods for different purposes... (Sri A.C. Bhakti Vedanta - under 7:20)
3. ... Now only one in a thousand is sattvic and devoted to the worship of the gods (devatas), while the Rajasic and Tamasic creatures form the majority... (Sri Sankaracharya - under 17:4)

The opinions of the exponents- is not the point that needs our concern, but let us pay heed to find out whether could there really a sanction for, and injunctions to worship the devatas have been made in the vedas. Vedas are also the divine scriptures once revealed for the guidance of the then people. If there is prohibition for the people of Gita to worship devatas, how could people of Vedic age have been allowed to worship devatas, so as to claim that there are vedic injunctions for the worship of devatas and thereby creating a back-door opportunity for the sanction to the worship of devatas? Right from the beginning only one religion (dharm) that is - the worship of only true God Almighty has been taught (18:66). Whenever there appeared pollution in the worship of God and others were also being worshipped and at the times of such decay of the original religion, God renewed and revived the old Dharm by condemning the interpolations already added in His former or earlier teachings or scriptures, through His new revelation. This was the reason why God cancelled such parts of Vedas as referred here under, through Gita.

Ref: Gita 2:42-44, 2:45, 2:46

This clearly shows that those parts which give sanction for the worship of devatas whether they are found in vedas or upanishads or anywhere - are mere interpolations. Surprisingly enough, God enjoins to leave (abandon) such parts of Vedas. But our commentators hold fast altogether such parts and in their commentaries make mention of slokas such as recommend the worship of devatas. This is a clear evidence that shows the tendency and attitude of our Gurus (Masters/leaders of the community) that how they are bent upon keeping the community active in the worship of devatas, which is already drowned head long in the heinous act of devata worhsip and image worship of so-called Awatars under the concept of Anthropomorphism. Instead of giving their helping hand to pull the community out of it - they are still pushing deeper and deeper into it. This is all being done only to

meet their vested interests.

Those who worship others - are naradhamas - The worst among men - according to Gita

God Almighty says

*Not me do the evil doers seek, the deluded, the vilest of men, deprived of wisdom by illusion, following the ways of the demons
-Gita 7:15*

In text we have "Not me do the evil doers seek". This implies that the evil doers seek others leaving God Himself. Seeking others here means 'worshipping others'. This speaks clearly that they worship devatas, bhutas, pretas etc., as made mention in several other slokas of Gita. And this is the evil act 'DUSHKRUTAM', which they do (7:20). But some commentators interpret the meaning of "Not Me do the evil doers seek" as applicable to Atheists who do not accept the existence of God Almighty. This meaning can also be taken for granted to some extent, but it is not correct and relevant in the present context. Because an atheist completely rejects the existence of God and His worship. The word 'Devotion' is not known to him. And hence there is no question of his being surrendering before others in devotion (7:20). So keeping in view of the discussions made in this regard so far, it can be well determined that the evil doers of this sloka are only those that worship others but not the atheists.

Thus the worship of other beings is described here as 'The heinous act' of foolish people. They do it just with a blind hope of acquiring the worldly desires fulfilled by those devatas. God describes them as... MUDHAH - FOOLISH; DUSHKRUTINAH - Evil Doers; NARADHAMAH - Worst among men (7:15).

Further it is said of their deeds as following of Asura (Demonic or satanic) ways. The sum and substance of this sloka is - the worship

of other beings is an evil act insinuated and prompted by demonic or satanic influence.

Every thing is given by God

To be very frank, God is all powerful. Hence he is capable of providing every thing what all his bhakta needs. No one needs call upon various devatas for the fulfilment of various desires and purposes. '*I am the source of all; from Me every thing evolves...*' (10:8) says God.

Fact being thus, would God Almighty ever have helplessly suggested His bhaktas to call upon various devatas for the fulfilment of various desires? Not at all. To clear off this delusion God assures as here under.

Having no mind on any other - worship me

Those men who meditate on Me, worship Me ever - to them who are ever devout, I preserve gain and safely -Gita 9:22

In the Sanscrit text we have.

Ananyas chinta yanto mam ye janah paryu pasate

In this verse we have three phrases...

1. Ye janah - Those people (who)
2. Mam paryupasate - Worship me.
3. Ananyas chinta yanto - Having no mind on any other

When these phrases are put in statement order - it reads as: those who worship Me having no mind on any other. Here we find two commandments...

1. To worship God Almighty alone.

2. and to worship none else

Why not worship others? God says in Gita 7:7

There is naught else higher than Me...

This is exactly the meaning of 'Kalima-e-Tayyiba of Islam' - LAA ILAAHA ILLALLAH (in arabic). LAA -None else, naught, ILAAH - Worshipable (deity); ILLALLAH - except Allah - God Almighty.

Thus we read the meaning of Kalima as here under.

There is none worshipable but God

Kalima-e-Tayyiba means the 'word' which after accepting, man becomes pure, forgiven of all his sins.

Gita accepts this view.

He who knows Me as the unborn, as the beginningless, as the supreme Lord of all the worlds - he only, undeluded among men, is freed from all sins -Gita 10:3

Those who worship Me, having no mind on any other... (9:22)

Like somany other slokas of Gita, this verse also discloses the fact that the people of the times of Gita revelations were not altogether agnostics, but majority of them were theists and worshippers of God. Then what was the reformation by new revelation through Gita teachings meant for? As far as the matter concerning the belief on God Almighty and His worship, right from the beginning people were believers and worshippers of God Almighty. But as the time passed on and after a long lapse of time they forgot the teachings of the then prophets (Rishis), given through Sri Paramatma by God Almighty. Thus

they began to profess and do all sorts of invented things in the name of the religion (dharm) which as a matter of course had no concern with the original religion taught. Thus under the influence of invented dogmas, they began to worship so many other beings along with God. Thus every time the religion was polluted and decayed necessitating Sri Paramatma to descend again and again to re-establish the religion. This was the exact fate of the people of the times of the Divine revelation through Gita.

Thus we know from the following:

1. ... This yoga, by long lapse of time, has been lost here...

-Gita 4:2

2. Whenever there is a decay of religion, O Bharata, and an ascendancy of irreligion, then I manifest myself -Gita 4:7

3. ...for the firm establishment of religion I manifest myself

-Gita 4:8

Thus by the time of Gita revelation, the then people belonging to sanatana dharma were worshipping so many deities along with God Almighty. Thus God became one of the deities, deprived of His exclusive Lordship over all the worlds (God forbid). This heinous practice was condemned and the religion was again re-established in the times of Sri Arjuna as the then prophet. We cannot find anywhere in any scripture God saying as- "worship Me also". But He ordained to worship Him alone. And we find in scriptures saying as 'worship Me' and 'The wise resorts to Me alone' and the like. God always expects a pure and undiluted devotion from His bhaktas. This is what actually the meaning of the phrase'... having no mind on any other'. But people of Gita have mistaken the meaning of this phrase for concentration in general term to mean as undisturbed mind at the time of meditating God; and to keep up this concentration, they have been involved in all such practices as have been seriously condemned in Gita. Now what

I would like to pinpoint on the fact is that God Almighty ordains in this sloka (9:22) that people should worship Him alone and that they should implore for help only on Him. In the light of these clear teachings of Gita, the polytheists have lost every plea to take shelter in the false religious sanction for devata worship.

O man! God is enough for you

Qur'an says as regards to those that call upon others as ...

The case of those who take helpers beside Allah - Is like unto the case of the spider, who makes for herself a house, and surely the frailest of all houses is the house of the spider, if they but knew
-Qur'an 29:41

Bible too admonishes that one should worship God alone:

And Jesus answered Him, "the first of all the commandments is hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" This is the first commandment -Mark 12:28-30

Now let us understand some slokas of Gita:

1. *I am the source of all, from Me everything evolves; thus thinking the wise worship Me endowed with contemplation.* -10:8
2. *By Me presiding, prakriti produces the moving and the unmoving: because of this O Son of Kunti, the world revolves.* -9:10
3. *And I am seated in the hearts of all; from Me are memory, knowledge, as well as their loss; it is I who am to be known by all the Vedas, I am indeed the author of the vedanta as well as the knower of the Vedas.* -15:15
4. *Intelligence, wisdom, non-illusion, patience, truth, self-restraint, calmness, pleasure, pain, birth, death, fear and security,*

innocence, equanimity, contentment, austerity, beneficence, fame, shame (these) different kinds of dispositions of beings arise from Me alone. -10:4-5

5. *Know Me O Partha as the eternal seed of all beings. I am the intelligence of the intelligent, the bravery of the brave.* -7:10

In the following sloka, God discloses His unsurmountable greatness and majesty; and His unsurpassing excellency and transcendental nature.

6. *Neither the hosts of devatas nor the great Rishis know My origin; for I am the source of all devatas and the great Rishis*
-10:2

To mean as saying ...

Devatas and great Rishis have been created by Me. They are living by My mercy as submissive servants. They are wholly dependent on Me. In what way are they capable and competent to fulfil your desires?

Power of discrimination awarded to man - yet he becomes foolish - Gita explains its reason

7. *He who knows Me as unborn and beginningless, as the great Lord of the worlds, he among mortals is undeluded, he is liberated from all sins* -Gita 10:3
8. *By Me all this world is pervaded, My form unmanifested. All beings dwell in Me; and I do not dwell in them* -Gita 9:4

In the above two slokas, God has provided His two main qualities as clues which are helpful for devotees to check whether they are worshipping the true God Almighty - or running after an imposter or an other being who is not really God. These two clues are ... (i) UNBORN (ii) UNMANIFESTED. Therefore know your God to be ONE

as unborn and unmanifested. Hence the simple logic leads to conclude that one who is begotten of, or manifested in any form cannot be your God Almighty. He is an imposter if one proclaims divinity in him or it is your illusion that makes you blind and believe him as your God.

No man hath seen God at any time... -John1:18

Eyes cannot reach Him but he reaches the eyes. And He is the incomprehensible, the all-aware -Qur'an 6:103

9. But know that to be imperishable by whom all this is pervaded. None can cause the destruction of that the imperishable - Gita 2:17

Note: God is imperishable one. So he who decays cannot be your God.

10. There is naught higher than I, O Dhananjaya! In Me all this is woven as clusters of gems on a string. -Gita 7:7

11. Know, that highest purusha, O Son of Pritha, within whom all beings dwell, by whom all this is pervaded, is attainable by exclusive devotion. -Gita 8:22

12. With their consciousness in that, their self being that, intent on that, with that for their supreme goal, they go never again to return, their sins shaken off by means of wisdom. -Gita 5:17

13. Fix thy mind in Me exclusively apply thy reason to me. Thou shall no doubt live in Me alone. -Gita 12:8

14. One should meditate upon the supreme person as the one who knows everything, as He who is the oldest who is the controller, who is smaller than the smallest, who is the maintainer of everything who is beyond all material conception who is inconceivable and who is always a person. He is luminous like the sun and He is transcendental, beyond this material nature -Gita As it is 8:9

Is not Allah sufficient for his servant? And yet they would frighten thee with those beside him. And he whom Allah adjudges astray for him there is no guide -Qur'an 39:36

Despite his clear sayings that God Himself alone is the Master of all the worlds and that every thing comes only from Him, the foolish and ignorant people worship various gods (devatas) for various desires.

Those whose wisdom has been led away by this or that desire, resort to other gods (devatas) engaged in this or that rite constrained by their own nature. -Gita 7:20

Endowed with such a faith, he endeavors to worship a particular devata and obtains his desires. But in actuality these benefits are bestowed by Me alone. -Gita 7:22

In these slokas God discloses the foolishness of the devata worshippers. They worship devatas for the fulfilment of their desires, knowing not that everything comes from God alone. The worship of devata is a sin by itself and on the otherhand regarding any particular devata as a master having the capability of performing that particular deed is an outcome of the mere foolishness. What a great pitiable thing is that one gets everything from God Almighty, but by his illusion, man thinks that it is given by a particular devata on whom he calls upon. God makes it clear that it is He who provides every thing to His creatures; but people mistake for these benefits as to have been conferred by those devatas to whom they worship with faith.

Whatever devotee seeks to worship with faith what form soever, that same faith of his I make unflinching. -Gita 7:21

Right from the beginning we have been stating that man has been sent into this world just as a trial with a free will and freedom of choice (18:63)¹. And to make him come out successful from this trial...

1. Thus I have explained to you knowledge still more confidential. Deliberate on this fully and then do what you wish to do.

1. God gave every man the power of discrimination of right and wrong provided one utilizes this faculty.

2. He sent His prophets for man's guidance

3. He revealed the scriptures (Sastras) following on which one gets success from this trial and attains Moksha

4. He has pointed out both the paths - the right leading to Svarga and the wrong leading to Naraka. And awarded free-will and freedom of choice (Gita 18:63)

A. Thus I have explained to you knowledge still more confidential. Deliberate on this fully and then do what you wish to do.
-Gita As it is 18:63

B. According to Vedic opinion there are two ways of passing from this world - one in light and one in darkness. When passes in light he does not come back; but when one passes in darkness he returns -Gita As it is 8:26

C. See, I have set before thee this day life and good and death and evil -Bible, Deuteronomy 30:15

D. And we have pointed out to him the two highways of good and evil -Qur'an 90:10

Despite all these, if any one wants to worship any other being, God won't interfere in the freedom awarded to His creatures (18:63), but lets them go as they like. This is the meaning of the phrase, "**That same faith of his I make unflinching**" of the foregoing sloka 7:21. This is a kind of hateful expression pointing on the wrong doing of the man.

We have a similar verse in Qur'an also.

So worship what you like beside Him. Say, "Surely the losers will be those who ruin their souls and ruin their families on the day of resurrection!" Beware! That will surely be the manifest loss
-Qur'an 39:15

Devata worshippers should not mistake this, for the grant of devata worship by offering sacrifices. This is why God further explains that He himself alone is deserved to receive all kinds of sacrifices but none. And says God that those who do not recognize this right of God, fall down (to perdition).

Thus we read in Gita:

I am the only enjoyer and master of all sacrifices. Therefore those who do not recognize My true Transcendental nature fall down. -Gita As it is 9:24

And again

Men of small intelligence worship the demigods (Devatas) and their fruits are limited and temporary. Those who worship the demigods go to the planets of demigods; but My devotees ultimately reach My supreme planet. -Gita As it is 7:23

The phrase "Their fruits are limited and temporary" does not mean that, as these fruits have been conferred by devatas they are limited and temporary-but figuratively implies to mean, as they are worshippers of devatas, they are liable for eternal Hell where they will have no enjoyments. And the worldly life in which these people are enjoying these fruits - is transitory. Hence, in this way it is described as "their fruits are limited and temporary".

The same inference can also be seen in the following Quranic verse

O My people, this life of the world is but a temporary provision, and the hereafter is certainly the home for permanent stay
-Qur'an 40:39

Those who worship the demigods (devatas) will take birth among demigods; those who worship the ancestors go to the ancestors; those who worship ghosts and spirits will take birth

among such beings and those who worship Me will live with Me. -Gita As it is 9:25

Qur'an presents the purport of the above sloka as here under.

Surely, you and that which you worship beside Allah are the fuel of Hell. To it shall all come -Qur'an 21:98

Altogether, two different abodes of men (after their death) are pointed out in this sloka. One—purely for devotees of Lord God, which is the highest transcendental and blissful, where one can have meeting with their Lord (Svarga).

Thus... Those who worship Me live with Me

And the other - the most infernal one (Hell) where one can have the fellowship with all those whom he worshipped on their demand leaving Lord God or along with Him. And again Ghosts and Spirits of this sloka are those satanic or demonic forces which have misled the majority of mankind from all communities with no exception, by insinuating the worship of other beings along with the supreme Lord God. And hence those demons or satans (Shayateen according to Qur'anic term) go to Hell, whom their followers will have their fellowship in Hell.

