

---

---

## RELIGION OF SLAVES AND OF THOSE WHO MADE THEM SLAVES CAN NOT BE THE SAME

### An Exposition of “Shivdharma”

by

**Dr. A.H.Salunkhe**

Translated from Marathi by Dr. K. Jamanadas

#### TRANSLATOR SUBMITS

A big silent revolution is taking place among the OBCs of Maharashtra. The majority community of Maharashtra — the Marathas the Knnbis—are holding a series of conferences in Maharashtra to break away from Hinduism and form a new religion to be named as “Shivdharma”. All these conferences are reported to be great success, though at one place, reportedly there was some vandalism by misguided youths. The message has reached all over India and abroad. People from Tamilnadu and Bihar and other states are also arranging the conferences, it is said.

The organizers are “Maratha Seva Sangha”, a prominent organization of OBCs in Maharashtra headed by Mr. Purushottam Khedekar. The brain behind the movement which is going on for last few years, is Dr. A. H. Salunkhe. He is writing the “Code of Conduct” and the “Scripture” of the new religion, which they connect with the Indus Valley civilization. There is participation of many OBC leaders in Maharashtra including Prof. Ashok Rana, and Prof. M. M. Deshmukh.

Parshuram Dhote, a former District President of BJP, editor of a local journal, “*Bhumi putra chi hak*” and the main organizer of “*Waman Dahan Programme*”, which they hope will be the OBC way to celebrate Diwali in future, was renamed as “BaliRaj Dhote” during the valedictory function in Chandrapur.

#### The details of Shiva Dharma

Their ideals and idols are Jijau—the mother of Shivaji, the Buddha, Shivaji and other non-Brahmin great personalities like Tukaram and Kabir and Shahu, Ambedkar, Phule and the Periyar. The date for conversion is fixed as 12<sup>th</sup> January 2005 on the birth anniversary of Jijau at Sindkhed Raja, her birthplace. There will be no founder of religion and no priests. Some may believe in “God” or may not, there will be no castes and no restrictions on marriage and dining. There will be no “*Satya-narayana*” puja — an alternative will be reading of biography of Jijau and Savitribai Phule. The religion would be based on science and there will be no blind faiths or exploitation of others.

Dr. Salunkhe has appealed to the Brahmin brethren that he has no bitterness about them while parting ways from them. He said that the Buddhists also should understand why they are not accepting Buddhism is because of “*samaj vastav*” — the ground realities in the society. The Buddha is a great “bridge” between them and the Buddhists, and expressed the hope that some good day we all would be one. Dr. Salunkhe declaring their movement as “Movement for Liberation”, said that we need toilets for women in villages rather than temples.

As a preliminary and first stage to explain their stand as to why they are going away from Hinduism and forming a new religion, Dr. A. H. Salunkhe has published in June 2002 a small booklet of about 30 pages, titled “*Gulama cha aani gulam karanaran cha dharm ek nasato*” i.e. - “Religion of Slaves and of those who made them Slaves can not be the same”. This is the translation of it in English. I tried to be more literal than literary.

#### Skepticism and hopes

There are many people among the Ambedkarites who express openly or in private the skepticism that this move of Marathas to part ways from Hinduism is just to sabotage the wave among the OBCs to adopt Buddhism. These people point out that wife of Mr. Khedekar is BJP member of Maharashtra Legislature.

But personally I do not find any such skepticism to be justified. This is because the people like Prabhakar Pawade, Adv. Eknath Salve who have already adopted Buddhism some ten years ago are associated with the movement. Khedekar has also explained the presence of his wife in B.J.P. as strategic. People like Prof. Ashok Rana, Prof. M. M. Deshmukh, and Dr. A. H. Salunkhe himself have been writing

many articles and books awakening the OBCs against Brahminism for long time, though it is only recently that the movement of Khedekar's "Maratha Seva Sangh" is coming up.

In 1947, in a message published in the Souvenir of "Maratha Mandir" of Bombay, Dr. Ambedkar had said that the Marathas and other OBCs, who used to be with lower classes, now seem to be with the upper class. He said that, the future of not only Indian masses but also their own, depends upon what decision the Maratha leaders take. He opined, it all should be left to the skill and wisdom of the leaders of Marathas, but lamented that there seems to be a lack of such wise leadership among the Marathas.

That period is now over. And we hope that this awakening among the OBCs, coming after a long time, will lead to liberation of Indian masses and fulfill the wishes of Dr. Ambedkar.

Dr. K. Jamanadas

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### **Religion is a deep rooted concept**

'Religion'—'dharma'—is an important concept rooted in human mind. With an exception of a few, it is a great mental support for majority of people. It is a controlling power in their lives. It decides their life style. It gives direction to their life events. It guides them in deciding how to lead own life as a human being and how to deal with others. Religion influences the cultural life of societies like its thoughts and actions, philosophy, myths, literature, other arts, rituals, festival and ceremonials. That means, if one inspects the cultural elements of anybody's personality, one would find various elements created by religion.

### **If I have to stay as a Hindu?...**

There are many religions in the world like Hinduism, Christianity, Islam etc. today. As I was born to Hindu parents and as I have not formally converted to any other religion as yet, at least now my religion is Hinduism. Now, if I am to be real, honest and loyal follower of Hinduism, things which are considered as holy by Hinduism, I must consider them as holy, and the things considered as profane by Hinduism, I must consider them as profane. If I have to lead my life as a Hindu, I must remain within the limits laid down by the religion. Under such circumstances, I must consider the Vedas as holy. Second to these, the 'Smritis' are my scriptures too. I must also respect the 'puranas'. Though the 'Ramayana' and 'Mahabharata' are considered as mere epics, I must accept the orthodox view that they are, in a way, my scriptures. I must believe in various thoughts and actions, ceremonials and rituals etc. prescribed by these books. I must respectfully believe that the consequences of deeds done in the past life are to be suffered in this life. I must believe the theories like Vishnu took '*avatar*' for killing the wicked. I must accept the division of society into four '*varnas*'. In short, if I have to be a Hindu, broadly speaking, I must believe all these faiths, I should not have any doubts about them, and should do nothing that will break these faiths.

### **We believed Brahmins to the hilt**

The peculiarity of Hinduism is that, all aspects of the religion have been entrusted to the Brahmins. To write the scriptures, to decide the rules of our conduct, to prepare the rituals, to create ceremonials and festivals, to decide the philosophy of religion, to construct the myths, and all such related subjects to decide the nature of this religion have been delegated, more or less completely, to Brahmins. We believed them to the extreme hilt. We considered them sacred. We considered them not only as representatives of God on the earth but also as actual gods on the earth, the 'bhudevas'. We respected each and every word uttered by them. We accepted all their commands. We behaved according to all their mandates. We shaped all our lives according to their orders. We never doubted about any of their deeds. We gave them supreme position in our lives. We gave them all powers and authority regarding religion. We gave them unbridled freedom.

### **In return of trust, we expected a righteous religious system**

While trusting the Brahmins with all these powers, we—the rest of Hindus—were sure that these holy, well-bathed people would liberate us. We expected that the Brahmins would relieve our sufferings, that they will create a pretty universe for us, that they will bring happiness to our lives, that they will fulfil

the dreams of our children, and will give us respectful lives as human beings. We believed that they will take upon themselves the beatings imposed on us by others. If not, at least they will not inflict injuries on us. They will not snatch away what we have laboriously produced, that they will not deprive us of the fruits of our labour, that they will not kick us out, that they would not despise us, that they will participate in our happiness and sorrows. If we, ourselves, can not approach the power that controls the Universe, we hoped, that they will carry the feelings of our heart without adulteration to that power, that they will pray to god on our behalf, will worship, will act as our representatives in religious fields, act as our trustees, that the language of our hearts will be automatically understood by their hearts. In short, we expected that we will get a transparent, generous, selfless, and comprehensive response to the trust we imposed on them.

