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PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

We consider ourselves fortunate in being able to present this publication to the reading-world. We are sure that the forcible style, the convincing arguments, the passionate pleading, and the able survey will attract the attention of even those that hold different views from the author of this work, and will pause to reconsider their decisions after its perusal.

Nothing is needed to introduce the reader to the subject as the author himself will do it, so beautifully that, we do not want to stand between the reader and the author any longer by thrusting an introduction where none is required. We have just taken the reader to the gate from where no formal permission or introduction is required. He has merely to turn over this and at once be conversant with the author himself.

PUBLISHER.
ESSENTIALS OF HINDUTVA.

I

We hope that the fair Maid of Verona who made the impassioned appeal to her lover to change "A name" that was "nor hand, nor foot, nor arm, nor face, nor any other part belonging to a man" would forgive us for this our idolatrous attachment to it when we make bold to assert that, "Hindus we are and love to remain so!" We too would, had we been in the position of that good Friar, have advised her youthful lover to yield to the pleasing pressure of the logic which so fondly urged "What's in a name? That which we call a rose would smell as sweet by any other name!" For, things do matter more than their names, especially when you have to choose one only of the two, or when the association between them is either new or simple. The very fact that a thing is indicated by a dozen names in a dozen human tongues disarms the suspicion that there is an invariable connection or natural concomitance between sound and the meaning it conveys. Yet, as the association of the word with the thing it signifies grows stronger and lasts long, so does the
channel which connects the two states of consciousness tend
to allow an easy flow of thought from one to another, till at
last it seems almost impossible to separate them. And when
in addition to this, a number of secondary thoughts or feelings
that are generally roused by the thing get mysteriously entwined
with the word that signifies it, the name seems to matter as
much as the thing itself. Would the fair Apostle of the creed
that so movingly questioned "What's in a name?" have
liked it herself to nickname the God of her idolatry as
"Paris" instead of "Romeo"? or would he have been
ready to swear by the moon that tipped with silver all the
fruit tree tops, that it would serve as sweet and musical to
his heart to call his "Juliet" by 'any other name' such as
for example--"Rosaline"? Nay more; there are words which
simply an idea in itself extremely complex or an ideal or a
vast and abstract generalization which seem to take, as it
were, a being unto themselves or live and grow as an organ-
ism would do. Such names though they be nor hand, nor
foot, nor any other part belonging to a man, are not all
that, precisely because they are the very soul of man. They
become the idea itself and live longer than generations of
men do. Jesus died but Christ has survived the Roman
Emperors and that Empire. Inscribe at the foot of one of
those beautiful paintings of 'Madonna', the name of 'Fatima'
and a Spaniard would keep gazing at it as curiously as at
any other piece of art; but just restore the name of 'Madona'
instead, and behold his knees would lose their stiffness and
bend, his eyes their inquisitiveness and turn inwards in ador-
recognition, and his whole being get suffused with a conscious-
ness of the presence of Divine Motherhood and Love! What
is in a name? Ah! call Ayodhya—Honolulu, or nickname
her immortal Prince—a Pooh bal, or ask the Americans to
change Washington into a Chengizkhan, or persuade a Moho-
median to call himself a Jew, and you would soon find that
the "open sesame" was not the only word of its type!

To this category of names which have been to mankind
subtle source of life and inspiration belongs the word
Hindutva, the essential nature and significance of which we
mean to investigate into. The ideas and ideals, the systems and
societies, the thoughts and sentiments which have centered
round this name are so varied and rich, so powerful and so
subtle, so elusive and yet so vivid, that the term Hindutva
defies all attempts at analysis. Forty centuries, if not more,
had been at work to mould it as it is. Prophets and poets,
lawyers and lawgivers, heroes and historians, have thought,
lived, fought and died just to have it spelled thus! For in-
deed, is it not the resultant of countless actions—now
conflicting, now commingling, now co-operating—of our whole
race? Hindutva is not a word but a history. Not only the
spiritual or religious history of our people as at times it is
mistaken to be by being confounded with the other cognate
term Hinduism, but a history in full. Hinduism is only a
derivative, a fraction, a part of Hindutva. Unless it is made
clear what is meant by the latter, the first remains unintelli-
gible and vague. Failure to distinguish between these two
terms has given rise to much misunderstanding and mutual
suspicion between some of those sister communities that have inherited this inestimable and common treasure of our Hindu civilization. What is the fundamental difference in the meaning of these two words would be clear as our argument proceeds. Here it is enough to point out that Hindutva is not identical with what is vaguely indicated by the term Hinduism. By an ‘ism’ is generally meant a theory or a code more or less based on spiritual or religious dogma or system. But when we attempt to investigate into the essential significance of Hindutva we do not primarily—and certainly not mainly—concern ourselves with any particular theocratic or religious dogma or creed. Had not linguistic usage stood in our way then “Hinduness” would have certainly been a better word than Hinduism as a near parallel to Hindutva. Hindutva embraces all the departments of thought and activity of the whole Being of our Hindu race. Therefore, to understand the significance of this term Hindutva, we must first understand the essential meaning of the word Hindu itself and realize how it came to exercise such imperial sway over the hearts of millions over millions of mankind and won a loving allegiance from the bravest and best of them. But before we can do that, it is imperative to point out that we are by no means attempting a definition or even a description of the more limited, less satisfactory and essentially sectarian term Hinduism. How far we can succeed or are justified in doing that would appear as we proceed.

Although it would be hazardous at the present stage of oriental research to state definitely the period when the foremost band of the intrepid Aryans made it their home and lighted their first sacrificial fire on the banks of the Sindhu, the Indus, yet certain it is that long before the ancient Egyptians, and Babylonians had built their magnificent civilization, the holy waters of the Indus were daily witnessing the incit and curling columns of the scented sacrificial smokes and the valleys resounding the chants of Vedic hymns—the spiritual fervor that animated their souls. The adventurous valour that propelled their intrepid enterprise, the sublime heights to which their thoughts rose—all these had marked them out as a people destined to lay the foundation of a great and enduring civilization. By the time they had definitely cut themselves aloof from their cognate and neighbouring people, especially the Persians, the Aryans had spread out to the furthest of the seven rivers—“the यमोः”—and not only had they developed a sense of nationality but had already succeeded in giving it ‘a local habitation and a name!’ Out of their gratitude to the genial and perennial network of waterways that ran through the land like a system of nerve-threads and wove them into a Being, they very naturally took to themselves the name of “सरसोऽहि” an epithet that was applied to the whole of Vedic India in the oldest records of the world—the Rigveda itself. Aryans or the cultivators as they essentially were, we can well
understand the divine love and homage they bore to these seven rivers presided over by 'the River'—the Sindhu,' which to them were but a visible symbol of the common nationality and culture;—

**The Indians in their forward march had yet to meet many a river as genial and as fertilizing as these but, never could they forget the attachment they felt and the homage they paid to the Saktis, which had welded them into a nation and furnished the name which enabled their forefathers to voice forth their sense of national and cultural unity. Down to this day a सिंध्या—a हिंदु—wherever he may happen to be, will gratefully remember and symbolically invoke the presence of these rivers that they may refresh and purify his soul. इस से गो बसने सरस्वती शृङ्गिदारूः संचलता पश्चिम्या । अस्तित्वान्निमित्वे बिततसर्वावशीकृतं गुणम् सूक्ष्मम् ॥ गंगा जय सूर्यादिकार सरस्वती ॥ नामदेव सिंध्या काविर्ति गोत्रिमान सार्वभूत ॥

Not only had these people been known to themselves as "Sindhus" but we have definite records to show that they were known to their surrounding nations—at any rate to one of them—by that very name—'सिंधिशु।' The syllable स (s) in Sanskrit is at times changed into श् (ś) in some of the Prakrit languages, both Indian and non-Indian. For example the word सस्त्र becomes शस्त्र not only in Indian Prakrits but also in the European languages too; we have इसम् इ. e., a week, in India and 'Heptarchy' in Europe. केर्सेर in Sanskrit becomes केर्सेर in old Hindi. सस्त्री बने बन बजरंगी in Persian and अश्वर बने अमर. अन

then we actually find that the Vedic name of our nation भारतीय had been mentioned as इसहिंदु in the Avesta by the ancient Persian people. Thus in the very dawn of history we find ourselves belonging to the nation of the सिंधु or Hindus and this fact was well known to our learned men even in the Puranic period. In expounding the doctrine that many of the भारतीय tongues had been but the mere offshoots of the Sanskrit language the भारतराजुरुणार्यa clearly cites this fact and says—संस्कृतशब्द भारत उ भारत सर्वसमानधाताम्। असस्त्रों गता शृङ्गे शुभाहराहांनिदिनंथवन्। पिता पैतृ ज्ञान गदार: पतितेन।

स्वरूपिनि भारतिः भारतस्यालसाहं ॥।

Thus knowing for certain that the Persians used to designate the Vedic Aryans as Hindus and knowing also the fact that we generally call a foreign and unknown people by the term by which they are known to those through whom we come to know them, we can safely conclude that most of the remoter nations that flourished then must have applied the same epithet Hindu to our land and people as the ancient Persians did. Not only that, but even in the very region of the सततिदधु the thinly scattered native tribes too, must have been knowing the Aryans as हिंदु� in the local dialects in accordance with the same linguistic law. Further on, as the Vedic Sanskrit began to give birth to the Indian Prakrits which became the spoken tongues of the majority of the descendants of these very हिंदु� as well as the assimilated and the cross-born castes, these too might have called themselves as Hindus without any influence from the foreign people. For,
the Sanskrit श changes into श as often in Indian Prakrits as it does in the non-Indian ones. Therefore so far as definite records are concerned it is indisputably clear that the first and almost the only cradle name chosen by the Patriarchs of our race to designate our nation and our people is समाजिकु त त त त त. And that almost all nations of the then known world seemed to have known us by this very epithet श्व or श्व.

So far we have not being treading on solid ground of recorded facts but now we cannot refrain ourselves from making an occasional excursion into the borderland of conjecture. So far we have not pinned our faith to any theory about the original home of the Aryans. But if the most widely accepted theory of their entrance into India be relied on then a natural curiosity arises as to the origin of the names by which they called the new scenes of their adopted home. Did they coin all those names from their own tongue? Could they have done so? Is it not generally true that when we meet a new scene or enter a new country we call them by the very names—may be in a slightly changed form so as to suit our vocal ability or taste—by which they are known to the native people there? Of course, at times we love to call new scenes by names redolent with the memory of the clear old ones—especially when new colonies are being established in a virgin and but thinly populated continent. But this explanation could only be satisfactory when it is proved that the name given to the new place already existed in the old country and even then it could not be denied that the other process of calling new scenes by the names which they already bear is more universally followed. Now we know it for certain that the region of the समाजिकु त त त त was, though very thinly, populated by scattered tribes. Some of them seem to have been friendly towards the new-comers and it is almost certain that many an individual had served the Aryans as guides and introduced them to the names and nature of the new scenes to which the Aryans could not be but local strangers.

The "विकारणाचार्य्य सर्वत्रोपायातम्यात ज्ञातारः" were not all or altogether numerical to the Aryans as, at times they are mentioned as being benevolent and good natured folks. Thus it is probable that many names given to these great rivers by the original inhabitants of the soil may have been sanskritised and adopted by the Aryans. We have numerous proofs of this nature in later assimilative expansion of those people & their tongues: witness the words शालाकटवर, मलय, आर्किंच, अल्कूस (Alexandria) शल्व (Seleucus) etc. If this be true then it is quite probable that the great Indus was known as श्व to the original inhabitants of our land and owing to their peculiarities of the Aryans it got changed into श्व when they adopted it by the operation of the same rule that श is at times the Sanskritised equivalent of श. Thus श्व would be the name that this land and the people that inhabited it bore from time so immemorial that even the Vedic name श्व is but a later and secondary form of it. If the epithet श्व dates its antiquity in the glimmering twilight of History then the word श्व dates its antiquity from a period so remoter than the first that even mythology fails to penetrate to—trace it to its source.
The activities of so intrepid a people as the विरङ्क or Hindoos could no longer be kept cooped or cabin'd within the narrow compass of the पंजाब, or the Punjab. The vast and fertile plains further stood out inviting the efforts of some strong and vigorous race. Tribe after tribe of the Hindus issued forth from the land of their Nursery and led by the consciousness of a great mission and their Sacrificial Fire that was symbol thereof, they soon reclaimed the vast, wasted and backwardly very thinly populated lands. Forests were felled, agricultural flourish'd, cities rose, kingdoms thrived,—the touch of human hand changed the whole face of the wild and unkempt nature. But while these great deeds were being achieved the Aryans had developed to suit their individualistic tendencies and the demands of their new environments a polity that was both loosely centralised. As time passed on, the distances of the new colonies increased, and different peoples of other highly developed types began to be incorporated into the culture, the different settlements began to lead a life politically very much centred in themselves. The new attachments formed, though they could not efface the old ones, yet grew more and more pronounced and powerful until the ancient generalizations and names gave way to the new. Some called themselves कुष्ठा or कार्सित or विद्रह or सप्तपुर, while the old generic name of the Sindhus or Hindus was first overshadowed and then almost forgotten. Not that the conception of a national and cultural unity vanished, but it assumed other names and other forms, the politically most important of them being the institution of a नागार्गार्जश.
not serve as a common name to a people that had welded Aryans and Non-Aryans into a common race and had carried their culture—empire—far beyond the bending summits of Vindhyanadri. This necessity of finding a suitable term to express the expansive thought of an Indian Nation was met or less effectively met when the house of Bharat came to exercise its sway over the entire world. Without entering into speculations as to who this Bharat was—the Vedic Bharat or the Jain one—or what was the exact period of which he ruled, it is here enough for us to know that his name has been not only the accepted but the cherished epithet by which the people of भारतवर्ष and राष्ट्रीय आधीनता delighted to call their common motherland and their common cultural empire. Thus as the horizon opened out to the South we find that the centre of gravity had very naturally shifted from the सस्तानिहृतो to the Gangetic Delta and the name बस्तानिहृतो और राष्ट्रीय आधीनता of राष्ट्रीय आधीनता gave way to the politically grander expression भारतवर्ष which included in its sweep all that lay between the Himalayas and the Seas. This is most clearly indicated by the definition of our Nation attempted at a period when the vast conception must have been dawning over the minds of our great thinkers. We have met with no better attempt to define our position as a people than the terse little couplet in the विभाषण “उत्तरार्थसत्तमां हिमालिकृत दक्षिणां। वर्ष तद्भवं नाम भारतीय यथा संतति।”

But this new word भारतवर्ष could not altogether suppress our cradle name सिन्धु or हिंदू nor could it make us forget the love we bore to that River of rivers—the सिन्धु at whose breast our patriarchs and people had drunk the milk of life. Our frontier provinces which bordered the course of Indus still clung to their ancient name सिन्धु. And throughout the Sanskrit literature we find सिन्धुवार्ण as an integral and an important part of our body politic. In the great Mahabharat war the king of सिन्धुवार्ण figures prominently and is said to have been closely related to the Bharats. Although the limits of the सिन्धु shifted from time to time, yet the language that the people speak—did it then and does even now mark them out as a people by themselves—from Multan to the sea, and the name ‘सिन्धी’ which it bears is an emphatic reminder that all those who speak it are सिन्धु and are entitled to be recognised as a geographical and political unit in the common-wealth of our Indian people. Although the epithet भारतवर्ष succeeded in almost overshadowing the cradle name of our nation in India, yet the foreign nations seem to have cared little for it and as our frontier provinces continued to be known by their ancient name, so even our immediate neighbours—the Avestic Persians, the Jews, the Greeks and others clung to our ancient name सिन्धु or Hindus. They did not merely indicate the borderland of Indus by this term as in days gone by, but the whole nation into which the ancient सिन्धु by expansion and assimilation had grown. The Avestic Persians know us as Hindus, the Greeks dropping the harsh accent as Indos and through the Greeks almost all Europe and later on America as हिंदू or Indians. Even Huent Sung who lived so long with us persists in calling us हिंदू or हिंदुs. Barring
a few examples as that of Afganistan being called as भारत by the Parthians, very rarely indeed had the foreigners forgotten our cradle name or preferred the new one भारत to it. Down to this day the whole world knows us as “Hindus” and our land as “Hindusthan” as if in fulfilment of the wish of our Vedic fathers who were first to make that choice.

But a name by its nature is determined not so much by what one likes to call oneself but generally by what others like to do. In fact a name is called into existence for the very purpose. Self is known to itself immutably and without a name or even without a form. But when it comes in contact or conflict with a non-self then alone it stands in need of a name if it wants to communicate with others or if others persist in communicating with it. It is a game that requires two to play at. If the world insists that a teacher or a wit must be handed down as an ‘अचारक’ or a ‘मुख दोष्पुकार’ well then he, in spite of his liking, is very likely to be remembered as such.

If the name chosen by the world for us is not directly against our liking then it is yet more likely to shadow all other names we might bear witness ‘पाग’, ‘गुंडामदार’, ‘पेशवे’. But if the world hits upon a word by which they would know us as one redolent of our glory or our early love then that word is certain not only to shadow but to survive every other name we may have. This fact added to the circumstances which brought us first into close contact and then into a fierce conflict with the world at large, soon enabled the epithet Hindu to assert itself once more and so vigorously as to push into the background even the well beloved name of भारतवर्ष itself.

Although Indians were by no means cut off from the outside world before the rise of Buddhism and although their world activities had already assumed such dimensions as to give a just occasion to our patriotic poet law-givers to claim “एवं एवं महत्तम सकाळादेशमां:। एवं स्यं च चरित्रं विक्रेस्नां चुरिस्यं सर्वदेशाभावं।” (भद्र) yet as far as the present argument is concerned, the international life of India, after the rise of Buddhism, requires chiefly to be considered. Because it was about this time when political enterprise having exposed or exhausted all possibilities of expansion in our own land naturally began to overflow its limits to an extent unforeseen before and the communications with the outside world grew more intense and more extensive than in the days gone by. Not only this but outsiders began to knock at our doors more impudently and even imperatively than they ever had done. In addition to these political developments the great and divine mission that set in motion “the wheel of the law of Righteousness” made India the very heart—the very soul—of almost all the then known world. To countless millions of human souls from Misar to Mexico, the land of the Sindhus came to be the land of their Gods and Godmen. Thousands of pilgrims from distant shores poured into this country and thousands of scholars, preachers, sages and saints went from this land to all the then known world. But as the outside world persisted in recognising us by our ancient name “Sindhu” or “Hindu” both these in-coming and outgoing processes
helped mightily to render that epithet to be the most prominent of our national names. The necessity of political and diplomatic correspondence with various states, who knew us as Hindus or Indus, must also have, by making it incumbent on our people to respond to it, revived the use of this epithet side by side with and then at times even instead of the name Bharatkhand.

