

# **Dalits & Muslims as blood brothers**

**Dr. Ambedkar's Praise for Islam**

**S.K. BISWAS**

Foreword  
**V.T. RAJSHEKAR**

# **Dalits & Muslims as blood brothers**

**Dr. Ambedkar's praise for Islam**

**S.K. BISWAS**

**Foreword: V.T. RAJSHEKAR**

**Dalit Sahitya Academy**

Copyright with author

First Edition: 2008

**DALIT SAHITYA AKADEMY**

No.109 - 7th Cross,  
Palace Lower Orchards,  
Bangalore - 560 003, INDIA.

email: [vtr@ndf.vsnl.net.in](mailto:vtr@ndf.vsnl.net.in)  
[dalitvoice@rediffmail.com](mailto:dalitvoice@rediffmail.com)

website: [www.dalitvoice.org](http://www.dalitvoice.org)

Price: Rs. 30  
2 euros (outside India)

Printed at:

GU Graphics  
Rajajinagar Indl. Town  
Bangalore - 560 044

## FOREWORD

### **Muslims as part of Bahujan Samaj**

The Hindu terrorist parties like RSS-BJP have been violent movements to establish their Brahminical dictatorship by *hinduising* (enslaving) India's over 65% of the non-Hindu (if not anti-Hindu) Dalits, Tribals and Backward Castes. Through its monopoly mass media and textbooks they have been spitting venom against Muslims (15%) and periodically managing mass murders of Muslims. The two biggest and the most famous violent mass murders of Muslims in post-independent India are the Babri Masjid demolition (1992) and the Gujarat Genocide (2002).

#### **Dalits killed Muslims**

Both the mass murders of Muslims were carried out — not by the micro-minority Brahminical people (15%) who control RSS-BJP —but by the non-Hindu (if not anti-Hindu) Dalits (20%) and Tribals (10%). India's 3% Brahmins are world-famous cowards and hence incompetent to carry out the bloodbath. The periodic anti-Hindu war and violence that Brahminical people engineer is not because they hate Muslims. But because killing of innocent Muslims and destroying their little property is the only way to *hinduise* (enslave) the non-Hindu Dalits and Tribals, the original Indians who have nothing against Muslims.

The problem with the Muslim leadership is either it doesn't know this fact or it is afraid of saying this in public.

## **Muslims as blood brothers**

History says over 90% of the Indian Muslims are converts from SC/ST/BCs and hence their blood brothers. All over India they live in perfect peace with Muslims. Besides, both the sections are beef-eaters.

Brahminical rulers go on producing poison against Muslims only to instigate SC/ST/BCs against Muslims. Such a periodic war and violence against Muslims help the micro-minority (15%) Hindu rulers to forcibly annex the 65% SC/ST/BCs into their poison-packed dungeon called Hinduism and thereby proclaim to the world that Hindus are India's majority (85%) community and India is Hindu.

To say that India is Hindu is down-right falsehood, says S.K. Biswas. Brother Biswas, a senior officer in the Census Commission of India in Delhi, is a noted Bengali Dalit writer, thinker, Ambedkarite scholar and follower of Kanshi Ram with several books to his credit.

The following text, "Dr. Ambedkar & Islam", is reproduced from his famous book, *Hindu Raj — Today, Yesterday & Tomorrow* (Orion Books, 382-B, J&K Pocket, Dilshad Garden, Delhi - 110 095, pp.205, 1996).

## **Anti-Muslim prejudices**

The last chapter of this book is reproduced to counter the powerful Hindu terrorist bid to *hinduise* our people — particularly the educated elite who have started developing strong prejudices against Muslims.

What happened in Gujarat (2002) was nothing but a Dalit-Adivasi attack on Muslims resulting in over 2,000 deaths of Muslims. In the year 2006 (May 20-21), we held our

*Dalit Voice* workshop at Ahmedabad where a large number of our old Dalit comrades attended and expressed shock over Dalits and Muslims, living side by side in perfect peace for decades in old Ahmedabad, killing each other.

### **Hindu poison injected into our blood**

How did centuries of peace and brotherhood turn into blood-bath? It was due to the Hindu poison injected into our innocent people.

Hindu rulers of India are the richest, the most powerful with their millions of gods in their pocket. With their Brahminical monopoly media at their command, they can turn day into night and vice versa. There is not a single part of India which has not witnessed anti-Muslim blood-bath. In fact the Brahminical people get stronger by drinking the Muslim blood.

### **Muslim leadership blamed**

Yes. They want to *hinduise* India to re-impose their Brahminical dictatorship by scrapping the existing constitution, their sham democracy and the rule of law. They are succeeding. SC/ST/BCs who are not only not Hindu but anti-Hindu are fast becoming Hindu and the unpaid fighting arm of the mere 15% Brahminical upper castes. This is the greatest tragedy of "independent" India. And we squarely blame the Muslim leadership for this tragedy.

Dr. Ambedkar, our Father, has said all these things and Kanshi Ram built his Bahujan Samaj Party with the support of Muslims. Brother Biswas profusely quotes from our Father and his well-thought-out opinion on

Muslims and Islam. There is no need for us to read or listen to anybody except our Father on the need for strong Dalit-Muslim unity on which we have also written so much.

### **Brahmins as servants of Muslims**

We are reproducing the entire chapter on Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar's thoughts so that SC/ST/BCs will at least read his wise words and stop falling into the Hindu net and get deceived by the enemy. We also want honest Muslim intellectuals to study this booklet, embrace the Dalits and win them over before greater blood-bath between the Dalits and Muslims pave the way for the *Hindu Rashtra*. The ball is in Muslim court.

The Brahminical people hate Dalits much more than the Muslims. In fact they have nothing against Muslims because they are not only outside the Brahminical Social Order but totally hostile — uncompromising. During the 1,000 year-long Muslim rule the Brahmins loyally worked as their servants.

The Brahminical Social Order can, therefore, do nothing to Muslims. That is why they are using Dalits to attack and kill Muslims with the two long-range objectives: *Hinduise* (enslave) our people and reduce Muslim population (which is fast expanding) by using us as their fighting arm.

### **Muslims are Dalit converts**

We want Dalits and Muslims to translate this booklet into Hindi and Urdu and all other regional languages and see it reaches our poor, illiterate, innocent Dalits and Muslims who are the principal victim of Brahminical

poison. Babasaheb Ambedkar says the Brahminical rulers hardly went over to Islam. The bulk of the converts were from SC/ST/BCs — the original inhabitants — unable to bear the Brahminical persecution.

In other words, over 80% of the Indian Muslims are Dalit converts.

The Muslim leadership also knows it. And yet it never publicly admits it. Muslim religious leaders should have said it at least in their prayer meetings so that the initiative would have come from the Muslim side to seek brotherhood with Dalits.

### **Superior Brahminical strategy**

But the Muslim religious leadership did not do this. So, can we say it has unconsciously become a party to the Brahminical conspiracy?

We often go round the country addressing scores of meetings of Dalits. At no meeting of Dalits we have so far heard any speaker complaining against the Muslims. The Dalit complaint is only against Brahmins.

Nowhere Dr. Ambedkar had complained against Muslims. In fact, he was all praise for Muslims and Islam. Brother Biswas repeatedly speaks of Babasaheb's all-round admiration for Muslims and Islam.

### **DV got no support from Muslims**

How come the BSO has turned Dalits against Muslims? This proves the superior strategy of Brahminical people and the failure of the Dalit movement. More than anything it is the failure of Muslim leadership.