### **Our trust was responded with treachery**

The Hindus reposed such a great trust upon the Brahmins but one feels sad to see their response to all this trust. They replied this trust with a betrayal. This is the greatest tragedy of a Hindu's religious life. The Brahmins actually injured the followers of their own religion. Instead of looking after the welfare of those who trusted them, they created laws, which benefited only their own 'varna'. They saw to it that all except the Brahmins remain in ignorance forever. They created insulting laws and made them helpless. They made arrangements to keep us suppressed under Brahminic hegemony for generations. They disregarded all morality for this purpose. They made laws degrading humanity. They ignored justice. They did not apply a goad of discretion upon themselves. They wrote a false history. They made their own co-religionist observe the moments of their defeats as festivals and celebrations of glory. They always drove away the common men. And whenever, they required their help at times of need, they used them for selfish and wicked purposes. They glorified their own misdeeds. Naturally, all this gave a heart rending nature to Hindu religion. It was anathematised externally as well as internally.

### **Complain against Brahmins, but still put head on their feet**

Numerous wise, compassionate, and active great personalities born in Hindu society, tried time and again to rescue the Hindus, the Bahujans, from this deadly grip of Brahmins. But it is a painful fact that the Bahujans did not whole-heartedly and fully support them. People from Bahujan Samaj, generally in private and rarely in public, complain of Brahminic hegemony, they grumble, criticise and despise. But in practice, never get ready to celebrate any important occasion in life without the presence of a Brahmin priest. Brahmins have instilled seeds of fear in their minds to such an extent that it has now thrived as a vast crop of blind-faith. Majority of non-Brahmins has such a terror about Brahmin religion that they can not even imagine of rescuing themselves from it. Even the people bleeding from abrasions by the thorns of the laws of that religion, do not think about uprooting these thorns or get away from these thorns, instead they are ever ready to let themselves gladly pricked by those very same thorns.

### **This Discussion is mostly for mainly those who call themselves Kshatriyas**

It is true that we find in our history several attempts to separate away from this cruel Brahminic system. Numerous people denied the system and have been liberated from it. Shortly I am going to deal with these attempts separately. However, here what I am going to discuss is meant for those who are stuck with this system in spite of being trampled upon by it. Specially this writing is meant for those who consider themselves as Kshatriyas or their descendants and therefore consider it their sacred duty to protect the Hindu religion, that is in effect Brahmin religion. This is meant for those who are about to shed blood—other's as well as their own—for protecting Brahminic religion. I have shown elsewhere, many a times, what Brahmin religion has done to the Vaishyas and Shudras. Even then, here I am attempting to show what the Hindu Scriptures say about the Kshatriyas once again in short. I expect that those who consider themselves as Kshatriyas should at least give a calm thought to this. This is my humble and honest request. Of course, I am also appealing to the intellect and the hearts of other Hindus who do not consider themselves Kshatriyas, but still consider it their sacred duty to cling to their chest the prison of the very same Brahminic system as their holy religion.

---

## **2. YOU CONSIDER YOURSELVES KSHATRIYAS; THEN DO YOU WILLINGLY ACCEPT DISHONOUR OF YOUR WOMEN?**

### **Mahabharata is a holy scripture of Hindus**

I am starting this discussion with a dialogue from Mahabharata, which is famous as a great book in our culture. On one side it called as History also and on the other as philosophy as it contains a book like Bhagwat Gita. Because of its total structure, it is dear and respectable to the Hindus. It is expected of a Hindu that he should consider it a matter of pride and hold it over his head and consider it worshipable.

Now, it is clear that the Kshatriyas, also being Hindus, must consider it holy. I like to present a sample of what this book says about Kshatriyas for the consideration of those groups of people who consider themselves as Kshatriyas. It is supposed that this book was written by Vyasa. Its original form was of only about eight thousand verses and it was called 'Jay'. Later a disciple of Vyasa, named as Vaishampayana, inflated it to twenty five thousand verses and named it as 'Bharat'. During later times a scholar named Shutee conflated it to hundred thousand verses and named it as 'Mahabharata'. This third edition came in existence in second century B.C.E. i.e. during the times of writing of '*Manu-smriti*'. The tradition itself accepts these three revised and enlarged editions. But in reality there have been many more revised editions.

The author of the second edition, Vaishampayana was the royal priest of Janmejaya, the great grand son of Arjuna. Later Janmejaya appointed another Brahmin as priest to conduct a Yajnya and outraged Vaishampayana became enemy of Janmejaya and made him abdicate the throne.

### **Dialogue between Janmejaya and Vaishampayana**

In the *Adiparva* [Chap. 58] of Mahabharata [edition published by Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Pune], there is a description of Vaishampayana narrating the genealogy of Kauravas Pandavas etc. to Janmejaya. Hearing this description, Janmejaya asked him: "O great sage, tell me clearly why these godly great warriors took birth on this earth." What Vaishampayana tells him on this request is worth understanding. He said, "O King, in reality, this is the secret of gods, so we heard. Even then, I salute to Brahmadeva and tell it to you."

### **All Kshatriyas were destroyed, they say**

Starting thus, he further narrated: [58.5 to 58.8, complete verses quoted]

"Parshuram, previously, had killed all the Kshatriyas on the face of the earth twenty one times and went to Mahendra mountain for tapas. O king, after the world was made devoid of Kshatriyas by Parshuram, the Kshatriya women went to Brahmin men with the intention of getting impregnated. O tiger in human form, then the Brahmins, honest in duties, cohabited with these women during each period ('*ritu*'). They did not do it out of lust. They did not cohabit during '*unritu*'. "

'Ritu' means that period of time which is after the menstrual period of women, and which is suitable for pregnancy. The rest of time is '*unritu*'.

Vaishampayana further narrates:

"O king, these thousands of Kshatriya women got pregnant from the Brahmins and gave birth to Kshatriyas from the Brahmins' semen. Thus they produced Kshatriya sons and daughters so that the Kshatriyas again proliferate. Thus the Kshatriyas procreated by the Brahmin sages on the Kshatriya women got long life and increased because of 'dharma'. Later, after the Brahmins, all the four 'varnas' were created."

After this, Vaishampayana, gives a charming and pleasant description of how people were following the 'dharma', how all the kings were ruling according to 'dharma' and how the varnas like Brahmins were seeking pleasures etc. during the days of 'krit yuga' i.e. 'satya yuga'. Vaishampayana then describes at length the religious behaviour of people in those days, that the Kshatriyas were giving ample 'daxina' (gifts) to Brahmins and doing '*maha-yajnyas*', Brahmins were not uttering Vedas in the presence of Shudras, all the 'varnas' were doing their duties as enjoined to them, there was no decline of 'dharma' anywhere, etc.

The account given in Mahabharata in this dialogue of Vaishampayana with Janmejaya, needs to be examined from many angles. Here I will put forward only a few points.

## Would you consider this wily story written by Vaishampayana as true?

The gist of story written by Vaishampayana is clear. The message given by Vaishampayana to the society by this story is clearly unequivocal. According to Vaishampayana the Kshatriyas after Parshuram, even in *Sat-yuga*, were not of pure seed, they were mixed breed. They were progeny of Brahmins on Kshatriya women, meaning they were misbegotten hybrids. Naturally, in the following periods, the real, legitimate Kshatriyas were not in existence, are not in existence and will never be in existence in future. If this is the state of affairs in '*sat-yuga*', it is better not to talk of the stand of scriptures that during the '*kali-yuga*' the Kshatriyas have become Shudras.

Now, I think some serious questions arise for those people who consider themselves as Kshatriyas in the present times. The first question is, do they have faith in Mahabharata. If they do, the record given by Vaishampayana must be considered as true, and in that case, they will have to accept it as a historical truth, that they are not of Kshatriya seed. On the contrary, the second question arises is, are they willing to critically analyze the account given by Mahabharata. After critical analysis, if the account given by Vaishampayana is found correct, it will have to be calmly accepted. But if it is proved beyond doubt to be false, another question arises whether they are willing to denounce it. And if they are ready for that a further question arises that, are they willing to reevaluate the whole of Mahabharata and other scriptures like it.