But if the rise of Buddhism had thus enabled this epithet to grow in prominence throughout the world and made us more and more conscious of ourselves as Hindus, then strange to say the fall of Buddhism only carried this process further than ever.

We fear that the one telling factor that contributed to the fall of Buddhism more than any other has escaped that detailed attention of scholars which it deserves. But as the subject in hand does but remotely involve its treatment here we cannot treat it here in full. All that we can do here is to make a few general remarks and leave them to be expounded and detailed out to a more favourable occasion if the work be not done by others better fitted to do it. Can it be that philosophical differences alone could have made our nation turn against Buddhism? Not wholly:—for these differences had been there all along and even flourished side by side with each other. Can it be the generalinanition and demoralization of the Buddhistic church itself? Not wholly:—for, if some of the Vihars sheltered a loose, lazy and promiscuous crowd of men and women who lived on others and spent what was not theirs on disreputable pursuits of life yet, on the other hand the line of those spiritual giants of Arhats and Bhikkus had not altogether ended: nor had such scenes been peculiar to the Buddhistic Vihars alone! All these and many other short-comings would not have attracted such fierce attention and proved fatal to Buddhistic power in India had not the political consequences of the Buddhistic expansion been so disastrous to the national virility and even the national existence of our race. No prelude to a vast tragedy could be more dramatic in its effect in foreshadowing the culminating catastrophe than that incident in the life of the Shaky Sinha when the news of the fate of the little tribal republic of the Shakyas was carried to their former Prince when he was just laying the foundation stone of the Buddhistic church. He had already enrolled the flower of his clan in his Bhikku-sangha and the little Shaky Republic thus deprived of its bravest and best, fell an easy victim to the strong and warlike, in the very life time of the Shaky Sinha. The news when carried to him is said to have left the Enlightened unconcerned. Centuries rolled on: the Prince of the Shakyas had grown into the Prince of Princes—the Lokajit—the great conqueror of worlds. The confines of his little Shaky state expanded and embraced the confines of India; and as if to give a touch of poetical precision and poetical justice, the woeful fate that had overtaken the tribal republic of Kapil-Vastu befell the whole of Bharatvarsha itself and it fell an easy prey to the strong and warlike—not like Shakyas of their own kith and kin but—the Lichis and Huns! Of course the Enlighten
ed would perhaps remain as unaffected as ever even if the news could ever reach him like the first. But the rest of Hindus than could not drink with equanimity this cup of bitterness and political servitude at the hands of those, whose barbarous violence could ill be soothed by the mealy-mouthed formulas of भृद्धि and spiritual brotherhood, and whose steel could ill be blunted by the soft palm leaves and rhymed charms. We do not mean to underrate—much less accuse—the services of the great brotherhood and its Divine Mission. We have only to point out the concomitance that is too glaring to escape the attention of any student of History. We know that it could easily be pressed against this statement that, the greatest and even powerful Indian Kings and Emperors known, belong to the Buddhist period. Yes—but known to whom?—to the Europeans and those of us who have unconsciously imbibed not only their thought, but even their prejudices. There was a time when every school history in India opened from the Mahomedan invasion because the average English writers of that time knew next to nothing of our earlier life. Lately the general knowledge of Europe has extended backwards to the rise of Buddhism and we too are apt to look upon it as the first and even the most glorious epoch of our history. The fact is, it is neither. We yield to none in our love and admiration and respect for the Buddha—the Dharma—the Sangha. They are all ours. Their glories are ours and ours their failures. Great was Asoka the Devapriya, and greater were the achievements of Buddhistic Bhikshus. But achieve-
altar of काली — "the Terrible", so that महाकाल — the "Spirit of the Times" be appeased. Nor were their anticipations belied. The success of the renovated Hindu arms was undisputed and indisputable. Vikramaditya who drove the foreigners from the Indian soil and Lalitaditya who caught and chastised them in their very dens from Tartary to Mongolia—were but compliments of each other. Valour had accomplished what formulas had failed to do. One more the people rose to the heights of greatness that shed its lustre on all departments of life. Poetry, art and philosophy, agriculture and commerce, thought and action felt the quickening impulse which consciousness of Independence and strength and Victory alone can radiate. The reaction as usual was complete even to a fault. "Up with the Vedic Dharma!" "Back to the Vedas!"

The national cry grew louder and louder, more and more imperative, because this was essentially a political necessity. Buddhism had made first and yet the greatest attempt to propagate a universal religion. "Go, ye Bhikkus, to all the ten directions of the world and preach the law of Righteousness!" Truly, it was a law of Righteousness—it had no ulterior end in view, no lust for land or lucre; quickening its steps, and grand though its achievements were it could not eradicate the seeds of animal passions nor of political ambitions nor of individual aggrandisement in the minds of all men to such an extent as to make it safe for India to change her Sword for a Rosary. Even then, to set an example, did India declare her will to "take more pleasure in the conquests of peace and righteousness than in the conquests of arms." Nobly she tried: ah! so nobly as to make herself ridiculous in the eyes of Lust and Lucre:—had she not issued Royal edicts to the effect that the very water be strained before it was poured out for horses and elephants to drink, so as to enable the tiny lives in the waters to escape immediate death? and had she not opened corn-throwing centres in the midst of the seas that fish be fed in her oceans, while men had not ceased to feed on fish in other oceans of the world, nor had the very fish ceased to feed on each other! Nobly did she try to kill killing by getting killed—and at last found out that palm leaves at times are too fragile for steel! As long as the whole world was red in tooth and claw and the national and racial distinctions so strong as to make men brutal, so long if India had to live at all a life whether spiritual or political according to the light of her soul, she must not lose the strength born of national and racial cohesion. So the leaders of thought and action grew sick of repeating the murmurs and murmurs of Universal Brotherhood and, bitterly complained—

"ने त्यत देव सहिष्णु अचुराचितता विषयम्। ते बाला मेघाङ्रेय घुनरां 
भराये।। व्यावहारिक ते विवेकादर्शिताः यथाविधिः।। इत्यत् सुधिकृत्यः 
कमालाय पापः। कि कि न कुबेरिः।। मुखाकाशि च मुखाके निहीर्यक्षारस्माम च।।
उच्चाकाष्ठिः च चंद्रपारे विशेषाकाशिः।। (शुक्लाधि)"

And when the barbarian hordes of the Shaks and the Huns—who had ravaged their fair land that had in utter confidence clad herself in a Bhikkus' dree, changed her Sword for Rosary and had taken to the vows of सहिष्णु and non-violence—were
expelled beyond Indus and further, and a strong national state was firmly established, then it was but natural that the leaders of our race should have realized what an immense amount of strength could be derived if but the new national state was backed up by a Church as intensely national.

Moreover every thing that is common in us with our enemies weakens our power of opposing them. The foe that has nothing in common with us is the foe likely to be most bitterly resisted by us, just as a friend that has almost everything in him which we admire and prize in ourselves is likely to be the friend we love most. The necessity of creating a bitter sense of wrong and invoking a power of undying resistance, especially in India that had under the opiates of Universalism and Non-violence lost the faculty even of resisting sin and crime and aggression, could best be accomplished by cutting off even the semblance of a common worship—a common Church, which required her to clasp the hand of those as her co-religionists whose had been the very hand that had strangled her as a nation. What was the use of a universal faith that instead of soothing the ferociousness and brutal egoism of other nations only excited their lust by leaving India defenceless and unsuspecting? No; the only safe guards in future were valour and strength that could only be born of a national self-consciousness. She had poured her life's blood for sophistry that tried to prove otherwise!

The reaction against the universal tendencies of Buddhism only grew more insistent and powerful as the attempt to re-establish the Buddhist power in India began to assume a more threatening attitude. Nationalist tendencies refused to better with our national independence and accept a foreign conquerer as our over-Lord. But if that foreign invader happened to be favourably inclined towards Buddhism, then he was sure to find some secret sympathisers in the Indian Buddhists all over India: even as Catholic Spain could always find some important section in England to sympathise with their efforts to restore a Catholic dynasty in England. Not only this but dark hints abound in our anciest records to show that at times some foreign Buddhistic powers had actually invaded India with an express national and religious aim in view. We cannot treat the history of this period exhaustively here but can only point to the half symbolic and half actual description given in one of our Puranas of the war waged on the अविदेशवर: by the न्यूग्दा (the king of the Huns) and his Buddhistic allies. The record tells us in a mythological strain how a big battle was fought on the banks of the river "हस्षा", how the Buddhistic forces made China the basis of operation "सवन्तसुपागम्य सुदुष्कियुक्तार्चन्.", how they were reinforced by contingents from many Buddhistic nations: स्वामिदेशोद्वभ व्यासमम् व्यास शास्त्र सार्या:। धर्मशास्त्री-वर्ष्ण्युद्धम सर्पदिब्याः॥ and how after a tough fight the Buddhists lost it and paid heavily for their defeat. They had formally to renounce all ulterior national aims against India and give a pledge that they would never again enter India with any political end in view. The Buddhists as individuals had nothing to fear from India—the land of toleration—but they should give up all dreams of endangering the national
life of India and her independentance "सत्यव चोटतुज्यात तोमाः भाषण माधव स्वात्मकः न वा बाप्पमः कदाचिद्गामहते ते। (भविष्यत्युपाय प्रतिसंपिवार्।)

And thus we find that institutions that were the peculiar marks of our nation were revived—वर्णमायमप्रक्षपनः यथा की न वा बाप्पमः न वा बाप्पमः कदाचिद्गामहते। ग्रेहु माधव सम्बन्धानात् त्रिवेदी न वा बाप्पमः। Reaction in favour of this institution grew so strong that our national identity was almost getting identified with it. Witness the definition that tries to draw a line of demarcation between us and foreigners “सत्यव चोटतुज्यात तोमाः भाषण माधव स्वात्मकः न वा बाप्पमः। ते मुनिवर शास्त्रवधान वरशिस्तसि व निषेधातः।” From this it was but a natural step to prohibit our people from visiting shores which were ungenial—in some cases fiercely hostile—to such peculiar institutions as these and where our people could not be expected to receive the protection that would enable them to keep up the spirit and letter of our faith. Reckless as the reaction was, it was perfectly intelligible when viewed politically; for, do we not frequently meet with patriotic thinkers even now in our land who would stand for laws prohibiting our men from emigrating to nations where they are sure to be subjected to national disabilities and dishonours?

Thus it was political and national necessity that was at once the cause and the effect of the decline of Buddhism in India. Buddhism had its geographical centre of gravity nowhere. So it was an imperative need to restore at least the national centre of gravity that India had lost in attempting to get identified with Buddhism. When the nation grewensely self-conscious as an organism would do and was in direct conflict with the non-self, it instinctively turned to draw the line of division and mark well the position it occupied so as to make it clear to themselves where they exactly stood and to the world how they were unmistakably a people by themselves—not only a racial and a national but even a geographical and political unit. On the southern side of our country the natural and strategic limits were already reached, sanctioned and sanctified. The frame-work of the deep and boundless seas in which our southern peninsula is set is almost poetical in its grace and perfection. The अभुरक्षना had pleased the eyes of generations of our poets and patriots. But on the north western sides of our nation the commingling of races was growing rather too unceremonious to be healthy and our frontiers too shifting to be safe. Therefore it would have been a matter of surprise if the intense spirit of self-assertion that had found so benigh an asylum under the patronage of the महानाथ of Ujjain had not made our patriots turn to this pressing necessity of drawing a frontier line for us that would be as vivid as effective. And what could that line be but the vivacious yet powerful stream—the River of rivers—the "मिश्र"? The day on which the patriarchs of our race had crossed that stream they ceased to belong to the people they had definitely left behind and laid the foundation of a new nation—were reborn into a new people that, under the quieting star of new hope and new mission, were destined by assimilation and by
expansion to grow into a race and a new polity that could only be most fittingly and feelingly described as सिख्त or विक्रम.

Nor was this attempt to identify our frontier line with the river Indus an innovation. In fact it was but the natural consequence of the great war-cry of the national revivalists—"Back to the Vedas." The Vedic State based on and backed up by the Vedic Church must be designated by the Vedic name, and—so far as it was then possible—identified with the Vedic lines. And this process of events which the very general trend of history should have enabled us to anticipate seems to have actually gone through. For one of our patriotic पुराणs assures us that शालिनाह, the grandson of the great विक्रमादित्य, after having defeated the second attempt of foreigners to rush in and expelled them beyond the Indus, issued a Royal Decree to the effect that thenceforth the Indus should constitute the line of demarcation between India and other non-Indian nations: “पुराणवाएं तत्र शालिनाहें पुराणवाएं। विक्रमादित्याय शिरसूक्ष्मैः प्रलेखादिकृतेऽविशेषैः। भारतमातृजातिरातिरिवद्विजायां। भारतवर्षमातृजातिरातिरिवद्विजायां। वालिकायोऽक्षरायोजनोऽसुधाम् बालिकायोऽक्षरायोजनोऽसुधाम्। स्वाम्यसेनेत्र तदन्तर्गतस्य स्वाम्यसेनेऽविदं भवेद्।”

The epithet विजयस्य besides being Vedic had also a curious advantage which could only be called lucky and yet is too substantial to be ignored. The word निश्चुत in संस्कृत does not only mean the Indus but also the sea—“समुद्रस्या” which girdles southern peninsula—so that this one word निश्चुत points out almost all the frontiers of our land at a single stroke. Even if we do not accept the tradition that the river निश्चुत is only a branch of the विक्रम which falls in two flowing streams on the eastern and western slopes of the Hiљa.
yas and thus constitutes both our eastern as well as western frontiers, still it is indisputably true that it circumscribes on northern and western extremities in its sweep and so the epithet सिंधुस्थान calls up the image of our whole Motherland—the land that lies between सिंधु and सिंधु—from the Indus to the Seas.

But it must not be supposed that the epithet सिंधु recommended itself to our patriots only because it was geographically best fitted. For, we find emphatically stated that the concept expressed by this word was national and not merely geographical, सिंधुस्थान was not merely a piece of land but it was a राज्य—a nation which was ideally if not always actually a state (राज्य राज्यम्). It also clearly follows that the culture that flourished in सिंधुस्थान and the citizens there-of were सिंधु even as they had been in the Vedic days. सिंधुस्थान was the “राजमयार्य चोलसम्” as distinguished from स्मृतिस्थान the land of the foreigners. However it must be clearly pointed out that the definition is not based on any theological hair splitting or religious fanaticism. The word आये is expressly stated in the very verses to mean all those who had been incorporated as parts integral in the nation and people that flourished on this our side of the Indus whether बैद्य or अबैद्य, श्रावण or चौवंश, and owned and claimed to have inherited a common culture, common blood, common country and common polity; while स्मृतिस्थान also by the very fact of its being put in opposition to सिंधुस्थान meant foreigners nationally and racially and not necessarily religiously.

This Royal Decree was as all Royal Decrees in सिंधुस्थान had generally been, the mere executive outcome of a strong and popular movement. For, the custom of looking upon अटक as the veritable Indian land’s end as the very word अटक signifies, could not have been originated and observed so universally and so long, had it not been inspired by and appealing to our national imagination. This custom that is so tenaciously and reverently observed by millions of our people, premiers and peasants alike, is a good proof that strongly corroborates the fact that some such royal edict sanctioning the identification of our frontiers with the ancient नदी and associating the name of our land and nation with it as सिंधुस्थान had actually been issued; and that the highest religious sanctification consecrating this royal sanction and popular will must have enabled this attempt to restore the Vedic name of our country to triumph in the end. Of course centuries had yet to pass and momentous events to happen to shape and mould the destinies of these words सिंधु and सिंधुस्थान till they came to be as powerfully influential as to colour the thought of our whole nation and be the cherished possession of our race. But after all they have done it and today we find that while thousands would not know what भारतवर्ष or भारतम् exactly means yet the very man in the street will understand and recognize the names सिंधु and सिंधुस्थान as his very own.*

*The verses from अविष्कर्त्तुराण quoted above seem to be quite trustworthy so far as their general purport is concerned: firstly, because they record a general tradition that, unlike dates or individual succes-
But before we proceed to state what further development of the history of this epithet had to undergo we feel it incumbent to render an apology to ourselves. We have written this section wounded our own feelings. So we hasten to add that the few harsh words we had to say in explaining the political necessity that led to the rejection of Buddhism in India should not be understood to mean that we have not a very high opinion of that Church as a whole.

No, no! I am as humble an admirer and an adorer of the great and holy श्रीकृष्ण—the holiest the world has ever seen—sions, can easily be remembered longer. Secondly, independently of that, the general trend of our history as shown points to some state of affairs. Thirdly, it is not necessary here for our argument to be very precise either about the date of this Decree or even the king by whom it was issued; and fourthly, the author does not seem to have been writing about things only half-hazardly or to which he is entirely a stranger.

For the family table that he gives of the House of Vikramaditya is again given in other part of the work and the two agree closely with each other. The writer who knows of details about the House is likely to know the Salient facts of the most distinguished king that belonged to it.

After all, the main resources of our history had been and must ever be our national traditions remembered or recorded in our ancient Puranas, Epics and Literature. Their details may be challenged, their dates determined and rejected, but on account of discrepancies here or miraculous coloring there which are in fact common to all ancient records of mankind we cannot dismiss them altogether; especially where the facts recorded have not an impossible or unnatural element in them or when they do not contradict events otherwise proved to be indisputably true. The habit of doubting every thing in the Puranas till it has been corroborated by some evidence is absurd. The sounder process would be to depend on our works especially where general traditions and events are concerned till they are found to be unreliable in the light of any more mighty and less ambiguous evidence and not simply on account of the airy imaginations of some one to whom it does not seem probable!