We have brought out so much literature on Dalit-Muslim

unity which nobody in the country has done so far. And yet we did not get any encouragement, not to speak of support, from the Muslim leadership. We are fully conscious of this and also worried about it.

It is in the interest of Muslims (more than that of Dalits) that the Muslim leadership, particularly religious leadership (*ulema*), that it should embrace the Dalits.

Muslims are our elder brothers endowed with a rich and powerful socio-cultural-religious philosophy. Whereas we have nothing: culturally deprived and religiously orphaned. Even Buddhism which Babasaheb embraced has been swallowed by the Brahminists.

We have said all these things many times. And yet we have repeated because we know the Hindu rulers have almost squeezed the Muslims. So much so they have become part of the country's poorest and illiterate.

Within 60 years of "independence", such a powerful community which ruled India for about 1,000 years has been made slaves. And yet the Muslim leadership wants to go with Brahmins rather than with its genuine brothers.

The leadership is not realising all these. Or has the leadership been purchased by the BSO?

Bangalore

**V.T. Rajshekar**

Date: Oct. 1, 2008

-----

# Dr. Ambedkar & Islam

S.K. BISWAS, 387-A, J&K POCKET, DILSHAD GARDEN, DELHI - 110 095

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, as a student in Columbia University, USA, while preparing the thesis for his MA degree, very dispassionately painted the portrait of Prophet Muhammad. He showered tributes on the Prophet for his great contribution towards the building up of the human civilization especially where it was almost difficult because of its geographical and natural causes. Impact of Islamic brotherhood that helped "the true sons of the desert" to come up with the zeal of the carrier of expansion along with philosophy of life, culture and material development in the mundane affairs. In his own words:

"The pagan Arabs were living in peaceful relations with the Christian communities in the North and at Najran in the South, with the Jewish communities residing in the North-East and the Zoroastrians living in close proximity to the Persian Gulf. As a result of this propinquity, the interchange of ideas had been working towards a spiritual monotheism among the Arabs long before the birth of Muhamad and is typified by the Hanifs.

## Eternal truth

Independently or otherwise of the Hanafi movement, Muhamad, an Arab camel driver, conceived the idea of improving the lot of the degraded Arabs constantly fighting among themselves and offering human sacrifices to the numerous idols in Caaba. No man ever arrogated to himself the virtue of being a Prophet with so little equipment, but he made bold and the faith which, under the name of Islam, he preached to his family and nation is compounded of an eternal truth and a necessary fiction. "That there is only one god, and that Mahomet is the apostle of God". The circumstances of Muhamed's

birth are seemingly favourable to his proclamation as a Prophet. It will be remembered that Arabia was populated by various tribes all enjoying equal independence. All these tribes however, united to respect the tribe of Koresh which by means, fair or foul, held the custody of the temple of Caaba and the Sacerdotal office of worshipping Caaba had fallen on the family of the Hashemites, chiefly on the grandfather of Mahomed. Taking advantage of his exalted position among the Arabs, Mohomed commenced the preaching of the monotheistic Gospel.

### **Mohomed expelled & threatened**

There isn't anything new in the Gospel of Mohomed who is the least original of the Prophet. His Koran is a compromise between Judaism and Christianity.

Whatever may be the value of his teachings, the Arabs looked upon it with the utmost hostility, so much so that the Hashemites were lowered in the estimation of their people. The stubbornness of the Arabs grew with the missionary zeal of Mahomed and that of the Hindoos today with the growth of the missionary propaganda.

Becoming impatient, the Arabs compelled the Hashemites to expel Mohamed whose very life was near being threatened; Mahomed centred his attention on the Medina but was not sure of welcome. He therefore negotiated with the Medinites through the few disciples he had made in Mecca. After being assured of their kindness, he stationed himself at Medina and saved his cherished and young religion from utter ruin, which would certainly "have perished in its cradle, had not Medina embraced with faith and reverence the holy outcasts of Mecca".

His stationing at Medina was of immense advantage to Mohamed. To his sacerdotal office was combined the regal and to the judicial, the executive. He became a missionary monarch strong enough to back his preaching by the cannon. "The choice of an independent people had exalted the fugitive of Mecca to rank of a sovereign and he was invested with the just prerogative of forming alliances and of waging offensive and

defensive wars. The imperfection of human rights was supplied and armed by the plentitude of divine power. The Prophet of Medina assured, in his new revelations, a fiercer and more sanguinary tone, which proves that his former moderation was the effect of weakness.

The means of persuasion had been tried, the season of forbearance was elapsed, and he was now commanded to propagate his religion by the sword, to destroy the monuments of idolatry, and without regarding the sanctity of days, or months, to pursue the unbelieving nations of the Earth".

So stationed, he began the expansion of his creed and kingdom, first by subjugating the Koreish of Mecca. The Arabs were both merchants and robbers in one, and the disciple of Muhamed at Medina began to harass the trade of the Koreish passing through Medina. The Koreish, being exasperated at this, began warring against Medina.

Muhamed, for a while, was on the defensive but he soon got on the offensive and subjugated the city of his birth.

Thus he augmented both his forces and resources. "The fair option of friendship, or submission, or battle, was proposed to the enemies of Mahomet. If they professed the creed of Islam, they were admitted to all the temporal and spiritual benefits of his primitive disciples and marched under the same banner to extend the religion which they had embraced".

"Having thus equipped his followers for a career of conquest, Mohamed left his mission to his successors, the Califs". The heroic courage of Ali, the consummate prudence of Moawiyah, excited the emulation of their subjects, and the talents which had been exercised in the schools of civil discord were more usually applied to propagate the faith and dominion of the Prophet.

## Arab greatness

In the sloth and vanity of the palace of Damascus, the succeeding princes of the house of Ommiyah were alike, destitute of the qualifications of statesmen and saints. Yet the spoils of the unknown nations were continually

laid at the foot of their throne, and the uniform ascent of the Arabian greatness must be ascribed to the spirit of the nation rather than the abilities of their chiefs. A large deduction must be allowed for the weakness of their enemies. The birth of Mahomet was fortunately placed in the most degenerate and disorderly period of the Persians, the Romans, and the Barbarians of Europe. The empire of Trojan, or even of Constantine or Charlemagne, would have repelled the attack of the naked Saracens, and the torrent of fanaticism might have been obscurely lost in the sands of Arabia”.

“With the same vigour and success they invaded the successors of Augustus and those of Artaxerxtus: and the rival monarchies at the same instant became the prey of an enemy whom they had been so long accustomed to despise. In the ten years of the administration of Omar, the Saracens reduced to his obedience thirty-six thousand cities or castles, destroyed fourteen thousand churches or temples of the unbelievers, and edified fourteen thousand mosques for the exercise of the religion of Mahomet.

### **Islam spreads from India to Atlantic**

One hundred years after his flight in Mecca, the arms and the reign of his successors extended from India to the Atlantic ocean, over the various and distant provinces which may be comprised under the names of (1) Persia, (2) Syria, (3) Egypt, (4) Africa, (5) Spain”. In this great Mahomedan empire, “we should vainly seek the indissoluble union and easy obedience that pervaded the government of Augustus and the Antonines, but the progress of the Mahomedan religion diffused over this ample space, a general resemblance of manners and opinions.

