

CHRISTIANITY
EXPLAINED TO A HINDU
OR
CHRISTIANITY AND HINDUISM COMPARED.



COMPILED FROM BISHOP CALDWELL,
THE REV. NEHEMIAH GOREH,
Dr. Krishna Mohun Banerjea, and other writers.
SECOND EDITION, 3,000— TOTAL COPIES, 5,000.

MADRAS:
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY.
S. P. C. K. PRESS, VEPERY MADRAS.

1893

Critically edited and responded to
by Paṇḍita Sri Rama Ramanujachari
srimatham.com Sydney 2015

CONTENTS

- 1 A Revelation Needed and Given
- 2 God
- 3 The Number of Gods
- 4 The Character of God
- 5 Idolatry
- 6 Creation
- 7 Maya
- 8 Adrishta or Karma
- 9 Man
- 10 Transmigration
- 11 Caste and the Brotherhood of Man
- 12 Man's Duty, or the Aim of Life
- 13 Sin
- 14 Punishment of Sin
- 15 Pardon of Sin
- 16 Incarnations
- 17 The Objects of Christ's Incarnation
- 18 The Christian Method of Obtaining Pardon of Sin
- 19 The Sufficiency of Christ as a Saviour
- 20 Mediation
- 21 The Intercession of Christ
- 22 Faith and Repentance
- 23 Adoption
- 24 The Holy Spirit, the Purifier
- 25 The Trinity
- 26 Means of Purification
- 27 Profession of Religion
- 28 Prospects at Death
- 29 Future State
- 30 Comparative Effects of Hinduism and Christianity
- 31 Summary

FOREWORD.

Indian attempts to systematically define the nature of 'Hinduism' as well as the cultural significance of Hindu religious thought and practice were often carried out in a context of politically charged intellectual disputation. In the middle of the century, Christian missionaries and their supporters developed increasingly sophisticated arguments to combat the myriad attractions of Hindu belief systems. For example, the Scottish administrator John Muir (1810-82) published in 1839 a text entitled *Matapariksha* ('an examination of [religious] doctrine'), in which he attempted to demonstrate the rational basis of Christianity in comparison with the irrationality of Hinduism. Writing in Sanskrit, Muir argued, for example, that the miracles of Christ were confirmed by the weight of testimony and historical evidence, while the recorded deeds of Hindu deities were clearly 'born from delusion'. Indians, and in particular the traditional Hindu intelligentsia, the *pandits* ('learned men'), now actively engaged with Christian polemics. In response to Muir's text, for example, the *pundit* Nilakantha Shastri (1825-95) argued in his 1844 *Silastra-tattvu-vinirnaya* ('a verdict on the truth of the *shastra* [the Sanskrit corpus]') that the tenets of Christianity could not be established by reference to reason, as the Bible contained many more palpable contradictions than Sanskrit texts did. Moreover, Nilakantha argued that the proper place of reason should be to more fully understand a body of scripture, and in this regard he also outlined the way in which the distinct 'traditions' within Hinduism simply represented different paths to the same ultimate goal. In so doing, Nilakantha effectively broke the British attempt to monopolize important intellectual values for Christian doctrine, such as conformity to reason, and declared an overarching unity to Hindu thought.

Four years later surrendering his intellect to a Christian missionary name Father N. Smith, Nilakantha Gore converted to Christianity and in 1848 was baptized and received the new name Rev. Nehemiah Goreh. Being a talented and learned Pandit he became a formidable adversary to his former coreligionists. In his subsequent writings he seems to have blindly accepted all the theological standpoints that he originally refuted!!

I as a Judeo-christian convert to Hinduism of the Srivaishnava sect will propose a rejoinder to this work. My words will be in blue. For the sake of diminishing prolixity I have also taken the liberty of editing out certain irrelevant passages. Although 122 years have passed between the publication and my response, and many of the topics raised have been greatly modified by time, yet many of the arguments against Hinduism are still in vogue among missionaries.

Sri Rama Ramanujachari

Sydney 2015

INTRODUCTION.

Importance of Religion. — With regard to this, Christians and Hindus are of one opinion. Our stay in this world is short and uncertain. Religion concerns our happiness or misery in the next world when we must leave this, and enter upon an eternal state of being. Religion, therefore, is of infinite importance. Hinduism teaches that our daily life should be pervaded by it. Christianity does the same. Whether we eat or drink or whatever we do, should be done in obedience to God's commands¹.

Different Religions not roads to the same City. — It is a common idea in India that all religions lead their followers to heaven. It is just as false to say that all religions lead to heaven. If one be right, the others must be wrong.

Comment — Hinduism never claims that all religions lead to heaven. It does claim that all Indian systems of thought are pointing to the same ultimate Truth (*ekam sat vipra bahudhā vadanti* — the truth is one but the wise describe it variously). From the Hindu point of view *heaven* is not achieved through ideology and theology but rather by *actions*. So a religion *per se* does not lead to heaven which according to Hinduism is a temporary and ephemeral state which is essentially undesirable.