Take the case of this गृहरक्षण itself: because it contains some inaccuracies and even absurdities—and is Plutarch free from them?—we see to reject the personality of Alexander himself because of the supernatural touches given to the story of his birth? Would it be reasonable to doubt, say, the following verse:—चैत्यवनस्य भूमे: परस्त्राः

पुराणा धर्मावतं भवति धर्मावतं भवति कालिन दीत्तिस्म।—२। In fact we owe a debt of gratitude to these Puranas and Epics for having preserved all ancient and venerable records of our people through revolutions which had effaced the very traces of whole nations and whole civilizations elsewhere in the world. For, after all these records of our ancient and patriotic पुराणा and इतिहास that are at any rate more faithful, more accurate and more reliable than the modern up-to-date eastern पुराणा that have such convincing discoveries to their credit as the one which assures us that रामायण of the foundation of विनाशास्त्र or the other which asserts that गौतम—the Buddha was merely the sun or the dawn personified!!
and who owned India as the land of their worship—fills us with feelings too deep for words. And if these be our feelings for thine, then what shall we say about its great Founder—the Buddha—the Enlightened? I, the humblest of the humble mankind can dare to approach thee, Oh! till the moment! with no other offerings but my utter humility and my utter emptiness. Although I feel that I fail to catch the purport of thy words, yet I know that it must be so. Because while thy words are gathered from the lips of Gods, mine ears and my understanding are trained to the accents and the din of this matter-of-fact world. Perhaps it was too soon for thee to sound the march and unfurl thy banner while the world was too young and the day but just risen! It fails to keep pace with thee and its sight gets dazzled and dimmed to keep the radiance of thy banner in full view. As long as the law of evolution that lays down the iron command: "वादासामस्यमं नदी
ष्ठसामास्यं
चौहसांध्यां सूर्यां चौवं " (मूः)
is too persistent and dangerously imminent to be categorically denied by the law of righteousness whose motifs shine brilliantly and beautifully—but as the stars in the heaven do,—so long the banner of Nationality will refuse to be replaced by that of Universality and yet, that very national banner hollowed as it is by the worship of gods and goddesses of our race, would have been poorer if it could not have counted the श्रावणिक मंगल under its fold. But as it is, thou art ours as truly as Shri Ram or Shri Krishna or Shri Mahavir had been and as thy words were but the echoes of yearnings of our national soul, thy visions the dreams of our race, even if ever the law of Righteousness rules triumphant on our human plane, then thou wilt find that the land that called thee, and the people that nursed thee, will have contributed most to bring about that consummation. If in-
So far we have depended upon Sanskrit records in tracing the growth of the word शिर्स और we have left the thread of our inquiry at the point where the growing concept of an Indian nation was found to be better expressed by the word जरासंधन than by any other existing words. It was precisely to refute any parochial and narrow minded significance which might, as in the case of शारीरिक, be attached to this word that the definition of the word जरासंधन was used. An association with a particular institution or party-colour was suggested. For example शास्त्रीय was according to an authority जातियतावस्थान सिद्धान्तेका क्षेत्रीया। ते में शास्त्रीय अमीरा उपस्थित। This solution, though legitimate, could not be lasting. An institution is meant for the society not the society or its ideal for an institution. The जातियतावस्थान may disappear when it has served its end or cease to serve it, but will that make our land a "शत्रुपक्ष"—a land of foreigners? The संस्कृति, the आयोग, the शिक्षा, and many others do not recognize the जातियतावस्थान and yet are they foreigners? God forbid! They are ours by blood, by race, by country, by God. "ते वर्ष भारत नाम भारती यथा संस्कृति।" is a definition ten times better because truer than that! We Hindus are all one and a nation, because chiefly of our common blood—वर्षा भारती संस्कृति।"

At this period of our history—the rise as well as the fall of Buddhism were accompanied by a remarkable spread and growth of the vernaculars of India and जरासंधन was fast being set up in the impenetrable fortresses of classical conventionality to such an extent that new ideas and new names had to be sanskritised before they could be incorporated in any acceptable work. Naturally the every day life and the ever changing phases of national and social activities gradually sought expression through the spoken प्राप्त which thus grew better fitted to convey the living and throbbing thoughts of the people in all their freshness and vigour and precision. Consequently although the words शिर्स and जरासंधन are at times found in sanskrit works, yet the sanskrit writers generally preferred the word भारत as being more in consonance with the established cannons of elegance. While on the other hand the vernaculars stuck almost exclusively to the more popular and living name of our land हिंदुस्थान [जरासंधन], instead of the ancient and well-beloved names भारत or जरासंधन. We need not repeat here how न in जरासंधन gets at times changed into न in हिंदुस्थान as well as non-Indian प्राप्त. So we find the living vernacular literature of India full of reference to हिंदुस्थान or हिंदुस्थान. Although the संस्कृत language must ever remain the cherished and sacred possession of our race, contributing most powerfully to the fundamental unity of our people and enriching our life, ennobling our aspirations and purifying the fountains of our being, yet, the honour of being the living spoken national tongue of our people is already won by that प्राप्त, which, being one of the eldest daughters of जरासंधन, is most fittingly called हिंदुस्थानी—the language of the national and cultural descendants of the ancient शिर्स or हिंदुस्थानी is
par-excellence the language of हिंदुस्तान or सिखस्तान. The attempt to raise Hindi to the pedestal of our national tongue was neither new nor forced. Centuries before the advent of British rule in India we find it recorded in our annals that this was the medium of expression throughout India. A sadhu or merchant starting from Rameshwaram and proceeding to Haridwar, could make himself understood in all parts of India through this tongue. Sanskrit might have introduced him to the circles of Pandits and Princes but Hindustani was a safe and sure passport to the राजमहल as well as to the bazzars. A Nanak, a Chaitanya, a Ramdas could and did travel up and down the country as freely as they would have done in their own provinces teaching and preaching in this tongue. As the growth and development of this our genuine national tongue was parallel to and almost simultaneous with the revival and popularization of the ancient names हिंदुस्तान or सिखस्तान or हिंदी it was but a matter of course that that language being the common possession of the whole nation should be called हिंदुस्तानी or हिंदी.

After expulsion of Huns and the Shaks the valor of her arms left हिंदुस्तान in an undisturbed possession of independence for centuries on centuries to come and enabled her once more to be the land where peace and plenty reigned. The blessings of freedom and independance were shared by the princes and peasants alike. The patriotic authors go in rapture over the greatness and the happiness that marked this long chapter of our history extending over nearly a thousand years or so.

From शिष्य (Ceylon) to जंगल the Rajputs—a single family of princesses—ruled, often connected closely by marriages and more closely by the traditions of chivalry and culture handed down by a common civilization and a common law: The whole life of the nation was being brought into a harmony as rich as divine, and the growth of a national language was but an outward expression of this inward unity of our national life.

But as it often happens in history this very undisturbed enjoyment of peace and plenty lulled our हिंदुस्तान, in a sense of false security and bred a habit of living in the land of dreams. At last, she was rudely awakened on the day when Moharm of Gazani crossed the Indus, the frontier line of हिंदुस्तान, and invaded her. That day the conflict of life and death began. Nothing makes Self conscious of itself so much as the conflict with the non-Self. Nothing can weld peoples into a nation and nations into a state as the pressure of a common foe. Hatred separates as well as unites. Never had हिंदुस्तान a better chance and a more powerful stimulus to be herself forged into an indivisible whole as on that dire day, when the great Iconoclast crossed the Indus. The Mohammedans had crossed that stream even under Rasim but it was a wound only skin-deep, for the heart of our people was not hurt and was not even aimed at. The contest began in grim earnestness with Moham and ended—shall we say with Abdali? From year to year, decade to decade, century to century, the contest continued. Arabia ceased
to be what Arabia was; Iran annihilated; Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Tartary,—from Granada to Gazne,nations and civilizations fell in heaps before the sword of Islam—of Peace!! But here for the first time the sword succeeded in striking but not in killing. It grew blunter each time it struck, each time it cut deep but as it was lifted off to strike again the wound stood healed. Vitality of the victim proved stronger than the vitality of the victor. The contrast was not only grim but it was monstrously unequal. It was not a race, a nation or a people India had to struggle with. It was nearly all Asia, quickly to be followed by nearly all Europe. The Arabs had entered Sindh and singlehanded they could do little else. They soon failed to defend their own independence in their homeland and as a people we hear nothing further about them. But here India alone had to face Arabs, Persians, Pathans, Baluchis, Tartars, Turks, Moguls—a veritable human Sahara whirling and colonizing up bodily in a furious world storm! Religion is a mighty motive force. So is Rapine. But where Religion is goaded on by Rapine and Rapine serves as a hand-maid to Religion, the propelling force that is generated by these together is only equalled by the profundity of human misery and devastation they leave behind them in their march. Heaven and Hell making a common cause—such were the forces, overwhelmingly furious, that took India by surprise the day the Mohmad crossed the Indus and invaded her. Day after day, decade after decade, centuries after centuries, the ghastly conflict continued and India single-handed kept the fight moral, and militarily. The moral victory was won when Akbar came to the throne and Darashukoh was born. The frantic efforts of Aurangzeb to retrieve their fortunes lost in the moral field only hastened the loss of the military fortunes in the battle-field as well. At last Bhan, as if symbolically, hammered the ceiling of the Imperial Seat of the Moguls to pieces, the day of Panipat rose, the Hindus lost the battle—and won the war. Never again had an Agfan dared to penetrate to Delhi. While the triumphant Hindu banner that our Marathas had carried to the Atak was taken up by our Sikhs and carried across Indus to the banks of the Kabul.

In this prolonged furious conflict our people became intensely conscious of ourselves as Hindus and were welded into a nation to an extent unknown in our history. It must not be forgotten that we have all along referred to the progress of the Hindu movement as a whole and not to that of any particular creed or religious section thereof—of हिंदूत्व and not Hinduism only. Sanatanists, Satnams, Sikhs, Aryas, Anayyas, Marathas and Madrasis, Brahmans and Panchas—all suffered as Hindus and triumphed as Hindus. Both friends and foes contributed equally to enable the words Hindu and Hindusthan to supersede all other designations of our land and our people. शायाबर्त्ति and दक्षिणायण, बंगुराय and भारतवर्ष none could give so eloquent an expression to the main political and cultural point at issue as the word Hindusthan could do. All those on this side of Indus who claimed the land from सिंधु to सिंधु, from Indus to the seas, as the land of their birth, felt that they were directly mentioned by that
one single expression हिंदुस्थाना. The enemies hated us as Hindus and the whole family of peoples and races, of sects and creeds, that flourished from कटक to कटक was suddenly individualised into a single Being. We cannot help dropping the remark that no one has up to this time taken the whole field of Hindu activities from A.D. 1300 to A.D. 1800 into survey from this point of view mastering the details of the various new parallel, now correlated, movements from Kashmere to Ceylon and from Sindh to Bengal, and yet rising higher above them all to visualise the whole scene in its proportion as an interlinked whole. For, it was the one great issue to defend the honour and independance of Hindusthan and maintain the cultural unity and civic life of हिंदुस्थ, and not Hinduism alone,—but हिंदुस्थan i.e., हिंदुस्थान—that was being fought out on the hundred fields of battle as well as on the floor of the chambers of diplomacy. This one word हिंदुस्थ �ran like a vital spinal cord through our whole body politic and made the Nayars of Malabar weep over the sufferings of the Brahmins of Kashmere. Our bards bewailed the fall of Hindus, our seers roused the feelings of Hindus, our heroes fought the battles of Hindus, our saints blessed the efforts of Hindus, our statesmen moulded the fate of Hindus, our mothers wept over the wounds and gloried over the triumphs of Hindus.

It would require a volume if we were to substantiate these remarks by quoting all the words and writings of our forefathers that bear on the point. But the argument at hand does not allow us to be drawn aside even by so alluring a task as that. Consequently we must content ourselves with quoting a few eloquent lines either from the lips or the pen of some of the foremost representatives of our Hindu race.

Of all the works written in the Hindi language, old and new, the epic "पृथ्वीराज राजो" by Chand Bardsin is, so far as present researches go, admittedly the most ancient and authoritative one. There is only one solitary verse which claims to be an earlier composition. But luckily and strangely enough this very first composition in our Northern Vernacular literature refers to the word Hindusthan in terms full of pride and patriotic fervour. The poet वें, father of प्रबाल, addresses the Raja of शाहीम, the father of पृथ्वीराज:—

अटक ठाट शहिदा, अटक तहरशहराने
अटक रत्न शाहीम, अटक हिंदव अस्वांज
अटक देव परशान, अटक लंकावं अंधेंव
अटक अस वहियान, अटक मुमिनस महे
संभरी सूर तोमेंदुह, अटक जनों भों भुतर
कहिरां नेह आसीं दे, अटक जयों रवेज्यर.

वंदनराई, who may justly be called आदिगीत of Hindi Literature, uses the words हिंदु, हिंदवान, हिंद so often and so naturally as to leave no doubt of their being quite common and accepted terms as far back as the eleventh century, when the Mohamadans had not secured any permanent footing even in Punjab and therefore could not have influenced the independent and proud Rajputs to adopt a degrading nick-name invented by their foes, and make it their national and proud appellation. Describing how महायुद्ध taken prisoner by the Hindus, was let go by the noble पृथ्वीराज on condition that he would not again attack the "Hindus," चंद says—
But शहाबुद्दैन was not a man to be won over by Hindoo chivalry. Again and again he sallies forth and fierce fight ensues to the boundless joy of that divine cynic नारायण—

"बहु हिंदुदलोकु रुद्र वृद्ध मारपिलक अथ अपत्त अर्कस्वताल चला कर उद्धारकम्"

and again,

"हरे हिंदु मारो, बहे धार, शुभ मारार बहे सुररार, किये समारोहे बहे सुररारे, तिल्ल लक्ष्मीद्वारे लखी लक्ष्मीद्वारे।"

But in spite of his efforts to crush the Hindus, शहाबुद्दैन lost the day and the triumphant news sent Delhi mad with joy that पुराणराज had once more taken शहाबुद्दैन a prisoner. The populace greeted their king पुराणराज—

"वाज्य शासन चाहुिश्च घर।
श्रेय शासन हिंदुदवान।
इन वाकितित दिवसिकार।
वेञ्च न लखी श्रेय।"

Further pledges solemnly entered by the man who had broken his former pledges as solemnly given, succeeded in securing the release of the Shah once more, and once more, but now for the last time, did he invade Hindusthan and by a fell swoop was almost at the gate of Delhi. The council of war is hurriedly summoned by the "हिंदुपति" पुराणराज, insolent.
of the vision he had seen and triumphantly but thankfully asserts that much of what he had seen in his vision has already come to be true:—

१ लक्षणों में देखिये राजे, ते ते दृष्टि लोहत से 
हिंदुस्तान किरता गेलो, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || २ ||
बुधाहे संतोष पापी, हिंदुस्तान विख्याते
रंगीले दाचा हाला, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || ३ ||
क्षमानं माधवा मोहा, स्वेदं दैर्घु बुधाहे
वैरा बेलिता बैली, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || ४ ||
वेंढ़ु वाहवत धरै, रामचरितमासामे
संतोष माधवा मोहा, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || ५ ||
बुधाहे अवस्था पापी, स्वेदं वेदार बुधवा
मोहिणी मोहिणी छरे, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || ६ ||
वेंढ़ु वाहवत धरै, रामचरितमासामे
कषमानं माधवा मोहा, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || ७ ||
स्वेदं वेदार बुधवा, बुधाहे बुधाहे हरी
राम बैल राम भोजा, अर्णदेवनसुनी वी || ८ ||

1 "In utter darkness I dreamt: behold dreams are realized! Hindu other than is up, has come by her own, and those that hated her and sinned against God are put down with a strong hand! Verily it is a holy land and happy! For, God has made her cause his own and Anurangabe is down! The dejected are enthroned and the enthroned is dethroned! Actions speak better than words! Verily हिंदुस्तान is a holy land and happy: Now that घरेलू is backed up by राजकां, 
Right by Might, the waters of हिंद, no longer divided, can enable us once more to perform our ablutions and austerities. Let come 
what may: Rama has made this land holy and happy!

2. भुत्रण, the Hindu poet who was one of the most prominent national bards that went up and down the country and roused विनियम to action and achievement in those days of the war of Hindu liberation, challenged श्रीराम—

1 "लक्षण घरी बिलासांसे करी यह स्वेद देख पाए कठोर पत्ताके! मुखं खाँह वाणकोटन हरे उन्हे स्वाम कटो मट तीने रिताके! हिंदुनके पति सौंभिर सिसात वटावत हंदु गरियन पत्ताके! छोटे कपड़े न दिनके बालक भालम भालकार बाहरअब त्योहारे!"

Again at another place: भुत्रण says—

1 "अभितम बाले महावीर महाराज ! ति परार सबन हे पाताल लेवाने। पाताल सबन बालबी दिनके भालक विशिष्ट पति पाताल बाली हंदुपति खेलाने।" द्वाराके स्वेद वाण को द्वाराकी रहित छाति बाली वा बालक हं दिन दिनके बालको बालको गर्वो रखके मनको कलक किट गायी तबक तमाम दुर्लोकी। 

भुत्रण भाव हिन्दुपति हिन्दु धार्मिक सुनियनी धार खिलास दरदारने।

1 "Thou art so busy in winning easy victories over the poor Hindu brothers and beggars there!—Why dost thou fight so shy to face the Rajput himself? Thou hast lost fort after fort in the fair field here: that is perhaps why thou art distinguishing thyself by pulling down unstanding convents, churches, and chapels there! Art thou not ashamed to call thyself भालकार—conqueror of the world, when thyself mustest vanquished by the Hindu Emperor Shivaji?"

1 जलदीसी।
मोटी मचि बंधो बिने बोटोके वचय सांस बोटी मचि बंधति जबलांके ॥ ॥

'Speaking of things that Shivaji achieved भूषण says—
राष्ट्रीय हिंदू Whereas, हिंदूस्तानीके विक्रम मार्की, स्वतंत्रता और पुराण राज्यों, वेद विश्व बुझ मे हिंदूस्तानी स्वतंत्रता और पुराण राज्यों, धरारी प्रहर राज्यो कुछ गुण मुख्यम भूषण दुधाँविनीत हृद मरहंसङ्के, देवत्सर्देश करिति व्यवस्था व वाणिज्य थे साहिके ईश्वर निर्माण वापस तेरी, निर्धारण वाष्टिके, दिवाला ॥ राष्ट्रीय नुसीमे।²

It was in this light that achievements of Shivaji and his compatriots were viewed by his race throughout Hindu- than भूषण though not a भारत, felt as much proud of the victorious march of the Maratha warriors from Shivaji to Bajirao (vide भूषणवाणी) as they themselves did. He was a Hindu of Hindus and till the last day of his life he kept on singing his stirring songs, emphasizing the national and Pan-Hindu aspect of the movement and impressing it on the minds of its great leaders. Amongst these छत्रासाह, the brave Bundela king, was his second favourite:—

“हेमा हरी साबी, नौरे, गरी शम्शेदर पह फीज तुकालकी
गुण मनत राष्ट्रवाचकतिके छत्रासाह रोयों रणावाल
भागे दीप हिंदुवाचली”

Nor was this tribute paid to छत्रासाह undeserved. छत्रासाह was

1 बाबुलके थानने. २ देवलय. ३ भाग ४ हिङ्गु. ५ जनवर ६ संयुक्त
तेमबहादुर, the Great Guru who not only championed the cause of this War of Hindu Liberation in Punjab but laid down his life for it, is reported to have advised the Brahmns of Kashmir who, oppressed and threatened with "Islam or death", solicited his help:—

1. तुम सबो विशेष हिङ टेकैसु शब्द इमामबो 
   तुम पर इमाम हिङ ताता भांड़वा चाहा पासी 
   है तेमबहादुर जाना लाभार २ अगर तुम्हे बने 
   तिसपैं तबही हम निर सबही बन है दुरक भरी 
   (पंचमकाल)

And when he was challenged by the foes of the race and religion he boldly answered:—

2. "ते पुत्र न हो तेमबहादुर। धर्म विवाहन विस्ते बहादुर 
   उल्लं भरो धर्म हिङ है। अर तिसपैं निमशिर निमन्दु।" 
   (श्रृंगकाल)

His illustrious son गुरु भोजविदम at once the poet, the prophet, and the warrior of our Hindu race and our Hindu culture exclaims in a moment of inspiration—

3. "सकल जगमाने खलसा पंख माणे।"

1. Oh Brahmins! Listen. You go and tell the Turkas (Mohammedans) without fear "there is a great Hindu leader of ours, with lack of followers. His name is Tej Bahadur—Uplifter and Awakener of mankind.—First make him embrace Islam and then we will all do the same.