The language and laws of the Koran were studied with equal devotion at Samarkand and Seville. The Moor and the Indian embraced as countrymen and brothers in the pilgrimage of Mecca, and the Arabian language was adopted as the popular idiom in all the provinces to the westward of the Tigris”. (1)

## Cruelty of Hinduism

The young Ambedkar on the other hand experienced extremely bitter treatment by the religion his ancestors are said to have followed. Hinduism treated him as an Untouchable, a non-human being. On the basis of this practical experiences he made an objective study of comparative religion, philosophy and its social impact. Only after 20 years he declared:

“Thus Hindu religion is the religion of our ancestors, but it was the worst type of slavery that was thrust upon them. Our ancestors had no means to fight this slavery and therefore they could not revolt. They were compelled to live in that religion. Nobody can force this type of slavery upon the present generation. We have all sorts of freedom. If the present generation does not avail of such freedom and free itself from the clutches of Hinduism they are sure to be dubbed as cowardly, mean and slavish people devoid of self-respect.” (2)

## Why India welcomed Islam ?

“Therefore, Babasaheb who was battling for freedom for his own self and for the entire humanity especially for the destitute *sudra* and Untouchables, who were seeking, in the blinding darkness, for the “human personality” for those Orphans of the world who were denied the same, welcomed the advent of Islam in this country and he said, “the difference between the two was that the slavery of Negroes had the sanction of the law, while that of the Untouchables is of religion”. (3)

He, on the other hand, did not consider Hinduism as a religion and had declared that there was nothing irreligious in destroying Hindu religion.

He questioned: “Why do you remain in the religion which insults you at every step?” The religion which teaches man to behave with man in an inhumanic manner is not religion but infamy. The religion which does not

recognise a human being as human being is a curse... The religion which compels the ignorant to remain ignorant and the poor to remain poor does not deserve to be called a religion" (4). Therefore, he gave a clarion call:

### **Call to quit Hinduism**

"If you want to achieve power change your religion. If you want equality change your religion. If you want your independence, change your religion". He however, cautioned, "I advise you to sever your connection with Hinduism and to embrace any other religion. But, in doing so, be careful in choosing the new faith and see that equality of treatment, status, and opportunities will be guaranteed to you unreservedly". (5)

Since his teens, being persecuted by the inconvenient and inhumanic treatment by the Hindu religious system, Ambedkar was contemplating the idea of deserting Hinduism and to embrace some other religion, so that he could live as an honourable human being, as was done by many people before him.

We find that the first conversion move that took place under his leadership, in 1929 led to 19 of his ardent followers to Islam.

### **Idea of embracing Islam**

In 1936 he declared that though born as a Hindu, he will not die as a Hindu. And ultimately he fulfilled his dream and mission of life for manumission and acquiring the "Human personality" in 1956 15th October by embracing Buddhism. Buddhism is a religion without god, a religion of love, knowledge and truth. Buddhism is the most ancient institutionalised religion of this world, a pre-Aryan religion of India.

In quest of truth Dr. Ambedkar, in course of his long journey to "Righteousness", discussed Islam at various places. At a certain point of time he seriously considered the idea of embracing Islam.

"The first question is what is the faith that the Depressed Classes are likely to embrace? Obviously the one most advantageous to them. There are three faiths from among which the Depressed Classes can choose. (1) Islam, (2) Christianity and (3) Sikhism. Comparing these three, Islam seems to give the Depressed Classes all that they need". (6)

Dr. Ambedkar was not at liberty even while choosing a new faith for conversion. The Hindus tried to bribe Dr. Ambedkar.

### Islam defended

Dr. Moonje offered:

"If Dr. Ambedkar were to announce his decision that he and his followers are prepared to embrace Sikhism in preference to Islam and Christianity, and that he shall honestly and sincerely co-operate with the Hindus and the Sikhs in propagating their culture and in counter-acting the Moslem movement for drawing the Depressed Classes into the Moslem fold, the Hindu Mahasabha will be prepared, in view of their having agreed to remain within the Hind culture, to make an announcement that it will not object:

(1). To the conversion of the Depressed Classes to Sikhism,

(2) To the inclusion of the non-Sikhs in the list of the Scheduled Castes; and

(3) To the enjoyment by the Depressed Classes of the political rights of the Poona Pact by free competition between the non-Sikh and neo-Sikh Depressed Classes as provided for under the Poona Pact." (7).

Dr. Ambedkar defended Islam:

“The Hindus criticise the Mohamedans for having spread their religion by the use of the sword. They also ridicule Christianity on the score of the inquisition. But really speaking who is better and more worthy of our respect? The Mohamedans and Christians who attempted to thrust down the throats of unwilling persons what they regarded as necessary for their salvation? Or the Hindus who would not spread the light, who would endeavour to keep others in darkness, who would not consent to share his intellectual and social inheritance with those who are ready and willing to make it a part of their own make up?

I have no hesitation in saying that if the Mohamedan has been cruel the Hindu has been mean and meanness is worse than cruelty”.<sup>(8)</sup>

Indeed, sword was not all for the Islam. Which one do the Dalits want? to be chopped off like “Sambuka”<sup>(9)</sup> for indulging in spirituality? Or to be a spiritual head in a Mosque?

### **Upanishad rejected**

Many, especially the opponents to the conversion move, spread a general propaganda that Islam has no philosophical sublimity and it was preached by the sword and coercion. Whereas, “from Budha to Ambedkar, many thinkers traced the principles of salvation of humankind, equality, fraternity and liberty in the Upanishads.” That is, Budha and Dr. Ambedkar believed in the tenets of Upanishads.

This is nothing but throwing mud on Dr. Ambedkar’s view points. His point on this issue was obvious:

“But I am told that for such religious principles as will be in consonance with liberty, equality and fraternity it may not be necessary for you to borrow from foreign sources and that you could draw from such principles on Upanishadas. Whether you could do so without a

complete remoulding, a considerable scraping and chipping off the ore they contain is more than I can say.

### **Divine slavery prevents freedom**

This means a complete change in the value of life. It means a complete change in outlook and in attitude towards men and things. It means conversion; but if you do not like the word, I will say, it means new life. But a new life cannot enter a body that is dead." <sup>(10)</sup>.

The Greek General turned historian, Thucydides, in his book, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, <sup>(11)</sup> questioned: It may be in your interest to be our master but what is our interest to be your slaves? Independent nations of free men spontaneously revolt against accepting the yoke of slavery. However, it is not the same in case of India and the Indians.

Indians have no history of their own. Indian history opens with the tales of the foreigner-masters and the slaves, the Brahmins and the *sudras*. Slaves in India are called *sudras* and Untouchables. The masters call themselves ("Gods on earth") Brahmins, *Bhudevatas* or Aryas. They have written in their colonial documents or constitution, the Vedas, that all these masters and slaves were created by god himself out of his holy divine body. Therefore, the divine slaves, the *sudras* and Untouchables, had no business to question their slavery or *sudrahood*.

### **Untouchables are slaves**

The *sudras*, therefore, enjoy their *sudratwa* without being aggrieved. They were destined to remain as servants of the Divine lords, the *Bhudevatas*. They were made a separate species who were at the genesis made devoid of all qualities required to be a master of

themselves or of others. Therefore, the point of Thucydides, became redundant in the life of the Untouchable and touchable *sudras*.

The slaves of India are enjoying slavery, their interest is said to have been protected in their next birth, when they will be of higher caste.

Indian autochthon were defeated in the hands of Aryans who adopted the policy of breaking bones by knocking them together. Indians were made to fight Indians by the Aryan war-lord Indra.