Thus... Those who worship ghosts and spirits will take birth among such beings

And again, in this sloka, 'the worship of ancestors' is figuratively used for (or) to mean as 'following of ancestors'. If one strictly follows on the ancestral path inherited to him, he shall reach the abode of his ancestors. It is but natural to believe that the ancestors left behind them the same path on which they themselves had actually followed. Therefore to know the abode of our ancestors we have to examine the path thus we have been given in our inheritance. If it is in conformity with the scriptural instructions, no doubt our ancestors will attain

the transcendental place where we too will have their fellowship; as otherwise we will go to Hell where we will find our ancestors too.

Thus... Those who worship the ancestors go to the ancestors

There are only two things before men - obedience or disobedience of which the former leads to Heaven and the latter to Hell. According as to our expositions given on various slokas of Gita, it is proved that one should worship God Almighty alone, by obedience of which one attains Heaven. Contrary to this if one worships any other than God Almighty may it be a devata or ghost or spirit goes to Hell. This is what has been expounded allegorically in this sloka that- 'The worshippers of Me live with Me' to mean as saying that they would attain Heaven and 'Those that worship others' attain Hell.

Thus the devotees of God will have fellowship with God in Heaven; and others will have in Hell the fellowship of those beings whom they worship. This point speaks clearly that all those beings which were or are being worshipped will also be thrown into foul hell along with their worshippers. It is reasonable that as the ghosts and spirits play an important role in perverting the majority of mankind from EKESWAROPASANA (Monotheism) and diverting them towards the worship of others are liable for Hell punishment and so is the case with those ancestors that had left behind them the most heinous and evil path of polytheism. And so is the case with those too who proclaim divinity in them and pose themselves as avatars of God who directly or indirectly demand or desire for a great number of their worshippers and followers. Thus all these categories are reasonably liable for Hell punishment along with their worshippers and followers. So far it is well and good. But the question is that how can these innocent devatas be held responsible for Hell punishment along with their devotees as has been pointed out in this sloka, merely because they had been worshipped by the people with the instigation of evil ones? Has any devata ever demanded his worship? If the answer is -

'NO'; how can they be held responsible for the evil act of the people, so as to make companions with them (people) in the infernal place called "Foul Hell"? And again to be very frank, nobody has ever seen devatas in their original forms. But in the names of these devatas people began to worship the imaginary, images, idols, and statues such as made of mud - iron, metal and the like.

These are but names which you have named- you and your fathers for which Allah has sent down no authority. They follow naught but conjecture and what their souls desire while there has already come to them guidance from their Lord
-Qur'an 53:23

So what we should know here is, as according to this sloka, devatas will not be cast into Hell along with their devotees, but those imaginary idols and statues and images in fact which are the real objects to which people are worshipping in the names of devatas will be cast into foul Hell.

Thus... Those who worship the demigods (Devatas) will take birth among demigods

You only worship idols beside Allah, and you forge a lie. Those whom you worship beside Allah have no power to provide sustenance for you. Then seek sustenance from Allah and worship Him and be grateful to Him. Unto Him will you be brought back.
-Qur'an 29:17

Now observe what God enjoins upon His bhaktas as regards to sacrifices.

Whatever you do, whatever you eat, whatever you offer or give away and whatever austerities you perform - do that, O Son of Kunti, as an offering to Me -Gita As it is 9:27

A number of slokas have been discussed so far, in which not only God forbids the worship of any other being than Himself but also warns of the evil consequences of polytheistic practices and also exhorts to

worship Him alone, and gives glad tidings of Heaven to His devotees. This is all the essence of the comprehensive expositions on the foregoing slokas. Fact being thus, to our great surprise, we find the following slokas in Gita as follows.

A. With this (by sacrifice) do ye nourish the gods (devatas) and the gods shall nourish you; thus nourishing one another ye shall attain supreme good. -Gita 3:11

B. Nourished by the sacrifice, the gods (devatas) shall indeed bestow on you the enjoyments ye desire. Whoso enjoys - without offering to them their gifts, he is verily a thief -Gita 3:12

C. Those who are devotees of other gods and who worship them with faith, actually worship only Me, O son of Kunti; but they do so in a wrong way -Gita As it is 9:23

The above three slokas appear as a permission for Devata worship and offering of sacrifices to them. And our Hindu scholars who are active in protecting their vested interests, make use of these slokas in promoting Devata worship and in preserving it as evergreen. If these slokas really convey to mean as the interpretation of our scholars, the authenticity of the slokas in the light of whole Gita teachings, becomes doubtful. As a matter of fact the authenticity of these slokas cannot be suspected. But what fact is the people have erred in taking its correct meaning the outcome of which is the basis for wrong interpretation. Our exposition on these slokas in the light of scriptures makes clear its ambiguity, which we have discussed in our another tract under the title of 'DEVATAS' which is under preparation.

Say Prophet...

My prayer and my sacrifice, and my life and my death are all for Allah, The Lord of the worlds. He has no partner. And so am I commanded, and I am the first of those who submit
-Qur'an 6:162-163

The same I am to all beings, to Me there is none hateful or dear, but whoso worship Me with devotion, they are in Me, and I am also in them -Gita 9:29

ANTHROPOMORPHISM

The concept of God's descent in human form is anthropomorphism. It is another bait of Demonic and Satanic influence upon human beings that plays an important role in diverting the minds and faith from Monotheism (EKESVAROPASANA) to polytheism.

Antithetic dogmas take place in religion when something is mistaken for something else.

YOGA: The chapters of Gita have been named after the manner of VISHDA YOGA, SANKHAYA YOGA etc. Thus the whole Gita has been divided under eighteen yogas.

Yoga as according to present context means - meeting. Literally also it carries the same meaning. Meeting with whom? As regards to this, Sri Vidya Prakasanandagiri of Kalahasti, in his introductory notes to 'Vishada yoga' the first chapter of Gita writes as "Yoga means meeting. The union of Jeevatma and Paramatma is Yoga" (Gita Makaranda).

This inference can be had from the following sloka.

'... tada yogam avapsyasi' (2:53). (Tada-then; Yogam-meeting; Avapsyasi-you will get - then you will get the meeting'. This sloka might have been explained by Sri Paramatma, when asked by Arjuna that how and when again the meeting with him could be possible. So Sri Paramatma explained certain conditions fulfillment of which enables him the meeting with him (Sri Paramatma).

Thus it is made clear that meeting of Paramatma with any Jeevatma to teach the Dharma (religion) is called yoga. And again that

which has been proktam (taught) by Sri Parmatma is also termed as yoga in the sense of 'Revelation', and this is the reason why Gita chapters are named after yoga to mean divine revelation.

Arjuna says to Sri Paramatma...

... Yeh - ayam yogastavaya proktham -6:33

The yoga which has been revealed by you

And in more clear terms the following sloka agrees that what was taught (Revealed) by Sri Paramatma is called yogam in the sense of Revelation.

... Etad guhyam Aham Param Yogam -18:75

... I heard this supreme and most secret yoga direct from Krishna, the Lord of yoga, himself declaring it... -18:75

In this regard the definition as given about 'Yoga' in the Patanjali philosophy is note worthy - which reads as follows:

"The chief aim of yoga is to teach the means by which the human soul may attain complete union with the supreme being (Moksha), whose existence it establishes..."

Why this yoga is made the necessary means to know the existence of God Almighty and his injunctions?

Because, we cannot comprehend Brahma (The creator, The Almighty) by means of direct perception, because - 'There sight goes not' (Keno upanishad 1-3)

In our ken lyeth not His form, None with the eye doth see Him (OP. Cit. 4-11; 6-9; 4-20)

Eyes cannot reach Him, but he reaches the eyes. And He is the

incomprehensible, the All aware -Qur'an 6:103

No man hath seen God at any time... -John 1:18

Therefore to know about God Almighty with all His attributes and about the ways and means following on which one attains salvation (Moksha), the Agama (Descent) and Proktam (Revelation) became Quite necessary.

Thus the necessity of Agama and Yoga is made known which Qur'an also confirms.

And it is not for a man that Allah should speak to him except by revelation or from behind a veil or by sending a messenger to reveal by His command what He pleases, surely He is high, wise -Qur'an 42:51

In this connection Sri Vidyananda writes in his 'Introduction to the study of Upanishads'

"As to Agama or Revelation, the ritualistic section being concerned with effects and the means by which to bring them about, there is no room left for the hope of obtaining knowledge of Brahma from that section".

The points as made above prove irrefutably the necessity of Agama (descent) and revelation (proktam/yoga) without which neither the existence of Brahma nor His instructions necessary for the attainment of salvation (Moksha) can be known. To speak the truth, such divine guidance has been appointed by God Almighty right from the beginning of the mankind and renewed whenever needed. In this regard observe the following slokas.

1. O Sinless Arjuna - In the beginning I taught Gnanayoga to Sankhyas and Karma yoga to yogins. Thus two fold path was taught by Me. -3:3

2. I taught this imperishable yoga to Vivaswath, Vivaswat taught it to Manu, Manu taught it to Ikshvaku. -4:1

3. This handed down thus in succession, the king sages learnt, this yoga by long lapse of time, has been lost here, O harasser of foes. -4:2

4. That same ancient yoga has been now taught to thee by Me, seeing that thou art My devotee and friend for this is the supreme secret. -4:3

Thus yoga means the meeting (descent) of Paramatma and the teaching of Dharm. And hence Agama and that which has been taught both are termed as yoga according to both Qur'an and Gita

KURUKSHETRA : A sacred place or a place of pilgrimage.

It has another name also. It is called Dharma Kshetra. Because it is the place where Sri Parmatma met with Jeevatma (Sri Arjuna) for the first time, for the re-establishment of Dharm. Thus as dharm was taught here by Sri Paramatma it became Dharma Kshetra.

Dharma Kshetre, Kurukshetre -Gita 1:1

Kurukshetra has another meaning also. (Kuru = do; kshetra = a place) so this means - a place where one has to act (according to the biddings of God). This literal meaning significantly stands for world where mankind has to perform karma.

Kurukshetra is a place where dharma was taught -Gita 1:1

The following sloka reveals that, how Paramatma appeared to Arjuna in his first meeting (Yoga).

Arjuna saw Sri Paramatma and enquired him as follows:

Tell me who thou art, so fierce in form. I bow to thee, O God Sreme, have mercy. I desire to know thee and thy original being and thy mission -Gita 11:31

Paramatma and Arjuna were unknown to each other

So fierce in form' speaks that Sri Paramatma appeared in an extraordinary human form, presumably with four arms which caused a little bit of fear in the mind of Arjuna at the first instance. This can be disclosed from the following sloka.

... I wish to see thee as before in thy former form only having four arms... -Gita 11:46

This was the request of Arjuna to Sri Paramatma not being able to see the Viswa roopa any more, to show him once again his former form having four arms, which was not so fierce as that of viswaroopa. Though this four armed form appeared to be fearful at the first instance, it was really not so fearful, as that of viswaroopa (universal form) but delightful. This was why Arjuna longed to see it once again. Most evidently with this four armed form only Paramatma might have appeared to Arjuna in the first occasion. This is just to impress upon Arjuna and to make him believe that he (Paramatma) was not an ordinary human being, but some one beyond human.

The questions such as (1) who art thou? and (2) what is thy mission? speak clearly that there was no acquaintance of Paramatma before and that it was his first meeting with Arjuna in the extraordinary human form, which created curiosity in the mind of Arjuna to know about him and his mission.

Paramatma met prophet Mohammad

More or less it was the same situation in which prophet Mohammad was caught when he happened to see Jibreel (Gabriel) who is known as Krishna by his original name in Hindu scriptures, in his original form at the time of his first revelation at Mount of Light with an authoritative voice commanding as follows:

Convey thou in the name of thy Lord who created - created man from a clot of blood. Convey and thy Lord is most generous, who taught (man) by the pen, taught man what he knew not -Qur'an 96:1-5

Mohammad was not yet made prophet. He was in the habit of going to remote place from township, known as Jabal-al-Noor (Mount of light), which was named latter, for seclusion for the purpose of meditation. Just as Kurukshetra was latter called as Dharmakshetra just because divine message was started to come from there so also since Paramatma, Roohul Quddus according to Qur'anic term¹ appeared to prophet Mohammad and taught the revelation at the mount it is named as Jabal-al-noor, mount of light where from the Divine light began to focus on the dark world. Though prophet Mohammad did not enquire Sri Paramatme (Rooh-al-Ameen)² the another title as bestowed in Qur'an, that who he was and what his mission was as did Sri Arjuna, he perplexed terribly as to what could have the message been and the vision.

INCARNATION OF PARAMATMA MISTAKEN FOR ANTHROPOMORPHISM

'Tell me who thou art so fierce in form' and 'I desire to know thy original being...'

These two clauses rule out the likeliness of Arjuna to have addressed Sri Paramatma as 'I bow thee, O God supreme'. Had he in know that he was God surpeme by himself he could never have further enquired about his original being. (However this points out on the human attempt made, to promote Paramatma to God Head)

In reply to Arjuna's questions Sri Paramatma says as here under taking the form of an ordinary man.

1. Rooh-al-Quddus (Qur'an 5:110, 2:87)

2. Rooh-al-Ameen - Trustworthy or Reliable (Qur'an 26:193)

As regards to me - hear O Arjuna!

Though I am unborn, of imperishable nature, and though I am the Lord of all beings, yet ruling over my own nature I do incarnate (Sambhavami or Srujami) by my own maya.

-Gita 4:6

In the above sloka we have four points (Natures) which disclose the real person of Sri Paramatma who had been in human form. 1. Unborn 2. Imperishable 3. Incarnation-possesing of ability in taking human form 4. The lord of all beings.

1. (AJAM) - UNBORN:

One who is unborn, is not subject to death. so he is not begotten like human beings who are subject to death. No human being is free from birth and death. So Paramatma who is unborn and hence undying in no way be a human being. And we know through scriptures that this nature belongs to God Almighty and hence it is the first ambiguous point which however became a source for the misinterpretation of the incarnation of Paramatma in human form for anthropomorphism.

2. (AVYA YATMA) - IMPERISHABLE PERSON:

A firm body without deterioration or a firm body which is immutable. This nature is also against to the nature of man. Man takes birth as an infant, infancy goes to child hood. Childhood transforms to youth. Thus man's body is mutable from one stage to other. From now onwards the decay or deterioration begins and gradually reaches to old age where finally he meets the death.

As according to Paramatma he is having a swaropa (body) of his own which is free from all such changes and deteriorations as described above. So taking the contrast for granted, it can be admitted that Paramatma in noway be a human being. And again what note-

worthy is God Almighty is also having the same nature. And this is the second point which strengthened in attributing divinity to Sri Paramatma under the doctrine of anthropomorphism.

ONE WHO IS BORN CANNOT BE AN INCARNATE

SAMBHAVAMI - I do incarnate - I do appear

3. INCARNATION : Taking of human form

Taking of human form having not been born and having the immutable and firm body is not possible if one is not descended directly from the heavens.

Let us bear in mind that one who takes incarnation must have two bodies - one his original one and the second one that which has been transformed as human incarnate body which vanishes soon after his original body is re-assumed. Thus though he takes various bodies, he remains always in only one body i.e., either in his own person or in the incarnate one. And what more surprizing is - that he is capable of keeping his company in midst of people invisible not being seen of any one. And yet more curious fact is that he is capable of descending direct on the heart of the prophet in such a short form as that of even smaller than an atom, where he causes inspiration (of revelation) in the heart of the prophet. This is what actually known as the union of Paramatma with Jeevatma. Whatever state or form he remains in, he is always the person of his original being only. Hence the qualities and nature as described by him relating to his original being, in no way attract to his incarnate human forms. "Sambhavami atma mayaya" manifest myself (by means of) my own miraculous power. So this clause 'Sambhavami atma mayaya' unequivocally discloses the fact that Paramatma descended in human form with his miraculous power but never took birth in any human womb of any time. This fact is evident

from Gita itself. Sri Paramatma took three different forms viz. 1. One as an extraordinary human form with four arms with which he appeared to Arjuna in his first meeting and 2. Then he took the ordinary human form and 3. the Viswaroopa shown to Arjuna on his request which is the real form and person of Paramatma (11:47).