## This is the central point in corrupt Brahminization

There is no doubt that people like me would prefer to follow the path of critical analysis. If you have to follow this path, you will have to go, mentally, to second century B.C.E. The Brahmin Commander Pushyamitra Shunga had assassinated the last Maurya King Bahadratha, in this century, and usurped the throne. After capturing political power, the people in Brahmin varna, created a tremendous havoc in the cultural life of India. On one hand, the system of *Chaturvarna* with Brahminic supremacy, and on the other, male dominated gender discrimination against women, were strengthened during this time. The Brahmins of Bhriгу race were on fore front in this. Manu-smriti which strictly implements above mentioned double social system was created by Brahmins of this Bhriгу *vamsha* during this period. Parshuram, who was born in the same Bhriгу *vamsha*, was a vigorous propagator of this double system. This is proved by the fact that, to establish Brahmin supremacy, he ruthlessly carried out a cruel genocide of Kshatriyas and beheaded his Kshatriya mother on the orders of Brahmin father. During the same period, the major changes were made in the innumerable books like Ramayana, Mahabharata, Puranas etc., completely changing their structure. In the name of religion, anything and everything was written as they pleased. The false imaginary stories that were not present in the original books were manufactured and were incorporated in various books. The sole purpose of doing all this was to glorify the Brahmins, to protect their vested interests and to strengthen their grip on the society. The culture was corrupted. To say it frankly, the culture was brahminized. The main part of this was to declare everybody except Brahmins, as ignoble.

About the process of this brahminization, I earnestly wish to invite attentions of readers to two observations of Siddheswara Shastri Chitrav. The now extant edition of Mahabharata goes by the name of Sautee. About this, Chitrav Shastri in his '*bharatiya prachin charitra kosha*' [hindi ed., 1964, Pune, p. 1088] observes:

“this is why, the author (*rachiyeta*) of present edition of Mahabharata is Sautee, though its originator (*pravartak*) were Vyasa and Vaishampayana. The period of the present Mahabharata authored by Sautee, is considered to be second century B.C.E.”

This means the present edition of Mahabharata was created during the same period as the creation of *Manu-smriti*, because this was the same time of Brahminic reign which created Manu-smriti during the rule of Pushyamitra Shunga.

Though the name of Sautee is put forward, in reality, it was created by the Brahmins. The father of Sautee, Romaharshana, belonged to *Suta* caste. The progeny of Brahmin mother and Kshatriya father used to be considered of *Suta* caste. Originally, the knowledge of 'puranic myths' was in the hands of this *Suta* caste, but was later usurped by Brahmins. This is clear by statement of Chitrav Shastri [ibid. p. 772] that, “Out of six disciples of Romaharshana five '*acharyas*' were Brahmins. Because of this the tradition of Mahabharata coming in *Suta* caste was destroyed and all this knowledge went in the hands of Brahmins. This is the reason why the later scholars of Puranas are Brahmins.” What happened to Puranas also happened to Mahabharata and gradually the brahminization of Indian culture increased. The non-brahmins neglected the work of writing books and they gave it to Brahmins as if in a dowry. Then the history was

written wholly by the Brahmins with their own view point, suitable to them, supporting them and declaring them as supreme.

### **Janmejaya would not have tolerated this**

This story told by Vaishampayana to Janmejaya about Kshatriya's origin in Mahabharata, is a part of this process of Brahminization. It might have been manufactured in second century B.C.E. or might have been in existence in seed form before hand; what ever might be the case, it is highly improbable that it was in reality told to Janmejaya. This is because this story is totally false and so derogatory to the existence of Kshatriyas, that no Brahmin could have dared to actually tell it to Kshatriya Janmejaya. However, it is possible that Vaishampayana and some other Brahmins might have propagated such false stories in the masses to denigrate the Kshatriyas and might have started such a secret propaganda. It is possible to be one of the reasons behind the enmity between Janmejaya and Vaishampayana. Of course, one can not say with confidence that Vaishampayana could not have dared to actually tell it to Janmejaya. In this society riddled with too much influence of religion on the masses, how the Brahmins are so arrogant due to religious power, and how the audacious priests used to humiliate the Kings is clear from the examples of Maharaja Chatrapati Shivaji and Rajarshi Shahu.

### **Hard struggle of Janmejaya against Brahmins**

My inference that such a story would not have been tolerated by Janmejaya, has some references in the life of Janmejaya. Being son of king Parikshit, Janmejaya is called "Janmejaya Parikshit". Siddheswara Shastri Chitrav thinks there were two kings of this name. I consider both the same. But even if they are considered to be two different ones, we find a hard struggle against Brahmins in the lives of both of them. About the first Janmejaya, Chitrav Shastri observes: [Ibid. p. 221]:

“Because of hard words uttered, he (justifiably — ‘*vadha*’) killed the Gargya putra. Because of ‘*brahma-hatya*’, he had to renounce the throne.”

About the second Janmejaya, he observes: [Ibid. p. 222]

“Second Janmejaya Parikshit was very religious. He made Bajseniya his ‘brahma’ in his yajnya. Then Vaishampayana cursed him. Brahmins stopped the priesthood of Kshatriyas. But with the help of Bajsenaya people, he performed two Horse sacrifices. Being brave, he was supported by other Kshatriyas. Because of support to Bajsenayas, the Brahmins removed him from the throne and sent him to forest. Because of struggle against Brahmins, he was destroyed. (Kautillya, p. 22) ... Even after the Bajsenayas got royal patronage, the Vaishampayanans created a lot of disturbances. They tried a lot to defeat Bajsenayas in debates. But Janmejaya foiled all their attempts. He not only accepted the opposition of people, opposition of brahmins, but also accepted the abdication of throne.”

It becomes clear from this, that there was a fierce struggle going on in life of Janmejaya against the Brahmins and specially against Vaishampayanans. That Janmejaya had selected some other priest instead of Vaishampayana, enraged the latter, who tried to take revenge. Similar things had happened about the King Nimi.

Looking at all this struggle of Janmejaya against the Brahmins, it is clear that it was not possible that some Brahmin like Vaishampayana might have told a false derogatory story of ignoble recreation of Kshatriyas from Brahmins directly to Janmejaya himself. And Janmejaya would not have tolerated it even if somebody told it to him. But actually the present book of Mahabharata tells us that, Janmejaya heard this history very humbly and piously from Vaishampayana. It is, however, true that Mahabharata got its revenge against Janmejaya in later times by construction of such a story—that Vaishampayana is telling him false history of ignoble recreation of Kshatriyas from Brahmin seed—by some Brahmin among the Vaishampayanans, the very people against whom Janmejaya had enmity.

### **Parshuram himself was born out of *varna-sankara***

There are many strong reasons to believe that the story put in the mouth of Vaishampayana is false. As a matter of fact, the story is written in the name Parshuram. to unjustifiably glorify Brahmins The mother of very same Parshuram was not a Brahmin. This means that, according to the scriptures of Vedics themselves, Parshuram, being son of Brahmin father Jamdagni and non-Brahmin mother Renuka, was himself born out of ‘*varna-sankara*’. It has to be said that, Parshuram, in whose name Mahabharata has declared all Kshatriyas as of ignoble origin (‘*kam-assal*’), is himself proved to be a Brahmin of ignoble origin. Perhaps, just to hide the ‘*varna-sankara*’ in his own blood, Kshatriya hater Parshuram might have beheaded Renuka though she was his own mother only because she was a Kshatriya. The information

furnished by Vaishampayana that Parshuram flourished during 'sat-yuga' is also false. Because, it is believed that he was in 'treta yuga' or in mid period between 'treta' and 'dwapar' yuga. [MB. adiparva 2.3 - verse quoted]. Anyway, I do not consider these points to be of importance in the present discussion.