The same policy of breaking bones by knocking them together and defeat of indigenous rulers is depicted in the Ramayana <sup>(12)</sup>. Only two brothers, Rama and Lakshmana, were the Aryan representatives in the Lanka War. To defeat the powerful Ravana and to destroy his golden metropolis these two brothers did not require to call the Aryan army from their capital, Kashi or Awadh. They sought no help of any Aryas. It were the natives of this land, the brethren of Bali and Ravana, who offered their hands to crown Rama with victory. The same thing happened in Medieval period when the Hindu ruler Hemu invited Babur to invade India. Even in the modern period Karl Marx got the truth and opined:

### Hinduism is more intolerant

“A country (India) not only divided between Mohammedan and Hindoo, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste, a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium, resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest? If we knew nothing of the past history of Hindostan, would there

not be the one great and incontestable fact, that even at this moment India is held in English thralldom by an Indian army maintained at the cost of India" (13).

Indeed, intra-Indian fight is the main cause of slavery of Indians. But for treachery from within India could never have been defeated.

Apart from the policy of "breaking bones by knocking them together" or making Dalits fight Dalits, the Brahminism adopted all positive action plan like coercing out every thing that opposes Brahminism. Dalits are Dalits because they fight each other for remaining *sudras* or slaves. Dalits are not allowed to learn anything.

There is a point, discussed by the defenders of the Brahminism that Islam is an intolerant creed. They do not tolerate any criticism of their scripture or the Prophet. Blasphemy is a serious offence. Whereas Brahminism is highly tolerant religion. It does not kill its critics.

### Women in Islam

The arguments are neither sound nor historically founded. The Brahminism do not even provide the chance to criticise its scripture. The *sudras* and Untouchables are not given right to education even (14). Thus they remain illiterate. The Brahmins enjoy prerogative to learn scriptures and indulge spiritual activities as their monopoly. Therefore, the remaining masses do not have any scope to criticise the Hindu *Shastras* which they did not read remotely. Brahminism did cut off the thumb of critic-Akalavya permanently.

Islam did not disable anybody, permanently from reading, criticising questioning or reasoning the

provisions of their scriptures.

In the history it has been witnessed that the highly intolerant Brahminism, on the contrary, coerced the Buddhist monks and lay worshippers to its total extinction from its birth place. Then it has plundered and plagiarised the Buddhist philosophy and wisdom in the name of assimilation. Brahmans tolerate everything but a damage to casteism, i.e. hereditary occupation.

On this point Dr. Ambedkar opined: "... The only thing that I did not know was how the meek and nonviolent looking Hindu can be violent when anybody attacks his Sacred Books..." (15).

In the chapter captioned, "Social Stagnation" of his book, *Pakistan or Partition of India*, Dr. Ambedkar discussed the evils of Muslim society in India and in Bengal only. Quran provided many protective laws for women.

### **Muslim society in India**

But men violated those. In India, the situation was worst. "Granting all these provisions of law in her favour, the Muslim woman is the most helpless person in the world". The women in other religion, perhaps were not even given the status of a person. On this Dr. Ambedkar opined: "No words can adequately express the great and many evils of misery to a Muslim woman". He further goes: "But the facts for Bengal are enough to show that the Mahomedans observe not only caste but also untouchability.

There can thus be no manner of doubt that the Muslim society in India is afflicted by the same social evils as afflict the Hindu society. Indeed, the Muslims have all

the social evils of the Hindus and something more, that something more is the compulsory system of *pardah* for Muslim women" (16).

Were these evils, according to Dr. Ambedkar, the contribution of Islam? The obvious answer to it was, no. After discussing the evils of Muslim society in India and in Bengal particularly, Dr. Ambedkar concluded:

"This answer though obvious, cannot be the true answer. If it were the true answer, how are we to account for the stir and ferment that is going on in all Muslim countries outside India, where the spirit of inquiry, the spirit of change and the desire to reform are noticeable in every walk of life. Indeed, the social reforms which have taken place in Turkey have been of the most revolutionary character. If Islam has not come in the way of Muslims of these countries, why should it come in the way of the Muslims of India? There must be some special reason for the social and political stagnation of the Muslim community in India.

### Hinduism corrupted Indian Muslims

What can the special reason be? It seems to me that the reason for the absence of the spirit of change in Indian Muslim is to be sought in the peculiar position he occupies in India. He is placed in a social environment which is predominantly Hindu. That Hindu environment is always silently but surely encroaching upon him." (17).

"If the Muslims in other countries have undertaken the task of reforming their society and the Muslims of India have refused to do so, it is because the former are free from communal and political clashes with rival communities, while the latter are not". (18).

The above analysis of Dr. Ambedkar, on the contrary, is a brilliant tribute to Islam. Indeed, he condemns Hinduism, which spoils everything everywhere, for successfully corrupting even Islam in India. In his book,

*Annihilation of Caste* <sup>(19)</sup> also, he clarified it.

Babasaheb made none but Hinduism responsible for all these evils prevalent amongst the Muslims in India and Bengal.

“They are partly due to incomplete conversions. In a land like India, where the majority of the Muslim population has been recruited from caste and outcaste Hindus, the Muslimization of the convert was neither complete nor effectual, either from fear of revolt or because of the method of persuasion or insufficiency of preaching due to insufficiency of priests” <sup>(20)</sup>.

Many tried to misinterpret and mislead the helpless and less informed Dalit masses.

Babasaheb on the contrary has proved that the position of Muslim women in India was far better than that of their sisters in Hinduism.

### **Krishna's many wives**

A data from Census Report has been furnished to show the extent of child marriages (from 0-15) per 1000 in different communities. The data is given below (see table).

This data well conveys the position of the Muslim women in respect to that of the Hindus.

Year/decade	Hindu girls	Muslim girls
1881	208	153
1891	193	141
1901	186	131
1911	184	123
1921	170	111
1931	199	186

Regarding polygamy and concubinage, is it not a fact

that Brahminism is the mother of all these institutions? Hindus recognise eight systems of marriage. Lord Krishna had a band of wives, not less than 16,000 in number.

“His sixteen thousand and odd wives could not shake His mind by their shafts of cupid and other charms, skilled in conveying the message of love despatched by their arched eyebrows fascinating with the sentiment expressed by their suppressed smile and sidelong glances”.

(*Srimad Bhagavat* 10/61/4).

Dasarath, the father of Sri Ram, had a harem full of concubines numbering more than a thousand. These were long before the Prophet Mohamad was born. This tradition continues even in modern India.

#### **Patiala ruler's sex orgy**

High Highness Shri Maharajadhiraj Sri Bhupinder Singh Bahadur, Ruler of Patiala state.. had a harem of about 300 women... As the night advanced and the worshippers got intoxicated, the high priest demanded some of them to get naked and copulate in front of Goddess and the devotees. One virgin after another from the harem nursery ranging from the age of twelve to sixteen was brought before the Goddess in intoxication... the sturdy Sirdars of the court deflowered them with all the devastating vigour and devotion demanded of them by the extraordinary and erotic nature of ritual... The orgy continued and men and women indulged themselves in such spiritual and religious rituals”. (21).

Why blame Islam? This was the vivid pen-picture of the “spirituality” of the Hindu harem. Indeed, the “Kulin” institution of Brahmins of 18th-19th century Bengal was

just an extension of this "spirituality" to allow them to marry as many women as they could and leave their wives in the in-laws houses to be used and misused in every possible manner.

### **Quran gives woman right of divorce**

There is evidence one Brahmin marrying more than 150 women, another marrying even 23 in a single day. <sup>(22)</sup>.