Now I draw your attention towards the fact that, when Arjuna was terribly afraid and could no more see the Viswaroopa, requested to show him the former extraordinary human form (11:49)). Then instantly the Viswaroopa of Sri Paramatma transformed to extraordinary human form with four arms and then again as an ordinary human form. In these transformations of roopas from one to another no need necessitated him to take the help of any human couple so as to conceive and deliver him on earth. This logic leads to conclude that Paramatma is capable of transforming his form, he takes whatever form he likes and requires. 'Sambhavami yuge, yuge' (4:8). Thus he descends from heaven. So this point further discloses more authentically that he never took his birth from any human womb of any age, nor does he ever take in future. But he descends in human form from heaven. In fact taking birth from any womb contradicts to his superior natures of being unborn and immutable and eternal since every born is subject to changes and finally meets death (2:13 and 26). Hence it goes to prove paradoxically that one who is born cannot be an incarnate. Thus the claim of so called awatars is dampened. One who is born and claims incarnation can be no more than an imposter. And if anyone regards such a one as an incarnate, it is his mere delusion.

Yogeswara - Lord of revelation for entire mankind

4. Lord of all beings

Bhutanam Iswaro Pisan. Bhutanam - all those that are born Iswarah = The Lord.

Thus Sri Paramatma says that he is the lord of all those that are born. As according to the present context the meaning of Bhutanam Iswarah is 'Lord for all mankind' Bhutanam here particularly applies only to mankind. It may be asked that how can this be established mere on speculation without any source of scriptural authority. For this we explain - Paramatma says being in assumed human form, 'I am unborn yet Lord of all born'. An unborn being assuming human form claims the lordship over all born - is self explanatory that he is Lord only to all mankind excluding all other creatures. More over no other creature needs yoga teachings.

Hence Paramtma is master (Yogeswara) for all mankind only.

Yogeswara is an another title for Sri Paramatma (11:4 & 11:9)

Param Yogam Yogeswarah

Param = Supreme

Yogam = that what has been taught or revealed.

Yogeswara (Yoga + Iswara) master or Lord of Yoga or revelation.

I have heard this supreme and most secret yoga (Gita teachings) direct from Krishna, the Lord of yoga (Yogeswara) himself declaring it. -Gita 18:75

So under these two clauses

Bhutanam of Iswarah ... of 4:6

and the word 'Yogeswarah' ... of 18:75

it is proved that Sri Paramatma is the master of revelation for the entire mankind. And his descent for revelations is not confined and restricted

to Bharat only but meant for entire mankind of the world. And it is why he is known as 'Jagadguru' (11:43). This is what exactly the meaning of 'Bhutanam Iswarah'. Thus his lordship of yoga is mistaken for lordship over every thing of the universe. Thus Yogeswara has been mistaken for lordship over every thing of the universe. Thus Yogeswara has been mistaken for lokeswara or Sarweswara and divinity has been attributed.

Sri Paramatma is from akshra class of beings

However taking into consideration the above four natures of Sri Paramatma as narrated by himself in sloka 4:6, which are apparently similar with the nature of God Almighty, a query may come as to what could Sri Paramatma have been, were he not God Almighty by himself who was incarnate and descended from heavens. To know in its perspective that who this being was (is) with similar nature (to some extent) that of God Almighty I would like to draw your attention towards the following slokas.

As according to Gita also we have two classes of beings. Of them the one is mortals - in this category all creatures belonging to earth planet are included. And the other-immortal beings which include all creatures and spirits belonging to heavenly planets.

Thus we read in Gita:

There are these two beings in the world, the perishable (Kshara) and the imperishable (Akshara). The perishable comprises all creatures, the immutable is called the imperishable -Gita 15:16

As according to above - one class comprises of all creatures which is perishable, and the other class consists of immutable which is imperishable. Thus it is made clear that God Almighty has created another class of celestial beings also which are entirely different in nature to that of human beings. As is pointed out in the above sloka

they are immutable and imperishable. These two natures are self explanatory that they should be unborn. And therefore the claim of one that appeared to Arjuna in fierce form, as one unborn and imperishable (4:6) does not give sanction to regard him as God Almighty Himself, simply because he is unborn and immutable; but he is to be regarded as one among the imperishable beings as mentioned in sloka 15:16. This fact can be well established from the coming arguments.

Just as Gita, Qur'an also makes mention as regards to the celestial beings as having been bestowed the eternity. The point of eternity covers both birthlessness and immutability within itself as pointed out in Gita 4:6. Let us recollect that Adam and his spouse, the first couple, the progenitors of mankind was seduced by Satan saying as - *'Your Lord has only forbidden you this tree, lest you should become Angels or such other beings as live for ever'* (Qur'an 7:20). From this it is made clear that mankind is mortal while the celestial beings are immortal. Thus there are two kinds of beings both according to Qur'an and Gita.

There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another. -(Bible) I Corinthians 15:40

And again in consecutive sloka God Almighty separates Himself from these two classes of beings.

Thus we Read in Gita:

But distinct is the Highest Spirit (Uttama purusha) spoken of as the supreme self (Param + atma), the indestructible Lord (Iswara) who penetrates and sustains the three worlds. -Gita 15:17

In this sloka God Almighty is described as Uttama Purusha and also as param-atma which point is likely to mislead to regard Sri Paramatma of our discussions as God Almighty Himself. According to context the words generally not only give different meanings but also

some times denote for different persons. For instance, atma is generally used for soul of a man and some times it refers to person such as...

1. Jitatma - a person who conquered his mind (6:7)
2. Truptatma - a contended person (6:8)
3. Mahatma - a great one (Sri Krishna) (11:37)
4. Mahatma - a great one (Arjuna) (18:74)
5. Paramatma - The sacred person (Krishna) (13:23)
6. Paramatma - The sacred person (one who conquers his mind) (6:7)¹
7. Kamatma - a person desirous of sense gratification (2:43)
8. Avya Yatma - a person free from decay or deterioration (4:6)
9. Samsayatma - a doubting person (4:40)
10. Mahatmanah - The great souls (9:13)

Paramatma is the title of Sri Krishna which mainly denotes for his supreme personality. In sloka 6:7 of Gita, God Almighty describes the man who controls his mind as 'Paramatma'¹. Thus here there are two Paramatmas. One Sri Krishna and the other any person who controls one's own mind. Can equality in status be awarded for these two alike?

Sri Krishna Mahatma (11:37). Sri Arjuna is also said as Mahatma (18:74). Can these two persons be equated in ranks and status

1. As according to Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastri's translation to Sri Sankaracharya's commentary.

simply because both are addressed with the same titles? Gita proclaims that those who worship God with exclusive devotion as Mahatmanah. Can all these Mahatmanahs and Arjuna and Krishna be equated? We call great people as Mahatma (Ex: mahatma Gandhi). We call God Almighty as Lord. We often hear in courts of law addressing the Magistrates and Judges as Lords. Does it mean that they are lords in the capacity of God Almighty? It is an admitted point that God Almighty is PARAMATMA (Supreme being in every respect 7:7). But however great Paramatma (in the sense of great person) one may be or one calls the other or God Himself bestows this title on any person either from Mortal beings or celestials cannot attain to the supremacy of God Almighty's being Paramatma - therefore the Paramatma of this sloka 15:17 exclusively denotes for God Almighty but to none else. And more particularly it does not refer to Paramatma, the person under discussion of celestial beings who has been appointed for the re-establishment of the Sanatana Dharm. To say in clear terms the PARAMATMA (God Almighty of 15:17) and Paramatma who belongs to AKSHARA class of beings of 15:16 can in no way be conjoined as one person. The following arguments make this point more vivid.

In an another sloka God Almighty says that He is a distinct person higher than any of his creatures both among from the mortal beings and the celestial beings ...

Thus we read in the following sloka.

Because I transcend the perishable and am even higher than the imperishable. Therefore am I known in the world and in the Veda as the highest person (Purushottama). -Gita 15:18

Therefore god Almighty is Uttama Purusha (Highest person)

There is naught else higher than I, ... -Gita 7:7

And your God is one God; there is no God but He, the gracious, the merciful -Qur'an 2:163

This is to mean that He is greater than all beings - animated or inanimated, mutable or immutable, perishable or imperishable. No one is greater than God nor is equal to Him. Whoso among all these categories - exists, he exists mere on the mercy of God Almighty.

And to the second question of Arjuna, Sri Paramatma answers as follows:

(I desire to know... Thy mission) -11:31

As regards to my pravritti (Mission) hear O Arjuna.

Whenever there is a decay of religion O Bharata, and an ascendancy of irreligion, then I manifest myself -Gita 4:7

for?

... For the firm establishment of religion, I do appear in every age -Gita 4:8

Further he says that it is his prescribed duty -

"O son of Pritha! There is no work prescribed for me within all the three planetary systems nor am I in want of anything, nor have I a need to obtain anything- and yet I am engaged in prescribed duty - (Bh. Gita As it is 3:22)

For should I not ever engage in action unwearied, men would in all matters follow my path, O son of Pritha -Gita 3:23

These worlds [people] would be ruined if I should not perform my duty; I should be the cause of confusion of castes [religions], and should destroy these creatures -Gita 3:24

From the above three slokas the following points became evi-

dent.

1. His only prescribed duty is of guarding the religion. Whenever it becomes contaminated and polluted, he manifests himself and reforms and revives it so that people may rightly be guided towards the attainment of Moksha.

2. And what noteworthy is that Sri Paramatma says that there is no any other prescribed duty in all the three planetary worlds except guarding of the Religion (3:22). If he were God Almighty himself in Anthropomorphism could ever have he said that there is no work in all the three planetary worlds neglecting His governance and supervision on all the three worlds (15:17)? Has God set Himself free from sustaining all the worlds? Does this fact not authentically prove that Sri Paramatma is not God Almighty in Anthropomorphism but "Deva vara" (11:31) in incarnation of human form who had been appointed as 'Yogeswara' (The Master of Revelation) for guarding of the religion?

After hearing the answers from Sri Paramatma about His original being and mission, Arjuna says as here under about Sri Paramatma.

Thou art the imperishable (Akshara), the supreme being worthy to be known. Thou art great abode of this universe, thou art the undying guardian of the Eternal Dharma, thou art the ancient Purusha, I deem -Gita 11:18

In this sloka Arjuna admitted Sri Paramatma as Akshara (of Sloka 15:16) and also as great abode of this universe - because without his services the whole mankind gropes in the darkness of irreligion and finally admitted him as an undying Gurardian of the Eternal Dharma (religion) as claimed by himself in various slokas such as 3:3, 4:1,2,3,7 &8. The sum and substance of the whole sloka (11:18) is, that Sri Paramatma was (is) one among the Akshara class of beings as stated in sloka 15:16 appointed on the duty of guarding the religion. Devatas (Devah) belong to one of the groups of Akshara class of beings. This

was why Arjuna addressed Sri Paramatma as Deva; and since Sri Paramatma is one of the most superior of devatas, he called him as 'Deva Deva' to mean as the leader of devatas or superior among Devatas. Arjuna addressed Sri Paramatma as:

1. Deva Vara - O best among the demigods (devatas) 11:31
2. Deva - O deva (demigod) 11:44
3. Deva Deva - O leader of demigods 10:15
4. (Deva+Isha) Devesa - O Deva Deva - O Lord of demigods or supreme among devatas (11:25)

Deva cannot be Bhagavan (God Almighty). Nowhere one can find Arjuna calling Sri Paramatma as Bhagavan. Because, when once it is agreed that Sri Paramatma is only a devata (Deva or deva deva) appointed on the duty of guarding the religion (11:18) it is merely ignorance to deem him again as Bhagavan (God Almighty). Leave alone the great personality of Sri Arjuna but even an ordinary sensible man cannot address Bhagavan as Deva and vice-versa. Paramatma being a devata, the fact having been disclosed by Sri Paramatma himself (8:4) Arjuna addressed him as Deva and deva-deva in various slokas such as (10:15, 11:25, 11:44) etc.

Devatas are one among akshara class of celestial beings

Deva (Singular number) and Devah (plural number) in Sanskrit, stand for devata and devatas respectively in Telugu¹. They are also called demigods and Angels. And the synonyms in Arabic are Malak

1. These words also are used in Sanskrit. Ex. Gita 4:12 and the word Sura (s) Sura-Gana (p) hosts of Demigods are also called in Sanskrit for Devatas. (Ex. Gita 10:2)

and Malaika respectively. They have been created by Brahma, Creator, God Almighty (Gita 10:2) and pressed into His service, with some delegated powers. According to saying of Prophet Mohammad, they are trillions and trillions in number. They have been appointed on the duty of various departments in the Divine Government, each department being headed with its chief and millions of subordinate devatas under him functions to carry out his entrusted work. No devata can act independent of divine instructions and supervision. Devatas are submissive servants of God Almighty who carry out the prescribed duties with no slight deviation from what has been enjoined to do. There are many departments in the divine sovereignty with which, however we are not concerned with the present subject except as regards to one main department of yoga. Its main obligatory duty is, the conveyance of message from God Almighty to the mankind following on which one attains moksha as otherwise falls into foul hell.

Sri Krishna - Head of the yoga department

For this high office Sri Krishna has been appointed as (yoga + Isvara) Yogeswara to mean - the master of the department of yoga. It may be noted that such departments as have been established by God Almighty to carry out the universal demands never confine themselves to the boundaries of any particular place or nation, but extend to entire universe. In this regard, it may be recalled that how aptly Gita points out on this fact relating to Sri Krishna saying as Jagadguru; meaning a divine teacher not merely to Bharat but to entire world. He is known as JIBREEL (Gabriel) in Muslim scriptures with his noble titles 'Rooh-al-Quddus' (2:87, 5:110) meaning spirit of Holiness; Rooh-al-Ameen' (26:193) meaning Spirit that is Trustworthy and 'Rooh' meaning Spirit (70:4, 78:38 and 97:4) while in Hindu scriptures as Paramatma; Yogeswara and Atma (spirit). Divine message and scripture were taught to every prophet of every place and of every time through Sri Paramatma only. Thus all scriptures were revealed by God through

Sri Paramatma except in some exceptional cases where God Himself had directly talked with His Prophets from behind a veil, ex. Abraham and Moses and hence he is called Jagadguru.

All scriptures - Make mention of Paramatma

In all divine scriptures, we can find a very significant place as given to Sri Paramatma, which speaks very high of himself. Arjuna addresses him - Deva deva (10:15); Deva vara (11:31); Devesa (11:37) to mean as supreme among devah and also as mahatma (11:20). Deva + Isa = Devesa - Lord of devatas (11:37).

The status of Paramatma as made mention in Gospel can be seen from the following passages...

1. Spirit of God (Atma of God):

But if I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you -Matthew 12:28

The purport of the above verse is that prophet Jesus said that he did cast out the devils from human beings by the power of spirit of God (Atma).

Thus Sri Paramatma helped Prophet Jesus in performing the miracles.

2. Holy Ghost (Param Atma - Holy Spirit):

Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the son of man [Jesus] it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, neither in the world to come -Matthew 12:31-32

These are the verses spoken by prophet Jesus, when he was being ridiculed and rejected by people saying that he was performing all the miracles by the help of Satan. But he said that he was performing all miracles by the help of the Holy Ghost (Paramatma according to Sanscrit). And again he stressed on the point that any sin of blasphemy done against himself might be forgiven but the blasphemy against Holy Ghost would never be forgiven. This shows a higher rank of Holy Ghost over all prophets.

In Qur'an:

Say, whoever is an enemy to Gabriel for he it is who has caused it (Qur'an) to descend on thy heart by the command of Allah, which confirms that which precedes it and is a guidance and glad tidings to the believers. Whoever is an enemy to Allah, and His angels, and His messengers, and Gabriel and Michael, then surely Allah is an enemy to such disbelievers -Qur'an 2:97-98

Sometimes prophets perform miracles as a part of their preaching so as to make the people believe in them as the real prophets of God Almighty. On all such occasions Sri paramatma (Holy Spirit) helps them in performing their miracles so as to strengthen the prophet and the believers and defeat the evil attitude of the nonbelievers (Gita 4:8) (The same view is confirmed by Qur'an)

When Allah will say [after general Resurrection -Kalpadi] O Jesus Son of Mary, remember My favour upon thee and upon thy mother, when I strengthened thee with the spirit of Holiness [Paramatma] so that thou didst speak to the people in the cradle and in the middle age; and when I taught thee Torah and the Gospel... -Qur'an 5:110

Paramatma in the Book of Moses:

1. And pharaoh said unto his servants, can we find such a one as this is, a man in whom the spirit of God [Atma] is? -Genesis 41:38

The above passage from Bible speaks that pharaoh admired Joseph the prophet of the time when his dream came true as interpreted by Joseph and admitted that he could do that only by the help of Spirit of God [Atma] who was in him.