2. "Hearing them, the Guru Teg Bahadur, the hero and the champion of धर्म, made reply "How can I disgrace the Hindu Dharma—so dear to my heart!"

3. "May this Khalsa Panth flourish everywhere (so that) long may Hindu Dharma live and all falsehood vanish!!

जगे धर्म हिङ सकल पंख माणे।।
(शिवाजी नाटक by गुरु भोजविदम)

The chronicler of Shivaji in the old work "शिवाजी नाटक बाणी" says—1 "सिवाजी नाटक बाणी" ने आगे भड़का विषय स्तंभांग श्रमण केले। गुरुराची मुल्ली गुरुराची, गुरुराची गुरुराची, गुरुराची गुरुराची। आपने प्रत्यक्ष नवीन दीर्घा संपर्के, अन्य सबूत। 

But the shrewd and trusted Dadaji advised—2 "महायात महायात 
   संरक्षण नैसर्गिक प्रकृति पदार्थ, या संसारवर विक्षेप 
   अत्यन्त। धर्म राजे व हिङ जीवा जागरणारी साधकांनी असाध्य: देखराचे 
   जीवन व बिच दुसराचा आशीर्वाद अन्तां ताचा गोडी बघतावा।"
(विराशेस बबर)

And yet Dadaji was the guiding hand of the whole movement. The youthful शिवाजी writes in 1646 A. D. to one of his young compatriots:—3 "शाहाक तम्हारी आपली बेहालाई का—

1. "Shivaji" thought to himself—"We are Hindus. The Mohammedans have subjugated the entire Deccan. They have defiled our sacred places! In fact they have desecrated our religion. We will therefore protect our religion and for that we would even lose our lives. We will acquire new kingdoms by our prowess and that bread we will eat."

2. "Your plans are certainly very good; but it would be exceedingly difficult to carry them to a finish. In the first place you are to establish powerful centres. Hindu Kings and Hindu armies must afford assistance from place to place. Again God Almighty must be on our side and we must be blessed with the benedictions of concastate armies.

3. "You would not be faithless to the Emperor. Our primordial God is self-existing (and therefore all powerful). He has given us our efforts so long and in future also will fulfill the object of our work by bringing about the establishment of हिङ हिङ हिङ (Hindu independence). Indeed it is the cherished wish of God that such a nation should be established."
Mr. Rajwade has the original copy of this letter which reveals, as it were, the soul of the great Hindu movement in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was no parochial movement—it was हिंदुस्थान— the Hindu Empire—that was the great ideal which had fired the imagination and goaded the actions of Shivaji while he was but within his teens. We have his own words for it.

But when Jaysing—a Rajput prince came to subdue Shivaji, and his movement, the edge of Shivaji’s power of resistance became very naturally blunted. It was disheartening in the extreme to find the Rajputs—the ancient shield of हिंदुस्थान—shedding their blood and the blood of their coreligionists and brother Hindus that the Mohamedans may win! Says Shivaji to Jaysingh—“हिंदुस्थान के हिंदु फांदे के मैं देसी विदेशी बचानीयों, पूरा मुसलमानीय यथा न देश कहीं हिंदु शासन करना अनुभव होता है। हिंदुस्थान में वह बल तब नर्व में हिन्दु राज्य में घर वाले हिंदु बल बढ़ाते मैं देशी बचानीयों का बल बढ़ाता है।”

1. “I am ready to hand over to you all fortresses you might ask for. I myself will plant your flag on them. But let not these Mohamedans triumph. I am a Hindu; you are a Rajput and therefore a Hindu. The kingdom has originally been of the Hindus. I will humble my head a hundred times before one who protects the Hindu religion. But I will never agree to do anything that is calculated to impair the honour of the Hindu religion.”

Jaysingh was doubtless touched and replied—“भैरवानेष बलः अमरणीयता व्याप्तिकृते, संघर्षानि सहिता व वाक्यानि परापथानि भावानि गावा। अमरणीय हिंदू वाप्रोतुरे राज्ये, अमरणीय हिंदूस्थान, अमरणीय स्थानमें स्थान करतो वावल हिंदूस्थान अमरणीय भावे।”

The rise of Hindu power under Shivaji had electrified the Hindu mind all over India. The oppressed looked upon him as an Avatar and a Savior. Thus we find that the people of the Savmoor District groaning under the Mohamedan yoke appeal to him—“हा हेमाय माता श्री भगवान् बल देख, यशोवर्धन सुधवा वेमा तरस। जलस गाँववाणि मिन्न करे अश्वशी वस्त्रवाणि वारंभ्यास करावलासः। अश्वशी वस्त्रवाणि संवर्षक, में में नागर, महाशय तुम्हाकरे हाथोः। तुम्हाके अश्वशी अश्वशी महाशय अश्ववेध द्वारा चोरी करकी हाथी। अपनाध्यक्षाने प्रभु हरे उदय साहित्य तरी राहीचा विविध करने येते।”

Again after Shivaji had restored the Jahagir to his brother वे गोवी हिंदूस्थान at Tanjore on the condition that he should cease to recognize the sovereignty of the Mohamedan sway, Shivaji

1. Emperor Aurangzeb is a very powerful sovereign. You should therefore agree to make terms with him. You will be able to live in peace by maintaining hostile relations with him. We, Princes or Jaipur, are Hindus; you are also a Hindu. We are in accord with you since you are out to rehabilitate Hindu religion.

2. This Yusuf is a very wicked fellow. He oppresses the women and the children, commits atrocities and even resorts to such reprehensible means as the massacre of cows! We are so disgusted that we can no longer live under him. You are the restorer of the Hindu religion and the destroyer of the Mischbas (foreigners). It is therefore that we have come to you for refuge. And since we have so approached guards have been stationed at our gates. In fact they are intent on starving us here without food and water. So do come with all haste (lit. by turning nights into days).
writes:—"‘हिंदुस्तानी यांस आपले उन्नयत खेल करून.

Rajaram, in order to express his sense of appreciation of the national services of संगाकार and his brothers in the war of independence, conferred on भारतीय the high and proud appellation "हिंदुराव". When the siege at Jinji was pressing the Maratha forces, to try their best to break through it an attempt was made to win over the Marathas in the services of the Mogul commander:—"भारतीय राशि धातु के संस्करण रहे; दुराहित आमतौर सी फीज मांडुळ हिंदुराव से बलन कहे, स्थायी दुराहित आमतौर के बाबे.

The same spirit animated the generations of Bajirao and Nana Sahib. SAYS THE HISTORIAN:—"उसके दर्शनी बाजीरावाचा उपाधि अनुसरण व परिपक्व केलेला दिसली... लब्धताबाही, शांतिवेच दीक्षित बाली देवसमर बाला ाहे काही काही शांतमार्गी साक्षात्कार शांतुलालचा शिक्षण वरील हिंदुपदाता बाला भावना स्तुरण पावत होती व ते आपल्या सव्य निषेधयोग्यता सांगणे उपेक्षेत होते."

Brahmendra Swami was the central figure of the intellectuals of that period. "परंतु हिंदुपदाता उष्णेद्र यज्ञ राज्यत होतो

1. Those who are bitter haters of Hindus should have no footing in your territory.

2. "Secret negotiations were opened with Nagoji Raje to the effect that if he joins with the Marathas they would break the enemy's forces and preserve the Hindu religion. He should therefore come over to them." Then upon Nagoji Raje gave up service under the Mohamadans and withdrawing the attack entered the city with his battalion numbering five thousands. . When Shirke entered the service of the Moguls (as Sambhaji had beheaded the Shirke family) Khandoji Ballal said, "Shirkes had been beheaded; but similarly three of my ancestors were killed by being trampled under the foot of an elephant. But we are striving for the establishment of the kingdom of the Hindus and you must be our partners." Then, Shirke also entered the plot and helped the Marathas with the result that Rajaram broke through the siege and escaped.
But in the meanwhile and before the fall of Bassein, Nadirshah invaded India and Delhi had fallen in his hands. The Maratha agents of Bajirao write to him:—"The Marathas of the Malabar coast have been defeated by the Mahrattas and their king, Chhatrapati Sambhaji, has been captured and is now in the hands of the Marathas. The Mahrattas have also captured the town of Bassein from the Portuguese."

The letters sent by this brave lady, Mathurabai Angre, are all so full with patriotic fervour and force that they deserve a perusal from all those who want to catch the real spirit of the great Hindu revival.

The Portuguese fanaticism at Goa was an Indian edition of the Inquisition in Europe. Once they prohibited the open observation of all Hindu religious rites and rituals. Then the public spirited Shankarji Somanath defied the order and encouraged other Hindus to do the same. But he knew perfectly well that impotent passive resistance is impotent suffering. To be successful under such conditions as those prevailing it must be backed up by the sword of a Bajirao or a Chimanaji. It was Shankarji Somanath who brought about the revolution in the Portuguese territories in India, enlisted the sympathies of all Hindu leaders on the side of Bajirao and in fact was the prime mover who brought about the Maratha invasion which ended in the liberation of almost all the Hindu territories after the triumphant campaign of Chimanaji Appa.

1. Shankarjibhai Mohite, Ranoji Sinde, Khandoji Nalkar, Ramaji Kharade, Krishnaji Mod and other powerful sardars have preserved the kingdom, exterminated the Mohamadians and protected the Hindu religion in Konkan.

2. The Hindus are placed in a critical situation. We have not yet captured Bassein. Under the circumstances all the Maratha armies should combine and cross river Chameli. The plan is that the (Nadir)
But his indomitable spirit rose triumphant over all obstacles. He writes again:—"The act of the people of Malwa to request Bajirao to extend the war of Hindu liberation to Malwa, and thus to take a further important step towards the realization of the mission of generations of the followers of the Shivaji cult all over India—the mission of the Hindu religion."

In one of his letters the enlightened and patriotic Rajput prince writes:—"May you get success and wealth! May your success and wealth be multiplied. Respectful greetings to Nandlalji, Prafull and Bhaji Thakur Sanathan Indore from Mahradjadhiraj Jaisang, camp Amargad.

You are informed that the Emperor has started operations. But you need not be anxious. God Almighty will bring the matters to a successful issue. We have served from Bajirao Peshva solemn promises concerning you.

Contd. Footnote page 55.
ceeded in making the Hindus the de facto Rulers of Hindustan. How conscious the national mind had grown of the triumphant turn events had taken, and how intensely proud they had been of Hindus and the Hindu Empire all but established, can best be seen in the letters of the most talented diplomatic writers of that period. Govindrao Kale writes to Nana Farnavis from the capital of the Nizams on learning the news that gladdened the Marathas from end to end of Maharashtra that the misunderstanding growing between the two men Nana and Mahadaji had disappeared:

311 पश्च पाइलां रोमांच उठे रहे: क्षणि संतोष शाला. विराज फर नज़ारा किती हुई! श्राक गये शासन नागरिक आते. अवक नवीनी वन्दिक वृक्ष वान समय पाप कोली अन्नु व्यापार नन्दे: हे आपलो चिंता प्रमाणापूष्ठ विस्मयांतः. तवांि नाचून उपवास नेतृता. तवांि नाचून उपवास नेतृता. पवनांि अाह्वान शाश्वात. पवनांि अाह्वान शाश्वात. वाचकांि वाचकांि ( वाचकांि वाचकांि ) अइल उपवास राज्य ठेवते. शीर्षका शरायतरांचे वार्तात सिद्धांत हा बालक बालक बाळ बाळ मित्र ज्ञानार्ण नीले गुजरली.

1. When I read your letter I was simply thrilled with joy. Indeed I felt mightily happy. I cannot express all this fully in a letter. Literally my mind was flooded with thoughts. All the territory from the river Atak to the Indian Ocean is the land of the Hindus—and not of the Turks. These have been our frontiers from the times of Pandavas down to those of Vikramaditya. They preserved it and enjoyed. After them, the rulers turned out to be quite effete and the Yavanas (Mohammedans) rose in power. The Moguls seized the Kingdom of Hastinapura. And eventually during the regime of Alangir we were reduced to such straits that wearer of every Yadnyopavita (the sacred thread) was required to pay a jijera tax of Rs. 3-8 and to buy cooked food.
Having thus tried to trace the successive chapters of the history of the words हिंदू and हिंदुस्थान from the earliest Vedic times to the fall of the last of our Hindu empire in 1818 A.D. we now in a position to address ourselves to the main goal of determining the essentials of हिंदू. The first result of our enquiry is to explode the baseless suspicion which has seeped into the minds of some of our well-meaning but hasty countrymen that, the origin of the words हिंदू and हिंदुस्थान is traced to the malice of the Mohamadans! After all that has been said in the previous section about the history of these words, this suspicion seems so singularly stupid that mention it is to refute it. Long before Mohmrad was born, long before the Arabians were heard of as a people, this great nation was known to ourselves as well as to the ancient world by the proud epithet शिखर or हिंदु and Arabs could not have invented this term any more than they had invented the Indus itself. They simply learnt it from the ancient Iranians, Jews, and other peoples. But apart from all serious historical refutation, is it not clear that it has been really contemptuous expression of our foes as it seemed to be, could it have ever recommended itself to the rest and best of our race? Surely our people were not such strangers either to the Arabic or Persian tongues! Mohamadans were apt to refer to us as भाषार also, but our people adopted that name and stuck it up as a distinguishing mark? Why did they submit voluntarily to the
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And really Patil Boa has broken the heads of those who tried to raise them. In fact the unachievable has been achieved. To establish order and reap its benefit like the great kings is still ahead. I am afraid where our merits will fall and the work will be spoiled. 

achievements are not limited to the acquisition of territory and region of our Kingdom but include the preservation of Vedas and Shastras, rehabilitation of religion, protection of cows and Brahmins, establishment of Sovereignty and the diffusion of our fame and victory. To keep all this in fact depends on you and Patil Boa. If there is difference among you the enemy is bound to grow strong. Now my misgivings are at rest. It was really splendid! Very excellent! The enemies besetting us on all sides. I was very uneasy. Your letter has been a relief to me (1793 A.D.)
national insult only in the case of the other epithets हिंदू and हिंदू? Simply because they knew more of our national conditions and were less cut off from our national life than we had been. That is why some of us keep harping on the fact that this word हिंदू is not found in Sanskrit. What of this word alone?—The Sanskrit literature has no mention of हिंदूस्तान-मराठा-मिश्र-मुगल-पारस-विषय तथा thousand other words that we use daily. But are we to be traced to some foreign source? The बंगाली form बंगाली is still ours because the प्राचीन form बंगाली which is found in Sanskrit is still ours because it is ridiculous to expect a प्राचीन word in classical Sanskrit literature for what is not found in Sanskrit. Nay more: although हिंदू being a प्राचीन form of हिंदू it is, it cannot be but a weighty proof of its importance in its प्राचीन form that, that form should be, at times, with in Sanskrit literature: for example the मेरठि uses this हिंदू. Great Sanskrit lexicographers like भाष्येन in Māraśtra and गोविण्ड ज्ञानेन्द्रनाथ in Bengal have also mentioned it. While the line देश देश न हिंदूने नवन: is too well known to be quoted.

It may be that in the modern Mohammedised form some contemptuous meaning has come to be associated with the term हिंदू but how does that show that the original देश was contemptuous and meant "black"? The words हिंदी or हिंदू are used in Persian but they do not mean black and yet we know that they along with हिंदू originated from the same Sanskrit word सिंधु or देश whose word हिंदू is applied to us because it means 'black' then it that हिंदू and हिंदू are also applied to us though they do not mean "a black man"? The fact is that the word हिंदू dates its origin not from the Mohammedised Persian but from the ancient language of Iran, the Zend, and then the पारस-विषय meant सारस्वत alone. It could not have been applied to us because we were black literally, for the simple reason that the ancient सारस्वत i.e. हिंदू in Avestic period were as fair as the Iranians and lived practically side by side and even at times together with them. Even so late as at the dawn of the Christian era the Parthians used to call our frontier provinces अ० तमरक त or white Inida. Thus originally हिंदू simply could not have literally meant a black man.

In fact, after it has been made so amply clear in the foregoing sections that the epithets हिंदू and हिंदूस्तान had been the proud and patriotic designations signifying our land and our nation long before the Mohammedans or Mohammedised Persians were heard of, it becomes almost immaterial, so far as the greatness of the epithet Hindu and its claim to our love are concerned, what meaning, complimentary or contemptuous, is attached to it by some swollen-headed fanatic here and there. There was a time when the term "England" had fallen so low in England itself in the estimation of her Norman conquerors that it became a formula of swearing against each other! "May I become an Englishman!" was the strongest form of self-denunciation and calling a Norman "an Englishman" an unpardonable insult. But did the English care to change the name of their land or their
nation and call it Normandy instead of England? Or would their disowning their name as "the English" have made them great? No; on the contrary, precisely because they did not disown their ancient blood or name, to-day we find that while the word Norman has become an historical fossil and Normandy has no place on the map of the world the contemplated English and their English language have come to own the largest empire the world has as yet seen! And yet great as the glories of the English world are, what on the whole has it to show to match the glories of the Hindu world?

In times of conflict nations do lose their balance of mind, and if the Persians or others once understood by the word फ़िर व a thief or a black man alone, then let them remember that the word Mohomedan too was not always mentioned to denote any very enviable type of man-kind by the Hindus either. To call a man Musalman or better still a "Musunda" was worse than calling him a brute. Such bitter fulminations and mutual recriminations, though they might have the excuse of inevitability in times of life-and-death struggles while the flame and flame of the angry brutal passions last, should be forgotten as soon as men recover from their fits and claim to be recognised as gentlemen. Nor should we forget that the ancient Jews used the term फिष्ट to denote strength or vigour for, these were the qualities associated with our land and nation. In an Arab epic named "So hab Mo Alakk" it is said that the oppressions of kith and kin are bitterer or more fatal than the stroke of a Hindu sword; while "Returning a Hindu answer" is a proverbial way with the Persians themselves, by which they are said to mean 'to strike bravely and deeply with an Indian sword'. The ancient Babylonians had been in the habit of denoting the finest quality of cloth दिल्लु because it generally came from the दस्सिमुड्र - a custom which also shows that they also knew our country by an ancient name दिल्लु; nor have we as yet heard of any other meaning being attributed to this word in the ancient Babylonian language than its national one.