Why blame Islam? At least harem was not a spiritual institution in Islam. On the other hand, Lord Krishna, appears to have had a vast harem. Or else it was a great act of irresponsibility and injustice towards those 15,992 concubines.

"Of those (sixteen thousand and odd) wives of Sri Krishna who had ten sons each, I mention to you the sons, Pradyumna and so on, of the eight principal spouses (alone) that have been previously referred to;" *(Srimad Bhagavat 10/61/7)*.

Babasaheb was the first Law Minister of free India. He resigned from the Cabinet for protecting the interests of women and safeguarding their basic human rights. ...He resigned his seat from the Cabinet on Sept.27, 1951.

### **Widow burning under Hinduism**

In his letter of resignation he wrote to the Prime Minister:

"For a long time I have been thinking of resigning my seat from the Cabinet. The only thing that had held me back from giving effect to my intention was the hope that it would be possible to give effect to the Hindu Code Bill and restricted it to Marriage and Divorce in the fond hope that at least this much of our labour may bear fruit. But even that part of the Bill has been killed. I see no purpose in my continuing to be a member of your cabinet..." <sup>(23)</sup>.

What he desired and for what he battled in the Indian Parliament was given to the women by the Quran.

Quran provides right to divorce for the women equally. Women have been given property right by the Islamic laws. Generally, critics raise the issue of polygamy sanctioned by the Quran.

A dispassionate examination, however, reveals that this system of polygamy in Islam was only an emergency provision. Normally, monogamy is the process. *Sura Nisa* holds:

“If you feel that you will not be able to control yourself to do justice to the orphan girls (fatherless), then marry them, two, three or four. If you think that you will fail to treat fairly, equally then marry one or even the slave girl (or war captive)” 4/3) <sup>(24)</sup>.

This Ayat was revealed on the Earth after the War of Ohod <sup>(25)</sup>. The destruction of warriors in the battle created the problem of surplus women.

Vedic religion solves this problem of surplus women by introducing permanent widowhood and institution of Sati, of burning of widow in the funeral pyre of her dead husband. Islam solved it by allowing man to marry up to four only on condition that each of the wives will be treated equally in every respect. But Islam did not allow the women (surplus) to be misused and ill-treated or exploited and dishonoured. Islam did not permit adultery. Irresponsible or illegitimate relation between a man and a woman is condemned in Islam.

Islam does not allow polyandry or group marriage. Brahminism appears to have provided all types of marriage, in its eight forms of wedding.

## No brotherhood in Islam ?

To say that Islam is not a religion that teaches love and spreads associative attitude amongst members of the society, some quote Dr. Ambedkar:

“The brotherhood of Islam is not the universal brotherhood of man... For those who are outside the corporation, there is nothing but contempt and enmity”.

Here again two positive sentences in between, have been unscrupulously omitted. They are, “it is brotherhood of Muslims for Muslims only. There is fraternity but its benefit is confined to those within that corporation” <sup>(26)</sup>.

Babasaheb was in quest of fraternity all along. The fraternity which he enshrined in the preamble of the Constitution of India, according to Dr. Ambedkar, was available in Islam, as was in many other religions. In Islam brotherhood is derived from the philosophy of One God who is the creator of every person. But what about the Hindus? He opined:

“Does the Hindu social order recognize fraternity? The Hindus like the Christians and the Muslims do believe that men are created by God. But while the Christians and the Muslims accept this as the whole truth, the Hindus believe that this is only part of the truth...”

## Islam did not kill Buddhism

The Brahmin is no brother to the Kshatriya because the former is born from the mouth of the divinity, while the latter is from the arms. The Kshatriya is no brother to the Vaishya because the former is born from the arms and the latter from his thighs. As no one is a brother to the other no one is the keeper of the other” <sup>(27)</sup>.

Many of late have projected the idea that the advent of Islam was the main reason for the decline and destruction of Buddhism in India. It is true that after

hundred years of Muslim rule in India even the slightest vestige of Buddhism and Buddhists was not traceable. From the socio-religious discussions the matter regarding Buddhism disappeared.

But it does not mean that it were the Muslims who were the main cause for expunging the names of Buddhists from the pages of Indian history. They were mere tools in the hands of the Brahmins or the governing castes.

There is no dearth of evidences in the history that the Brahmin leaders led the Muslim sword to destroy Buddhist Universities, vihars along with all the Shramanas etc.

That is why, Alberuni could just mention ten to fifteen lines in different places of his leviathan called "Bharattatwa", indology. Alberuni stayed in India as a captive of Sultan Mahmud and he completed his book in 1030 AD. He lamented for his failing to meet any Buddhist monk and to have a single book on Buddhism despite his all-out efforts<sup>(28)</sup>. F. Bernier failed to write more than only one sentence in his lengthy and detailed account in 1660 AD on Buddhists, "A seventh sect has arisen called *Baute*, which again is the parent of twelve others, but the sect is not so considerable as the former: its adherents are despised and hated, censured as irreligious and atheistical, and lead a life peculiar to themselves"<sup>(29)</sup>.

Dr. Ambedkar in his article, "Decline and Fall of Buddhism" commented:

"The Mission to break idols thus became the mission to destroy Buddhism. Islam destroyed Buddhism not only in India but wherever it went"<sup>(30)</sup>.

## **Brahminism destroys Buddhism**

The Hindus are really pagan or idol worshippers. Most of the gods in Hinduism are personified gods and hence idols. Idol of Buddha was not regarded as the idol of god, he was the great teacher in Buddhism. During the period of Islamic rule, however, temples of Hindu gods and their idols were constructed, they flourished. While Buddha stupas and University buildings were destroyed. This paradoxical situation obviously indicates that there was some deeper cause for destruction of Buddhism. It was not idol worship merely.

But that was not all that he wanted to say finally. Therefore, Dr. Ambedkar further advanced his conclusion:

“The reason why Brahminism rose from the ashes and Buddhism did not, is to be accounted for, not by any inherent superiority of Brahminism over Buddhism. It is to be found in the peculiar character of their priesthood.

Buddhism died because its army of priests died and it was not possible to create. Though beaten, it was never completely broken. Every Brahmin alive became priest and took the place of every Brahmin priest who died.”

(31)

He also said:

“Unfortunately the causes that have forced the Buddhist population of India to abandon Buddhism in favour of Islam have not been investigated and it is therefore impossible to say how far the persecution of the Brahmanic Kings was responsible for the result.” (32)

Finally in his articulated command he recorded:

“The Sungas, Kanvas and the Andhras fought for supremacy among themselves. But they, like the Muslim invaders of Hindu India, had one object in common that

was to destroy Buddhism and the Buddhist Empire of the Mauryas.

Surely if Muslim invasions of Hindu India are worthy of study at the hands of the historians, the invasions of Buddhist India by Brahmanic invaders are equally deserving of study.

### **Muslim invaders did not destroy Hinduism**

The ways and methods employed by the Brahmanic invaders of Buddhist India to suppress Buddhism were not less violent and less virulent than the ways and means adopted by Muslim invaders to suppress Hinduism. From the point of view of the permanent effect on the social and spiritual life of the people, the Brahmanic invasions of Buddhist India have been so profound in their effect that compared to them, the effect of Muslim invasions on Hindu India have been really superficial and ephemeral.