2. And the Lord spoke unto Moses "Saying, see I have called by name Bazaleel the Son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah; And I have filled him with the spirit of God [Atma] in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge and in all manner of workmanship... -Exodus 31:1-3

The above passage speaks that God Almighty informed Moses that he had appointed Bazaleel as prophet on whom He sent His spirit (Atma) to give him wisdom, understanding and knowledge.

God Almighty had appointed the communion of Holy Spirit (Paramatma) with every prophet of every time so as to teach the prophet knowledge and wisdom and to pass on the revelation from God Almighty.

For instance:

Jesus:

*And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost [Paramatma] returned from Jordan and was led by the spirit [Atma] in to the wilderness
-Luke 4:1*

John the Baptist :

*For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink, and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost [Paramatma] even from his mother's womb
-Luke 1:15*

Zachariah:

And his father Zachariah was filled with the Holy Ghost [Paramatma] and prophesied, saying... -Luke 1:67

Qur'an has been revealed through Paramatma (Rooh-al-Quddus)

1. Verily this is the word of a most honourable Messenger
2. endued with power
3. established with rank before the Lord of the throne
4. with authority there and faithful to his trust
(Qur'an 81:19-21)

Purport for the above:

This Qur'an is not the word of Prophet Mohammad but the word of the most honourable messenger (Yogeshwara). Here one should not mistake that this is the word of messenger by himself; but the word 'Messenger' itself makes it clear that he is only a bringer of the divine message from God Almighty. 'Most honourable' speaks a great deal about the status given to Sri Paramatma which point is further emphasized with phrases such as...

2. endued with power... he has been bestowed with great power
3. established with rank before the Lord of throne - There is a special place before the Lord of throne (Pratishta of 14:27 of Gita)
4. with authority... He has been endued with authority over all celestial beings who obey his orders. Thus he is a supreme being among all demigods and celestial beings (Devadeva 10:15 of Gita).

Brahma dictates religious injunctions and Paramatma brings them

We read in Gita 3:15 I. Verse.

Karma Brahmodbhavam Viddhi Brahmakshara Samudbhavam

1 Phrase of 1 verse of 3:15

Karma - enjoined actions

Brahma - (from) Brhama

Udbhavam - springs

Viddhi - know

know that enjoined actions spring from Brahma.

II Phrase of the I verse of 3:15

Brahma - (here) Veda or divine injunctions

Akshara - Paramatma (Sri Krishna)

Samudbhavam - directly revealed (through)

divine injunctions (Vedas) are directly revealed through Paramatma

The whole verse reads to mean as -- one must know that enjoined actions spring from Brahma (and) these divine injunctions are directly revealed through Akshara (Paramatma) (Gita 3:15, I verse). This is to say in clear terms that Brahma dictates the injunctions relating to Dharma which have been directly revealed through Sri Paramatma. Thus it is made clear that Sri Paramatma is the conveyor of the divine injunctions as and when dictated by Brahma, the creator.

For this purpose only he makes manifest himself (Sambhavam Yuge Yuge 4:8).

Say: The Spirit of holiness [Rooh-al-Qudus- Paramatma according to Sanscrit] has brought it down from thy Lord with truth [Satt] that He may strengthen those who believe and as a guidance and glad tidings for Muslims -Qur'an 16:102

Does this not prove that God almighty do not descend in Anthropomorphism, but sends Paramatma who descends in human form which process is known as incarnation?

The above fact is further explained in more clear terms, in the following sloka.

*Having created mankind before along with Yagna (here commandements) the Prajapati (Brahma) said - By these shall ye prosper, these are to you your desire yielding sources
-Gita 3:10*

Your attention is invited. This sloka is revealed by Sri Paramatma wherein he explains that Brahma had laid down certain commandments obeying of which one can prosper. Does this not disclose the fact that Brahma dictates the Brahma sutras (Divine injunctions) which Sri Paramatma reveals to mankind whenever the Dharma declines? This is the purpose for which he manifests himself (Sambhavam Yuge Yuge 4:8).

And verily this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The Spirit faithful to the trust (rooh-al-Ameen) [Yogeswara] has descended with it on thy heart that thou mayest be of the warners, in plain and clear Arabic tongue. And it is surely (mentioned) in the scriptures of the former people -Qur'an 26:192-196

Thus Brahma and Paramatma, two distinct persons are obvious. This sloka discloses the fact that Brahma never descends in Anthro-

pomorphism but it is Paramatma who has been appointed on the duty of guarding the religion, who takes incarnation in human form. Thus no Anthropomorphism of the Almighty, but descent of Paramatma in human incarnation is manifest.

Paramatma consecrated for the conveyance of divine message

In this regard let us examine the sloka 14:27 of Gita, which has been mentioned by Sri Paramatma, in connection with the reply to the question of Arjuna as regards to his mission.

In this sloka he discloses his identity as 'Brahmano hi pratishthaham'. Paraphrase of this clause reads as follows: Brahmanah - of Brahma; hi-indeed; pratishtha (N) - Consecration; aham - I am.

The key word of this clause is 'pratishtha' (noun) the synonyms of which are - installation, inauguration, consecration, fame, ground, base, celebrity, reputation, the state of being fixed, standing.

Meaning of the clause, taking 'Pratishtha' as noun reads to mean 'Indeed I am the consecration of Brahma'. Thus the whole sloka can be interpreted as follows. 'Indeed I am the consecration of Brahma who is immortal, imperishable and (who is provider of) eternal Dharma (which leads to) ultimate happiness' (Gita 14:27).

However, with the word 'Pratishtha' (as noun) the sloka rendered ambiguity. So let us take into consideration the following scriptural facts so as to arrive at the correct meaning.

- I. Sri Paramatma descended in human form (Sambhavami atma maya 4:6)
 - a. to revive the declining religion (Yada Yada hi Dharmasya Glani 4:7)

- b. for the firm establishment of the religion (Dharma - Samsthapanarthaya Sambhavami Yuge Yuge 4:8)
- II. He is yogeswara (Master of Divine teachings to all mankind) (18:75 and 4:6)
- III. Hence he is known as Jagadguru (11:43)
- IV. He is duty bound...
 - a. I am engaged in prescribed duty (3:22)
 - b. If I do not perform my duty... (3:24)
- V. He is guardian of the religion...
 - a. Arjuna says... 'You are the undying guardian of the eternal dharma' (11:18)
 - b. Paramatma says ... 'I am engaged in my duty of guarding the religion, right from the beginning of the world' (3:3, 4:1-4)
- VI. And again Sri Paramatma says in unequivocal terms that Brahma being the fountain of the religion - dictates the religious duties (Dharmasastras) which have been revealed through him (Paramatma) (3:10, 3:15)

Do all these points not disclose the fact that Sri Paramatma has been appointed as jagadguru of the divine revelation?

Then therefore, keeping in view of all these facts if the word 'Pratishtha' as verbal adjective, the sloka not only becomes relevant but also clears the ambiguity with (Noun) 'Pratishtha'.

The meanings of the word 'Pratishthitam' (as verbal adjective) are ... erected, fixed, established, endowed, consecrated, firmly placed,

set up...

Hence, with the word 'Pratishthitam' the sloka can be interpreted as follows:

For I am [Paramatma] consecrated of Brahma who is immortal and immutable and (who provides) the eternal dharma (following of which lead to) unending bliss. (-14:27)

We have a reference in Qur'an also showing that Paramatma has been consecrated of God Almighty.

Thus we read:

*That this (Qur'an) is surely the word of a noble messenger, possessor of power established [Pratishthitam] in the presence of the Lord of the throne, obeyed there and faithful to his trust...
-Qur'an 81:19-21*

The points discussed in the light of foregoing scriptural facts reveal that Sri Paramatma has been appointed by Brahma, as a teacher of Dharm (The religion). He descends from heavens, in human form with the religious ordinances as and when dictated by Brahma. Thus the revelation is sent by Brahma through Sri Paramatma or by his deputies to the person who has been appointed by Him to act as a prophet who in turn convey the message to the people. This is the process through which religion is revived whenever it is found to be declining. These facts can be seen in Qur'an also.

He (God Almighty) sends down the angels [devatas] with revelation by His command on whomsoever of His servants He pleases (saying), warn (people) that there is no God but I, so take Me alone for your protector -Qur'an 16:2

Incarnation of Paramatma - A stumbling block

Let us examine another sloka wherein the word 'Pratishtha' (N)

is used to signify the consecration of Sri Paramatma in bringing the Divine message. We know the fact that Sri Paramatma descends when the religion is destroyed and irreligion is substituted. In the situation such as this people would have become either polytheists or atheists but none remained on the original religion. Atheists reject both yoga (Agama) - the descent of Paramatma and the existence of Lord Brahma. The following sloka is the best example which briefly furnishes these points. In the foregoing discussions under sloka 14:27 it is learnt that Paramatma himself says that he has been consecrated (Pratishthita) in the service of Divine message from Brahma. In the following sloka we find the atheists rejecting of this same point.

They (atheists) say -

Asatyam apratishtham te jagad ahur anaiswar yam ... -16:8

Paraphrase of the above...

te - they (atheists) ahur - say; asatyam - (the claim of Arjuna that he is being taught by Paramatma about Brahma and His ordinances) not true; apratishtham - (There is no consecration such as claimed in 14:27) to say in clear terms that there is no yogam or Agama - the descent of Paramatma and his proktam - revelation; anaiswaryam - There is no Iswara (God) Master; (Iswara is another attribute of God Almighty to mean 'Master' which is equivalent to 'MAALIK' in Arabic term).

They say that there is no Pratishtha (consecration) nor creator - but this world is the result of sexual desires. Except this there is no other cause. (Gita16:8)

As according to this it is implied that Sri Paramatma had proclaimed two things. One to accept himself as a divine teacher (consecration) and the second to accept the existence of God Almighty, who is the creator and nourisher which points were not acceptable to athe-

ists. Now what we primarily point out from this is that Sri Paramatma distinguished himself as one consecrated of God Almighty which point rules out Anthropomorphism. It is a known fact that Agama (descent) and proktam (revelation) is the only source through which the existence of Brahma and His commandments following on which one attains moksha, can be established. Thus through this source one can believe in the existence of Brahma. Just as one has to believe in the existence of God without seeing Him, so also one must have to believe in Agama and proktam, for in Agama, Paramatma in his original form cannot be seen by every one except the prophet of the time (7:25). This is because he descends either directly on the heart of the prophet or manifests in human form which act again confounds people, and so they think of him as no more than an ordinary man like ourselves. Thus believing him as Paramatma consecrated (Pratishthitham) of Brahma again becomes a matter as difficult as of believing in the existence of God Almighty himself. We find in the following sloka wherein Sri Paramatma himself pitied for the fate of the poor people who could not understand him as consecrated of Brahma.

Not knowing my supreme being as the great master (Maheswaram) who descended taking the human form, the foolish people deride (neglect me) saying - 'He is no more than an ordinary human being' -Gita 9:11

Just as Arjuna was accused that he was being taught by an ordinary man only but not by pramatma, so also prophet Mohammad was rejected which fact can be seen from the following Qur'anic verse.

And indeed We know that they say that it is only a man who teaches him (Prophet Mohammad) -Qur'an 16:103

Thus the incarnation of Sri Paramatma in human form became a stumbling - block to the atheists.

Another sloka of Gita speaks about the then so-called followers of Sanatana dharma who eventually became irreligious. It is an admit-

ted fact that Paramatma takes incarnation, only when the religion is destroyed and needs be reformed. And these reformations definitely go against to the then prevailing beliefs and dogmas and practices of the people of the corrupt religion. What was the main reformation advocated and that what was their corrupt practice that has been pointed out in the coming sloka is a matter that incites curiosity. They had been involved themselves in the main dogma of ANTHROPO-MORPHISM which finally hurled them into polytheism as they were worshipping the images of previous incarnations of Paramatma treating as the descent of God Almighty Himself in human form. But when Paramatma taught about himself as a devata appeared in human incarnation for the purpose of reviving the religion, as it fell against to the then existing dogma of Anthropomorphism, they regarded him only as an imposter. Thus his incarnation became a stumbling - block to the other group of people too. As regards to them God Almighty speaks through Paramatma as here under.

The foolish people regard Me [God Almighty] as coming in manifestation in human form, not knowing My supreme, immutable and unsurpassed nature of being unmanifest -Gita 7:24

This sloka very clearly explains that those people whom God described as foolish were not atheists but believers in the existence of God Almighty and Agama of Paramatma. But where they erred is - they regarded the descent of Sri Paramatma (the incarnation) as the coming of God Almighty Himself in human form (Anthropomorphism). Here it is clearly explained that God Almighty never manifests in human form. This point rules out Anthropomorphism, the gate way of polytheism (7:24) and at the same time it establishes the fact that it was Sri Paramatma who descended in human form (9:11) having been consecrated of Brahma the Almighty (14:27) on the duty of safeguarding the religion right from the beginning (3:3 and 4:1-4). Those that profess Anthropomorphism should ponder over this sloka (7:24).

Incarnation - Defined

And without a doubt it can be well presumed that Arjuna might have also been under the impression that God Almighty Himself descended in human form for the establishment of the religion. But knowing the facts (which have so far been discussed under the chapter of Anthropomorphism) from Sri Paramatma himself, he curiously enquired (under Ref: 8:1-2) to explain him in detail about Brahma and about Paramatma himself. In this regard he asked three questions pertaining to Brahma and three regarding paramatma himself consecutively. The answers for these, have been provided by Sri Paramatma in consecutive slokas under Ref. 8:3-4 respectively, which we have quoted below in series in the form of question and answer for the easy understanding of the readers.

Q1. Kim tad Brahma? (8:1)

What is that Brahma?

Ans: Akshara Brahma Paramam (8:3)

Supreme Brahma is (Akshram) imperishable and Eternal (one).

Q2. Kim adhyatmam? (8:1)

What is Adhyatmam?

Ans: Svabhavo adhyatmam uchyate (8:3)

(And His) nature of being supreme and Eternal is called Adhyatmam.

NB: According to 15:5 and 13:12 the Gnana (knowledge) useful to know this Supreme Being is also called 'adhyatmam'.

Q3. Kim Karma? (8:1)

What is (His) Karma?

Ans: Bhuta - bhavodbhava - karo visargah karma samjnita (8:3)

(And His) Action pertaining to creation of all entities (animated or inanimated) is called His Karma.

NB: Brahma creator of mankind and Devatas (3:10 & 10:2)

Paramatma discloses Himself as Devata in guise of human form - a strong testimony to refute ANTHROPOMORPHISM.

Q4. Adhibhutam cha kim proktam? (8:1)

And What is said about adhibhutam?

Ans: Adhibhutam Ksharo bhavah (8:4)

Paraphrase: Adhibhutam = physical manifestation. Ksharah = Perishable (vanishing); Bhavah = nature (subject to).

(My) incarnation (physical manifestation) is subject to vanish (not permanent). To say in clear terms...

"The human form in which I have manifested myself is subject to disappear (Ksharah)".

Q5. Adhidaivam kim uchyate? (8:1)

What is said (about) adhidaivatam?

Ans: Purusha cha adhidaivatam (8:4)

Paraphrase: Purusha = (My) Original being, adhidaivatam = Adhidaiva (means super devata or presiding devata employed for the purpose)

(My) original being is called adhidaivatam meaning a presiding devata employed for the purpose (of safe guarding the religion).