### **Self Contradictory statement is absurd**

The statement of Mahabharata that Parshuram made the earth devoid twenty one times, is in itself so full of contradictions that must be considered as ridiculous. This is called in Sanskrit as 'vadato-vyaghat'. This word is used to denote a statement which negates its own meaning. Suppose somebody says, 'I always tell lies'. If this statement is true, what he said must be untrue and hence it proves he sometimes speaks the truth, which negates the statement. If the statement that Parshuram made earth devoid of Kshatriyas twenty one times is taken literally, the same contradiction arises. Once the earth is made devoid of Kshatriyas, the question of again doing it does not arise, as all Kshatriyas were killed the first time and none remained to get killed the second time. It does not stand to reason that it can be done twenty one times as it is impossible to do even twice.

### **This is a wily attempt to destroy the Kshatriya seed**

To attempt to divest the earth of Kshatriyas is to destroy the Kshatriya seed. This means Parshuram destroyed even the fetuses in the wombs of their mothers. One can understand the killing of the enemy standing in front ready for war, but to kill a life in womb is to destroy the seed and feel gratified is the most cruel thing.

One can get the idea of cruelty of Parshuram by the account given by Chitrav Shastri: [p.392]

“... enraged, Parshuram again took to arms and (justifiably *vadha*) killed the Kshatriyas left alive the first time considering them innocent. Irrespective of young age, **he destroyed even the lives in wombs.**” [emphasis not original]

The following account given by Chitrav Shastri is also worth noting: [p. 391]

“Earth divested of Kshatriyas — Thus, Parshuram (justifiably - *vadha*) killed six hundred and forty million Kshatriyas. Out of those hundred and forty million were those openly hating the Brahmins. The remaining were punished in many ways. He (justifiably — *vadha*) killed Dantkrura. He killed one thousand warriors with a *musal* (rod for thrashing grain), thousands were cut by a sword, thousands were hanged on trees, and a similar number were drowned. Teeth, noses and ears of thousands were cut. Seven thousand were given the inhalations of chilies. They rest were tied and beaten up and they were destroyed by beheading them. The battle took place with Kshatriyas at the foot of the hills to the north of Gunavati and south of Khandava-aranya. Here he destroyed ten thousand warriors. After that, he (justifiably -*vadha*) killed the various kings like insects at various places like Kashmir, Drad, Kunti, Khsudrak, Malava, Anga, Vanga, Kalinga, Videha, Tamrlipti, Rakshovaha, Vitihotra, Trigarta, Martikavat, Shibi etc. Similarly he killed (*vadha* - justifiable killing) the forest dwellers.”

“In this way Parshuram cut the heads of twelve thousand crowned kings (*murdha-abhishikta*). Then he brought thousands of kings as prisoners to Kurukshetra. Here he dug up five big pools (*kund*) and filled them up with the blood of prisoner kings. Then Parshuram took blood-bath (*rudhir-snan*) in these ponds, and offered oblations (*tarpan*) to his dead ancestors (*pitars*). These 'kunds' are even now famous in the names of '*samant-panchak teerth*' and '*parshuram-hruda*'.”

It is true that there might be some exacerbation in this account. Chitrav Shastri also says so. Some part may be of vain adoration of Brahmins. But it becomes unquestionably clear from this account that Parshuram performed the pogrom of Kshatriyas very cruelly. Sautee, it is said, narrated his 'Mahabharata' to *rishis* like Saunak etc. in the vicinity of this very same 'samant-panchak teerth'. This means that, there is no doubt that, the people making third revised edition of Mahabharata were lovers of Parshuram and haters of Kshatriyas. While inflating Mahabharata from twenty five thousand verses to one hundred thousand verses, these haters of Kshatriyas must have newly constructed this story of ignoble origin of Kshatriyas or if it was narrated by Vaishampayana in essence, it was inflated by those Brahmins who were lovers of Parshuram, in Sautee's times.

### **It impossible that all Kshatriyas were killed**

Now, if we take this statement of 'making earth devoid of Kshatriyas twenty one times' either literally or as a rhetoric, we get the gist of it that Parshuram conducted mayhem of Kshatriyas on a greatly

devastating scale, that he took to battles many times and that approximate number of his invasions were twenty one. But this also makes clear that, even after twenty one battles there were Kshatriyas in existence and the later Kshatriyas flourished and grew from Kshatriya seed only. In recent times Hitler tried to do genocide of Jews, but even he could not kill all the Jews. In the same way, even after Parshuram's all attempts of killing all Kshatriyas, some lives were saved. It was also impossible to kill all Kshatriyas as Parshuram's activities were limited to certain areas alone.

### **Great doubt of Yudhishtara**

This inference of mine is based on an important observation in Mahabharata itself from Vasudeva himself. Of course, one must not forget that the original statement of Shrikrishna is brahminized at various places. Mahabharata puts this account also in the mouth of Vaishampayana.

Once, Krishna went to Kurukshetra with Pandavas etc. He narrated the bravery of Parshuram. He said: [MB, *shanti parva*, 48.8,9 - full verses quoted]

“O Partha, these five ‘ramhrud’ (Parshuram doha) are seen at a distance. Parshuram offered oblation (*tarpan*) to his ancestors in these ponds with the blood of Kshatriyas. That lord made the earth devoid of Kshatriyas twenty one times and then stopped his work (of killing).”

The response of Yudhishtara to this is very important. He said: [shanti parva 48.10-14 full verses quoted]

“O great among the Yadus, you said that Parshuram made the earth devoid of Kshatriyas twenty one times. I have got great doubts about this action. If he has burned the Kshatriya seed completely, then how were they recreated? In later times the earth became so much full of Kshatriyas, that in the Mahabharata war billions of Kshatriyas were killed. O Krishna, where from these Kshatriyas had come? Kindly remove this doubt of mine. There is no greater source of knowledge than you.”

### **Krishna's account is against that of Vaishampayana**

On this doubt of Yudhishtara, Krishna told him a lot of history of Parshuram. He told him that Parshuram killed the Kshatriya children also. But the earth flourished with Kshatriyas from the lives in the womb of pregnant women. Then Parshuram started destroying the fetuses as soon as women got pregnant. Even then, some Kshatriya women saved their sons, Krishna told him. [shanti parva 49.54,55 full verses quoted]

Later Parshuram performed Horse Sacrifice and gifted the earth to Kashyapa. After this to preserve Kshatriyas Kashyapa asked Parshuram to go to coastal regions of south sea. And also told him not to stay in his area under any circumstances. Then Kashyapa handed over the earth to Brahmins and went away to great forest. After his departure the Shudras and Vaishyas who had become promiscuous started cohabiting with Brahmin women. There was chaos in the world. Stronger started hurting the weak. After the stoppage of Kshatriya protection of earth as per rules laid down, after a time, the earth went to ‘*rasa-tal*’ — the nether worlds. Then she requested Kashyapa to bring the strong Kshatriyas.

The earth said to Kashyapa: [*shanti parva* 49.66-75 full verses quoted]

“O Brahmin, there are in existence among human beings great Kshatriyas protected by me.”

So saying she narrated the names of several Kshatriyas and assured him that they could protect her. The earth told him, using the plural forms, that there were several Kshatriyas even in the *Hayhay kula* itself, the original race which had enmity with Parshuram — that is, Krishna told this history to Yudhishtara. Apart from the Hayhayas, many other names of Kshatriya descendants were told by the earth who assured that they will protect her and she will become stable. These names included, Viduratsut descendant of Pauravas, Saurkarma descendant of Saudasa, Gopati son of Shibi, Vatsa son of Pratardana, Anga son of Divirath and grandson of Dadhivahana, Mahabahu Bahidratha, three Kshatriyas like Turvasuche Marutpati from the clan of Maruttas.