The Muslim invaders destroyed only the outward symbols of Hindu religion such as temples and Maths etc. They did not extirpate Hinduism nor did they cause any subversion of the principles or doctrines which governed the spiritual life of the people. The effects of the Brahmanic invasions were a thorough-going change in the principles which Buddhism had preached for a century as true and eternal principles of spiritual life and which had been accepted and followed by the masses as the way of life. To alter the metaphor, the Muslim invaders only stirred the waters in the bath and that too only for a while. Thereafter they got tired of stirring and left the waters with the sediments to settle. They never threw the baby if one can speak of the principles of Hinduism as a baby out of the bath.

### **Dr. Ambedkar's opinion**

Brahmanism in its conflict with Buddhism made a clean sweep. It emptied the bath with the Buddhist Baby in it and filled the bath with its own waters and placed in it its own baby.

Brahmanism did not care to stop how filthy and dirty was its water as compared with the clean and fragrant

water which flowed from the noble source of Buddhism. Brahmanism did not care to stop how hideous and ugly was its own baby as compared to the Buddhist baby. Brahmanism acquired by its invasions political power to annihilate Buddhism and it did annihilate Buddhism. Islam did not supplant Hinduism. Islam never made a thorough job of its mission. Brahmanism did. It drove out Buddhism as a religion and occupied its place. (33).

Practically, the above tale is supported by many other documents: The historian Satis Mitra in his book, *Jossore Khulnar Itihas*, has recorded:

“Earlier majority of the people of this country were Buddhists. Buddhism was an universal faith. The Brahmins inflicted so intensive atrocities on the Nehiloist Buddhists that people dared not uttering name of Buddha. The remnant was wiped out by the Pathans. Abulfazzal failed to mention the word Buddha, even as a reference in his voluminous book, *Akbar Nama*. Brahmin and Pathan, in collaboration, accomplished it very efficiently.” (34).

### **Shankaracharya's violence**

We can, rather see Dr. Ambedkar's opinion for destruction of Buddhism and its final wiping out from the soil of India in his caustic but obvious comments that he made to M.O. Mathai, the Sepcial Assistant of the then Prime Minister, Mr. J.L. Nehru.

You Malayalees have done the greatest harm to this country... You sent that man Shankaracharya, a desiccated expert at logic, on a *padyatra* (walking tour) to the north to drive away Buddhism from this country”.

(35).

### **Budha's Brahmin disciples**

Indeed, every social phenomenon has to face its counter forces. Inter-ideological and inter-group conflicts are

natural phenomenon. Why to blame Pushya Mitra or Shankaracharya and his chelas? Buddhism could not survive their attacks mainly because of its own ideological and philosophical weakness. Its greatness was the cause of its fall.

Love is the essence of Buddhism. Loving even the enemy is extremely detrimental for one's own entity. In a state of co-existence of Brahminism and Buddhism; philosophy of Love and Hatred; non-violence and violence, Buddhism and philosophy of Love will eventually wither away; tyranny and terrorism will survive. If bad money and good money are allowed to be in circulation, at a time, the bad money will prevail. Buddha preached against private property but he accepted all prominent Kings, senapatis, Minister and merchants like Anathpindad (Sudatta), Bishakhā, Mrigar etc. who were embodiment of private property in his order. Besides, what Lord Buddha preached, he did not practise that. He gave the philosophy of "*Bahujan Hitaya: Bahujan Sukhaya*" good for majority, pleasure for majority is the criteria for good. However, he accepted "*Sarvajana*" that is all irrespective of caste and status.

### **Periyar prescribes Islam**

He made Brahmins his principal disciples and they gradually arranged everything for finishing off Buddhism from within. Kutadanta, Asvaghosh, Shonadanda, Sariputra, Moudgallyan, Mahakatyan, Dharmakirti, Dingnag, Asanga, Basubandhu, Kashyap, Nagasen, Nagarjun etc. all noted Buddhist masters were Brahmins.

E.V.R. Naikkar, the Thandahi, the Periyar, the leader

of the masses of the South also considered the question of conversion very seriously. He was a *sudra* by caste. The self-respect in the millionaire *sudra* did not allow himself to sleep even for a moment in peace as a *sudra*. He therefore, declared:

“Our disease of being sudras is a very big monstrous disease. This is like cancer. A very old complaint. There is only one medicine for it. And that is Islam. There is no other medicine. Otherwise we have to suffer, taking sleeping doses to forget or suppress the disease and carry on as stinking corpses. To cure the disease, stand up and walk as worthy human, Islam is the only way”.

(36)

UNESCO of the United Nations Organisations honoured Periyar. It ushered, “Periyar as the prophet of New age, Socrates of the South East Asia, arch enemy of ignorance. Such a rationalist man, as Jotiba Phule did, suggest conversion.

### To be a Hindu means slave

Phule wanted Christianity, while Periyar recommended Islam:

Islam means peace, surrender or devotion in Arabic language. Islam means universal brotherhood.

“The Adi-Dravidas (Untouchables) suddenly got luck only because of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar who declared openly: I am not a Hindu, not a Panchama and not connected with any division of the Hindus. “Give me the LIST, I will give you more than your legitimate share”, says Sardar Patel. I am Adi-Dravida *Bhangi*, says Gandhi. All this because of Ambedkar’s assertion that he is no Hindu, which has now become an *Astaksharamantra*. In 1925 alone, I told Ambedkar about this. But saying the same thing five years after my suggestion he has succeeded. He will further succeed by saying, I am not a Hindu. By this mantra, the Adi-Dravidas (Untouchables) will get many more rights”. (37).

Periyar, thus wanted to follow the same avenue as was followed by Ambedkar, by declaring himself as a non-Hindu and was vehemently criticised for supporting Islam. Despite it he argued:

Reservation in jobs is not our only aim. We must cease to be *shudras*. We must build a society without the treacherous Vibhishanas. What a shame. In my own country and with my own tax money I have no representation. If I don't have reservation, if I don't have manly strength, does it mean I should know-tow to the Aryan, petition to him rights worship and dance before him? Just because there are some Dravidians who are prepared to serve the Brahmins calling themselves as Hindus (*shudras*). Should the others also join the slavish path? To escape from this stigma, Islam (meaning I am not Hindu) is the best mantra. I am not saying this just today. I have been saying this from 1919 and 1920 for the last over 28 years. I have not thereby lost my reputation with the people. The reason is there is no other method for eradicating degradation". <sup>(38)</sup>

Though he was an atheist and iconoclast, he supported Islam as, men cannot so easily abandon the idea of God and religion. So in such a situation, it would be better to choose the faith which renders progress of soul and mind, body and brain.

### M.N. Roy on Islam

M.N. Roy, a Bengali Brahmin, represented Indian Communist Party in the 2nd Communist International. He came back in India in 1930. The British Government sentenced him to six years imprisonment for his activities to overthrow the British Raj from India. He remained in Jail till 1937. While in jail, he wrote a marvellous book on Islam. The analytical approach in the book reveals his towering intellectual stamina, lusters in his brevity and clarity:

"This country has become the home of a very considerable number of the followers of the Arabian Prophet. One seldom realises that many more Mohammedans live in India than in any single purely Islamic country. Still, after the lapse of many centuries, this numerous section of the Indian population is generally considered to be an extraneous element".<sup>(39)</sup>

So completely have the Mohammedans become an integral part of the Indian nation and that annals of the Muslim rule are justly recorded as chapters of the history of India.