Q6. Adhiyajnah Katham Kah atra dehe asmin Madhusudana? (8:2)

Who is adhiyajna in this body and how to know regarding him?

Ans: Adhiyajno ham evatra dehe (8:4)

Paraphrase: Adhiyajnah = super soul, spirit of Holiness (Rooh-al-Quddus as per Arabic and Paramatma (Sanskrit); Aham = I am (My self); Eva = indeed; Atra dehe = in this body (in this incarnation)

Indeed I am the super soul (param + atma) in this (incarnate) body. The sum and substance of all the three answers given in connection to the questions regarding Paramatma is as follows. 'I am a devata by my original being who manifested in human form (incarnation) which is subject to vanish (yet), I am indeed the super soul (Param + atma) in this human body (which is taken for the purpose of the firm establishment of the religion - Sambhavami yuge yuge 4:8).

Two main points came into light.

1. Paramatma is not God Almighty but a devata consecrated on the divine service of guarding the religion and

2. That it is not God Almighty that takes incarnation of human form but Parmatma who has been employed for the purpose.

These points altogether rebut Anthropomorphism.

Incarnation and Anthropomorphism - compared

On the examination of the Gita one can find that all its teachings were meant for the reformation of the then people whose religion had been polluted and irreligion succeeded (4:7). In a situation such as this, the ordinances that had been revealed purely meant for bringing into remembrance of the correct religious duties and to forbid the wrong dogmas that had been crept into the religion.

For instance...

A. 'Worship Me alone' (10:8)

This implies the fact that the people of the times of Gita revelation had been under the influence of the corrupt practice of worshipping of other deities leaving God Almighty or along with Him.

In the very same way...

B. 'The foolish people regard Me as coming in manifestation in human form ...' (7:24)

... explicitly points out on the fact of the then people having been involved in the corrupt belief of Anthropomorphism which has been condemned vide sloka 7:24.

In our foregoing pages, we have discussed about incarnation and Anthropomorphism in detail. To arrive at the correct contrast between these two, we are obliged to refer the following two slokas once again.

1. Not knowing my supreme nature (Parambhavam) as a great master (Maheswara) who descended taking the human form, the foolish people deride (neglect) me, saying, 'He is no more than ordinary human being' -Gita 9:11

2. The foolish people regard Me as coming in manifestation in human form, not knowing My supreme, immutable and unsurpassed nature of being unmanifest. -Gita 7:24

At a first glance, the above two slokas appear to be contradictory. If anybody denies its contradiction it looks more ridiculous. Because in the former sloka a stress has been given on saying that a great master (Maheswara) comes in human form (incarnation) rejecting of which is foolishness.

While the latter sloka stresses on saying that believing the supreme Being as coming in manifestation in human form is foolishness. Thus a grave contradiction is obvious between these two slokas. As long as one believes these two divergent slokas to have been spoken relating to one person, contradiction continues to be existing. Basing on this logic we are obliged to regard admittedly these two slokas must have been spoken relating to two different persons - viz., one that comes in manifestation and the other that never comes in manifestation.

And again, as regards to one that manifests, we must take into consideration two factors...

1. His manifestation in human form (incarnation - 4:7 and 9:11)
2. Manifestation of his original being (Visvaroopaa- 11:47)

And, as regards to one that never manifests... is to be admitted logically that he keeps himself beyond these two factors. As according to (7:24) God Almighty is having immutable and unsurpassed nature of being unmanifest. Contrary to this Paramatma is bestowed with the faculty of mutability. He takes human forms (4:6-8). He changes his forms (11:46). His original form was seen by Arjuna (11:47). Thus he is not unmanifest. While Brahma is whom Gita enjoins to worship is unmanifest (12:3, 12:1, 9:4). Brahma, the unmanifest, has not been

manifested even to devatas or demons (10:14) while the original being of Paramatma has been manifested to hosts of Gandharvas, Yakshas, Asuras and Sidhas... and to many more (11:22).

Brahma is (anirdesam) indefinable (12:3). While Paramatma is definable (refer Visvaroopaa Yogam). Brahma is (Achintyam) unthinkable or inconceivable (12:3, 8:9). While Paramatma is conceivable to any reader of Visvaroopaa yogam.

Brahma is (Kutastham) unchangeable (12:3) while Paramatma is changeable at every such time as he takes human form.

Brahma is (Sarvatra - gam) all pervading (omnipresent). It is, a word which is mistaken to mean as God's presence in His person at every where. If He were really to be present in person every where, He should have been divided into so many peices as that of dust particles of the earth. But God is indivisible one (13:17). He is always ONE, ONLY ONE. He is so great as to be termed as OMNIPOTENT and OMNISCIENT. His omnipotence and omniscience are all-pervading. But His person is seated on His throne with all His glories above the skies where from he sees and hears every thing (Qur'an 39:75). To know any thing or see or hear - He needs not personally be present (in His person) on the spot of the event. This is why it is further said of Him as (Achalam) immovable and (Dhruvam) fixed (12:3).

While the case of Paramatma is quite different. He should move on from place to place (being Jagadguru) and has to descend from heaven to earth. Thus he is neither Dhruvam nor Achalam nor all-pervading.

The original being of Sri Paramatma is fierce -so fierce as Arjuna himself could not stare at it (11:23,24) while the yogins after their moksha attain Brahma's bliss which speaks the fact that the manifesta-

tion of Brahma will be so delightful and blissful as the Yogins in ecstasy forget themselves and need nothing thereafter (5:24, 6:28, 4:31).

The contrast as pointed out above discloses that one that manifests (takes incarnation) is Paramatma and the one who does not manifest is God Almighty. Thus the concept of God's coming in human form (Anthropomorphism) is ruled out.

Bhagavan Vuvacha - A clue

One more significant clue we have in Gita to know whether God Almighty Himself descended to reveal Gita teachings or a deva appointed for the purpose appeared in human form to convey the divine revelation. What noteworthy here is that whatever message Sri Paramatma gave to Arjuna, it was started in direct speech beginning with - 'Bhagavan Vuvacha' (God said). This speaks convincingly that what all was taught by him, was not of his own, but the message brought from Bhagavan, the Almighty. Thus two distinct persons are obvious, one Bhagavan the dictator and other the messenger Sri Paramatma. But instead of treating the teachings as direct revelation from God Almighty through Sri Paramatma, since they were commenced by saying "God said" the prejudiced commentators moulded this opportunity in favour of attributing divinity to Sri Paramatma himself. As a matter of fact there are some direct answers also given by Paramatma to some of the questions of Arjuna relating to himself which have been discussed in various places. These answers also have been incorporated in the scripture, which is essential too, in which case no necessity is there, of specifically mentioning as 'Sri Paramatma Vuvacha', since he discriminated the message of God Almighty by beginning with 'Bhagavan Vuvacha'. Thus the statements relating to Paramatma himself deprived of the necessity of the specific mention in the text as 'Paramatma Vuvacha'. But having these two statements been intermingled in the scripture under one head 'Bhagvan Vuvacha', there is every likelihood of people to mistake the entire speech (Revelation and his personal

answers) to be of Paramatma's own unless a diligent and minute observation of the slokas is made with a free and unbiased mind. Thus there is every likelihood of mistaking Paramatma for God Almighty, and this is what actually had happened too.

No need of specific mentions as - 'Paramatma Vuvacha' - An illustration

To know our view point that how and why the answers of Paramatma pertaining to himself not necessarily be followed by a specific mention of 'Paramatma Vuvacha', and in the same way that the questions and opinions of Arjuna also need not be categorised under the head of 'Arjuna Vuvacha', whereas that the revelation from God Almighty, when it is recorded in direct speech should essentially be specified under the head of 'Bhagvan Vuvacha', please observe the following illustration.

Example; (Somebody knocked at the door of the petitioner in the suit filed in the court of law. And the door was opened).

Are you not Mr. XYZ, the petitioner in the suit...?

Yes - of course! But who are you?

I am a clerk of the lawyer, newly appointed

What is your errand?

Lawyer - Vuvacha (Lawyer said)

"You have to attend the court tomorrow with all your witnesses".

In the above context, is it necessary to state that XYZ Vuvacha' and 'Clerk-Vuvacha' to indicate their specific statements respectively?

not necessary. Even without this, it is very easy to discriminate the statements as to whom they are aptly applicable to. This is because the conversation is going on between two persons i.e., the client and the clerk. But here we must bear in mind that the clerk met the client with the main purpose of conveying the message brought from the lawyer which should be delivered in direct speech where a specific mention of 'Lawyer-Vuvacha' becomes necessary. These literary rules are known to every learned man.

Just as in the above illustration, in Gita too we have the statements of Paramatma pertaining to himself in the form of replies to Arjuna's questions where there is, no need of specific mention as 'Paramatma Vuvacha and Arjuna Vuvacha' but the message which he brought from Bhagavan the Almighty which was to be revealed in direct speech where the necessity of specific mention as 'Bhagvan-Vuvacha' became inevitable. Instead of taking the sense of 'Bhagvan Vuvacha' in this spirit - it is manipulated to impress that revealer himself is Bhagvan since his statements begin with a special indication of 'Bhagvan Vuvacha'. And to maintain this articulation, not only the slokas have been arranged in such an order as to lead the reader, to think that revealer himself is Bhagvan, but also other 'Vuvachas' have been added in mere defence of the Vuvacha mystery which can be disclosed by our following points.

UVVACHA - MYSTERY

Even though there is a remarkable disparity in these two statements (Bhagvan's & Paramatma's) why people became confounded in discriminating between these two is the question that needs a little clarification.

Just as in our illustration, if the conversation of Arjuna and Paramatma with divine revelation under specific head as 'Bhagvan-Vuvacha' had been preserved intact with no other Vuvachas included

therein, there could have been no place for Vuvacha mystery. But we have a chain of Vuvachas in Gita such as Dhritarastra - Vuvacha, Sanjay vuvacha, Duryodhana vuvacha (1:3-11). All these vuvachas seem to be latter development in gita which might have been crept into the original text from the footnote commentaries or wilful interpolations subsequently added with an aim to garb over the fact which has been pointed out by us under 'Bhagvan Vuvacha' factor.

Gita is a reminder of earlier teachings:

A known fact is that Bhagvad Gita was revealed to Arjuna. And in turn it was to be taught to the people of Bharat by Arjuna himself. Thus he was to reform them by reminding them of their forgotten religion.

Thus we read in Gita:

Sri Bhagvan Vuvacha -

I taught this imperishable yoga to Vivasvat; Vivasvat taught it to Manu; Manu taught to Ikshvaku. This handed down thus in succession, the king-sages learnt. This yoga by long lapse of time, has been lost here, O Parantapa -Gita 4:1-2

Gita was taught to Arjuna:

That same ancient yoga has been today taught to thee by Me, seeing that thou art My devotee and friend; for this is the supreme secret -Gita 4:1-3

Thus Sri Paramatma conveyed the whole Bhagvad Gita to Arjuna since he was appointed as the then prophet for the reformation of the religion which was vanished away completely.

Thus the sole responsibility of teaching of Gita not only by means of mere giving sermons but also by becoming a model by adopting the

enjoined duties by Practical means, has been laid on the shoulders of Arjuna.

- a. ...Even with a view to the protection of the masses thou shouldst perform karma -Gita 3:20*
- b. Whatsoever a great man does, that alone the other men do; whatever he sets up as the standard, that the world follows -Gita 3:21*

Gita is not a new teaching but continuation of the earlier revelations. Thus it is a reminder of the earlier teachings that had been given to many a prophet prior to Arjuna. Thus this teaching had been coming in succession from prophet to prophet. But at the time of its revelation to Arjuna in the form of Gita, owing to long lapse of time it had been lost. Thus it became a thing quite forgotten and became the greatest secret (Gita 4:1-3 & 18:63).

Thus has wisdom, more secret than all that is secret, been declared to thee by Me... -Gita 18:63

Originally Gita was to be propagated through Arjuna:

Thus it is proved that the first hand information about Gita teachings were revealed only to Arjuna but to none else. Hence, Arjuna should have been the main source from whom the authentic divine message should have been spread and preached.

Role of Sanjay - A product of human brain

But contrary to above facts, we find that the whole Gita had been recited by Sanjay to Dhritarashtra as a reply to his simple question that what his sons and Pandu's sons did when they assembled in the Kurukshetra battle field (1:1). This discloses, that there was another person, Sanjay to whom the Gita teachings, word by word had been transmitted even without the knowledge of the revealer Sri Paramatma himself. How absurd it is! It is a sheer contradiction to Sri

Paramatma's above saying as - "I taught Arjuna this supreme secret..."

And again:

This Gita sastra has been forbidden to be taught to one who is devoid of austerities and one who is not devout etc. (18:67). For argument's sake even if it is admitted that by the mercy of Vyasa, Sanjay could hear the whole Gita, as has been claimed by himself, a curious question that poses is - could he ever have recited the Gita before an impious enemy of God, even after this clear admonition? Do these points not lead to suspect that Sanjay's character in Gita as a subsequent addition?

Despite this clear ordinance Sanjay disclosed every thing before Dhritarashtra the enemy of God. And what more curious to note is that he never repented for doing this even after this clear admonition came, but rejoiced again and again (18:76). And what more tragic is that Sanjay not only heard the most secret discourses held between Paramatma and Arjuna by the grace of Vyasa Maharshi (18:75) as has been claimed but also disclosed it before an impious man Dhritarashtra - yet neither Arjuna nor Paramatma could detect that how their confidential dialogue was being copied secretly by Vyasa and transmitted to Sanjay just as in case of tapping the telephones. Can any sensible man believe this? Could anything have happened without coming into the knowledge of Sri Paramatma? And again Paramatma awarded Arjuna the divine eyes with which he could see the Visvarupa of Sri Paramatma (11:8). And further Paramatma stressingly says that none can see his original form however great devotee one may be, unless he is conferred with a special mercy by him (11:47 & 11:53). Contrary to these facts, Sanjay proclaimed that he rejoiced remembering the form (18:77). And again, in spite of having been blessed with divine eyes, Arjuna could not stare at Visvarupa, the original form of Sri Paramatma while Sanjay proclaimed that he rejoiced remembering the form.

And further more Sanjay says that Arjuna beheld the whole world established in one place of the universal form of Paramatma (11:13).

But Arjuna, who had actually seen the form out rightly condemned this by saying that he saw the visvaroopas having been spread between heaven and the earth (11:20).

Do all these absurdities and improbabilities as made out on the part of Sanjay not prove that the role of Sanjay has been concocted simply to add many more 'Vuvachas' in the scripture so as to make the readers think of 'Bhagvan Vuvacha' also in an equal level and sense just as other Vuvachas and thereby lowering down the real spirit of 'Bhagavan Vuvacha' as pointed out by us under Bhagvan Vuvacha factor?

To say in clear terms, thus it is manipulated to impress upon the readers to think of Paramatma, the revealer of Gita himself as Bhagavan, since his discourse recorded under the head of 'Bhagavan Vuvacha' just as other vuvachas are applicable to the persons that spoke under their respective heads such as 'Dhritarashtra Vuvacha' and Sanjay Vuvacha etc. Keeping in view of these points a diligent study of the slokas enables the readers to discriminate the statements relating to Paramatma himself and God Almighty though they are arranged under one head-Bhagvan Vuvacha. Then therefore the true sense of 'Bhagvan Vuvacha' can be conceived which further make easy to understand that Paramatma himself is not God Almighty, but a messenger (Pratishtitam) of Brahma in whose name he revealed beginning with 'Bhagvan Vuvacha'.

In Brief:

The discussions made so far on the subject of Anthropomorphism disclose the fact that Brahma (the Almighty) sends Paramatma with His Divine Message (Revelation) and Paramatma descends in hu-

man form. Thus the transformation of his original body into human body (or any other form) is called INCARNATION, which has been mistaken for ANTHROPOMORPHISM.

Anthropomorphism as we know, is a doctrine founded on the dogma of the descent of God Almighty (Brahma) in human form. Did ever Brahma descend in human form? No. But it is proved that it was not Brahma, but Paramatma who took incarnation in every age and in every part of the world for the firm establishment of the Religion. Thus Anthropomorphism is ruled out.