No Hindu can help feeling proud of himself at the curious interpretation put upon this epithet by the illustrious traveler Yuan Chwang, himself belonging to our highly civilized and ancient neighbours the Chinese, when he identifies our national name दिल्लु with the sanskrit विद्यु and says in justification that the world had rightly called this nation दिल्लु for they and their civilization had, like the moon, ever been a constant source of delight and refreshment to theaged and weary soul of man. Does not all this clearly show that the way of inspiring respect for our name in the minds of men is not either to change or deny it but to compel recognition of, and homage to, it by the valour of our arms, purity of our aims and the sublimity of our souls. Even if we allow some of our brethren to ride their hobby horse in all this and get themselves recognised and registered in the various reports as "Aryans" instead of as Hindus yet they could only succeed in dragging down the word Aryan to their own level and adding one more synonym to the vocabulary of the words for a "helot" and a "poor" - as long as our nation does not attain to
the heights of greatness and of strength as in the days of yore.

But apart from any serious arguments against the absurd proposal of denying the epithets Hindu or Hinduism, and granting for a while the stupid theory that their origin is to be traced to the malice of foreigners,—we simply ask, is it possible to deny them and coin a new word for our national designation? As it stands at present, the word Hindu has come to be the very banner of our race and the one great feature that above all others contributes to strengthen and uphold our racial unity from Cape to Kasmere, from Attak to Kat-tak. Do you think you can change it as easily as a cap? Once it happened that a gentleman, well-meaning and patriotic, intended to get himself registered in the Census records as an Aryan instead of a Hindu, as he had been a victim to the wide-spread lie that we were first called Hindus by the Persian Mohammedans out of their contempt—that the word meant a thief or a black man. Yet I could not enter into any detailed discussion about the origin of the word for want of time and so simply questioned him as to what his own name was. He told it was “तद्भविष्यः.” “My good friend,” I continued, “unlike the word Hindu whose origin is at the worst disputable, your name is indisputably a hybird word and should therefore be first replaced in the register by some ancient and purely Aryan word—say भिन्न-जगन्नाथ or बिन्न-जगन्नाथ.” Having evaded the point for a while he tried to point out how difficult it was to do so and how it would completely upset his economical position and after all how could he get

the world to call him by the new fangled name or what could be gained at all by this risky experiment of calling himself बिन्न-जगन्नाथ while all others persisted in calling him “रक्षितारमण”. But” I rejoined, “if to change your individual name, which is indisputably foreign, seems to you so difficult, nay harmful, then my friend, how much more difficult would it be to change the name of a whole race which is so far from being a foreign invention that it is ours as much as Vedas are ours!—and how much more futile? Of the futility of any such attempt to change a deep-rooted name, a far more convincing example than this personal one is furnished by our Sikh brotherhood in the Punjab. The band of the best and the bravest of the Hindu race whom our Great Gurn had chosen, triumphantly exclaiming “नीऽिरायस्ते करके पढ़े तुरक पाणी श्रद्धा जगाया!” for the expressed purpose of यम्म नालावन संत दार देते देते मुज़ उठाया, बाहिर खान घर ते तत्तम समस्त लेते सालुषाय गस्ताताम्। (परिबधार ल्या ल्या विनावायल दुश्मलाताम्। वमेसंस्कारवार्ताय संवर्ताय हुन्ते हुने) that band of warriors was named “Khalasa”! The saintly man who bewailed “क्षत्रियांत यहै छोड़िया स्वप्न साया नाही। नृपि सब आरम्भय हुन्न लम्बकिय गति रहने!” is daily greeted with a "बाहु गुरुवारी फतेन। बाहु गुरुवारी खालसा।” The words पुराण, रिकार देखातु, have crept like thieves to the very heart of our Hari-mandirs. They are the scars of our old wounds. The wounds are healed but the scars persist and seem to be incorporated with our form. As long as any attempt to scratch them out threatens to harm us more than profit, so long all that we can do is to tolerate them; for after all they are the scars of wounds received in a conflict that we have
Hindu heroes fell inflicting fatal wounds on the foes, on the battle field of Panipat—and Bhan at the head of them all and sword in hand!—within one single day! It was for the राष्ट्रवादियो शाही that inspire of all that martyrdom and in virtue of it, Nana and Mahadji steered the nation clear of all rocks and shoals and brought it almost within sight of the coveted shores. It is this epithet राष्ट्रवादी or राष्ट्रवादियो that, even to this day, owns a loving allegiance of millions of our people—from the throne of Nepal to the begging bowl in the street. To disown these words is like to cut off and cast away the very heart of our people. You would be dead before you do that. It is not only fatal but futile. To outset the words Hindu or Hindusthan from the position they hold is to try to outset the Himalayas from theirs!—Nothing but an earthquake with all its terrible wrenches and appalling uncertainties can accomplish that!

The objection that is levelled against the appellation राष्ट्रवादि and राष्ट्रवादियो on account of the mistaken notion which attributed their origin to foreign sources could, if left to itself, be easily laid low by advancing undesirable historical facts. But as it is, this objection is in some cases backed up by a secret fear that if the epithet be honoured and owned then all those who do so would be looked upon as believers in the dogmas and religious practices that go by the name “Hinduism”. This fear, though it is not often admitted openly, that a Hindu is, necessarily and by the very fact that he is a Hindu, a believer in the so-called Hinduism, makes many a man determined not to get convinced that the epithets are
not an alien invention. Nor is this fear totally unjustified. But it would be more candid if those who entertain this fear should openly advance it as the ground of their objection to being recognised as Hindus and not try to hide it under a false and untenable issue. The superficial similarity between these two terms हिंदू and Hinduism is responsible for this regrettable estrangement that, at times, alienates well-meaning gentlemen in our Hindu brotherhood. The distinction between these two terms would be presently made clear. Here it is enough to point out that if there be really any word of alien growth it is this word Hinduism and so we should not allow our thoughts to get confused by this new-fangled term. That a man can be as truly Hindu as any without believing even in the Vedas as an independent religious authority is quite clear from the fact that thousands of our Jain brethren, not to mention others, are for generations calling themselves Hindus and would, even to this day, feel hurt if they be called otherwise. We refer to this simply as an actual fact apart from any detailed justification and examination of it which would presently follow. Till then, we hope, our readers would not allow prejudicial fear regarding the conclusion of our argument as to its intrinsic merit and bear in mind we have throughout the foregoing sections been dealing—not with any "ism" whatever but—with हिंदू alone in its national and racial and cultural aspects.

Now we are fairly in a position to try to analyse the contents of one of the most comprehensive and bewilderingly synthetic concept known to human tongue. हिंदू is a descriptive word from हिंदु. We have seen that the earliest and the most sacred records of our race show that the appellation साधु or हिंदु was applied to a region in which the Vedic nation flourished. This geographical sense being the primary one has, now contrasting now expanding, but ever consistently, been associated with the words हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान till after the lapse of nearly 5000 years if not more, हिंदुस्थान has come to mean the whole continental country from the गंगा to गंगा, from the Indus to the Seas. The most important factor that contributes to the cohesion, strength and the sense of unity of a people is that they should possess an internally well connected and externally well demarcated "local habitation," and a "name" that could, by its very mention, rouse up the cherished image of their motherland as well as the loved memories of their past. We are happily blessed with both these important requisites for a strong and united nation. Our land is so vast and yet so well-knit, so well demarcated from others and yet so strongly entrenched, that no country in the world is more closely marked out by the fingers of nature as a geographical unit beyond cavil or criticism. So also is the name हिंदुस्थान or हिंदु that it has come to bear. The first image that it rouses in the mind is unmistakably of our motherland and by an express appeal to its geographical and physical features it verifies it into a living Being. हिंदुस्थान meaning the land of हिंदु, the first essential of हिंदू must necessarily be this geographical one. A Hindu is primarily a citizen either in himself or through his forefathers of "हिंदुस्थान" and claims the land as his mother-
land. In America as well as France the word Hindu is generally understood thus exactly in the sense of an Indian without any religious or cultural implication. And had the word हिंदू been used to convey this primary significance even which it had in common with all the words derived from हिंदु it would really have meant only an Indian citizen of हिंदुस्थान, as the word हिंदी does.

But throughout our inquiry we have been concerning ourselves more with what is than with what would have been or what should be. Not that to paint what should be is not a legitimate pursuit; nay, it is as necessary and at times more stimulating; but even that could be better done by first getting a firm hold of what actually is. We must try therefore to be on our guard so that in our attempt to determine the essentials of हिंदुत्व we be guided entirely by the actual contents of the word as it stands at present. So, although the root-meaning of the word Hindu, like the sister epithet Hindi, may mean only an Indian, yet as it is we would be straining the usage of words too much—we fear, to the point of breaking—if we call a Mahomedan a Hindu because his is a being resident of India. It may be that at some future time the word Hindu may come to indicate a citizen of Hindusthan and nothing else; that day can only rise when all cultural and religious bigotry has disbanded its forces pledged to aggressive egoism, and religions cease to be “isms” and become merely the common fund of eternal principles that lie at the root of all, that are a common foundation on which the Human State majestically and firmly rests. But as even the root-streaks of this consumption, so devoutly to be wished be are scarcely discernible on the horizon, it would be folly for us to ignore stern realities. As long as every other “ism” has not disowned its special dogmas, which ever lead into dangerous war cries, so long no cultural or national bond can afford to loosen the bonds, especially those of a common name and a common banner, that are the mighty sources of organic cohesion and strength. An American may become a citizen of India. He would certainly be entitled, if so he pleases, to be treated as our भारतीय or हिंदी, a countryman and a fellow citizen of ours. But as long as, in addition to our country, he has not adopted our culture and our history, inherited our blood and has come to look upon our land not only as the land of his levée but even of his worship, he cannot get himself incorporated into the Hindu fold. For although the first requisite of हिंदुत्व is that he be a citizen of Hindusthan either by himself or through his forefathers, yet it is not the only requisite qualification of it, as the term Hindu has come to mean much more than its geographical significance.

The reason that explains why the term हिंदू cannot be synonymous with भारतीय or हिंदी and mean an Indian only, naturally introduces us to the second essential implication of that term. The Hindus are not merely the citizens of the Indian state because, they are united not only by the bonds of the love they bear to a common motherland but also by the bonds of a common blood. They are not only a राष्ट्र but also a जाति. The word जाति, derived from the root
to produce, means a brotherhood, a race determined by a common origin—possessing a common blood. All Hindus claim to have in their veins the blood of the mighty race incorporated with and descended from the Vedic fathers, the ।

We are well aware of the not-uncommonly preferred objection that carpingly questions “but are you really a race? Can you be said to possess a common blood?” We can only answer by questioning in return, “are the English a race? Is there any thing as English blood, the French blood, the German blood or the Chinese blood in this world? Do they, who have been freely infusing foreign blood into their race by contracting marriages with other races and peoples, possess a common blood and claim to be a race by themselves? If they do, then the Hindus also can emphatically do so. For the very castes, which you, owing to your colossal failure to understand and view them in the right perspective, assert to have barred the common flow of blood into our race, have done so more truly and more effectively as regards the foreign blood than our own. Nay, is not the very presence of these present castes a standing testimony to a common flow of blood from a राजपूत to a चाँदाल? Even a cursory glance at any of our मुलियार would conclusively prove that the श्रेष्ठमुलि and प्रतिलोम marriage institutions were the order of the day and have given birth to the majority of the castes that obtain amongst us. If a श्रेष्ठ has a son from a छन्द woman, he gives birth to the उज caste; again, if the श्रेष्ठ raises an issue on an उज, he founds a श्रेष्ठ class. While a राजपूत mother and a छन्द father beget the caste चाँदाल. From the vedic
both the families? Down to the day of वर्ण—not to mention the partial break-down of the caste system itself in centuries of Buddhistics—intermarriages were the order of the day. Take for example the case of a single family of the Pandavas. The sage परशुराम himself, being in love with the fair maid of a fisherman who gave birth to the world-renowned व्यास, who in his turn raised two sons as श्रवणीतिप्रिय princesses अधिन्द्रिय and श्रवणीतिप्रिय; one of these two sons allowed his wives to raise issue by resorting to the caste system and they, having solicited the love of men of unknown castes, gave birth to the heroes of our great epic. Witnessing equally distinguished characters of the same period कृष्ण, च०राल्प, पटेल, विश्‍वनाथ and others, we may point out to the relatively modern cases of चंद्रावेंद्र who have married a श्रवणीतिप्रिय girl who gave birth to a श्रवणीतिप्रिय child; यजुरवेद who had as a prince married a श्रवणीतिप्रिय maid; वर्ण who being a यजुर्वेद gave his daughter in marriage to a श्रवणीतिप्रिय prince; व्यासकुमार who is said to be a son of a श्रवणीतिप्रिय with whom his mother, a श्रवणीतिप्रिय girl, had fallen in love who grew to be the “गुड़ियाँ” of श्रवणीतिप्रिय सूर्यासु; कृष्ण who being a श्रवणीतिप्रिय fell so desperately in love with a चंद्रावेंद्र as to lead an open married life with her and subsequently became the founder of the religious sect “मातिखंडा पेशा” who, never the less, call themselves and are perfectly entitled to be recognised as Hindus. This is not all. An individual at times by his or her iron actions may loose his or her first caste and be re-gated to another.—हो कर श्रवणीतिप्रिय संयोगी कुमुदचरणे। आधुनिक दृष्टि राजपक्षी। उपासने नेत्र पुराण प्रीति गुण्यों न परिवर्तिये। संयोगित प्रसाद राजपक्षी श्रवणीति दुरशास्त्राय।” The injunction “न कृष्ण त्रिभुवनस्तुस्पर्शितं कुमुदचरणे। आधुनिक दृष्टि राजपक्षी। उपासने नेत्र पुराण प्रीति गुण्यों न परिवर्तिये। संयोगित प्रसाद राजपक्षी श्रवणीति दुरशास्त्राय।” was not always an empty threat. Many a श्रवणीतिप्रिय have by taking to agriculture and other occupations of life lost the respect due to a श्रवणीतिप्रिय and were mixed with some of the other castes; while many a brave one, in cases whole tribes, raised themselves to the position, rights and titles of the श्रवणीतिप्रियs and were recognised as such. Being outcasted from a caste, which is an event of daily occurrence, is only getting incorporated with some other.

Not only is this true so far as those Hindus only who belong in the caste system based on the Vedic tenets are concerned, but even in the case of आदिवासी sects of the Hindus people. As it was true in the Buddhistic period that a Buddhist father, a आदिवासी mother, a आदिवासी son, could be found in a single joint family, so even to-day. आदिवासीs and आदिवासीs intermarry in Gujarath. हाथिया and संगमरमर in Punjab and Sind. We over-to-day’s मामपाट or बिंदाज or बिंदाज वाहिया is yesterday’s ब्रह्मन and to-day’s ब्रह्मन may be to-morrow’s ब्रह्मम or ब्रह्मम or ब्रह्मम.

And no word can give a full expression to this racial unity of our people as the epithet Hindu does. Some of us were खायाons and some आदिवासीs; but खायाons and आदिवासीs—we were all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are खायाons and some नागपुरास or पंचायाons; but खायाons or ब्राह्मण—we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are दास्तिजाभीस and some गोव्यस; but दास्तिजाभीस or सारस्तवस—we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us were राजपूत and some तोम्भस; but राजपूत or तोम्भस—we are all Hindus and own a common blood.
mental unity of man from pole to pole is true—all else only relatively so.

And speaking relatively alone, no people in the world can more justly claim to form a racial unit than the Hindus and perhaps the Jews. A Hindu marrying a Hindu may lose his caste but not his देवता. A Hindu, believing in any theoretical or philosophical or social system, orthodox or heterodox, provided it is unquestionably indigenous and founded by a Hindu, may lose his sect but not his देवता—his Hinduness—because the most important essential which determines it, is the inheritance of the Hindu blood. Therefore all those who love the land that stretches from तिरलु to तिरलु, from Indus to Seas, as their father-land and consequently claim to inherit the blood of the race that has evolved, by incorporation and adaptation, from the ancient तिरलु, can be said to possess two of the most essential requisites of देवता.

But only two; because a moment’s consideration would show that these two qualifications of एक राष्ट्र and एक जाति—of a common fatherland and therefore of a common blood—cannot exhaust all the requisites of देवता. The majority of the Indian Mohomedans may, if free from the prejudices born of ignorance, come to love our land as their fatherland, as the patriotic and noble-minded amongst them have always been doing. The story of their conversions, forcible in millions of cases, is too recent to make them forget, even if they like to do so, that they inherit Hindu blood in their veins. But can we, who here are concerned with investigating into facts as
they are and not as they should be, recognize these Moham-
dans as Hindus? Many a Mohamadan community in Kash-
mere and other parts of India as well as the Christians in
South India observe our caste rules to such an extent as to
marry generally within the pale of their castes alone; yet, it
is clear that though their original Hindu blood is thus almost
unaffected by an alien adulteration, yet they cannot be called
Hindus in the sense in which that term is actually understood.

Because, we Hindus are bound together not only by the tie
of the love we bear to a common fatherland and by the com-
mon blood that courses through our veins and keeps our
hearts throbbing and our affections warm, but also by the
tie of a common homage we pay to our great civilization—our
Hindu culture, which could not be better rendered than by the
word संस्कृति suggestive as it is of that language, the संस्कृत,
which has been the chosen means of expression and preser-
vation of that culture, of all that was best and worth preserving
in the history of our race. We are one because we are a राष्ट्र,
a जाति and own a common संस्कृति.

But what is civilization? Civilization is the expression of
the mind of man. Civilization is the account of what man had
made of matter. If matter is the creation of the Lord then
civilization is the miniature secondary creation of man. At
its best it is the perfect triumph of the soul of man over
matter and man alike. Wherever and to the extent to which
man has succeeded in moulding matter to the delight of his
soul, civilization begins. And it triumphs when he has
tapped all the sources of Supreme Delight, satisfying the

Spiritual aspirations of his Being towards strength and beauty
and love, realising Life in all its fulness and richness.

The story of the civilization of a nation is the story of its
Thoughts, its Action and its Achievements. Literature and art
tell us of its thoughts; history and social institutions of its ac-
tions and achievements. In none of these can man remain
isolated. The primitive "हंगी" (cane) of the Andamanese can
only claim to have influenced the up-to-date dreadnaughts of
America. The latest adventure of fashion amongst the fair
sex in Paris is but the lineal descendant of the bunch of
leaves stuck in the girdle-string which constitutes the perfec-
tion of the toilet of a "पंतुशा" girl.