After telling all this to Yudhishtara, Krishna said: [*shanti parva*, 49. 78, 79]

“O son of Pandu, after that, Kashyapa respectfully brought those Kshatriyas, the protectors of earth, and crowned them. The descendants of their sons and grand sons flourished as Kshatriyas. This is what happened about the things you asked me.”

He then departed, along with all of them, elsewhere after telling this to Yudhishtara.

Here I am not narrating the whole struggle of Parshuram with Kshatriyas. That I will do separately some other time. Here I am mentioning only a few important points.

### **Vaishyampayana corrupts Krishna's history**

Whatever was told about Kshatriyas to Yudhishtara by Krishna, in Mahabharata is put in the mouth of Vaishyampayana and that too telling to Janmejaya. This means that this account was known to Vaishyampayana or let us say to the author or editor of Mahabharata. We have already seen in the beginning what the very same Vaishyampayana had told Janmejaya about the Kshatriyas. The account of Krishna, it is clear, is chronologically of earlier period because he has told to Arjuna Yudhishtara etc. whereas Vaishyampayana's account is narrated to Janmejaya the great grandson of Arjuna. Even after the genocide of Kshatriyas by Parshuram, the fact, that there were many powerful Kshatriyas is existence and Kshatriya race thrived from then, as told by Krishna to Yudhishtara, was known to Vaishyampayana. Even then Vaishyampayana told blatant lies to Janmejaya. How history was corrupted is clear from this account. Even the account of Krishna is brahminized to some extent. For example, the Mahabharata which describes that Kshatriya women went begging to Brahmin men for procreation and these Brahmin sages only fulfilled their duties by impregnating them. The very same Mahabharata calls Shudras and Vaishyas men 'promiscuous' when it comes to narrating their relations with Brahmin women. It is clear from this how these people express the malaise and venom in their mind while writing each and every word — each and every sentence. The Kshatriyas and others did not do the work of writing history themselves. They entrusted it to Brahmins, say either by trust or by laziness. The result was this dishonor. This is not an exceptional example of corruption of history, the entire history is corrupted like this.

### **This is kind of abusing after mother**

Now I turn to a very important point. If one has to insult ones opponent to very great extent, one utters abuse about the chastity of some woman member in the family of opponent like mother, sister, wife etc. We often see such acts in social life, to call abusing names like their chastity is defiled or actually perform the act of defiling them. From this mentality alone has given rise to numerous abuses concerning mother sister etc. What the Brahmins put in the mouth of Vaishyampayana about the story of Kshatriya women is just like abusing Kshatriyas in the same sort of way.

### **Vain boasting of Brahmins and their day dreams**

Such kind of abuse is never an indication of real happenings, but an indication of the wily thoughts of abuser. Brahmin authors have been dreaming of such pervert dreams about women specially non-brahmin women. What can not be done in actual practice, they have boasted to have done reality. Let us again see a statement hating Bahujans from Atharva veda, which I have repeated many times in my books. The gist of this rule is that if a Brahmin holds the hand of a woman already having ten non-brahmin husbands, then he alone is her husband. It is the Brahmin who is always husband and not Kshatriya or Vaishya. This is what is being constantly declared by Sun in front of five humans (four varnas and one outcaste society). This rule is in Atharva veda, which is considered by Hindus as their holy book.

### **Dishonor of 'Tulsi'**

Taking advantage of this rule from Atharvaveda, how ceremonials are created in actual practice can be seen from the rituals of "Marriage of Tulsi". Tulsi is Vrunda, the chaste wife of Asur Emperor Jalandhar. Some tricky Brahmin, considered to be Vishnu, defiles her chastity and the agonized Vrunda commits suicide by jumping into fire. But now this chaste Vrunda, that is Tulsi, is married every year not to her real husband Jalandhar but to the very person who defiles her and compels her to kill herself. Bahujans have blindly accepted this ritual and considered as sacred. [A separate book is written by Salunkhe on the subject. — Tr.]

### **Dishonor of Queens in Horse Sacrifice**

During the horse sacrifice, the brahmin priest (*ritvij*) utters such obscene dialogues that it shameful for a civilized person to repeat or write them. One of the 'dharma sutras' mentions that a '*ksotriya*', well-versed in Vedas, and the he goat are both full of sexual lust. The dialogues of these priests at horse sacrifice easily prove the same point. In spite of this, some Universities in modern times name their sports events as *Ashwamedha*

### **Rama is depicted as a Slave of Brahmins**

Rama, in the eyes of majority of people, is a respectable personality. But during the period, when Manusmriti is created, he was completely brahminized. To use his personality dear to Bahujans but to

depict him as a king always acting as a slave of Brahmins, was the technique employed. As a matter of fact, the original Ramayana does not contain the episodes of Rama abandoning Sita and of Rama killing Shudra sage Shambuka for his '*tapashya*' (austerity) to revive back to life an untimely died Brahmin child. After the Manusmriti waged a war against women and Shudras, the Brahmins interpolated these episodes in Rama's name. Thus, they remained aloof themselves but instilled in the society and propagated the anti-Shudra and anti-women values they wanted, in the name of Rama.

### **False and derogatory remarks secretly expressed about Rama**

Other venomous tactics were used to declare Rama as slavish devotee of Brahmins. It was a nasty wily thought impressed on the minds of society about the story of his birth. King Dashratha was incapable for procreation, which means Rama etc. were not his real children. At the time of '*putra kameshti yajnya*', he got his queens impregnated by a Brahmin priest Rishi Shring. [Chitrav Shastri, *op cit*, p.98] All this means, what was frankly put in Mahabharata about origin of Kshatriyas in story of Parshuram, is also mentioned about birth of Rama here. To construct such entirely false stories was very simple and natural act for these Brahmin writers. Because such wily tricks are not yet properly exposed many great scholars drew unpleasant inferences—but that is not our subject now.

### **Bhishmacharya cornered**

In later times, while constructing the stories of Bhishmacharya, Vichitravirya, Vyasa etc., a lot of fraud is committed. The subject needs a detailed discussion and I will deal with it separately if time permits. Now only a few salient points are mentioned. It is told to us that Bhishmacharya vowed to remain celibate all his life for the sake of his father. But the matter is not so simple. Bhishmacharya was a great dynamic person. Therefore, the Brahmins thought they would not be able to interfere in the state matters if he or his sons come to throne. Many an intrigue and conspiracy was hatched so that Sambhaji should not come to throne after Shivaji. There is no doubt that similar plot was engineered to keep Bhishma away.

It is told that after the death of childless Vichitravirya, progeny was created on his wives through '*Niyoga*' by Brahmin Vyasa. I feel there are two possibilities. First, the conspiracy of Brahmins, to call a Brahmin for '*Niyoga*' instead of a Kshatriya and thus to bring the whole reigning clan under Brahmin subjugation, was successful. Second, a story to denigrate the Kshatriyas was created and incorporated in Mahabharata. In either case, it is an attempt to maintain Brahmin supremacy. For the time being this is all on the subject.

### **Brahmins encroached in the Niyoga**

It is worth noting the encroachments by Brahmins in making the rules for '*Niyoga*'. There used to be permission for husband's brother or a person of the same '*varna*' to procreate on the wife, as an unavoidable evil, in case the husband dies childless or is unable to impregnate. This rule was justifiable as per the norms of the then society because the child born was from the seed of the same family. But even this attracted their attention and here also the Brahmins encroached and included their name in the list of men suitable for '*Niyoga*'. This clearly shows how immorally they used their right of creating the rules in scriptures.

### **Kshatriyas should utter '*pravars*' of priest, they say.**

There is a rule that during certain '*yajnyas*', the host should utter the names of his '*pravars*', that is his ancestors. The Dharmashastra tells us that if the host is Brahmin, he should utter the names of his ancestors. But if the host is a Kshatriya, he should utter the names of the ancestors of the priest instead of his own ancestors. This rule, no doubt, denotes the wicked mentality of Brahmins.