Appearance of Paramatma in his original form to prophet Mohammed mentioned in Qur'an

We must bear in mind that the entire Qur'an is the direct dictation of God Almighty revealed through Sri Paramatma (Rooh-al-Quddus) in direct speech. Thus he is the mouthpiece of God Almighty who spoke to prophet through him (Paramatma).

A. And they ask thee concerning the spirit. Say, 'The spirit is by the command of my Lord and of the knowledge thereof you have been given but a little -Qur'an 17:85

From the above verse of Qur'an prophet Mohammad is understood to have told the people that he had been inspired by the spirit (Atma). Then people began to ask various questions regarding Sri Paramatma. Hence as a reply prophet Mohammad was directed to declare as above.

The above verse discloses:

1. The Spirit (Atma) comes by the command of God Almighty.
2. The knowledge of him had been given to the people of earlier

times

3. Yet, not complete knowledge, but a little thereof had been provided.

We can find the same inference as above, in the following sloka of Gita.

2. One sees him (the spirit) as a wonder; and so also another speaks of him as a wonder; and as a wonder another hears of him; and though hearing none understand him at all.

-Gita 2:29

(This is because the knowledge about him had been given but a little as said in Qur'an).

1. ...none understands him at all, does not mean, that there is none at all who understands him (Paramatma) but what it actually conveys to mean is that a great majority of people have mistaken him for Anthropomorphism in human form (This is the belief of Hindus) and Christians have mistaken him for one of the Gods of trinity while many have mistaken him for an imposter (Humanbeing); and some others as an evil spirit. Thus many failed to understand him.

2. And again this sloka is one of the best examples that can be forwarded to prove that Paramatma revealed the message of God Almighty in direct speech under the head of 'Bhagvan Vuvacha' (Gita). Pertaining to this point, we have a corroborative information in the following verses of Qur'an.

B. And verily this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The spirit faithful to the trust has descended with it on thy (Mohammad) heart, that thou mayest be of the warners, in plain and clear Arabic tongue. And it is surely mentioned in the scriptures of the former peoples -Qur'an 26:192-196

Rooh-al-ameen (The spirit faithful to the trust) is another Qur'anic term for Paramatma and Holy Spirit of Hindu and Christian Scriptures respectively. The key point of the above verse is, the spirit faithful to the trust has descended with revelation on prophet Mohammad's heart. He being the last prophet (Qur'an 33:40) who has been appointed for the entire mankind (Qur'an 7:159) is hereby informed that the process of revelation which had been sent on him was not a new one but the same ancient process as had been adopted for sending the revelation on every prophet of former times. And again he had also been informed that the process of the descent of Paramatma with the divine message could also be seen in the scriptures of the former peoples, so as to make sure himself that he was not being misled by any evil spirit but it was Paramatma (Rooh-al-Ameen) consecrated of God Almighty who was teaching him. Thus to enable him to proclaim his prophethood and the divine message with good confidence and faith. And at the same time, the peoples of the former times having scriptures containing this process of AGAMA (descent) and proklam (Revelation) of Paramatma might also understand that what prophet Mohammad was preaching was not a new message but a reminder of the religion taught to them by Sri Paramatma; the Jagadguru.

Whenever there is a decay of religion O Bharata, and ascendancy of irreligion, then I manifest myself -Gita 4:7

C. And thus have we revealed to thee (Mohammed) the word by our command. Thou didst not know what the Book was nor what the faith. But we have made it (Revelation) a light whereby We guide such of our servants as We please. And truly thou guidest (mankind) to the right path -Qur'an 42:51-52

Just as prophet Mohammed was ignorant of the Book (Revelation) and of faith, so also prophet Arjuna was ignorant before he was made prophet (2:7). He was taught by Sri Paramatma the message which was light (wisdom) from God Almighty.

We read thus in Gita

Thus has wisdom, more secret than all that is secret, been declared to thee by Me... -18:63

As ignorant men act attached to work, O Bharata So, should the wise man act unattached for the sake of leading people on the right path -Gita 3:25

D. And when we substitute one revelation for another, - and God knows what He reveals - they say - 'thou art but a forger'. But most of them understand not. Say, - the Holy Spirit [Paramatma] has brought the revelation from thy Lord in truth [Satt], in order to strengthen those who believe and as a guide and glad tidings to Muslims. We know indeed that they say, 'It is a man that teaches him' (Qur'an 16:101-103).

Surprisingly enough We find in Gita, prophet Arjuna to have been accused in the same manner as prophet Mohammed had been. Examine the following sloka which discloses the fact by the direct speech of Paramatma as recorded in Gita.

Not knowing my supreme nature (Parambhavam) as a great master (Mahesvara) who descended taking the human form, the foolish people deride me saying - He is no more than an ordinary human being. -Gita 9:11

E. Your companion (Mohammed) is neither astray nor being misled. Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) desire. It is nothing but pure revelation sent down to him. He was taught by one mighty in power [Paramatma] endued with wisdom for he appeared (in stately form) while he was in the highest part of the horizon: Then he appeared and came closer and was at a distance of but two bow-lengths or even nearer. So did (God) convey the revelation to his servant- (conveyed) what He (meant) to convey. The prophet's (mind and heart) in no way falsified that which he saw. Will ye then dispute with him concerning what he saw? For indeed he saw him [Holy Spirit - Paramatma] at a second descent, near the lote Tree beyond which none may pass: Near it is the

garden of Abode. Behold, the Lote tree was shrouded (in mystery unspeakable). (His) sight never swerved nor did it go wrong! For truly did he see, of the signs of his Lord, the greatest.

-Qur'an 53:2-18.

1. To every people have We appointed ways of worship which they observe. The ways of worship may differ from one people to the other. But the worshipable object (i.e) God Almighty is one- only one to every people. So let there be no dispute in worshipping the only true God though there may be disparities in the ways and means of worship. So let them not dispute with thee in the matter; and invite thou to thy Lord. For surely thou followest the right guidance (Qur'an 22:67)
2. And truly thou (Mohammad) guidest mankind to the right path" (Qur'an 42:52)

In the same way Arjuna had been consoled by God saying as...

"O Arjuna grieve not thou art born for devine lot (Gita 16:5)

Notes from the above pasage -Qur'an 53:2-18

1. For he (Rooh-al-Quddus - Paramatma) appeared while he was on the highest part of the horizon.

This means as saying that Paramatma was seen of prophet Mohammad in his original form occupying the space in between the earth and the sky. Similarly exact in the same state prophet Arjuna also saw Sri Paramatma which point can be seen from the following sloka of Gita.

This space betwixt heaven and earth and all the quarters are filled by thee (Paramatma) alone. Having seen this, thy marvellous and awful form... -Gita 11:20

2. For Truly did he see, of the signs of his Lord, the greatest. Prophet Mohammed saw great wonders at the time of seeing

Paramatma in his original form.

Similarly prophet Arjuna also saw many wonders which fact can be seen from the following sloka.

Behold the Adityas, the Vasus, the Rudras the Asvins and also the Maruts, behold many marvels never seen before, O Bharata.
-Gita 11:6

F. That this is surely the word of a noble Messenger, possessor of power, established (Pratishtha Gita 14:27 & 16:8) in the presence of the Lord of the throne, obeyed there and faithful to his trust. And your companion (Prophet Mohammad) is not mad. And he assuredly saw him [spirit/Atma] on the clear horizon. And he is not niggardly with respect to the unseen. Nor is this the word of Satan, the rejected. Wither then are you going? It is nothing but a reminder unto all peoples, unto such among you, as desire to go straight, while you desire not a thing except that Allah, the Lord of the worlds desires it. (Qur'an 81:19-29).

Please take note of the clause from the above passage 'It is nothing but a reminder unto all peoples...'

A. a reminder; and B. unto all peoples.

A reminder 1. This is to mean as saying that right from the beginning the only religion (Sanatana 1:40)¹ dharma according to Hindu scriptures and Islam according Muslim (3:19)² scriptures was taught, to all mankind of every nation and place. The religion can be divided into two main parts viz., the faith and the laws. The laws may differ from one place to another depending on the geographical and environmental conditions while the faith is common to all mankind. That is belief in the existence of only God and Devatas (Angels) as his ser-

1. Dharma Sanatana -Gita 1:40

2. Surely, the true religion with Allah is Islam (Complete submission)...
-Qur'an 3:19

vants and belief in the prophets of God as their divine guides and in the scriptures (the divine revelation) and firm faith on the life after death wherein one is provided either the paradise or perdition according as to one's own deeds he did while he was living on the planet of this earth. The main part of the religion is - the worship of only true God.

Abandon all varieties of religion and just (Saranam)¹ surrender unto Me. I shall deliver you from all sinful reactions. Do not fear. -Gita 18:66

Surely the true religion with Allah is Islam (Complete submission)¹
-Qur'an 3:19

Thus from the above sloka of Gita and verse of Quran it is disclosed that submission to the will of God is the real religion. The will of God is that one should worship Him alone. Thus the worship of only true God the creator, the cherisher with exclusive faith, devotion and love is the religion that God expects from His mankind.

And your God is one God; there is no God but He, the gracious, the Merciful -Qur'an 2:163

A. a reminder - (2) And again by saying that it is nothing but a reminder, it is made clear that Islam is not a new religion, and Allah (God) to whom the Religion enjoins upon people to worship is not newly invented by Prophet Mohammed but it is the same religion which has been coming right from the beginning in succession from one prophet to other, thus being reformed whenever it is found to be declining and contaminated. Thus it is only a reminder. This point can be seen from Gita also from the following slokas.

A. I taught this imperishable yoga to vivasvat; vivasvat taught it to Manu; Manu taught to Ikshvaku -Gita 4:1

1. Abandon all varieties of religion and just [saranam] surrender unto me- is the exact meaning of surely the true religion with Allah is Islam (complete submission) of Qur'anic verse 3:19

**B. This handed down thus in succession, the king-sages learnt.
This yoga, by long lapse of time, has been lost here O harasser
of foes -Gita 4:2**

**C. That same ancient yoga has been today taught to thee by Me,
seeing that thou art my devotee and friend; for this is the
supreme secret -Gita 4:3**

*He has prescribed for you the religion which He enjoined on
Noah, and which we have revealed to thee, and which we
enjoined on Ahraham and Moses and Jesus saying remain
steadfast in obedience -Qur'an 42:13*

B. unto all peoples: This is to mean as saying that earlier reminders were meant for the particular race or nation or place. But the last reminder is meant for the whole mankind of the entire world, which further discloses the fact that neither there will be descent of Paramatma with reminder again, nor there will be any further revelation of the scripture nor there will be another prophet after Mohammad. Thus Qur'an is the last reminder and Mohammad the last prophet of God.

*a. Mohammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the
Messenger of Allah and the seal of the prophets; and Allah has
full knowledge of all things -Qur'an 33:40*

*b. ... This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed
My favour upon you and have chosen for you Islam
(Submission) as religion -Qur'an 5:3*

*c. The revelation of this book is from Allah, the Mighty, The all
knowing, The forgiver of sin and the acceptor of the repentance,
severe in punishment, the possessor of bounty. There is no God
but He. Towards Him is the final return -Qur'an 40:2-3*

*d. Call ye then upon God with sincere devotion to Him, even though
the unbelievers may averse it. Raised high above ranks, (He is)
the Lord of the throne. By His command doth He send the Spirit
[Atma] to any of His servants, He pleases that he may warn
(peoples) of the Day of mutual meeting -Qur'an 40:14-15*

Forward

MY FINDINGS FROM GEETA, is a comparative and critical review of Bhagavath Gita, written by Sri Ahmed Ali, whose knowledge of religion, scriptures, is profound. Coming from an ordinary family, he grew mentally and spiritually, in spite of health problems, to gain confidence of reviewing in English, one of the greatest scriptures of all times. It is said of Gita, 'that what is not there is nowhere else', and is considered as a true guide to attain MOKSHA.

Sri Ahmed Ali, has sent me in piecemeal this contribution, and the first I received was on 4-9-95; and since then I have regularly received his writings. There are somany, who have reviewed Gita & Qur'an, separately. My findings from Gita is a comparative study of Gita & Qur'an, written by one who studied both in great depth. It gave me immense mental solace, while reading this humble attempt; and prompted me to read again and again, all these years. Iam confident that this excellent presentation of a difficult subject, will lead us to immortality.

I congratulate Sri Ahmed Ali, for this exhaustive presentation to public at large irrespective of whichever religion one belongs. I wish that many more such books from this great person, for the public to understand what is DHARMA, when ADHRMA is all around and in all places.

Visakhapatnam
26.10.2000

(sd) **Dr. C.V. Krishnarao**
Retd. Director of Medical Education
Govt. of Andhra Pradesh & Former Rector
of N.T.R University of Health Sciences.

Books Referred:

1. **The Bhagavad-Gita** with Sri Sankaracharya's commentary- Translated from the original Sanscrit into English by **Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastry**.
2. **Dhagvad-Gita As it is**- Second edition revised and enlarged - with its original sanscrit text, Roman Translation, English equivalents, translation and elaborate purports by his divine grace **Sri A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami prabhupada**, Founder Acharya of the International Society for Krishna consciousness.
3. **Geeta makarandam** - Translated from original sanscrit into Telugu with commentary by **Sri Vidyaprakasanandagiri Swami** of Kalahasti.
4. **The Holy Qur'an** - Translated into English by the late **Maulwi Sher Ali**.
5. **The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an**, Text, Translation and commentary (in English) by **Mr. Adbullah Yusuf Ali**.
6. **The Holy Bible** - Popularly known as King James Version.
7. **Glimpses of World religions** by **Dr. S. Radhakrishnan**.
8. **Introduction to the study of Upanishads** by Sri Vidyaranya Translated into English by **Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastry**.

PREFACE

If one is born in the family of Hindus he becomes a Hindu. If one takes his birth in the family of Muslims, he is known as a Muslim. And so is the case with every one of every community. Every one rejoices in the community to which he belongs and thinks that the way of life which is being led by him is the only true religion however much contradictory may it be to the Scripture of his own, merely because of his accidental birth in the family from which ever community it belongs. He never takes pains to observe his Scriptural commandments but goes on practising the traditions of his forefathers. This elucidates that man gives more importance to the teachings of his family heads rather than accepting the Scriptural facts.

He who discards Scriptural injunctions and acts according to his own whims attains neither perfection, nor happiness, nor the supreme destination. (Bhagawad Gita As it is 16:23)

In the light of the above sloka one has to ponder over the scriptural ordinances and examine himself whether his religious practices are in accordance with them. I am not going to condemn any religion, but what my appeal is if one were to be a Hindu let him be a true follower of Sanatana Dharma, as dictated through Sri Paramatma, with no slight deviation from the original teachings. Discard not the teachings of Sri Paramatma but desist from the blind following of the inherited traditions. And so is my appeal to every other religious followers too.

And when it is said to them, 'Follow that which Allah has sent down' they say, 'Nay, we follow that wherein we found our fathers.' What! even if their fathers had no sense at all and no guidance? -Qur'an 2:170

Prejudiced people say that one should become the follower of their own community for the attainment of salvation (MOKSHA). But God ordains that one should become a Monotheist.

Thus we read in Qur'an

And they say, 'Be ye Jews or Christians that you may be rightly guided', - Say: 'Nay, follow ye the religion of Ahraham who was ever inclined to God; he was not of those who set up gods with God'. -Qur'an 2:135

From the above, it is evident that one must ever incline to God and should not set up equals (gods) with God. This was the religion of Abraham that one should follow. Thus Qur'an ordains Monotheism (Ekeswaropasana); As regards to Ekeswaropasana, Gita teachings run in parallel with no lesser stress than that of Qur'anic and Biblical exhortations.

Sarva dharman parityaja mam ekam Saranam Vraja aham tvam sarva papebhyo mokshaisyami ma suchah. -Gita 18:66

Abandon all religions and surrender unto Me alone. I shall deliver you from all sins; do not fear.