And yet a 'Dungi' remains a Dungi and a dreadnaught a
dreadnaught; they are too much more unlike each other
than like to be identified as one and the same. Even so, al-
though the Hindus have lent much and borrowed much like any
other people yet, their civilization is too characteristic to be
mistaken for any other cultural unit. And secondly, however
striking their mutual differences be, they are too much more
like each other than unlike, to be denied the right of being
recognized as a cultural unit amongst other such units in the
world owning a common history, a common literature and a
common civilization.

Paradoxical as it may sound to those who have fallen
victims to the interested or ignorant cry that has secured the
ear of the present world that the Hindus have no history
it never the less remains true that Hindus are about the
only people who have succeeded in preserving their history—
riding through earthquakes, bridging over deluges! It begins with their Vedas which are the first extant chapter of the story of our race. The first cradle songs that every Hindu girl listens to, sings of Sita, the good. Some of us worship Rama as an incarnation, some admire him as a hero and a warrior, all love him as the most illustrious representative monarch of our race. Maruti and Bheemsen are the never failing source of strength and physical perfection to the Hindu youth; Savitri and Damyanti, the never failing ideals of constancy and chastity to the Hindu maid. The love that Rashtra made to the Divine Cowherd in Gokul finder ris echo wherever a Hindu lover kisses his beloved. The giant struggle of the Kuru, the set duels of Arjun and Karna, of Bhim and Dushhasan, that took place on the field of Kurukshetra thousands of years ago, are rehearsed in all their thrill from cottage to cottage and from palace to palace. Abhimanyu could not have been dearer to Shri Jee than he is to us. From Ceylon to Kashmir—Hindusthan daily sheds tears as lovingly and as bitterly as his father did at the mention of the fall of that lotus-eyed youth. What more shall we say? The story of Ramayana and Mahabharata alone would bring us together and weld into a race even if we be scattered to all the four winds like a handful of sand. I read the life of a Mazzini and I exclaim “how patriotic they are,” I read the life of a Madhavacharya and exclaim “how patriotic we are!” The hill of Pundarika is bewailed in Bengal; the martyred sons of Govindaising, in Maharasthra. An Arya Samajist historian in the extreme north feels that Harihar and Bukka of the extreme south fought for him; and a Sanatanist historian in the extreme south feels that Guru Tejashahadur died for him.

We had kings in common, we had kingdoms in common. We had stability in common, we had movements in common. We had triumphs in common, and disasters in common. The names of Sivakasipuram and Vishak, a Vaishnav and Shakyaputra, make us all feel as sinners do. The names of Aswak, Madrasa, Parsana and Kampil leave us all electrified with a sense of personal elevation.

But what about the internecine wars amongst Hindus? We answer, what about the wars of Roses amongst the English? What of internecine struggle of states against states, sects against sects, class against class, each invoking foreign help against his own country-men, in Italy, in Germany, in France, in America? Are they still a people, a nation, and do they possess a common history? If they do the Hindus do. If the Hindus do not possess a common history then none in the world does.

As our History tells the story of the Action of our race so does our literature taken in its fullest sense tell the story of the Thought of our race. Thought, they say, is inseparable from word; and our literature inseparable from our common tongue, the Sanskrit. Verily it is our mother tongue—the tongue in which the mothers of our race spoke and which has given birth to all our present tongues. Our Gods spoke in Sanskrit, our sages thought in Sanskrit, our poets wrote in Sanskrit. All that is best in us—the best thoughts, the best idea, the best love—seeks instinctively to clothe itself in Sanskrit. To mil—
lions it is still the language of their Gods; to others it is the language of their ancestors; to all it is the language par excellence: a common inheritance, a common treasure, that enriches all the family of our sister languages, गुरुभाैंग, गुर्मू, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग, गुरुभाैंग.

constitutes the vital nerve thread that runs through us all, vivifying and toning our feelings and aspirations into a harmonious whole. It is not a language alone; to many Hindus it is a Bania; to all it is a music. The Vedas do not constitute an authority for all Bani. But the Vedas as the most ancient work and the history of their race belong to the Bani as much as to any of us. आद्यपुराण was not written by a सामाजिक, yet the आद्यपुराण is the common inheritance of the सामाजिक and the Bani. The बस्निपुराण is the Bible of the हिंदूya; but a belongs to Lingayat and non-Lingayat Hindus alike, as one of the foremost and historical kanarese work extant. विशेषभाषा of गुर्मू is as truly the property of a Hindu in Bengal as the वैष्णवितावरण is of a Sikh. कालिवर, वरक and सुन्दर, शाहवर and वराहमिहिर, भास and भास, भास and भास, दीर and दीर, wrote for us all, appeal to us all, are the cherished possessions of us all. Let the work of वंद the तामिल poet and say, a copy of Hafiz be kept before a Hindu in Bengal and if he be asked, “what belongs to you of these?” he would instinctively say, “वंद is mine!” let a copy of the work of विन्दनाथ and one of Shakespeare be kept before a Hindu in Maharashtra, he would claim “वंद, वंद is mine.”

The works of art and architecture are also a common inheritance of our race, whether they be representative of वैदिक...
other Mohammedan communities, observe the Hindu law in regulating some departments of their life, notably in matters of inheritance. Some of the Hindu customs in Maharashtra or Punjab may differ from some in Bengal or Sind. But the similarity in all other details is so great that the law of the Maharashtras as a whole seems to be an echo of the law books ruling our brothers in Bengal or Sind and vice versa. When all the rules, customs and laws observed by any given community are collected together it can immediately be found to be nothing but a fitting chapter of the Hindu law while no amount of ingenuity or torture can fit it in, say, the English or Mohamadan or the Japanese law books.

We have feasts and festivals in common. We have rites and rituals in common. The दसरा and दिवाली, the रंगोंवार and the होली, are welcomed wherever a Hindu breathes. शाती and जैन, ब्राह्मण and शैव, alike, you would find the whole Hindu kingdom engulfed on the Divali day. Not only Hindusthan, but the Greater Hindusthan that is fast growing in all the continents of the world. Not even a cottage in the ताड़ी forests could be found on that night that has not shown its little light! While the रंगों day would reveal to you every Hindu soul from the delighted damsels of Punjab to the austere Brahmins of Madras tying the silken tie that, heart to heart and mind to mind, in body and in soul, can bind.' Yet we have deliberately refrained ourselves from referring to any religious beliefs that we as a race may hold in common. Not had we referred to any institution or event or custom in its religious aspect or significance. Because we wanted to deal with

the essentials of धर्म not in the light of any "ism" but from a racial point of view; and yet even from a national and racial point of view do the different places of pilgrimage constitute a common inheritance of our Hindu race. The जयंती festival at अमरावती, the वेश्याली at अमृतसर, the कुम and the अजयेंद्र all these great gatherings had been the real and living congresses of our people that kept the current of life and thought nursing through out our body politic. The quaint customs and ceremonies and sacraments they involve, observed by some as a religious duty, by others as social amenities, impressed upon each individual that he can live best only through the common and corporate life of the Hindu race.

These then in short—and the subject in hand does not permit us to be exhaustive on this point—constitute the essence of our civilization and mark us out a cultural unit. We Hindus are not only a राज, a जाति, but and as a consequence of being both, own a common संस्कृति expressed and preserved chiefly and originally through संस्कृत, the real Mother-tongue of our race. Everyone who is a Hindu inherits this संस्कृति and owes his spiritual being to it as truly as he owes his physical one to the land and the blood of his forefathers.

A Hindu then is he who feels attachment to the land that extends from बौद्ध to बौद्ध as the land of his forefathers—as his Fatherland; who inherits the blood of the great race whose first and discernible source could be traced by the Himalayan altitudes of the Vedic सातवाणिक्य and which,
assimilating all that was incorporated and ennobling that which was assimilated has grown into and come to be known as the Hindu people; and who, as a consequence of the foregoing attributes, has inherited and claims as his own the देहाती, the Hindu civilization, as represented in a common history, common heroes, a common literature, a common art, a common law, and a common jurisprudence, common fairs and festivals, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments. Not that, every Hindu has all these details of the Hindu संस्कृति down to each syllable common with other Hindus; but that, he has more of it common with his Hindu brothers than with, say, an Arab or an Englishman. Not that a non-Hindu does not hold any of these details in common with a Hindu but that, he differs more from a Hindu than he agrees with. That is why Christian and Mohamedan communities, who were but very recently Hindus and in majority of cases had been at least in their first generation, most unwilling denizens of their new fold, claim though they might a common fatherland, and an almost pure Hindu blood and parentage with us, cannot be recognised as Hindus; as, since their adoption of the new cult they had ceased to own Hindu संस्कृति as a whole. They belong, or feel that they belong, to a cultural unit altogether different from the Hindu one. Their heroes and their hero-worship, their fairs and their festivals, ideas and their outlook of life, have now ceased to be common with ours. Thus the presence of this third essential of देहाती, which requires of every Hindu an uncommon and loving attachment to his racial संस्कृति enables us most perfectly to determine the nature of देहाती without any danger of using over-lapping or exclusive attributes.

But take the case of a patriotic Bohra or a Khaja countryman of ours. He loves our land of देहाती as his fatherland which, indisputably, is the land of his forefathers. He possesses—in certain cases they do—pure Hindu blood; especially if he is the first convert to Mohamedanism he must be allowed to claim to inherit the blood of Hindu parents. He, as an intelligent and reasonable man, loves our history and our heroes; in fact the Bohras and the Khojas, as a community, worship as heroes or great ten Avatars only adding Mohamad as the eleventh. He is actually, along with his community, subject to the Hindu law—the law of his forefathers. He is; so far as the three essentials of राज, जाति and संस्कृति are concerned, a Hindu. He may differ as regards a few festivals or may add a few more heroes to his pantheon of his supermen or demigods. But we have repeatedly said that difference in details here or emphasis there, does not throw us outside the pale of Hindu संस्कृति. The sub-communities amongst the Hindus observe many a custom, not only contradictory but even conflicting with customs of other Hindu communities. Yet both of them are Hindus. So also in the above cases of a patriotic Bohra or a Christian or a Khoja, who could satisfy the three required qualifications of देहाती to such a degree as that, why should he not be recognised as a Hindu?

He would certainly have been recognised as such but for his attitude towards a single detail—which, though it is covered by the word संस्कृति or 'culture, is yet too important'
to be lost in the multitude of other attributes, and therefore deserves a special treatment and analysis; which again brings us face to face with the question which, involving as it does the religious aspect of Hinduism, had often been avoided by us, not because we fight shy of it, but on account of our wish to fight it out all the more thoroughly and effectively. For, we are now better equipped to determine the significance and attempt an analysis of the two terms Hinduism and हिंदुस्थान.

VI

The words हिंदुस्थान and Hinduism being both of them derived from the word हिंद, must necessarily be understood to refer to the whole of the Hindu people. Any definition of Hinduism that leaves out any important section of our people and forces them either to play false to their convictions or to go outside the pale of हिंदुस्थान stands self-condemned. Hinduism means the system of religious beliefs found common amongst the Hindu people. And the only way to find out what those religious beliefs of the Hindus are, i.e., what constitutes Hinduism, you must first define a Hindu. But forgetting this chief implication of the word Hinduism which clearly presupposes an independent conception of a Hindu, many a people go about to determine the essentials of Hinduism and finding none so satisfactory as to include, without overlapping, all our Hindu communities come to the desperate conclusion—which does not satisfy them either,—that therefore those communities are not Hindus at all because,—not that the definition they had framed is open to the fault of exclusion but because those communities do not subject themselves to the required tenets which these gentlemen have thought it fit to label as "Hinduism"! This way of answering the question 'who is a Hindu?' is really preposterous and has given rise to so much of bitterness amongst some, of our brethren of the अर्थवित्त school of thought, the शिक्षा the जैन, the देवादन्त, the धार्मिक and even our patriotic and progressive भारतमानी.
Hinduism. Very well. What is Hinduism?—those tenets to which the Hindus are subjected! This is very nearly argued in a circle and can never lead to a satisfactory solution. Many of our friends who have been on this wrong track have come back to tell us "there is no such people as Hindus at all!" If some Indian, as gifted as that Englishman who first coined the word Hinduism, coins a parallel word "Englishism," proceeds to find out the underlying unity of beliefs amongst the English people, gets disgusted with thousands of sects and societies from the Jews to the Jacobins, from Trinity to Utility, and comes out to announce that "there are no such people as the English at all," he would not make himself more ridiculous than those who declare in cold print "there is nothing as a Hindu people." Any one who wants to see what a confusion of thought prevails on the point and how the failure to analyse separately the two terms हिन्दु and Hinduism renders that confusion worst confounded may do well to go through the booklet 'Essentials of Hinduism' published by the enterprising 'Natesan & Co'.

Hinduism means the 'ism' of the Hindus; and as the word Hindu has been derived from the word विष्णु, the Indus, meaning primarily all the people who reside on the land that extends from विष्णु to विष्णु, Hinduism must necessarily mean the religion or the religions that are peculiar and native to this land and this people. If we are unable to reduce the different tenets and beliefs to a single system of religion then the only way would be to cease to maintain that Hinduism is a system and to say that it is a set of systems consistent with, or if you like contradictory or even conflicting with, each other. But in no case can you advance this your failure to determine the meaning of Hinduism as a ground to doubt the existence of a Hindu nation itself, or worse still to commit sacrilege in hurting the feelings of our अनेकदाता Hindu brethren and दैविक Hindu brethren alike, by relegating any of them to the Non-Hindu pale.

The limits of this essay do not permit us to determine the nature or the essentials of Hinduism or to try to discuss it at any great length. As we have shown above the enquiry into what is Hinduism can only begin after the question 'who is a Hindu' is rightly answered by determining the essentials of हिन्दु; and as it is only with these essentials of हिन्दु which enable us to know 'who is a Hindu,' that this our present enquiry is concerned, the discussion of Hinduism falls necessarily outside of our scope. We have to take cognizance of it only so far as it trespasses in the field of our special charge. Hinduism is a word that properly speaking should be applied to all the religious beliefs that the different communities of the Hindu people hold. But it is generally applied to that system of religion which the majority of the Hindu people follow. It is natural that a religion or a country or a community should derive its name from the characteristic feature which is common to an overwhelming majority that constitutes or contributes to it. It is also convenient for easy reference or parlance. But a convenient term that is not only delusive but harmful and positively misleading should not any longer be allowed to blind our judgment. The ma-
iority of the Hindus contributes to that system of religion which could fitly be described by the attribute that constitutes its special feature, as नृतिस्मान्तपुरुषारण " or सनातनवम. They would not object if it even be called वैदिक धर्म. But besides these there are other Hindus who reject, either partly or wholly, the authority—some of the गुरुण, some of the आदि and some of the ज्ञातिस themselves. But if you identify the religion of the Hindus with the religion of the majority only and call it orthodox Hinduism, then the different heterodox communities, being Hindus themselves, rightly resent this usurpation of धर्म by the majority, as well as their unjustifiable exclusion. The religion of the minorities also requires a name. But if you call the so-called orthodox religion alone as Hinduism then naturally it follows that the religion of the so-called heterodox is not Hinduism! The next most fatal step being that therefore those sections are not Hindus at all! But this inference seems as staggering even to those who had unwillingly given wholehearted support to the premises which have made it logically inevitable that while hating to own it they hardly know how to avoid arriving at it. And thus we find that while millions of our Shikhs, Jains, Lingayats, several Samajis and others would deeply resent to be told that they—whose fathers' fathers up to the tenth generations had the blood of Hindus in their veins—had suddenly ceased to be Hindus!—yet a section amongst them takes it most emphatically for granted that they had been faced with a choice that either they should consent to be a party to those customs and beliefs which they had in their puritanic or progressive zeal rejected as superstitions, or they should cease to belong to that race to which their forefathers belonged.

All this bitterness is mostly due to the wrong use of the word Hinduism to denote the religion of the majority only. Either the word should be restored to its proper significance to denote the religions of all Hindus or if you fail to do that it should be dropped altogether. The religion of the majority of the Hindus could be best denoted by the ancient accepted appellation, the सत्सनातन धर्म or the ज्ञातिस्मांतपुरुषारण धर्म or the वैदिक धर्म; while the religions of the remaining Hindus would continue to be denoted by their respective and accepted names शाक्तिधर्म or शाख्य धर्म or बैतल धर्म or शूद्र धर्म. Whenever the necessity of denoting these धर्म as a whole arises then alone we may be justified in denoting them by the generic term हिन्दू धर्म or Hinduism. Thus their would be no loss either in clearness, or in conciseness but on the other hand a gain both in precision and unambiguity which by removing the cause of suspicion in our minor communities and resentment in the major ones would once more unite us all Hindus under our ancient banner representing a common race and a common civilization.

The earliest records that we have got of the religious beliefs of any Indian community—not to speak of mankind itself—are the Vedas. The Vedic nation of the सरस्वतिः was subdivided into many a tribe and class. But although the majority then held a faith that we for simplicity call Vedic religion, yet it was not contributed to by an important
minority of the Ṛṣis themselves. The Pāṇiṇis, the Gṛhaṇis, the Māsās, and many others from time to time seem to have either seceded from or never belonged to the orthodox church and yet racially and nationally they were conscious of being a people by themselves. There was such a thing as Vedic religion, but it could not be even then identified with the religion of the orthodox; for the latter term, had it been coined, would have naturally meant the set of religions prevailing in the land of the Ṛṣis, orthodox as well as heterodox. By a process of elimination and assimilation the race of the Ṛṣis at last grew into the race of the Hindus—and the land of the Ṛṣis, i.e., the Vidarbha, into the land of the Hindus, i.e., the Punjab. While their orthodox and the heterodox schools of religions have,—having tested much, dared much and known much,—having subjected to the most searching examination possible till then, all that lay between the grandest and the timeliest, from the atom to the Atman, from the Purusa to the Purusha,—having sounded the deepest secrets of thoughts and having soared to the highest altitudes of Ecstasy,—given birth to a synthesis that sympathises with all aspirants towards truth from the Monist to the Atheist. Truth its goal, Realization its method. It is neither Vedic nor non-Vedic, it is both. It is the veritable science of religion applied. This is the conclusion of the conclusions arrived at by harmonising the detailed experiences of all the schools of religious thought—Vedic, Samāstis, Brahm, śaiva, śākhā or dēvasamāj. Each one and every one of those systems or sects which are the direct descendants & developments of the religious beliefs and practices, that obtained in the land of the Ṛṣis,
or in the other unrecorded communities in other parts of India in the Vedic period, belongs to and is a part integral of Hindus.