### Why Hindus hate Muslims

Yet, the Muslim hatred, especially what he observed current in the democratic process of Indian modern life and its effect on Hindu society made him analyse from a different angle. He accepted the prevailing state of Hindu mind:

"For the orthodox Hindus who constitute the great majority of the Indian population, the Mussulman, even of noble birth or high education or admirable cultural attainments, is a *mlechha* — impure barbarian — who does not deserve a social treatment any better than accorded to the lowest of the Hindus"<sup>(40)</sup>

He therefore, did not hesitate to condemn the Hindu intellectuals:

No civilised people in the world is so ignorant of Islamic history and contemptuous of the Mohammedan religion as the Hindus. Spiritual imperialism is an outstanding feature of our nationalist ideology. But this nasty spirit is the most pronounced in relation to Mohammedanism. The current notion of the teachings of the Arabian Prophet is extremely ill-informed.<sup>(41)</sup>

He found the seed of liberty of the suffering masses in

the preachings of the Arabian Prophet. The utility and the potency which made Islam acceptable to the masses of all the countries were highlighted by him in plain words:

The phenomenal success of Islam was primarily due to its revolutionary significance and its ability to lead the masses out of the hopeless situation created by the decay of the antique civilisations not only of Greece and Rome but of Persia and China — and of India. <sup>(42)</sup>

Vulgar interpreters of the Islamic history lay stress upon its military achievements either to praise or to deprecate its far-reaching revolutionary significance.

Islam rose rather as a political movement than a religion in the strictest sense of the word. In the initial stages of its history, it was essentially a call for the unity of the nomadic tribes inhabiting the Arabian desert. <sup>(43)</sup>

### **M.N. Roy praise for Islam**

M.N. Roy strongly argued that Islam was a religion of peace. It was a religion of law and order.

Traders and mercantile community cannot afford violence. Non-violence is the essence of trade. He found:

There are few figures in history more romantic, more devout, more sincere and more modest than the first "Commander of the Faithful" — Abu Bakr. His memorable injunction to the "Army of God" ran: Be just; the unjust never prosper. Be valiant; die rather than yield. Be merciful; slay neither old men, nor women, nor children. Destroy neither fruit trees, nor grains, nor cattle. Keep your word even to your enemy. Molest not those men who live retired from the world". The irresistible march of the "Army of God" bears testimony to that this remarkable injunction was uttered sincerely by the venerable chief, and obeyed strictly by the devout followers. <sup>(44)</sup>

## God Krishna orders killing

By the side of this war command, if we just make a glance to the warfare that was carried on by Indra in the vedic period against the *Assuras* of India and his vandal acts or if we read through the lines of *Gita* where Lord Krishna lured Arjuna to kill his kinsmen makes us upset.

The Quranic teachings, indeed, brought the heaven on earth. The people got enriched in all respects:

The laws of the Koran revolutionised social relations. Increased production, the result of this revolution, quickened trade which ushered in an era of cosmopolitanism and spiritual uplift. Trade broadens the vision of man.

The stringent cry of the new religion — there is but one god — softened by great toleration, subject to this fundamental creed, was enthusiastically hailed by the distressed multitudes searching for the secure anchor of a simple faith in the stormy sea of social disintegration, intellectual bankruptcy and spiritual chaos. The historic cry was raised by the caravan traders of Arabia who had stood outside the ruinous conflict of arms and beliefs. <sup>(45)</sup>

In the light of his wisdom, he very rightly visualised the truth and expressed his opinion vividly:

It was not the philosophy of Islam, but its sociological programme which won so many converts for it in India. Of course, for the masses philosophy has no appeal. They are always attracted by a sociological programme which offers them something better than the given conditions of their life... <sup>(46)</sup>

The Muslim conquest of India was facilitated by similar native factors as in the case of Persia and the Christian countries. No great nation can ever succumb easily to a foreign invasion, unless the invaders command the sympathy and acquiescence, if not active support, of the

masses of the conquered people. Brahminical orthodoxy having overwhelmed the Buddhist revolution, India of the eleventh and twelfth centuries must have been infested with multitudes of persecuted heretics who would eagerly welcome the message of Islam.

Mohammad Ibn Kassim conquered Sindh with the active assistance of the Jats and other agricultural communities oppressed by the Brahmin rulers.

Having conquered the country, he followed the policy of the early Arab conquerors. He employed the Brahmins in pacifying the country by taking them into confidence. He allowed them to repair their temples and to follow their own religion as before, placed the collection of revenue in their hands, and employed them in continuing the traditional system of local administration.<sup>(47)</sup>

Roy's explanation on the point of Islam's rapid growth and territorial expansion in India seems to be nearest to the truth.

### Nehru on Islam

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who was a man of vision discovered India in his own way, while he was in jail. He, because of the circumstances in which was born and brought up became to a great extent secular minded. The intellect in him did not fail to see and express the truthful comments on Islam. His own words go strong and startling:

Having rapidly conquered large parts of Asia, Africa and a bit of Europe, the Arabs turned their minds to conquests in other fields. The empire was being consolidated, many new countries had come within their knee and they were eager to find out about this world and its ways. The intellectual curiosity, the adventures in rationalist speculation, the spirit of scientific inquiry among the Arabs of the eighth and ninth centuries are very striking...

## Muslim glory

Arab travellers, among the greatest of their kind, go to far countries to find out what other peoples were doing and thinking, to study and understand their philosophies and sciences and ways of life, and then to develop their own thought. Scholars and books from abroad were brought to Baghdad and the Khalif al-Mansur (middle eight century) established a research and translation bureau where translations were made from Greek, Syriac, Zend, Latin and Sanskrit. Old monasteries in Syria, Asia Minor and the Levant were ransacked for manuscript. The old Alexandria schools had been closed by Christian bishops and their scholars had been driven out. Many of these exiles had drifted to Persia and elsewhere. They now found a welcome and a safe heaven in Baghdad and they brought Greek philosophy and science and mathematics with them — Plato and Aristotle, Ptolemy and Euclid. There were Nestorian and Jewish scholars and Indian physicians; philosophers and mathematicians..

There were many contacts with India during this period and the Arabs learnt much of Indian mathematics, astronomy, and medicine. And yet, it would appear, that the initiative for all these contacts came chiefly from the Arabs and though the Arabs learned much from India, the Indians did not learn much from the Arabs...

The Indians remained aloof, wrapped up in their own conceits, and keeping as far as possible within their own shells. This was unfortunate, for the intellectual ferment of Baghdad and the Arab renaissance movement would have shaken up the Indian mind just when it was losing much of its creative vigour. In that spirit of intellectual inquiry the Indians of an older days would have found kinship in thought...

This frequent intercourse inevitably led to Indians getting to know the new religion, Islam. Missionaries also came to spread this new faith and they were welcomed. Mosques were built. There was no objection raised either by the state or the people, nor were there any religious conflicts. It was the old tradition of India to be tolerant to all faiths and forms of worship. Thus

Islam came as a religion to India several centuries before it came as a political force...

Nevertheless it is true that the Prophet of Islam vitalised his people and filled them with faith and enthusiasm.

Europe was backward then in learning and science and art and the amenities of life. It was Arab, Spain and especially the university of Cordoba, that kept the lamp of learning and intellectual curiosity burning throughout those dark ages of Europe and some of its light pierced the European gloom.

### Greatness of Islam

They must have derived their vast energy from the dynamic and revolutionary character of their Prophet and his message of human brotherhood...

Arabic was a highly developed language at the time of the Prophet, with a mixture of Persian and even some Indian words. Like the Phoenicians, the Arabs went far across the seas in search of trade. There was an Arab colony in South China, near Canton, in pre-Islamic days.