Thus it is ordained in Gita that one should abandon all religions except as oneself ever surrendering to God. Thus it further goes to emphasise on the point that worship of only true God is the religion which has been coming in succession right from the beginning. In its successive line, Moksha is promised for such a monotheist. Thus this implies that one should become a Monotheist to get moksha.

As regards to the religion of God, read what Qur'an emphatically says...

Say ye, 'We believe in Allah, and what has been revealed to us and what was revealed to Ahraham, and Ishamael and Isaac, and Jacob and his children, and what was given to Moses and Jesus and what was given to (other) prophets from their Lord, We make no difference between any of them, and to Him we submit ourselves -Qur'an2:136

In the above Qur'anic verse, a covenant is taken from the believ-

ers that they should make no difference between any of the prophets and their teachings. This means the teachings given to all prophets were one and the same - Thus all prophets taught the same religion. This point is agreed with no deviation in Gita.

I taught this imperishable Yoga to Vivasvat, Vivasvat taught it to Manu; Manu taught to Ikshvaku. This handed down thus in succession, the king-sages learnt. This Yoga, by long lapse of time, has been lost here; O harasser of foes. That same ancient Yoga has been to-day taught to thee by Me, seeing that thou art My devotee and friend; for this is the supreme secret.

-Gita 4:1-3

Thus we read in Qur'an

He has prescribed for you the religion which He enjoined on Noah, and which We have revealed to thee, and which We enjoined on Abraham and Moses and Jesus saying, 'Remain steadfast in obedience and be not divided therein. Hard upon Polytheists is that to which thou callest them. Allah chooses for Himself whom He pleases, and guides to Himself him, who turns to Him. -Qur'an 42:13

Thus, right from the beginning only one religion, - either you call it by name- Sanatana Dharma or Islam, is coming in succession from one prophet to the other. This is the reason why Qur'an holds a broader view in granting everyone the permission to follow one's own religion being in it, which act ultimately leads to the unity of religions.

Thus we read from Qur'an :

A. Surely, the believers (Muslims) and the Jews, and the Christians and the Sabians - which ever party believes in God Almighty, and the last day and does good deeds shall have their reward with their Lord, and no fear (shall come) upon them, nor shall they grieve -Qur'an 2:62

B. Surely, those who believed (Muslims) and the Jews, and the Sabians, and the Christians - whoso believes in God Almighty, and the Last Day and does good deeds on them (shall come) no fear, nor shall they grieve -Qur'an 5:69

Gita too holds the same opinion:

The same I am to all beings; to me there is none hateful or dear; but whoso worship Me with devotion, they are in Me and I am also in them -Gita 9:29

From the above two verses of Qur'an and the sloka of Gita, it became evident that to get moksha one should become Monotheist. Monotheism is a doctrine which advocates that there is only one God, beside whom there is none (in the capacity of God). One should not worship or honour any other being in the capacity or status of God, but worship the only True God Almighty.

How God Almighty can be made known?

By means of empirical inference one can admit the existence of God, by pondering over the creation - just as one can understand by seeing the foot-steps left behind, that a man has passed by that way. But it is not possible to establish the fact whether the foot-steps belong to a female or male, of old aged one's or of young one's or of diseased one's or of healthy one's. Thus the whole matter becomes a mystery. Why, because we have not seen the person that has passed by the way leaving the foot-steps behind. Therefore, to know about the person and (her/his) intention in passing by that way, either meeting with that person or a message (necessary information) from (her/him) becomes quite essential.

This is the exact case with God. As God Almighty is AVYAKTAH (invisible), we cannot see God, hence it is not possible for us to know about His person in perfection and His intention, Unless-

A. He makes Himself visible and Speaks with us

or

B. Sends His message as regards to Him and His intention.

God Almighty has adopted the second point to make His people know about Him (i.e.) He sends His message...

Surely it is for Us to guide -Qur'an 92:12

For this He made incumbent on Himself to appoint prophets through whom He makes people know about His person and that what His intention is in creating all this, and the way on which if one follows, attains His nearness.

In Qur'an God Almighty says...

O Mankind, we have created you from a male and a female; and We have made you into tribes and sub-tribes that you may recognize one another. Verily, the most honourable among you, in the sight of Allah, is he who is the most righteous among you. Surely, Allah is All-knowing, All-aware. -Qur'an 49:13

And verily this brotherhood of yours is a single brotherhood¹, and I am your Lord and cherisher; Therefore fear Me (and no other). But people have cut off their affair (of unity) between them², into sects: each party rejoices in that which is with itself³ -Qur'an 23:52-53

Mr. Abdullah Yusuff Ali writes in his commentary for the above verse as follows:

1. UMMAT: This is best translated by brotherhood here. 'Community', 'Race' and 'Nation' and 'People' are words which import other ideas and do not quite correspond to 'UMMAT'. 'Religion & Way of life' are derived meanings, which could be used in other passages, but are less appropriate here. Our attention has been drawn to people of every different temperaments and virtues, widely different in time, race, language, surroundings, history and work to be performed, but forming the closest brotherhood as being men and women united in the highest service of God. They pre-figure the final and perfected brotherhood of Islam.
2. God's Message was and ever is one; and His Messengers treated it as one. It is people of narrower views who come later and trade on the earlier names, that break up the Message and the Brotherhood into Jarring camps and sects.
3. All prophets from one Brotherhood: Their Message is one, and their religion and teaching are one; they serve the one True God, who loves and cherishes them; and they owe their duty to Him and Him alone.

God appointed prophets to thus divided communities

Mankind was one community (then they differed among themselves), So Allah raised Prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners, and sent down with them the book containing the TRUTH[SATT] that he might judge between the people wherein they differed. (But now they began to differ about the book) and none differed about it except those to whom it was given, after clear signs had come to them out of envy towards one another. Now has Allah by His command, guided the believers to the truth in regard to which they (the unbelievers) differed. And Allah guides whomsoever He pleases to the right path -Qur'an 2:213

Prophets were raised from among the people of every nation

To every people (was sent) a Messenger: when their messenger comes (before them) the matter will be judged between them with justice and they will not be wronged. -Qur'an 10:47

Thou (Mohammad) art only a warner. Verily we have sent thee with the truth, as a bearer of glad tidings, and as a warner: and there is no people to whom a warner has not been sent -Qur'an 35:23-24

And how many a prophet did We send among the earlier people! But there never came to them a prophet but they mocked at him -Qur'an 43:6-7

Prophet Mohammad is not a new Messenger - But messengers like unto Him passed away

Say, I am no new messenger, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you in this life. I do but follow what is revealed to me, and I am but a plain warner. -Qur'an 46:9

This is a warner from among the class of warners of old -Qur'an 53:57

One should believe in God and in all of His messengers and should make no distinction between them

Surely, those who disbelieve in Allah and His messengers and desire to make a distinction between Allah and His messengers, and say, "We believe in some and disbelieve in others", and desire to take a way in between - these indeed are veritable desbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers an humiliating punishment. And as for those who believe in Allah and in all of His messengers and make no distinction between any of them, these are they whom He will soon give them their rewards. And Allah is most Forgiving, Merciful - Qur'an 4:150-152

Now let us know that what ways and means that God had adopted in sending His message to the appointed prophets.

We read in Qur'an

He sends down the Angels [Devatas] with revelation by His command on whomsoever of His servants (prophets) He pleases saying - 'Warn people that there is no God but I, so take Me alone for your protector', - Qur'an 16:2

WHY GOD ADOPTED THE METHOD OF ESTABLISHING HIS DHARAM BY APPOINTING PROPHETS AND SENDING THE MESSAGE THROUGH DEWATAS (Angels) ?

The answer is given as follows in Qur'an :

It is not fitting for a man that God should speak to him except by inspiration or from behind a Veil, or by the sending of a Messenger [Adhidaivam] to reveal with God's permission what God wills : for He is most High, Most wise. - Qur'an 42:51

Thus the prophets received the necessary message from God in three ways:

1. by means of inspiration
2. by way of speaking the prophet from behind a Veil
3. by the sending of the messenger

In the process of third category, a Divine Messenger (Dewata/ Angel) comes from God, in human form to reveal the prophet what God wills. This process is popularly known as revelation (AWATARANA). For this high office ROOH (Atma/spirit) is appointed as the head of the department of revelation. He descends in human form with the revelation in the language of the prophet and the people.

And we have not sent any Messenger (prophet) except with the language of his people, in order that He might make (things) clear to them... - Qur'an 14:4

HOLY SPIRIT - ROOH-AL-QUDDUS - PARAMATMA

From Bible:

For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy spirit -II Peter 1:21

From Qur'an :

And verily this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The spirit [Atma] faithful to the trust [Adhidaiwam] (Gita 8:4) has descended [Sambhavami sambhavam - Gita 4:8] with it, on thy heart, that thou mayest be of the warners in plain and clear Arabic tongue. And it is surely (mentioned) in the Scriptures of the former peoples. - Qur'an 26;192-196

To say in other words, the descent of Spirit (Atma) and teaching of the Religion (Dharm) is not a new process just adopted in the

case of prophet Mohammad, but the same process is conspicuous in the Scriptures of former peoples too. Thus it is surely mentioned in the Scriptures of the former peoples.

From Gita:

Though I am unborn, of imperishable nature, and though I am the Lord of all beings, yet ruling over my own nature, I am born by my own maya. Whenever there is a decay of religion, O Bharata and an ascendancy of irreligion, then I manifest myself
-Gita 4:6-7

Whenever there was decay of religion, God substituted the irreligion by reviving the religion by appointing a new prophet and sending the revelation through Holy Spirit (Paramatma). But except a few, almost all people derided both prophet and the spirit by accusing of falsehood.

And when we bring one sign in place of another - and Allah knows best what He reveals - they say, 'Thou art but a fabricator'. Nay, but most of them know not. Say, 'The Rooh-al-Quddus' [Paramatma /Holy Spirit] has brought it down from thy Lord with truth [Satt] that He may strengthen those who believe and as a guidance and glad tidings for Muslims!'¹And indeed We know that they say that it is only a man who teaches him.

-Qur'an 16:101-103

We read in bhagawad Gita

1. '...as a guidance and glad tidings for Muslims' may be taken to mean exactly in the sense as stated in Bhagawat Gita 4:8 'Paritranya Sadhunam' (for the deliverance of the devotees) only. But here Muslims do not mean to refer as a particular group of people belonging to the existing Muslim community but just in the sense of Sadhunam of Gita, or any other equivalent word of any other scripture of any other people. In other words it may also be explained as that Qur'an called the believers of any race or nation of any community as Muslims in the sense of Sadhunam or its equivalent in other languages.

Whenever there is a decay of religion, O Bharata, and an ascendancy of irreligion then I manifest Myself. -Gita 4:7

For the protection of the good (Sadhunam), for the destruction of evil-doers, for the firm establishment of religion, I am born in every age. -Gita 4:8

BUT

Fools disregard Me when I manifest in human form not knowing My being as Supreme master. -Gita 9:11

Just as Qur'an (16:101-103), Gita also admits that whenever Sri Paramatma 'Roohul Quddus' appeared in human form to revive the declining dharma through a prophet appointed for the purpose, peoples derided the prophet by accusing that the Rooh/Atma who was teaching him, was no other than an ordinary man; thus a majority of people had mistaken him for only a man who was cheating them and hence remained in their former polluted religion. And, those that believed him as (Rooh-ul-Quddus) Paramatma gradually after the lapse of some period, treated the descent of Paramatma as the descent of God Almighty Himself in human form. Wrong dogmas and interpretations formed by speculators contributed a lot for this conjecture. Thus again the religion contaminated necessitating God to send Paramatma to re-establish the dharma again. This cycle of incarnation had been in process right from the beginning of the world till the time of prophet Mohammed who was the last prophet after whom there came/ comes no prophet nor there can be the descent of Paramatma for the purpose of re-establishment of the religion¹. Thus a great number of prophets had been appointed to every nation (and people) of the world before whom Sri Paramatma (Rooh-al-Quddus) had appeared in human in-

1. Mohammad is not the father of any of your men, but (he is) the apostle of God and the seal of the prophets: And God has full knowledge of all things -Qur'an 33:40

Mr. Abdullah Yusuff Ali writes in his commentary on the word 'SEAL' of the above verse of Qur'an as follows: 'When a document is sealed, it is complete and there can be no further addition. The Holy prophet Muhammad closed the long line of Apostles. God's teaching is and will always be continuous, but there has been and will be no prophet after Muhammad. The later ages will want thinkers and reformers, not prophets. This is not arbitrary matter. It is a decree full of knowledge and wisdom: 'For God has full knowledge of all things.'

carnation and taught Dharma. Thus 'Many births of mine have passed' says Sri Paramatma. (Gita 4:5).

The sum and substance of the points propounded so far, makes it clear that entire mankind had been taught the religion by raising prophets from among the peoples themselves.

Verily We have sent thee with the truth [Satt] as a bearer of glad tidings and as a warner; and there is no people to whom a warner has not been sent. -Qur'an 35:24

It is a known fact that geographical divisions became source to give rise to different cultures and languages. Thus different people belonging to different places were/are speaking different languages. So God revealed His message relating to Dharma in their own language of the people of every place so as to make them well conversant with the will of God as regarding to Moksha.

And We have not sent any Messenger except with the language of his people in order that He might make (things) clear to them... -Qur'an 14:4

This is to say that God Almighty had arranged His message to be given to every nation and people in the respective languages that they speak. Thus God Almighty is known by different Words equivalent to God Almighty in different languages. Just as any matter (material noun) for example GOLD has no proper name but is known by different words in different languages such as ex. Gold (English); Zahb (Arabic); Sona (Urdu), Swarna (Sanskrit and Hindi) and Bangaram (Telugu) etc. He is always known by His attributive words (Names) equivalent in the respective languages but not by His any personal name (Proper name). He do not have any personal (proper) name.

Mankind of prehistoric times had no as accessible means of conveyance and communications as the people of modern age. So the man of antiquity mostly restricted to his own place while, the latter began to settle in other places.

Thus the whole globe became like one family with multilingual multicultural races, where the necessity of translations of Scriptures into other languages became necessary so as to understand each other (whatever be the real motive behind this). But to our surprise with no exception, the translators have presented their translations and interpretations in such a way as to impress that the God of their scriptures is the only true God. Thus various GODS - each belonging from every community came into being. Can there be really so many Gods?

If there had been in them (heaven and the earth) other gods beside God (Almighty) then surely both would have gone to ruin. Glorified then be Allah the Lord of the throne above what they attribute. He cannot be questioned as to what He does, but they will be questioned. Have they taken gods beside Him? say, 'Bring forth your proof. Here is the book of those with me, and the book of those before me'. Nay, most of them know not the truth, and so they turn away. And We sent no messenger before thee but We revealed to him, saying, 'There is no God but I, So worship Me alone'. -Qur'an 21:22-25

Now let us observe some important attributes of God Almighty so as to make sure whether we are worshipping the True God or running after Speculations.

01. ANUSMARATE + YAH = The One Who is of unthinkable form 8:9
02. ACHINTYA + RUPAM = Whose form is inconceivable 8:9
03. ADITYA + VARNAM = Luminous like the Sun 8:9
04. AKSHARAM = The imperishable 12:3
05. ANIRDESYAM = The undefinable (that which is beyond the perception of the senses) 12:3
06. AVYAKTAM = The unmanifest 12:3
07. SARVATRA - GAM = Omnipresent 12:3
08. ACHINTYAM = The unthinkable (the inconceivable) 12:3
09. KUTASTHAM = The unchangeable 12:3
10. ACHALAM = The immovable 12:3 (One who needs no necessity of going from one place to another place. He can see and hear from the place where He is sitting on His throne.)

11. DHRUVAM = Fixed (eternal) 12:3
12. AVYAYAM = Imperishable 7:24
13. ANUTTAMAM = The finest 7:24
14. AJAM = Unborn 10:3
15. ANAADIM = Without beginning 10:3
16. LOKAMAHESWARAM = Lord of the worlds 10:3
17. ADIH = The first 10:2

Dear reader, make a diligent comparison with unbiased state of mind, dispassionately and judiciously of the attributes of God Almighty - as mentioned above, which have been taken from the scriptures, with your God - I mean whom you are worshipping as God. If your answers are in conformity with these attributes, it is well and good. IF NOT, it is certain that you are not worshipping the true God.