Therefore the Vedic or the सनातन धर्म itself is merely a sect of Hinduism or हिंदूधर्म—however over-whelming be the majority that contributes to its tenets. It was a definition of this सनातन धर्म which the late Lokamanya Tilak framed in the famous verses "प्रामाण्यदर्शनं शास्त्राय अर्थाय दर्शनोऽवलोकितम्। उपासनाम-निष्पन्न एलेक्सन्स तद्गमाः॥" In a learned article that he had contributed to the विद्वत्मन, which bears the mark of its deep erudition and insight, the Lokamanya in an attempt to develop this more or less negative definition into a positive one, had clearly suggested that he had an eye, not on हिंदूम् as such but only on what was popularly called हिंदूम्; and had also admitted that it could hardly include in its sweep the आयुर्वेदाकास्मिन and other sects which never the less are racially and nationally Hindus of Hindus. That definition, excellent so far as it goes, is in fact not a definition of हिंदूम्, much less of हिंदूम्, but of सनातन धर्म—the धृतिसमर्पण-पौर्णमिता sect, which being the most popular of all sects of हिंदूम् was naturally but loosely mistaken for हिंदूम् itself.

Thus हिंदूम् being etymologically as well as actually and in its religious aspects only, (for धर्म is not merely religion) the religion of the Hindus, it necessarily partakes of all the essentials that characterise a Hindu. We have found that the first important essential qualification of a Hindu is—that, to him the land that extends from रघु to त्रेयस is the
The system or set of religions which we call वैदिक -- वैदिक and अवैदिक -- are as truly the children of this soil as the men whose thoughts they are or who "saw" the Truth revealed in them. To वैदिक with all its sects and systems this land विद्वेश्वान is the land of its revelation—the land of its birth on this human plane. As the Ganges, though flowing out of the lotus feet of Vishnu himself is even to the most orthodox devotee and mystic so far as human plane is concerned, the daughter of the Himalayas, even so, this land is the birth-place—the मानव and the विद्वेश्वान—of that समाज which in its religious aspect is signified as वैदिक. The second most important essential of वैदिक is that a Hindu is a descendant of Hindu parents, claims to have the blood of the ancient विद्वेश्वान and the race that sprang from them in his veins. This also is true of the different schools of religion of the Hindus. For, they too being either founded by or revealed to the Hindu sages and seers, are the moral and cultural and spiritual descendants and development of the Thought of the समाज through the process of assimilation and elimination, as we are of their Seed. Not only is वैदिक the growth of the natural environments and of the thought of the Hindus but also of the संस्कृत or culture of the Hindus. The environmental frames in which its scenes, whether of the वैदिक period, or of युद्ध, वैन or any extremely modern ones of वैतानिक, वनवास, सागर, नानक, दालनेवान or राहा राममोहन, are set, the technical terms and the language that furnished expression to its highest revelation and ecstacies, its mythology and its philosophy, the conceptions it controverted and the conceptions it adopted, have indelible stamp of Hindu culture, of Hindu संस्कृति, impressed upon them. वैदिक of all shades and schools, lives and grows and has its being in the atmosphere of Hindu culture, and the वैदिक of a Hindu being so completely identified with the land of the Hindus, this land to him is not only a विद्वेश्वान, but a वैदिक, not only a fatherland but a holy land.

Yes; this भारतमूल्यि, this विद्वेश्वान, this land of ours that stretches from वैदिक to वैदिक is our दुर्गमान, for it was in this land that the Founders of our faith and the Seers to whom वैदिक the Knowledge was revealed, from वैदिक seers to युद्ध, from जीन to महानवि, from युद्ध to नागमोहन, from नडा to गाथिक, from बंडा to बसर, from बंडा to गाथिक, from गाथिक to राममोहन, our Gurus and Godmen were born and bred. The very dust of its paths echoes the footfalls of our Prophets and Gurus. Sacred are its rivers, hallowed its groves, for it was their moonlit ghats or under their eventide long shadows, that the deepest problems of life, of man, soul and God, of बंडा and माया, were debated and discussed by a बंडा or a बंडा. Ah! every hill and dell instinct with memories of a कपिल or a ब्यास, a बंडा or राममोहन. Here गाथिक rules, there गाथिक lies. Here रामचंद्र made his first halt of an exile, there आनंद saw the golden deer and fondly pressed her lover to kill it. Here the divine cowherd played on his flute that made every heart in गाथिक dance in harmony as in a hypnotised sleep. Here वैदिक, here the deer park. Here महानवि entered निर्बाह. Here stood crowds of worshippers amongst whom नानक sat and sang the अरात्ति
"गमन चाहिए रविवार अष्टक करे।" Here गंगा, the king, took on vows of गंगा, the जङीर, and with a bowl in his hand knocked at his sister's door for handful of alms! Here the son of बंगाली, was hacked to pieces before the eyes of his father and the young bleeding heart of the son thrust in the father's mouth for the fault of dying as a Hindu! Every stone here has a story of martyrdom to tell! Every inch of thy soil, Oh mother! has been a sacrificial ground. Not only 'where the निर्मला is found' but from वास्तव, व्यक्ति it is 'वांछित, जीवित' sanctified with a ध्वनि, or an अवधारण, So to every Hindu, from the संताज्ञान to the गुप्तमय, this विश्वस्यादि, this विश्वस्यादि, is at once a विश्वस्यादि and a गुप्तमय.

That is why in the case of some of our Mohamadan or Christian countrymen who had originally been forcibly converted to Non-Hindu religion and who consequently have inherited, along with Hindus, a common Father-land and greater part of the wealth of common culture—language, law, customs, folklore and history—are not and cannot be recognized as Hindus. For though श्रीनाथ to them is फिलिप as to any other फिलिप yet it is not to them a फिलिप too.

Their Holyland is far off in Arabia or Palestine. Their mythology and godmen, ideas and heroes are not the children of this soil. Consequently their names and their outlook smack of foreign origin. Their love is divided. Nay, if some of them be really believing what they profess to do, then there can be no choice—they must to a man set their Holy-land above their Father-land in their love and allegiance. That is but natural. We are not condoning nor are we lamenting. We are simply telling facts as they stand. We have tried to determine the essentials of विश्वस्यादि and in doing so we have discovered that the Bohras and such other Mohamadan or Christian communities possess all the essential qualifications of विश्वस्यादि but one: and that is that they do not look upon India as their Holyland.

It is not a question of embracing any doctrine propounding any new theory of the interpretation of God and Soul and Man. For we honestly believe that the Hindu Thought—we are not speaking of any religion which is dogma—has exhausted the very possibilities of human speculation as to the nature of the Unknown—if not the Unknowable, or the nature of the relation between अन्त and भू. Are you a monoist—a monothest—a pantheist—an atheest—an agnostic? Here is ample room, oh soul! whatever thou art, to love and grow to thy fullest height and satisfaction in this Temple of temples, that stands on no personal foundation, but on the broad and deep and strong foundation of Truth. Why goest thou to fill thy little pitcher to wells far off, when thou standest on the banks of the crystal-streamed Ganges herself? Does not the blood in your veins, oh brother, of our common fore-fathers cry aloud with the recollections of the dear old scenes and seas from which they were so cruelly snatched away at the point of sword? Then come ye back to the fold of your brothers and sisters who with arms extended are standing at the open gate to welcome you—their long lost kith and kin. Where can you find more freedom of worship than in this
land where a चर्क न अहिन्द मन कर सक्ता है from the steps of the temple of महाकाल—more freedom of social organisation than in the Hindu society where from the Patna to the Pandits of Benares, from the संताल to the नर्मदा, each can develop a distinct social type of polity or organize a new one. Verily बंगाल है न सब चेहरा बंगाल है न कुंत विलिं द. Whatever could be found in the world is found here too. And if anything is not found here it could be found no where. Ye, who by race, by blood, by culture, by nationality possess almost all the essentials of हिन्दुत्व and had been forcibly snatched out of our ancestral Home by the hand of Violence—ye have only to render whole hearted love to our common Mother and recognize her not only as विजय, but even as a पुष्य, and ye would be most welcome to the Hindu fold.

This is a choice which our country-men and our old kith and kin the Bohras, Khojas, Mamons and other Mohamades and Christians communities are free to make—a choice again which must be a choice of love. But as long as they are not minded thus, so long they cannot be recognized as Hindus. We are it must be remebered, trying to analyse and determine the essentials of हिन्दुत्व as that word is actually understood to signify and would not be justified to strain it in its application to suit any preconceived notions or party conveniences.

A Hindu therefore, to sum up the conclusions arrived at is he who looks upon the land that extends from सिंह तिथि तिथि, from the Indus to the Seas, as the land of his forefathers—his वित्त, who inherits the blood of that race whose first discernible source could be traced to the Vedic सत्वित्व-
VII

The rough analysis to which the conception of रितुः was subjected in the foregoing section has enabled us to frame a working definition embodying or rather indicating the salient essentials of it. It now remains to see how far this general definition can stand a detailed examination that could be best conducted by testing a few typical and some of the most different cases which have in fact made the necessity of a definition so badly felt. While developing it we have tried at each step to free it, so far as it is possible to do so in the case of so comprehensive and elusive a generalization as that, from the defect of being overlapping. If we find in testing a few typical cases in the light of this definition that they all fit in well then we may be sure that it is free from the opposite defect of exclusiveness too. We have seen that it is not open to अशिष्यासिति; it remains to be seen whether it is not open to अश्चर्चित also.

The geographical divisions that obtain amongst the Hindus would, at a glance, be seen to harmonise well with the spirit of our definition. The fundamental basis of it is the land रामचुः रितुः, and although many of our brethren, and especially those who had been the most undoubted descendants of the ancient रितुः, and who besides are the very people that to this day have never changed the ancient name either of their land or of their race, and are called to day as five thousand years ago, ‘सिद्ध’, the children of शिन्नुः, inhabit on the other bank of the Indus, yet as in the mention of a river the mention of both its banks is implied as a matter of course so that part of शिन्नुः which constitutes the western bank of Indus is a natural part of रितुः and is covered by our definition. Secondly, accessories to the mainland are always known by the name of the latter. And thirdly, our Hindu people on that side of the Sindhu had through out history looked upon this land of भरतवर्ष as their real रितुः as well as रामचुः. They had never been guilty of matricide in attempting to set up the patch they inhabit as their only रितुः or only रामचुः. On the other hand their तारास्वति and कालस्वति and गंगा माता are our कालस्वति and कालस्वति and गंगा माता. From the Vedic time they are a part integral of भरतवर्ष. ‘रितुःस्वतिः’ are mentioned in रामचुः and महामधुर्यम as the rightful constituents of the great Hindu confederacy and commonwealth. They belong to our रामवर्ष, to our ग्लूः and to our संस्काराः. Therefore they are Hindus and their case is well covered by our definition.

But even if one rejects the contention that the ownership of a river does imply, unless otherwise stated, the ownership of both its banks yet the definition remains as sound as ever and applies to our शिन्नुः brethren on other grounds. For, apart from the special case of our शिन्नुः brethren that inhabit on the other side of the Indus, there are hundreds of thousands of Hindus who have settled in all parts of the world. A time may come when these our Hindu
colonists, who even to-day are the dominating factor in trade
numbers, capacity and intellect in their respective lands.
may come to own a whole country and form a separate state.
But will this simple fact of residence in lands other than हिंदुस्तान render one a non-Hindu? Certainly not; for the first es-
essential of हिंदु is not that a man must not reside in lands out-
side India, but that wherever he or his descendants may
happen to be he must recognize हिंदुस्तान as the land of his
forefathers. Nay more; it is not a question of recognition
either. If his ancestors came from India as Hindus he cannot
help recognizing India as his रिणमु. So this definition
of हिंदु is compatible with any conceivable expansion
of our Hindu people. Let our colonists continue unabated
their labours of founding a Greater India, a महाभारत, to the
best of their capacities and contribute all that is best in our
civilization to the upbuilding of Humanity. Let them en-
rich the people that inhabit the earth from Pole to Pole with
their virtues and let them in return enrich their own country
and race by inbibing all that is healthy and true wherever
found. हिंदु does not clip the wings of the Himalayan eagles
but only adds to their urge. So long as ye, Oh Hindus, look
upon हिंदुस्तान as the land of your forefathers and as the
land of your prophets, and cherish the priceless heritage of
their culture and their blood, so long nothing can stand in
the way of your desire to expand. The only geographical
limits of हिंदु are the limits of our earth!
So far as the racial aspect of our definition is concerned we
cannot think of any exception that can seriously challenge its
validity. Just as in England we find Iberians, Kelts, Angles,
Saxons, Danes, Normans now fused in spite of the racial re-
strictions on intermarriages into one nation, so the ancient
racial distinctions of Aryans, Kolarsians, Dravidians and others
even if they had ever been keen, can no longer be recognized.
We have dealt with the point as exhaustively as necessary in
the foregoing sections and pointed out that the अवशेष अववेष
systems recognized in our lawbooks bear indisputable testi-
mony to the fact that a fusion sufficient to keep the flow of
common blood through our body politic vigorous and fresh
was even then an accomplished fact. Nature again broke
the barriers where custom refused to pull them down in time.

मायेन was neither the first nor the last of Aryans to
make love with a मित्रिण, nor the Brahmin lady, the mother
of व्यायाम, to whom we have referred already was the
only Aryan girl that took a fancy to a मित्र youth. Out of
a dozen Bhils or Kolis or even Santals, a youth or a girl
may at times be picked up and dropped in a city school with-
out any fear of being recognized as such either by a physical
or by a moral test. The race that is born of the fusion,
which on the whole is a healthy one, because gradual, of the
Aryans, Kolarsians, Dravidians and all those of our ances-
tors, whose blood we as a race inherent, is rightly called neither
an Aryan, nor Kolarian, nor Dravidian—but the Hindu race:
that is, that people who live as children of a common mother-
land, adoring a common holyland—the land that lies between
the रिणस. Therefore the संसार, ब्रूति, भिक्ति, प्रथम, नामसुत
and all other such tribes and classes are Hindus. This हिंदुस्तान
is as emphatically, if not more emphatically, the land of their forefathers as of those of the so-called Aryans; they inherit the Hindu blood and the Hindu culture; and even those of them who have not as yet come fully under the influence of any orthodox Hindu sect, do still worship deities and saints and follow a religion, which however primitive, are still purely attached to this land, which therefore to them is not only a fatherland but a Holyland.

There would have been no serious objection raised against the cultural aspect of हिंदुस्तान too, but for the unfortunate misunderstanding that owes its origin to the confusing similarity between the two terms हिंदु and Hindu. We have tried already to draw a clear line of demarcation between the two conceptions and protested against the wrong use of the word Hinduism to denote the सनातन धर्म alone. हिंदु is not identical with हिंदूस्तान; nor is हिंदूस्तान identical with Hinduism. This twofold mistake that identifies हिंदू with हिंदुस्तान and both with सनातन sects or religious systems and goes a small section of people amongst them—not to explode this mistaken notion, but unfortunately to commit another grave and suicidal mistake in the opposite direction and disown their हिंदू itself. We hope that our definition will leave no ground for any such bitterness of feelings on either side and based on truth as it is would be acknowledged by all the fair-minded people throughout our Hindu Society. But as in the general treatment of this question we could not take any notice of any special case we shall do so now. Let us first take the case of our सिख brotherhood. No one could be so silly as to contest the statement that सिखवाण, “सिखवाण सिखवाण सरस्तानि”, is their Fatherland—the land that ever since the first ancient records of the Vedic Period has been the land where their forefathers lived and loved and worshipped and prayed. Secondly, they most undoubtedly inherit the Hindu blood in their veins as much as any one in Madras or Bengal does. Nay more: While we Hindus in Maharashtra or Bengal inherit the blood of the Aryans as well as of those other ancient people who inhabited this land, the Sikhs are the almost direct descendants of those ancient सिख and can claim to have drunk their being at the very fountain of this Ganges of our Hindu Life before she had descended down to the plains. Thirdly, they have contributed and therefore are the rightful copartners in our Hindu culture. For सरस्तानि was a river in the Punjab before she became the Deified Image of Learning and Art. To this day, do millions of Hindus through out Hindusthan join in the enchanted chorus with which the सिख, your forefathers, Oh Sikhs, paid the tribute of a grateful people to, and extolled the glories of, the River on whose banks the first seeds of our Culture and civilization were sown, and catching their Rigvedic accents sing “आदि महानदी मे बिस्तर्नें | सरस्तानि सरस्तानि!” The Vedas are theirs as they are ours, if not as a revelation, yet as a revered work that sings of the first giant struggles of Man to tap the sources of Nature, the first giant struggle of Light against the forces of Darkness and Ignorance, that had stolen and kept imprisoned the spirited waters and refused to allow the rays of Illumination to touch
man and rouse the Soul in him. The story of the Sikhs, like any one of us must begin with the Vedas, pass on through the palaces of Ayodhya, witness the battlefield of Lanka, help

leave the confines of अक्षयकल्प and enter the caves to find some way out to lighten the sorrows of Man. The Sikhs along with us bewail the fall of पुर्वराव, share the fate of a conquered people, and suffer together as Hindus. Millions of Sikhs-

नन्दी, निरंदी, the गहन, गोलार्थ, the निम्न, निम्नगंगा, and the सिंधी Sikhs are proud of being Hindus by race and by nationality. As their Gurus themselves had been the children of Hindus they would fail to understand if not resent any such attempt to class them as Non-Hindus. The गुरुपाल is read by the सनातन, as well as by the Sikhs as a sacred work: both of them have fairs and festivals in common. The Sikhs of the राजस्थान also, so far as the bulk of their population is concerned, are equally attached to their racial appellation and live amongst Hindus as Hindus. It cannot be but shocking to

them to be told that they had suddenly ceased to be Hindus. Our racial Unity is so unchallenged and complete that inter-marriages are quite common amongst the Sikhs and सनातन.

The fact is that the protest that is at times raised by some leaders of our Sikh brotherhood against their being classed as Hindus would never have been heard if the term Hinduism was not allowed to get identical with Sanatanism. This confusion of ideas and the vagueness of expression resulting therefrom, are at the root of this fatal tendency that mars at times the cordial relations existing between our sister Hindu Communities. We have tried to make it clear that हिंदु is not to be determined by any theological tests. Yet we must repeat it once more that the Sikhs are free to reject any or all things they dislike as superstitions in सनातन, even the binding authority of the Vedas as a revelation. They thereby may cease to be सनातन, but cannot cease to be Hindus. Sikhs are Hindus in the sense of our definition of हिंदु and not in any religious sense whatever.
Religiously they are Sikhs, as Jains are Jains, Lingayats are Lingayats, Vaishnavas are Vaishnavas—but all of us racially and nationally and culturally are a polity and a people, one and indivisible, most fifty and from times immemorial called Hindus. No other word can express our racial oneness—not even भारतीय can do that for reasons dealt with in the foregoing sections. भारतीय indicates an Indian and expresses a larger generalization but cannot express racial unity of us Hindus. We are Sikhs, and Hindus and Bharatiyas. We are all three put together and none exclusively.