(48)

The brilliant tribute that has been showered by Nehru on the monument of Islam is remarkable. On India, this aspect of Islamic contribution towards the building up of the world civilization and cultural heritage has generally not been given by anybody.

In fact Indian society, what today we have, is not altogether free from the deep influence of Islamic culture. Indian culture has a definite touch of international universality. It is a composite culture. Civilization and human culture prosper through give and take method. Truth is universal and it cannot be restricted by any geographic, religious or ethnic wall. ■

**References:**

1. *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar W&S*, Vol.12, p.32-35
2. *Thus Spoke Ambedkar*, Bhagwandas, Vol.4, p.43.
3. *Ibid*, p.45
4. *Ibid* p.62
5. *Ibid* p.108
6. *Ibid* p.296
7. *Ibid*, 0.295
8. *Annihilation of caste*, Dr. Ambedkar, p.61
9. *Ramayana*
10. *Annihilation of Caste*, Dr. Ambedkar, p.101
11. *Encyclopaedia*, Funk & Wagnals
12. *Autochthon of India & the Aryan Invasion*, S.K. Biwas, p.83
13. *Selected correspondence*, Marx Engels, vol.1
14. *Manusmriti*, Yajur Veda
15. *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, W&S*, Vol-7 (introduction), p.14
16. *Ibid*, Vol.8, p.230
17. *Ibid*, Vol.8, p.235
18. *Ibid*, Vol.8, p.237
19. *Ibid*, Vol.1, p.64-65
20. *Pakistan or Partition of India*, Dr. Ambedkar, Vol.8, p.33
21. *Maharaja*, Diwan Jarmani Dass, p.25 & 28.
22. *Evidence of Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar Before Commission*.
23. *Life & Mission of Dr. Ambedkar*, Dhananjay Keer, p.435.
24. *Quran, Surar Nisa* (Harap Publication), p.60.
25. *Islam Rup-Rekha*, Hammudah Abdality, p.269.
26. *Babasaheb Dr. Ambedkar, W&S*, Vol.8, p.30.
27. *Ibid*, Vol.3, p.100.
28. *Bharattatwa*, Alberuni (Bangladesh Publication), p.8,24,64.
29. *Travels in Mogul India*, F. Barnier, p.336.
30. *Babasaheb Dr. Ambedkar, W&S*, Vol.3, p.229-30
31. *Ibid*, p.235
32. *Ibid*, p.237
33. *Ibid*, Vol.3, p.274.

34. *Jossore Khulnar Itihas*, Satis Mitra, p.449.  
35. *Remeniessence of Nehru Age*, M.O. Mathai, p.25  
36. *Speech of Periyar on 18th March 1947 at Tiruchirapally* (South Indian Railway Employees Association).  
37. Ibid  
38. Ibid  
39. *The Historical Role of Islam*, M.N. Roy, p.1  
40. Ibid, p.2  
41. Ibid, p.3.  
42. Ibid, p.6.  
43. Ibid, p.9.  
44. Ibid, p.11.  
45. Ibid, p.28  
46. Ibid, p.84  
47. Ibid p.81  
48. *Discovery of India*, J.L. Nehru, p.228-237.
- 

Bengali Brahmin founder of Indian  
Communist Party on Islam

**HISTORICAL ROLE OF ISLAM**

M.N. Roy

1939 pp.91

Ajanta Publications

1-U-B, Jawahar Nagar, Bungalow Road  
Delhi - 110 007.

The book was written when the author was  
in jail under a 12-year RI.

Says Islam is the best weapon to destroy  
Brahminism which is killing India.

Photocopy available with DV. Rs. 75.

## DALIT SAHITYA AKADEMY BOOKLIST

1. Dalit - The Black Untouchables of India ..... V.T. Rajshekar .... 150
2. Caste — A Nation Within the Nation ..... V.T. Rajshekar .... 140
3. Jati —Rashtradolagāndu Rashtra (Kannada)V.T. Rajshekar ... 140
4. Jati - Rastrake Andar Ek Rashtra (Hindi) ... V.T. Rajshekar .... 140
5. Know the Hindu Mind ..... V.T. Rajshekar .... 100
6. Tereyannu Teredaga (Kannada) ..... Rajendra ..... 100
7. Gandhi — You Do not Know (Collection of articles) ..... 75
8. Ready Reference to Revolutionaries ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 75
9. Development Redefined ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 75
10. Weapons to Fight Counter Revolution  
(Brahminism) ..... V.T. Rajshekar .... 75
11. Shape of the Things to Come ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 50
12. Brahminism ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 50
14. Aggression on Indian Culture ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 50
15. India's Intellectual Desert ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 50
16. Grave-Diggers of History ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 40
17. Merit, My Foot..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 30
18. V.T. Rajshekar & Dalit Voice ..... (Interview) ..... 25
22. Judicial Terrorism ..... V.T. Rajshekar &  
..... Iqbal Ahmed Shariff.. 25
23. When Dalits Disobeyed Final Wards  
of Their Father ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 20
24. Caste Identity & Social Justice ..... Dr. V.D. Chandanshive 10
26. Riddle of Rama & Krishna ..... Dr. B.R. Ambedkar ... 10
28. "Jews of India" getting Closer to Jews .... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 5
30. Liberation From Brahminism ..... Joseph D'Souza ..... 5
31. Marathas Declare War on  
Brahminism ..... Purushottam Khedekar . 5
32. In Defence of Brahmins ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 5
35. Crisis in Dalit Movement ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 5
36. Brahminism killing India: Zionism  
killing Israel ..... V.T. Rajshekar ..... 5

25% discount on bulk purchase

Write to Dalit Voice office

## FURTHER READING

- V.T. Rajshekar: *What is wrong With Muslims?*, DSA-2008.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *How America got Defeated in War on Terror*, DSA-2007.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Hindu Serpent Vs. Muslim Mongoose*, DSA-2007.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Hindu Mind vs. Muslim Mind*, DSA-2007.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Brahminism in India & Zionism in West*, DSA-2007.
- Rajendra: *Muslim Failure to See Brahminical Tricks*, DSA-2002.
- Dr. K.K. Sidhu: *Sikhs Turned into Muslim Haters*, DSA-2002.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Genocide of Muslims: How to Advert Second Gujarat?* DSA-2002.
- Shyam Sundar: *Zionist Plot to Dominate the World*, DSA-2002.
- Scientific Research House, Kuwait: *Zionist Arthashastra — The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, (Reprint DSA-2002).
- V.T. Rajshekar: *India's Muslim Problem*, DSA-1997.
- Prof. Rahmatullah & Others: *Curse of Allah — Articles on the Revolutionary Spirit of Islam*, DSA-1997.
- Dr. Ram Nath: *Dalit-Muslim Unity, Why & How?*, DSA-1995.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Bhoodevaton Ki Batchit* (Urdu), DSA-1992.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Muslims to Divide Muslims: Hindu Nazi's Latest Trick*, DSA-1987.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Muslims & the Liberation of the Oppressed*, DSA-1986.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Who Made the Muslims Communal?*, DSA-1986.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *The Hindu Demand for Common Civil Code*, DSA-1986.
- Periyar EVR asks *shudras* to convert to Islam, DSA-1986.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *The Agony of Being a Muslim*, DSA-1982.
- V.T. Rajshekar: *Conspiracy Behind Communal Riots*, 1977.
- Yoginder Sikand: *Muslim Writings in Dalit Voice*, EPW, Sept.14, 2002 (Photocopy Rs. 10).