“Every one should follow his own religion.” — This is another common saying equally erroneous. There are many false religions in the world, some of them enjoining the most wicked practices. According to the above maxim, religions — however false and however wicked their rites — should not be given up by those who hold them. One God created all men, and His religion is one. All other religions are the inventions of men, and displeasing in His sight.

Comment — True, but the learned Pandit is playing with words. The saying is “everyone should follow his or her own DHARMA — ethical and morally responsibility in reference to family, society and the world. Dharma does not equate to “religion” *per se*.

All religions (including Christianity²) are the invention of humankind, all are attempts by humans to answer the great questions of — Who are we? What are we doing here? And how should we act?

True Religion Needed. — Unless it is **the true one**, it will profit us nothing.

Comment — We have yet to parse this idea of ‘true’ religion. What are the criteria for judging? According to Hinduism a true religion must be *satyam* – satisfy the demands of reason, *shivam* – have a moral code which universally beneficial, *sundaram* – must be aesthetic and above all must contribute to *shanti* – peace. Let the discerning reader study the great religions and decide which one most fits these criteria.

Duty of Religious Inquiry. — In money matters people act wisely. In religion, however, people generally act like a flock of sheep, which, if the first leap over a bridge, the rest follow and are drowned. Bad money may be known from good by means of the touchstone, God has given us a touchstone to distinguish between true and false religion — **our reason. If we do not use it, we must suffer.**

Comment — Absolutely agree!

¹ In the Bible God give 613 commands – all of which a legalistically followed by orthodox Jews but almost none of which are carried out by devout Christians. The other set of commands which the reverend is referring to would be the Decalogue or Ten Commandments to which we respond later. Ed.

² Jesus in fact did not begin a new religion. He was born, lived, died as was buried as a Jew. It was Paul who was not even a disciple of Jesus who began the Jesus Cult known today as Christianity. Ed.

Differences as well as agreements to be considered. — A monkey and a man have each one head, one mouth, one tongue, two eyes &c.; but there are also essential differences between them. So it cannot be said that Hinduism and Christianity are the same because they agree on some points. There are also irreconcilable differences between them. They cannot both be true. Even *one* great error, like the poison in food, may render a man's religion worthless.

Comment — Strangely enough the Pandit pointed out numerous logical errors in Christian theology in his work *Shastra-tattva-vinirnaya*. Using sound reason to refute most of the claims of Christianity and now he again emphasizes the importance of reason to determine philosophical errors!! What are the 'essential differences' between humans and monkeys?

Prayer for Light. — While it is our duty earnestly to inquire which is the true religion, we should ask for God's help to assist us in the search. Say to Him:— “O all-wise, all-merciful God and Father, pour the bright beams of Thy light into my soul, and guide me into Thy eternal truth.”

Comment — We already say — *asato mā sad gamaya, tāmaso mā jyotir gamaya, mṛtyo mā amṛtam gamaya!* “from untruth lead us to the Truth, from darkness to light from death to immortality!” Rather than ask God to reveal to us the 'true' religion we should apply the rules of logic and common sense.

A REVELATION NEEDED AND GIVEN.

Hindus and Christians agree that a Revelation is needed, and that God has made known His will to men. Hindus have their Vedas, Puranas, and other Shastras; Christians have the Bible. The Hindu Shastras are so numerous and differ so much, that all the views expressed in them cannot be noticed. Only the most important doctrines will be considered and compared with those in the Bible.

This needs to be nuanced. The Hindus only consider the Vedas as “revealed” and none of the other Shastras (Scriptures). The Vedas also are not the revelation of laws and directives from an *omniscient* God like the Bible but rather the deep spiritual insights of sages. The Bible would better be compared to the Puranas which are collections of myths with some scattered moral injunctions. The Vedas are without compare!

The claims of each to be regarded as the true Revelation will be better understood when their teachings have been contrasted.

GOD.

There is no more important question for a nation than this — What is the nature of the God it worships? *yathā devaḥ tathā bhaktaḥ*; as is the God, so is the worshipper. We become like in character to the God we worship. If he is revengeful and impure, our evil passions will be strengthened; if He is loving and holy, we shall put on more and more of His image.

Comment — The Bible says:— Nahum 1; 2 The LORD is a jealous and avenging God; the LORD takes vengeance and is filled with anger.

Right views about God lie at the foundation of true religion. Our welfare both in this world and the next depends upon Him. If we do what is displeasing in His sight, all our religious services will be in vain.

Important questions under this head will now be considered.

The Number of Gods.

There are three different opinions on this point. One is called *pantheism* (*pan* – all, *theos* – God), that all is God. Hinduism expresses it in the words — *ekam-eva-advitiyam*. "One only, without a second." This does not mean that there is only one God, but that nothing else exists. The Chandogya Upanishad says — *sarvam idam Brahma*, All this (universe) is Brahma."