Another reason besides this fear of being indetified with the followers of सनातनवांश which added to the zeal of some of our Sikh brothers and made them insist on getting classed separately as non-Hindus, was political one. This is not the place of entering into merits or demerits of a special representation. The Sikhs were naturally anxious to guard the special interests of their community and if the Mohomedans could enjoy the privilege of a special and communal representation, we do not understand why any other important minority in India should not claim similar concessions. But we feel that the claim should not have been backed up by our Sikh brothers by an untenable and suicidal plea of being non-Hindus, Sikhs, to guard their own interests, could have pressed for and succeeded in securing special and communal representation only on ground of being an important minority as our non-Brahmins and other communities have done without renouncing their birth-right of हिन्दुस्तान. Our Sikh brotherhood is certainly not a less important community than the Moha-
your other Hindu brethren. Whenever in the future as in the past, a foreigner raises a sword against the Hindu civilization, it is sure to strike you as deadly as any other Hindu community. Whenever in future as in the past, the Hindus as a people come to their own and under a Shivaji or a Ranjit a Ramchandra or a Dharma, an Ashoka or an Amoghwarsha feeling the quickening touch of life and activity mount the pinnacles of glory and greatness—that day would shed its lustre on you as well as on any other member of our Hindu Commonwealth. So, brothers, be not dismayed by the immediate gains, paltry or otherwise, nor be duped by misreadings and misinterpretations of history. I was once told by one, who posing as a मंत्री was nevertheless convicted for committing a dacoity in the house of a Brahmin to whom he owed money and whom he consequently murdered—that the Sikhs were not Hindus and that they could incur no guilt by killing a Brahmin as the sons of Govind Singh were betrayed by a Brahmin cook! Fortunately there was another Sikh gentleman and a real मंत्री and was recognized as such by all learned Sikhs who immediately contradicted and cornered him by several examples of मंत्रादाता and others, who had sheltered the Guru and proved true to the Sikhs even unto martyrdom. Was not Shivaji betrayed by his kith and kin and his grandson again by a मंत्री who too was a Hindi? But did Shivaji or his nation disown their race and cease to be Hindus? Many of the Sikhs have acted treacherously first at the time of desertion of the heroic Banda, then again at the time of the last war of the Khalsa forces with the English. Guru Govind Singh himself was deserted by a number of Sikhs and in the very thick of fight and it was this act of treacherous cowardice of these Sikhs which by forcing our lion-hearted Guru to try a desperate sortie, gave occasion to that cursed Brahmin wretch to betray his two sons. If therefore for the crime of the latter we cease to be Hindus, then for the crime of the former we ought to cease to be Sikhs too!

The minority of the Hindus as well as the major communities of them did not fall from the skies as separate creations. They are an organic growth that has its roots embedded deep in a common land and in a common culture. You cannot pick up a lamb and by tying a कच्चा and रुपाक on it, make a lion of it! If the Guru succeeded in forming a band of martyrs and warriors he could do so because the race that produced him as well as that band, was capable of being moulded thus. The lion’s seed alone can breed lions. The flower cannot say “I bloom and smile and smell; surely I came out of the stalk alone—I have nothing to do with the roots!” No more can we deny our seed or our blood. As soon as you point a Sikh who was true to his Guru you have automatically pointed out a Hindu who was true to the Guru, for before being a Sikh he was, and yet continues to be, a Hindu. So long as our Sikh brethren are true to Sikhism they must of necessity continue to be Hindus; for so long must this land, this भारतमूर्ति, अति रूपपति, remain their रूपपति and their रूपम्. It is by ceasing to be Sikhs alone that they may, perhaps, cease to be Hindus.
We have dealt at some length with this special case of our Sikh brotherhood as all those arguments and remarks would automatically test all similar cases of our other sectarian and religious in the light of our definition. The समाजस is for example agnostics: but हिन्दू has little to do with agnosticism, or for the matter of that, atheism. The समाजस look on this land as the land of their forefathers, their ज्ञान, as well as their पुण्य, and are therefore Hindus. Of course, it is superficial, after all this, to refer to our ज्ञानसमाज,—all the essentials of हिन्दू hold good in their case so eminently that they are Hindus of Hindus. We, in fact, are unable to hit upon any case that can lay our definition open to the charge of exclusiveness.

In one case alone it seems to offer some real difficulty. Is, for example, Sister Nivedita a Hindu? If ever an exception proves the rule it does so here. Our patriotic and noble minded sister had adopted our land आधिकारिकता as her ज्ञान. She truly loved it as such, and had our nation been free, we would have been the first to bestow the right of citizenship on such loving souls. So the first essential may, to some extent, be said to hold good in her case. The second essential of common blood, of Hindu patronage must, never-the-less and necessarily, be absent in such cases as these. The sacrament of marriage with a Hindu which really fuses, and is universally admitted to do so, two beings into one may be said to remove this disqualification. But although this second essential failed, either way, to hold good in her case, the third important qualification of हिन्दू did entitle her to be recognised as a Hindu. For, she had adopted our culture and came to adore our land as her पुण्य. She felt, she was a Hindu and that is, apart from all technicalities, the real and the most important test. But we must not forget that we have to determine the essentials of हिन्दू in the sense in which the word is actually used by an overwhelming majority of our people. And therefore we must say that any convert of non-Hindu parentage to Hindutva can be a Hindu, if bona fide, he or she adopts our land as his or her country and marries a Hindu, thus coming to love our land as a real ज्ञान and adopts our culture and thus adores our land as the पुण्य.

The children of such a union as that would, other things being equal, be most emphatically Hindus. We are not authorised to go further.

But, by coming to believe into the tenets of any sects of the Hindus, a foreign convert may be recognised as a समाजस, or a आधिकारिक, or a ज्ञान; and as these religions being founded by or revealed to Hindus, go by the name of हिन्दू-धर्म the convert too may be religiously called a Hindu. But it must be understood that a religious or cultural convert possesses only one of the three essentials of हिन्दू and it is owing to this disqualification that people generally do not recognise as a Hindu any one and every one who contributes to the religious beliefs of our race. So deep our feeling of gratitude is towards a Sister Nivedita or an Annie Besant for the services they rendered to the cause of our Motherland and our culture, so soft hearted and sensitive to the touch of Love as a race we Hindus are, that Sister Nivedita or a person like her who so
VIII.

So far we have not allowed any considerations of utility to prejudice our inquiry. But having come to its end it will not be out of place to see how far the attributes, which we found to be the essentials of हिन्दु, contribute towards strength, cohesion, and progress, of our people. Do these essentials constitute a foundation so broad, so deep, so strong that basing upon it the Hindu people can build a Future which can face and repel the attacks of all the adverse winds that blow; or does the Hindu Race stand on Feet of clay?

Some of the ancient nations raised huge walls so as to convert a whole country into a fortified castle. To-day their walls are trodden to dust or are but scarcely discernible by a few scattered mounds here and there; while the People they were meant to protect are not discernible at all! Our ancient neighbours, the Chinese, laboured from generation to generation and raised a rampart, embracing the limits of an empire—so wide, so high, so strong—a wonder of human world. That too, as all human wonders must, sank under its own weight. But behold the ramparts of Nature! Have they not, these Himalayas, been standing there as one whose desires are satisfied—so they seemed to the Vedic bard—so they seem to us to-day. These are our ramparts that have converted this vast continent into a cosy castle.
You take up buckets and fill your trenches with water and call it moat. Behold, Varuna himself, with his one hand pushing continents aside, fills the gap by pouring seas on seas with the other! This Indian ocean with its bays and gulfs, is our moat.

These are our frontier lines bringing within our reach the advantages of an in-land as well as an insular country.

She is the richly endowed daughter of God—This our Motherland. Her rivers are deep and perennial. Her land is yielding to the plough and her fields loaded with golden harvests. Her necessaries of life are few and a genial nature yields them all almost for the asking. Rich in her fauna, rich in her flora, she knows she owes it all to the immediate source of light and heat—The Sun. She covets not the icy lands; blessed be they and their frozen latitudes. If heat is at times 'enervating' here, cold is at times blemming there. If cold induces manual labour, heat removes much of its very necessity. She takes more delight in quenched thirst than in the parched throat. Those who have not, let them delight in exerting to have. But those who have—may be allowed to derive pleasure from the very fact of having. Father Thames is free to work at feverish speed, wrapped in his icy sheets. She loves to visit her ghats and watch her boats gliding down the Ganges, on her moonlit waters. With the plough, the peacocks, the lotus, the elephant and the Gita, she is willing to prolong, if that must be, whatever advantage the colder latitudes enjoy. She knows she cannot have all her own way. Her gardens are green and shady, her granaries well stocked, her waters crystal, her flowers scented, her fruits juicy and her herbs healing. Her brush is dipped in the colours of Dawn and her flute resonant with the music of Gokul. Verily Hind is the richly endowed daughter of God.

Neither the English nor the French—with the exception of the Chinese and perhaps the Americans, no people are gifted with a land that can equal in natural strength and richness the land of भारतमाय. A country, a common home is the first important essential of stable and strong nationality; and as of all countries in the world our country can hardly be surpassed by any in its capacity to afford a soil so specially fitted for the growth of a great nation, we Hindus whose very first article of faith is the love we bear to the common Fatherland, have in that love the strongest talismanic tie that can bind close and keep a nation firm and enthuse and enable it to accomplish things greater than ever.

The second essential of हिन्दू is the estimate of our latent powers of national cohesion and greatness yet higher. No country in the world with the exception of China again, is peopled by a race so homogeneous, yet so ancient and yet so strong both numerically and vitally. The Americans too, whom we found equally fortunate with us so far as the gift of an excellent geographical basis of nationality is concerned, are decidedly left behind. Mohamadans are no race nor are the Christians. They are a religious unit, yet neither a racial nor a national one. But we Hindus, if possible, are all the three put together and live under our ancient and
common roof. The numerical strength of our race is an asset that cannot be too highly prized.

And culture! The English and the Americans feel they are kith and kin because they possess a Shakespeare in common. But not only a Kalidas or a Bhas, but Oh Hindus! ye possess a Ramayan and a Mahabharat in common—and the Vedas! One of the national songs the American children are taught to sing attempts to rouse their sense of eternal self-importance by pointing out to the hundred years twice told that stand behind their history. The Hindu counts his years not by centuries but by cycles—the long and the short—and amazed asks ‘रुपते वषों समाय: | नामुनी वषों नामकाः’

He does not attempt to rouse the sense of self importance so much as the sense of proportion, which is Truth. And that has perhaps made him last longer than Ramses and Nebuchadnezzar. If a people that had no past has no future, then a people who had produced an unending galaxy of heroes and heroworshipers and who are conscious of having fought with and vanquished the forces whose might struck Greece and Rome, the Pharaohs and the Incas, dead, have in their history a guarantee of their future greatness more assuring than any other people on earth yet possess.

But besides culture the tie of common holy-land has at times proved stronger than the chains of a Motherland. Look at the Mohamadans. Mecca to them is a sterner reality than Delhi or Agra. Some of them do not make any secret of being bound to sacrifice all Indian if that be to the glory of Islam or could save the city of their Prophet. Look at the Jews: neither centuries of prosperity nor sense of gratitude for the shelter they found can make them more attached or even equally attached to the several countries they inhabit. Their love is, and must necessarily be, divided between the land of their birth and the land of their Prophets. If the Zionists’ dreams are ever realized—if Palestine becomes a Jewish State and it will galvanize us almost as much as our Jewish friends—they, like the Mahomedans would naturally set the interests of their Holy-land above those of their Motherlands in America & Europe and in case of war between their adopted country and the Jewish state, would naturally sympathize with the latter, if indeed they do not bodily go over to it.

History is too full of examples of such desertions to cite particulars. The crusades again, attest to the wonderful influence that a common holy-land exercises over peoples widely separated in race, nationality and language, to bind and hold them together.

The ideal conditions therefore under which a nation can attain perfect solidarity and cohesion would, other things being equal, be found in the case of those people who inhabit the land they adore, the land of whose forefathers is also the land of their Gods and Angels, of Seers and Prophets; the scenes of whose history are also the scenes of their mythology.

The Hindus are about the only people who are blessed with these ideal conditions that are at the same time incentive to national solidarity, cohesion and greatness. Not even the Chinese are blessed thus. Only Arabia and Palestine—if ever the Jews can succeed in founding their state there—can
be said to possess this unique advantage. But Arabia is incomparably poorer in the natural, cultural, historical, and numerical essentials of a great people; and even if the dreams of the Zionists are ever realized into a Palestine State still they too must be equally lacking in these.

England, France, Germany, Italy, Turkey proper, Persia, Japan, Alghanistan, Egypt of to-day (for the old descend- ands of ‘Punto’ and their Egypt is dead long since)—and other African states, Mexico, Peru, Chilly (not to mention states and nations lesser than all these)—though racially more or less homogeneous, are yet less advantageously situated than we are, in geographical, cultural, historical and numerical essentials, besides lacking the unique gift of a sanctified Motherland. Of the remaining nations Russia is Europe, and United States in America, though geographically equally well-gifted with us, are yet poorer in almost every other requisite of nationality. China alone of the present comity of nations is almost as richly gifted with the geographical, racial, cultural and numerical essentials as the Hindus are. Only in the possession of a common, a sacred and a perfect language, the Sanskrit, and a sanctified Motherland are we, so far as the essentials that contribute to national solidarity are concerned, more fortunate.

Thus the actual essentials of भूतान are, as this running sketch reveals, also the ideal essentials of Nationality. If we would we can build on this foundation of भूतान a future greater than what any other people on earth can yet dream of:—greater even than our own Past. Provided we are able to utilize our opportunities! For let our people remember that Great Combinations are the order of the day. The leagues of Nations, the alliances of Powers, Panislamism, Panaslavism, Panethiopism—all little beings seeking to get themselves incorporated into greater wholes, so as to be better fitted for the struggle for existence and power. Those who are not naturally and historically blessed with numerical or geographical or racial advantages are seeking to share them with others. Woe to those who have them already as their birthright and know them not; or worse, despise them! Thenations of the world are desparately trying to find a place in this or that combination for aggression:—can any one of you, Oh Hindus! whether बैं or सामाजिक or सरकारी or शास्त्र or any other subsection, afford to cut yourselves off or fall out and destroy the ancient, the natural and the organic combination that already exists?—combination that is bound not by any scraps of paper nor by the ties of exigencies alone, but by the ties of blood and birth and culture? Strengthen them if you can: pull down the barriers that have survived their utility, of castes and customs, of sects and sections: What of inter-dining?—but intermarriages between provinces and provinces, castes and castes, be encouraged where they do not exist. But where they already exist as between the Sikhs and Sainatanies, Jains and Vaishnavas, Lingayats and Non-Lingayats—suicidal be the band that ties to cut the nuptial tie. Let the minorities remember they would be cutting the very branch on which they stand. Strengthen every tie that binds you to the main organism, whether of blood or language or common festivals.
and feasts or culture and the love you bear to the common Motherland. Let this ancient and noble stream of Hindu blood flow from vein to vein, from हर्वक to करूक, till at last the Hindu people get fused and welded into an indivisible whole, till our race gets consolidated and strong and sharp as steel.

Just cast a glance at the past, then at the Present: Pan-Islamism in Asia, the Political Leagues in Europe, the Pan-African movement in Africa and America:—and then see, Oh Hindus, if your future is not entirely bound up with the future of India; and the future of India is bound up, in the last resort, with Hindu strength. We are trying our best, as we ought to do, to develop the consciousness of and a sense of attachment to the greater whole, whereby Hindus, Mohamedans, Parsis, Christians and Jews would feel as Indians first and every other thing afterwards. But whatever progress India may have made to that goal one thing remains almost axiomatically true—not only in India but everywhere in the world—that a nation requires a foundation to stand upon and the essence of the life of a nation is the life of that portion of its citizens whose interests and history and aspirations are most closely bound up with the land and who thus provide the real foundation to the structure of their national state. Take the case of Turkey. The young Turks after the revolution, had to open their Parliament and military institutions to Armenians and Christians on a non-religious and secular basis. But when the war with Servia came the Christians and Armenians first wavered and then many a regiment consisting of them went bodily over to the Servians, who politically and racially and religiously were more closely bound up with them. Take the case of America; when the German war broke out she suddenly had to face the danger of desertions of her German citizens; while the Negro citizens there sympathise more with their brethren in Africa than with their white countrymen. American State, in the last resort, must stand or fall with the fortunes of its Anglo-Saxon constituents. So with the Hindus. They being the people, whose past, present and future are most closely bound with the soil of Hindusthan as आर्डुस, as a दुर्ग, they constitute the foundation, the bedrock, the reserved forces of the Indian state. Therefore even from the point of Indian Nationality, must ye, Oh Hindus, consolidate and strengthen Hindu Nationality: not to give wanton offence to any of our non-Hindu compatriots; in fact to any one in the world, but in just and urgent self-defence of our race and land; to render it impossible for others to betray her or to subject her to unprovoked attacks by any of those 'Pan-isms' that are struggling forth from continent to continent. As long as other communities in India or in the world are not respectively planning India first or Mankind first, but all are busy in organising offensive and defensive alliances and combinations on entirely narrow racial or religious or national basis, so long, at least so long. Oh Hindus, strengthen if you can those subtle bonds that like nervethreads bind you in One Organic Social Being. Those of you who in a suicidal fit try to cut off the most vital of those ties and dare to disown the name Hindu will find to their cost that in doing so they have cut
themselves off from the very source of our racial Life and Strength.

The presence of only a few of these essentials of nationality which we have found to constitute हिंदुत्व enabled little nations like Spain or Portugal to get themselves lionised in the world. But when all of those ideal conditions obtain here what is there in the human world that the Hindus cannot accomplish?

Twenty-two crores of people, with India for their basis of operation, for their Fatherland and for their Holyland, with such a history behind them, bound together by ties of a common blood and common culture, can dictate their terms to the whole world. A day will come when mankind will have to face the force.

Equally certain it is that whenever the Hindus come to hold such a position whence they could dictate terms to the whole world—those terms cannot be very different from the terms which Gita dictates or the Buddha lays down. A Hindu is most intensely so, when he ceases to be a Hindu; and with a शंकर claims the whole earth for a Benares’ विशालाकाशी अमरिन्दी! or with a Tukaram exclaims ‘क्षेत्री स्वेतुः शुभरत्नाभायं बांधे—my country? Oh brothers, the limits of the Universe—the frontiers of my country lie!’