### **Biography of Krishna is distorted**

Krishna was a great hero of Bahunas. The offerings going to Vedic Indra was distributed by him among the cowherds and faced the anger of Indra for it. He is well known as the highest philosopher in Indian culture. Even as a godhead, as an '*avatar*' of Vishnu he is well known.

Brahmin authors, distorted to the hilt, such a personality. On one side he is depicted, like Rama, as subservient to Brahmins. On the other, his moral character is torn into pieces. They said, that he took away the clothes of '*gopis*', that he was acting immorally with them. If he were taking away the clothes of gopis, would the people of that town consider him as their leader? Would he have been respected as a philosopher? Would the people in town allowed him inside the threshold of their houses? Or rather, would they have allowed him to stay within the bounds of town? Would they not have killed him? When the very character of Radha is itself imaginary, what is the relevance of gopis and their clothes? These authors

poured in all the pervert lust about women in their minds in writing this account in the name of Krishna as it was not possible to put these ideas in their own name, reducing him to a level of a promiscuous person. In the name of Krishna, these authors took an opportunity to paint the obscene descriptions of the female anatomy of Bahujan women. In the eyes of these authors, Krishna became such a peg that anybody would hang the bag of his lust on it. What a great misuse of writing and speech!

### **See these rules about Bahujan women in scriptures**

Manusmriti says that, a Brahmin possessed of lust can marry woman from all four *varnas*, namely Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. A Kshatriya, however, can not marry a Brahmin woman. In marriages there is an important ritual of '*pani-grahan*', i.e. holding the hand of bride by bridegroom. But when a Kshatriya girl marries a Brahmin boy, it is enjoined, that this ritual should not be performed. Manusmriti says that the girl should hold the arrow in the hand of the man. This means, the marriage of a Brahmin man and a Kshatriya woman is not a real marriage. In a way, she becomes his concubine. Therefore, this Kshatriya wife does not get the rights bestowed on a Brahmin wife in religious rites.

In cases of rape or illicit sex, Manusmriti generally prescribes death penalty to a non-brahmin. But a Brahmin man is not punished for such offences with a non brahmin woman. If a Brahmin man commits such a crime with a Brahmin woman, he is punishable by minor fine. And this fine imposed for offence with brahmin woman can also be condoned by another rule. It is enough to quote the rules from Manusmriti without any comments on them:

“If a non-Brahmin commits an adultery, he is punished by death penalty. ... if a Shudra man has sex with a Brahmin woman who is unprotected by her husband etc., his penis should be cut and all his property should be confiscated. If he has sex with a protected Brahmin woman, all his property should first be confiscated and then he be given death penalty. ... If a Kshatriya or Vaishya man has sex with a protected Brahmin woman, he should be punished like a Shudra man or should be burnt alive in a grass pyre. ... If a Brahmin man rapes a protected Brahmin woman, he should be fined one thousand coins. If he commits adultery with her, with her consent, he should be fined five hundred coins. ... For whatever sin committed by him, a Brahmin man should never be put to death. Keeping his body unharmed, he should be driven out of the kingdom along with all his wealth.”

Even Puranas have made rules to the extent that a prostitute should only have a Brahmin man as her first customer. This explains the level of morality of these authors. There are innumerable such rules, insulting Bahujan women and also men, in the Brahminic books under the garb of *hindutva*.

### **What more can I do, apart from appealing to your self respect?**

The question before me is that, what stand the Bahujan society is going to take after knowing such nature of these Brahminic books. Heart-rending fact is that, even now, there are many people from Bahujan society who consider these books as holy. These people feel hurt at heart, if someone criticises these books. What more can I do, under such circumstances, apart from appealing to their self-respect, dignity, self-esteem, and pride?

### **How can Parshuram be respectable to us?**

I like to earnestly mention my experience in this regard. Once I had an occasion to visit an aristocratic family, who considered themselves as Kshatriyas. I was highly agonised by a photo on the entrance to his chambers from the drawing room. There was a huge portrait of Parshuram over it—a picture with a robust body, bow and arrow in the hand, a pouch full of arrows on the back and awesome features. What should I call such a mentality of a family, so proud of its Kshatriya origin, worshiping the very Parshuram, who destroyed the Kshatriya seed by killing the children in mothers' wombs, as per a vicious declaration by the Mahabharata? One is anguished to the extreme seeing this kind of seeds of slavery sown in the heads of Bahujans by Brahminic terror. How can we consider Parshuram respectable as an avatar of our god? And how can we consider that part of Mahabharata which tells the story of Parshuram, as our holy book? At least I can not understand this.

### **We will not allow these stigmata of slavery to remain**

I always wonder, how our self-respect is not hurt, when we put our heads on the feet of the very same people who made such extremely dirty and insulting rules about our society and specially our women. I am not writing this to create fire of hate and revenge against somebody. For those, who accuse me of such things, I humbly wish to tell them that, had I wished so, I would have explained in entirely different style. I wish to say that, I have dealt very mildly with these Brahminic rules which are heart rending for us. But

one thing is certain. Though we are not going to do anything with a hot head, but we will not stop the war against our cultural freedom under any circumstances. Now, we will not allow these stigmata of slavery on our self-respect to remain.

---

### **3. IF YOU CONSIDER YOURSELVES TO BE KSHATRIYAS, READ THIS AND DECIDE PROPERLY**

#### **Prohibited to think**

The scriptures have written a lot more about the Kshatriyas. As a sample, I quote a few examples. The Shatpath Brahmana says,

“Brahmin thinks and a Kshatriya (accordingly) acts. ... There is no harm if a Brahmin has no king or a Kshatriya. Of course, if he gets a king, he would be benefited. But it is harmful for a Kshatriya to remain without a Brahmin. Whatever a Kshatriya does without an order from a Brahmin friend, it will be unsuccessful. Therefore, a Kshatriya wishing to do anything must first go to a Brahmin. This is because the work done by him according to the orders of Brahmin, will only be successful.”

This book has given an indication to Kshatriyas that a Kshatriya should not bother to think. Do not use your intellect independently. Do not decide yourselves, who your friends are and who your enemies are. Do not decide the nature of your own religion. In short, the book enjoins the Kshatriyas to believe entirely in the Brahmins. To ask any society to let its intellect rust is it not a method making it a slave?

#### **Kshatriya as a Guru**

This also explains, why a Kshatriya is not given a right to become a guru, a preceptor. A guru gives direction to the thoughts of his disciples. Guru impresses upon the minds of his disciples what should be worshipped and what should be despised. In short, he moulds up the entire set up of the disciple's mind. The Brahmins kept to themselves the monopoly to become a guru, just to turn the minds of Bahujan samaj favorable to the vested interest of Brahmins. It was enjoined by a rule that, if a Brahmin does not get a Brahmin guru and under compulsion has to make a non-Brahmin his guru, it is enjoined, he should not serve him like a Brahmin guru. Not only this, but after the end of learning, the Brahmin disciple becomes the guru of his Kshatriya guru. This was the rule.

#### **Kshatriya as a ruler**

Brahmins have never accepted the Kshatriya kings as their real rulers. Their stand was that their real king was Soma — a Brahmin '*ritviz*' having the authority to drink soma. The Kshatriya kings were denied the right to drink soma. The Brahmins have become successful in making the Kshatriya kings drink the juice of roots of *pipal* and Bunyan tree. They made laws that the reign of Kshatriya kings extends to all except the Brahmins. They also made laws that kings should not take any taxes from Brahmins. A street belongs to king, but only till such time that a Brahmin does not come to that street. This law is self explanatory.