SYED ISMAIL, B.A.
Rtd. Asst. Commissioner of Excise
10-4-36, Seshagiri Rao Street
Chousia Manzil, Ramarao peta
KAKINADA - 533 004

Introduction

Dharm is unique with no other Dharm in parallel with it. It has been taught to different prophets of different nations in different languages, which however became apparent to be various Dharms. As according to factual reality there are no dharms but there is only one dharm right from the beginning. It can be classified as two main parts... one dealing with the faith and the other with acts. Acts can be further divided under two... one ethics and the other traditions. The traditions varies from one another, with which however the religion does not effect. But the faith and the ethics are the back bone of the dharm without which the dharm becomes adharm. Ethics are meant mainly for the reciprocal banefits of the co-human beings while the faith is concerned with one's own beliefs for the purification of one's own soul, on which alone the point of salvation (Moksha) rests. This faith is the kernal of all religions which are apparently different.

In this regard Dr. S. Radha Krishnan writes in his book - Glimpses of the world religions...

"The reader who surveys this field of religion can hardly fail to discern unity in apparent diversity and a general trend of evolution". (P.P.7).

Further he writes in his introduction...

"Different religions are nothing but milk in Vessels of different shapes and forms, and one reality is comprised in each of them. All creeds have a common source as their origin. The real coincidences between all the religions spring from the same soil - the human heart, that they all look to the same ideals. Differentiation may appear in the external forms of the various creeds, theories and doctrines, but there is no real difference between them for each is not contradictory but supplementary to the other..." (P.P. 16).

"...Truth is one; sages call it by different names." (P.P. 20 Last line).

There is no evidence of any Scripture in India before the Vedas. Thus the first scripture revealed to Hindus is known as Rigveda, while the consecutive two are Yajur Veda and Sama Veda. The process of revelation as we know in Gita as Sambhavam and other Upanishads as Agama was first seen in RigVeda (Being it was the first revelation) which is stated by Dr. S. Radha Krishnan as follows.

The conception of 'Rta' that is order contained in the Rig Veda is the harbinger of the law of Karma which is the predominant note of Hindu Philosophy. 'Rta' Swings the world of men and of God and it influences every one. It is considered as standard of morality and the good are those who trod its path. It is the truth and kernal of things. The opposite of 'Rta' was disorder and falsehood. (P.P. 25).

This passage explains that the 'Rta' which one can find in Rigveda is the harbinger of law of Karma who swings between the world of men and of God. This speaks very clearly that there is a harbinger who has been appointed to bring the law of Karma (Divine message relating to Dharm) from God Almighty to the prophet of the people. 'Rta' (The Harbinger) of Rigveda was no other than the Paramatma of Gita - the Adhidaiwatam who appeared in human form (Adhibuta 8:4) for the "*Dharma Samsthapanardhaya Sambhavami yuge yuge*" 4:8.

But this Agama (descent of paramatma) was mistaken for the Agama or Awatarana of God Almighty Himself. Thus a doctrine of Anthropomorphism was invented. So the Agama and anthropomorphism have been discussed in detail in this small work which invites a deep insight of the readers.

The second important point relating to faith in dharm is the concept of Rebirth. In this regard Dr. S. Radhakrishnan writes about the existing concept of rebirth and that how it has been transformed in to

a doctrine of Janma after Janma until the Soul is merged into the God Almighty, as is being professed in existing Hinduism. Please examine the following passage.

The concept of rebirth occupies a dominant position in the Upanishads. Their view is that the soul is not annihilated at death. They have a strong conviction as to the continuity of life. It is corollary to the law of karma. In the Upanishads the belief is transformed into the doctrine of rebirth in the world, in contrast to the belief in the Brahmins of birth in the next world. The highest kind of immortality is becoming one with Brahman. So life eternal is, union with Brahman. The undeserved soul is subject to the law of births and deaths and has to work-out its destiny by lives on earth. The kind of birth depends upon the nature of work. Between one life and another, there is persisting identity... (P.P. 38).

From the above passage it is evident that the belief of 'REBIRTH' in the next world (Paraloka) was taught in the Brahmins, the second part of Vedas. But, in the Upanishads this belief is transformed into the doctrine of 'Rebirth in this present world'.

Thus, relating to the belief in rebirth, a grave contradiction between the teachings of Brahmins and Upanishads is obvious. The former one holds that man after his death, takes his rebirth in the next world (Paraloka) which is to come after pralaya, while the latter one suggests the doctrine of rebirth in this present world only, which point needs a meticulous examination and detailed discussion. I hope the points and arguments made in this book basing on the scriptures are enough to rebut the suggestions as made in Upanishads and to uphold the teachings as found in Brahmins as authentic which conform the Islamic and Christian view in this regard.

The another fundamental belief of Islam that comes in contrast with the belief of Hindu philosophy is ... The belief in Unity.

Islam professes the faith that there is only one God Almighty beside whom there is none in the status or capacity of God Almighty. This is what meant by the word 'Unity' of Islamic terminology.

Hinduism also professes faith in the Unity of God Almighty. But this unity has no comparison with the unity of Islam. A soul released from the curse of rebirth in this world, gets united with God and becomes one with Him. This is known as 'Unity' in the Hindu philosophy. This also needs a diligent comparative study and close examination of Scriptures. Undoubtedly in Hinduism also the unity in the sense of oneness of God Almighty was taught. But it was gradually transformed in to plurality and ultimately the worship of various Dewatas became the common practice, treating them as the chief manifestations of God Almighty. The following passages from the Glimpses of the world religions by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan give a clear picture as regards to this.

"... They (Upanishads) recognize only one God who is defined as eternal self-existent, incomprehensible and omniscient. He alone creates, preserves and destroys. He is the light, lord and the life of the world without any second and He is the sole object of adoration and worship". How many Gods are there really, yagnavalkya? 'ONE' he said, now answer another question, 'Some do meditate on Agni, Brahma, Rudra, shiva, Vishnu, Say which of these is best for us'. He said unto them "They are but chief manifestations of the Highest, the immortal, the incorporeal Brahman. Brahman indeed is all these, and man may meditate, worship or discard also those which are its manifestation". (P.P. 28).

"The central feature of religion as evidenced from the teachings of the Upanishads is that there is one Supreme Being who is to be worshipped with love and reverence, and faith".

"The Upanishad holds that the absolute and the God are identical, we name it supreme Brahma to emphasise its transcendence of the infinite, its inexplicability and its all comprehensiveness. We call it Ishwara to emphasise the

personal aspect so necessary for religious devotion". (P.P. 36)

Thus the unity (Monotheism) was first propounded in Hindu philosophy became transformed into plurality (polytheism). And again a doctrine of Unity in the sense of assimilating with God and becoming one with Him has taken a dominant place. In this regard elaborate discussions have been made basing on logical as well as scriptural facts which appeal to your discretion.

AHMED ALI
(Author)

An Appeal to Muslims

Krishna of Mahabharat and Krishna of Gita are two different persons. The former one was one that was born to a human couple namely Devaki and Vasudeva. Human as he was, he was born like any other human being just taking birth from the mother's womb, who gradually passed through all the natural phenomena such as childhood, boyhood, youth, old-age and ultimately died a natural death. He was thus not unborn and immutable. But the latter one was Param Atma (Roohul Quddus or Holy Spirit) who was not born but directly descended from heavens. He was not a man but a Dewata appeared in human incarnation. As he is an angel, he is free from birth and death and the mutability such as a man passes through. Thus he was unborn and immutable.

The former one was a charioteer of Arjun. Human as he was, he was influenced by Tamoguna (Nafs-e-Ammara), Rajoguna (Nafs-e-Lavvama) and Sattwaguna (Nafs-e-Mutmainna). He played his role, not being free from human weakness, merits and demerits that generally go with every human being and passed away. In Mahabharata he appears as the hero of the epic.

But Krishna of Bhagawadgita is Param Atma who is known as Rooh-al-Quddus in Qur'an. He was a presiding Dewata appointed for establishment of Dharm (Deen). He appeared to all prophets of all times of all nations, in human incarnation and brought the message relating to Dharm and thus he was called in Qur'an as 'rasool-un-kareem' (Noble Messenger) (Qur'an 69:40 & 81:19).

We read in Qur'an

"And verily this Qur'an is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The Spirit (Atma/Rooh) faithful to the trust has descended with it on thy heart that thou mayest be of the warners in plain and clear Arabic tongue. And it is surely mentioned in the

Scriptures of the former peoples" (Qur'an 26:192-196).

Mahabharat is an epic written by Sri vyasa Maharshi; while the Bhagawad Gita is a divine message revealed through Sri Paramatma. Having Gita been clubbed with Mahabharat, people were confused in differentiating the characters of both Krishnas and failed in identifying their independent personalities but began to treat them both as one person whereby the mystery began to prevail which never ends, but continues as long as this distinction of things as pointed out are not made.

The another thing that perplexes is that how I could arrive at to declare that the Bhagwad Gita as a divine revelation like Qur'an when it makes no mention about Gita. To know whether Gita is a revelation from God or not the first thing that we should take into consideration is that in Qur'an God declares that He had sent His prophets and divine books to every nation and people. And again we have Qur'an with us which is a discrimination (Furqaan). By the help of it, if one makes a diligent comparative study of Gita with Qur'an, under the guidance of our points raised and discussed, I am sure that everyone may he be a Hindu or a Muslim does not hesitate to accept both Qur'an and Gita as divine revelations sent by God Almighty through Rooh-al-Quddus (Param+Atma). As regards to him God Almighty speaks very high of his status given to him.

*"...That this is surely the word of a Noble Messenger (Rasoolun-Kareem), Possessor of Power, established in the presence of the Lord of the throne, obeyed there and faithful to the trust.
(Qur'an 81:19-21)*

These Qur'anic verses speak very high of him. He is the possessor of power and the leader of all the dewatas (Malaika). His orders are obeyed there, and carried on with all respect.

And we have references in Gita too where Arjuna addressed Sri Paramatma as Deva-Vara meaning O! great one amongst the demi-gods (11:31). These points have been discussed in detail in our main subject matter.

Dear friends - set aside your preconceived thought and study the book with an open mind, so that the facts may become crystal clear.

Ahmed Ali
(Author)

An appeal in general

The title of this book was originally "MY FINDINGS FROM GEETA". But on the esteemed suggestion by Dr. N. Srinivasa Rao, M.Sc., Ph. D. who has gone through the manuscript, the present form of the title has been taken place.

Some people have found fault with me saying that I am a layman in Sanscrit language and hence that I have no right whatever to write or comment on any Scripture of Sanscrit language. For this, my humble submission to such people is, that they should know that the meanings and the translations of the well-known Scholars of Sanscrit such as Sri Alladi Mahadeva Sastry, Sri A.C. baktivedanta Prabhu Padula, and Sri Vidya Prakasanandagiri have been taken by me. Fact being thus, if anyone hesitate to accept the translations and meanings quoted by me, he is indirectly rejecting the above great Scholars and their translation only, but not me.

Translations of Slokas or Verses of any Scripture should not be made independent of the paraphrase. Hence they are the exact reflections of the text in other languages; while commentaries are the products of human intellect. Yet they should not be out of context and beyond relevance. We have various commentaries on various Scriptures. At times one disagrees with other while some other contradicts. This shows the liberty that the commentators have, to give their independent opinion on any sloka or verse. Yet an unbiased commentator does not misuse this liberty, but is strictly confined himself within the limits of the basic and fundamental message propounded in the scripture. Therefore, I request our discerning readers to kindly examine my commentaries propounded in my work, so as to arrive at a discretion whether they are in consonance with the main theme of the text. As regards to the meanings, I have taken them from the masterly works of the great Hindu Sanscrit scholars. So there appears no other rea-

son in rejecting my work on simple ground of my being layman in Sanscrit, than escapism.

The other thing that needs clarification is... Transfiguration or transformation can be well defined as 'taking another form'..., that is a being appearing in any other form than that of his own. In religious terminology this act is known as incarnation. Anthropomorphism and incarnation are two words which convey more or less the same meaning ... as attributing human form to God. When people mistook the Dewata's (Angel's) descent in human form for the descent of God Himself a dogma of Awatarana (incarnation or Anthropomorphism) in the sense of the descent of God in human form has been developed. Incarnation of Dewatas cannot be denied whereas the incarnation of God Almighty is a fiction. So to prove these two points, in the last chapter of this book, I have taken liberty to use these two words, Viz., Incarnation and Anthropomorphism as two words different in meaning. The former one for dewata's descent in human form which is a fact, while the latter one for the speculated descent of God Almighty Himself which is a fiction. Thus it is done with sole object, only to make our discerning readers understand the subject with no confusion.

Ahmed Ali
(Author)

CONTENTS

1. Follow sastras to attain Moksha.

1. Man has been created by God.
2. Pre-existence of man.
3. Once man did exist-in his own body.

II. For performance of Karma, term of life on earth is given only once.

1. Prakriti is womb for out coming of all beings.
2. First seed of Gita is first man of Qur'an and Bible.
3. matter plus spirit becomes living being (Jeevatma).
4. Changes that man undergoes between his first creation and second.

III. What does Moksha mean?

1. Moksha is mistaken for cessation of Rebirth.
2. Expecting to merge in God for Moksha?
3. Not merging in God but attaining Swarga is Moksha.
4. Sloka 9:33 dampens the Doctrine of Transmigration of soul to Various bodies.

IV. Battle of Kurukshetra.

1. Both parties - Kowravas themselves.
2. Battle of Kurukshetra a dispute not for LAND.
3. paramatma descended in human form with a message to fight.
4. Close similarities between battle of Bader by Prophet Mohammad and battle of Kurukshetra by Prophet Arjuna.
5. Kurukshetra battle given colour of lawful political battle.
6. No casteism - No political rivalry - but a battle between Dharm and Adharm.
7. Battle of Kurukshetra - Not for worldly gains.

V. Mankind divided under two groups - The divine and demonic. The former one for Heaven and the latter one for Hell.

1. Two worlds - Iha loka (karmanushthana Loka) and paraloka (karmaphalanubhavaloka)
2. Narkam Nityam - Svargam Saswatam.
3. Judgement appointed.
4. Soul must have a body.
5. Decayed body renewed.
6. Dead must be transformed to eternity.
7. Former body renewed but not new body created - Why?

VI. Gita ordains monotheism.

1. Gnani worships none but God Almighty.
2. Polytheism in the mask of Monotheism.
3. Those who worship others are naradhamas - the worst among men - according to Gita.
4. Power of discrimination awarded to man - Yet he becomes foolish - Gita explains its reason.

VII. Anthropomorphism.

1. Paramatma and Arjuna were unknown to each other.
2. Incarnation of Paramatma mistaken for Anthropomorphism.
3. One who is born cannot be an incarnate.
4. Sri Paramatma is from Akshara class of beings.
5. Brahma dictates religious injunctions and Paramatma brings them.
6. Paramatma Consecrated for the conveyance of Divine Message.
7. Paramatma discloses himself as devata in Guise of human form - a strong testimony to refute Anthropomorphism.
8. Incarnation and Anthropomorphism - Compared.
9. Bhagwan Vuvacha - a clue.

**MY FINDINGS
FROM
GITA
CONFORM WITH
QUR'AN...**

Title of the book : My findings from Gita-
Conform with Qur'an...

written by : Ahmed Ali

All Rights Reserved
For legal proceedings : Subject to Kakinada Jurisdiction only.

First Edition : 2001
Copies : 1000

Published by : Ahmed Ali
(Vill) Chidiga
Kakinada rural - 533 006
Dist East Godavary
(A.P) INDIA

Typeset by : Sambasiva Graphics
The True Message Institute
Recharlapeta
kakinada - 533003

Contact No : 9848516362
9490163604

Website : www.thetruemessagecentre.com

Printed at :

Ahmed Ali