#### **Discriminatory Laws**

In the eyes of a Brahmin, a non-Brahmin can not be '*atithee*' — a guest. The scriptures enjoin that, if a Kshatriya is at all invited to a *yajnya*, he should be given food after all the Brahmins have eaten. It was a law that, a Brahmin can not be brought before the court of law as a witness on the statement of a non-brahmin. Only the non-brahmins should be made to take an oath in court to speak truth, Brahmins should not be made to take such an oath, says the religion. Innumerable such examples of laws discriminating in favor of Brahmins could be quoted, such as: While saluting, only the non-brahmin should bend. A ten year old Brahmin, is like a father to a hundred year old Kshatriya. Brahmin should not touch the feet of a non-brahmin. Only the non-brahmins be given death sentence for killing a Brahmin, etc. Have Brahmins cut down the sensations of Bahujans?

My simple question is: the books that contain such laws, could they be sacred to us? That time, we were prohibited to think so should we continue to tread the same path of not thinking? If we deny these books which are insulting us, is the god going to be angry on us? Is our religion going to be drowned if we protect our self-respect? And suppose the religion that is anathema to our dignity is drowned, is the heaven goings

to fall over us? Are we not going to use any of our power to decide as to how we should lead our lives? Have the Brahmins cut down all our sensations in our existence to feel our dishonor, with the weapon of religion?

#### **4. SHOULD WE PRESERVE THE RELIGION DENYING CORONATION TO CHATRAPATI SHIVAJI MAHARAJ?**

##### **Kshatriyas made Shudras in Kali age**

There is no limit to the number of honest and virtuous people tortured by this religion. Brahmins oppressed all those Bahujan loving kings who tried to deny the Brahminic social order, right from Vena, Nimi, Nahusha to Rajarshi Shahu. I am going to write a separate book on this topic, if time permits. Here, I am discussing some examples of selected individuals. These are known to many, but it is essential to explain the religious background. Specially we have to see some of the cases where Brahmins have insulted the Kshatriyas in ancient times and also in Kali age how the Kshatriyas were considered as Shudras and were deprived of various rights and further degraded.

Great personality Olike Saint Namdeva was driven out of a temple while narrating a '*kirtana*'—an exposition—because of his Shudra caste. About such a personality who had attained full maturity in the field of noble life values, they propagated false stories declaring him as 'raw earthen pot'. They tortured the young Dnyaneshwara brothers to extreme. They drowned the books of poetry of great souls like Saint Tukarama. Because of Shudra caste, he was denied the authority to write about religion, it was declared that he had no right to express his opinions, and was tortured to extreme.

Chatrapati Shivaji was such a towering personality. Being brave, accomplished, courageous, full of good qualities, meritorious, judicious, Shivaji was such a great soul that, all the adjectives in any language would fall short to describe him. He created a universe from zero. He hazarded his life in peril to protect that religion, and the leaders of the very same religion denied him the right of coronation because of Shudra caste. They declared that he had no right to the Vedic '*mantras*'. Not one single Vedic priest came forward to coronet him. But the Brahmins tried their level best to swallow the kingdom created by him with great danger to his life. They declared his son Sambhaji as promiscuous, with that intention. They plotted to imprison him and hand him over to the Moguls. They denigrated him by the false propaganda.

Later, when they saw Rajarshi Shahu trying his best to liberate the Bahujans, they got so aggrieved that they heaped extreme mental torture on him.

##### **Should we be proud of our own dishonor?**

I am extremely agonised to see that even after being surrounded by such extremely cruel and wily circumstances, the Bahujan-samaj is not showing any courage to try and face the natural inferences arising out of this situation. If we have got great respect for Saint Tukarama, it is beyond my understanding, how can all these Brahminic religious books responsible for drowning his poetry, be our own?

Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj has done such a great epoch making work, that every one of us should bow his head again and again. Then, I also do not understand, how that religion can be ours, the very leaders of which, opposed the crowning of Shivaji. If Maharaj was a Hindu, and if the Vedas are the holy books of the Hindus, the people saying that Shivaji has no right to hear the vedic mantras of the very same religion, is it not a form of slavery to think that they are our brethren-in-religion?

Under these circumstances, I think, we should throw away these cobwebs of slavery from our minds. This is not a game of sentimental appeal or an attempt to arouse emotions. If we continue to worship those who dishonoured our sources of inspiration, we will never come out of our dreadful mean lowly helpless and ignoble condition.

##### **What should we be proud of?**

Today, our young boys are taught to say, '*garv se kaho ham hindu hai*' (say proudly - we are hindus). We are Hindus, what does it exactly mean? Who are we? What has the 'hindutva' given to our share? Which numbered grade of Hindus, are we? Was Dnyaneshwara not a Hindu? Then why he and his brothers were tortured? Were the torturers some Hindu hater non-Hindus? Or were they the Brahmins in the disguise of Hindus? The temple where Saint Namdeva was expounding a '*kirtana*', was it not a Hindu temple? And who were those who drove him away? What are all those things about which we should be proud of? Should we be proud of those Hindu religious books, on the strength of which poetry of Tukarama

was drowned or on the strength of which the coronation of Shivaji was opposed? Those of us, who wish to lead a life of like a human being and maintain their own self-respect, should think calmly about all these matters.

---

## **5. REMAIN SLAVE OR BECOME INDEPENDENT?**

### **Social and Cultural Life of Non-brahmins**

The religious and cultural life given to the non-brahmins by the Brahmins has made the former a secondary follower of this religion. Those of non-brahmins having first grade and at times much higher merit than Brahmins are also treated as lower than an average Brahmin. The prestige and opportunity a Brahmin of ordinary caliber gets without any efforts, is not available, even after a great struggle for life time, to the most meritorious non-brahmin. The numerous cruel and insulting laws made by Brahmins in their religious books are hurting the hearts of non-brahmins. They create the feelings of self pity among them. In short, the Brahmins have erected a machinery, by the laws in their religious books, to make them slaves and keep them slaves. The Brahmins have written millions of venomous statements about the non-brahmins. If even one statement of that kind is uttered by the non-brahmins about brahmins, the latter will go mad, get highly aggrieved and shower millions of stings. It would be too difficult for them to tolerate this insult. Why then should the non-brahmins tolerate such insults of Brahmins? Why should they lead their lives as slaves of Brahmins even though they are fully capable of leading their lives respectfully. The Brahmins have tried their best, throughout the span of history, to make non-brahmins their slaves. Now the non-brahmins have two different and clear alternatives—whether to live as helpless slaves of Brahmins or to lead a life of self respect as a free human being. If the Brahmins wish to make non-brahmin their slaves and use their religion as their weapon for this purpose, how can the religion of the non-brahmins, the slaves and the religion of the Brahmins, those who want to make them slaves, be the same?

Since times immemorial, numerous men and women tried their best to change the Brahminic social order of Brahmin supremacy and bring in a healthy order based on equality, by appealing to the reason of Brahmins. But the tragedy of cultural life in this country is that, Brahmins paid no heed to these appeals.

### **They can not see wounds on our heart**

I, myself, have through all my writings and speeches, appealed earnestly to the conscience of the Brahmins. But all my mild appeals brought me their hate and despise. They tried to malign me as hater and a castiest. They did not bother to understand, with a few exceptions, what my aim is and what I am trying to say. Even those so-called progressive Brahmins could not see the wounds on my heart. And these wounds on my heart are not wounds on my heart alone but are the wounds on the hearts of whole of the Bahujan Samaj.

### **This is their ‘All India’-ness**

An example will clarify my point. On 18<sup>th</sup> January 2002, an All India Marathi Literary Conference was organized in Pune. The photos of inauguration ceremony were published on 19<sup>th</sup> January. One caption said: the conference was inaugurated by Shiv shahir Babasahib Purandare, Present on the occasion (from left) are Chairman of Welcome Committee Dnyaneshawr Aagashe, Treasurer D.S.Kulkarni, shri Purandare, Working president Mukund Anagal, outgoing president Dr. Vijaya Rajadhaksha, president designate Rajendra Banhatti, chief secretary of welcome committee Mohan Date, and the president of all India sahitya mahamandal Dr. G. N. Joglekar.

### **Appeal to change the core of Literary meets**

After reading this news, I commented on it in my speeches in Hingoli and Amaravati. I appealed saying,

“See the surnames of those present on the dais of this conference. It will clarify whether the Conference is ‘All India’ or not. Just the name “All India” would not do, but, that the core content of the Conference must be changed.”

### **He broke 45 years of friendship for ‘brahmanya’**

An example of the responses I got to this appeal was a phone call from a Brahmin friend having friendly relations with me for 40 - 45 years. He said, ‘Anna, you always said that your war is not against any caste but against the tendency. Then why did you mention the caste of those present in conference? Are you not, thereby, increasing divisions in the society? I was pained and also surprised by his talk. For the sake of improper support to Brahminism, he broke the friendship of 45 years.

He did not see the increase of divisions of the society in not taking a single representative, even for name’s sake, from 95 per cent of population, and give opportunity to only 5 five percent, and had the audacity to pretend they represent whole of India by calling such a conference ‘all India’. I, who said such a conference is not all-compassive, in his eyes, was considered as an agent of the divisive forces. Personally, I have no grudge against these eight persons. I do not deny their right to attend the conference. I only wish to say that, the base of such ceremonies must be socially wide. But this small expectation of mine was considered as treason against society, and their action was mark of high culture. It clarifies the great and cruel duplicity in the social structure of this country. My question is: why should we be the victims of this duplicity.

### **This is not an exceptional episode**

This conference is not a lone exceptional example in the cultural history of India. This is only a representative form of the discriminatory and unjust laws on the pages after pages of the Brahminic religious books. We are considered as gentle religious and pious if we meekly admit the system of slavery imposed on us by Brahmins. We get some little recognitions as a piece of the thrown away crumbs. If we accept what the Brahmins say, then we get some little prestige. The only remedy is to play their tune. We have to consider their dignitaries as heroes, even if they are our enemies. We have to consider their hate objects as our hate objects even though they may be our well wishers. This is the only way open to us. If we do not follow this path and use our brain to ask them some polite questions, use our intellect to express some doubts, we are labeled as betrayer of religion and traitors of nation. We get some small place in this system, only if we ourselves destroy the buds of our own spouting excellence. About the episode on the dais of Pune conference of all the dignitaries being from one single Brahmin caste, let somebody impartially say:, is the instance more castiest and denoting divisive tendencies or my comments on it are more castiest and divisive. It is needless to say, the Brahminic social order has already declared me castiest.

## **6. ONE THING IS CERTAIN: THIS IS NOT OUR RELIGION**

### **Vast number of masses are getting choked**

I am not alone, who is suffocated in this Brahminic social order, but a vast population is suffering. They are kicking us and not allow us to even groan. The mind of masses is anxious to fly in the sky but the fetters of religion bind his feet. He is dreaming of life of self respect, but a wily religion has fettered him in shackles of slavery. Well now, if the life is suffocating in this slavery, one must search for a way to be from it. I see three possible ways.

### **The appeal to Brahmins rationality is not possible**

The first way would be that, the Brahmins themselves should renounce their special privileges and adopt a new religious order based on equality. The important aspect of this would be to review the old religious books and while accepting what is good, discard everything that is evil. During this process, not only the gist but also the names of these scriptures will have to be changed. In short, these books will be required to be made all-compassive, respectful to all and giving equal opportunities to all. Or rather, new religious books will have to be written replacing the old ones. This is the best way of creating utmost unity among the Indian masses. But the Brahmins are least likely to adopt this method. All the appeals made to their conscience, during last three four millennia, have all gone vain. If the situation is adverse, they will, for a time being, regress a few steps, wait for suitable opportunity and will again try their best to strengthen their grip on the masses. There can be no doubt about this. Thus, this way is useless for the Bahujans to liberate themselves from the Brahminic slavery.

### **Brahmins will not leave the garb of Hindutva**

The second way of liberating themselves from the Brahminic slavery for Bahujans is to drive them away from Hindu religion. Their religion is “Vedic Brahminism”. They are free to lead their own lives the

way they want. They should not call themselves as Hindus. That's all. But there are difficulties in accepting this path too. Firstly, if Vedic Brahmins separate themselves with their scriptures etc., others will have to create new scriptures to fill the gap in religious books and ceremonials etc. Of course, in the third option also this will have to be done. Secondly, the media of propaganda being in the hands of Brahmins, they will not loosen their customary grip on the word 'Hindu'. Not that they have love for this word. They do not see their identity in *hindutva*, but in '*brahmanya*' only. In spite of this they will have to create an illusion of broad based all-compassiveness, to have dominance over the Bahujan masses here. For this purpose, the mask of *Hindutva* is essential. Naturally, to religiously separate from them, the way of declaring them as non-hindus, though not impossible, is indeed very difficult. It is so difficult that it is more or less impossible.

### **One thing is certain: This religion is not ours**

The third way out of this situation is to declare that our religion is different from Vedic Brahminism. The religion which dishonours us, deprives us from all opportunities, which keeps us in darkness, and in short makes us a slave, how can that religion be ours?

That way, the Indian society has now become racially, unified to a large extent. As projected by Rabindranath Tagore in his poem '*Hethay Arya, hetha anarya*', all the streams of Aryans and Non-Aryans etc. exist in our blood now. Therefore, I consider even Brahmins to be genetically our brethren in flesh and blood. But what is the use of me, or people like me, unilaterally saying so? We declare the near and dear relationship with them and either they discard us or take us near to make use of us for their vested interests. This can not be the method of religious unity.

Whose religion can be the same? The religion of only those is same who have love, concern, attachment and affinity among themselves. Those, whose idols and ideals are same and the subject matters of pride are same, they only can be of the same religion. They only can be of the same religions, whose life values are same and who have equal rights in religious matters.

It can be proved by thousand and one ways that the religion of Brahmins and non-brahmins can not be the same if we apply various such criteria. The religion of the class which is exploiting on the basis of religion and the religion of the class which is victim of this exploitation, also on the basis of religion, can not be the same. To consider these religions to be same means legitimizing the exploitation. The advantages are in the side of exploiters and therefore, it is clear that, they will try their best to maintain the state of exploitation. But when the victims of the system try to maintain on their own lives the continuance of the system of their own exploitation, what else can one call it, other than slavery?

We welcome those who wish to argue against the inference that, the religion of Brahmins and religion of the Bahujans are not same. If somebody puts forward the serious moral grounds to prove that the religions of both are the same, we will definitely consider these arguments. But we will not waste our time in lingering discussions over the shallow, arrogant and senseless arguments in support of the system of exploitation. Whatever it may be, in the present circumstances, one thing is dead certain, that the religion of Brahmins can not be our own religion. And we are, therefore, declaring undoubtedly that it is not our religion.

### **The reasons of denying Brahminism**

The reasons behind our declaration are already clear but again as a summery, I mention them below:

- 1 This religion is not created by us. It has not voluntarily sprung up from amongst us. We have not accepted it ourselves of our free will. It has been thrust upon us from outside.
- 2. We have no authority to frame its rules or to change them as need arises. We have no freedom to analyze it.
- 3. It does not think of our welfare or wellbeing. But it is tyrannical to us. It erodes away the feeling of humanity from within us.
- 4. It compels us to commemorate the moments of our defeats as our festivals and celebrations.
- 5. It impresses on our minds the "sanskaras" of self-indignity such that we should denounce our own forefathers and worship the immoral forefathers of Brahmins.
- 6. It distorts the History.
- 7. It does not believe that all people in our own religion are equal as human beings.
- 8. It deprives us from all proper opportunities of development.

- 9. It has tortured all those who have tried for our cultural freedom. And this tendency has not changed even now.
- 10. In this religion, there are no 'sanskaras' to give proper respect to women.

Many more reasons could be narrated but as guide lines, these would be enough. From all these reasons, **I declare my verdict again that, ONE THING IS CERTAIN: THIS IS NOT OUR RELIGION.**