The second opinion is called 'polytheism (*polus* – many, *theos* – God), a belief in many gods. In India this opinion is generally held along with pantheism. Ask any villager how many gods there are, and he will say, " There is only one God." At the same time he acknowledges the existence of 33 million of divinities, including Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, with their wives and children.

Comment — The figure of 33 million given in the Upanishads is a symbolic number to indicate infinity of manifestation and not a poll. The Pandit keeps returning to this figure in order to ridicule Hinduism. Christianity is considered by both Judaism and Islam to be polytheistic because it begins with ONE and then divides one into 3 and resolves 3 into 1. Once one is divided then it matters not whether it is one into 3 or 33, or 333, or 333 million.

The third opinion is called monotheism (*monos* – one, *theos* – God), a belief in only one God, who is distinct from the universe which He has created. This is the doctrine of the Bible; in the Shastras the unity of God generally means pantheism.

Pantheism. — The *mahāvākya*, or great sentence of Vedanta is *Tat tvam asi*, " That art Thou," or *Aham Brahma'smi*, I am Brahma." For a sinful, miserable mortal to use such language is blasphemy. **We are as different from God as light is from darkness.**

Comment — Another strange assertion from a learned man!!

Genesis 1:27 So **God** created man in his own **image**, in the **image of God** he created him; male and female he created them.

If a man is Brahma³, so is a dog, a cat, a pig, a mosquito. If all this universe is Brahma, then it must be held that Brahma (n) commits sin, that he steals, tells lies, and is guilty of murder, for men do such things. God is made the author of all sin, and so He must be a being infinitely worse, instead of infinitely better, than ourselves.

Comment — A few quotations from the Bible may clarify how much God is infinitely better than mere humans in his character.

Deut. 39 — 42 ¶ "See now that I myself am He! There is no god besides me. I put to death and I bring to life, I have wounded and I will heal, and no-one can deliver out of my hand. I lift my hand to heaven and declare: As surely as I live for ever, when I sharpen my flashing sword and my hand grasps it in judgment, I will take vengeance on my adversaries and repay those who hate me. I will make my arrows drunk with blood, while my sword devours flesh: the blood of the slain and the captives, the heads of the enemy leaders."

2 Chronicles 18; 22 "So now the LORD has put a lying spirit in the mouths of these prophets of yours. The LORD has decreed disaster for you."

1 Samuel 16; 14 ¶ But the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him.

³ The Pandit is purposely being loose with the terminology in order to mislead readers. There is a difference between BRAHMAN and Brahma. *Brahman* refers to the Absolute Supreme Being and *Brahma* refers to the creator god. I shall be inserting an (n) to make this difference clearer.

It is true that God is everywhere; but that is quite different from saying that God is everything. If it is held that Brahma(n) and the world are the same, then there is no difference between the creator and the creature, between the potter and the pots he makes.

Comment — We shall return to this topic later.

Our consciousness assures us that we are personal beings, different from everything around us and from our Creator. We also feel a personal responsibility for our actions. Brahma(n) is said to be *akhaṇḍa*, indivisible: how then can he be divided?

Comment — Brahman being indivisible indicates that there is no duality, there are three realities — Brahman also known as *Nārāyaṇa* — the ground of Being, *jīvas* — individual modes of consciousness and the world of matter — *jagat*. The three form one totality of Being and are not separate entities.

A Hindu writer justly says:–

The word *tat* (it) stands for the ocean of immortality, full of supreme felicity. The word *tvam* (thou) stands for a miserable person, distracted through fear of the world. The two cannot therefore be one. They are substantially different. He is to be worshipped by the whole world: thou art but his slave.”

Comment — This is obviously the writer’s own opinion and misinterpretation of this verse. *Tat* stands for the Ultimate reality Brahman/Nārāyaṇa, *tvam* refers to the *atman* — the self of the individual and not one’s conditioned mind and body (as “a miserable person, distracted through fear of the world”.) The verse means that in essence we are one with God.

Pantheism strikes at the root of all religious feeling. The essence of religion is to love, honor, and obey God, to pray to Him, to worship Him. If I am God, why should I worship myself?

Comment — The essence of *religion* may be to “love, honor, and obey God, to pray to Him, to worship Him” but the essence of Sanātana Dharma is fulfill one’s duties to family, society, the environment and God. It is defined in the Mahabharata as non-aggression to any living being, compassion for all life and generosity.

Pantheists in India look upon the popular deities as mere fictions of the popular mind. Their association with polytheism, says Plint, "means a conscious alliance with falsehood, the deliberate propagation of lies, a persisting career of hypocrisy. Pantheism, instead of elevating and purifying Hindu polytheism, has contributed to increase the number, the absurdity and the foulness of its superstitions.”

Comment — An insulting rant and not a rational intellectual opinion.

Polytheism. — Men are apt to judge of God by themselves. But God is everywhere and has all power. He does not require help. In any place and at any time, He is present to listen to our petitions. Inferior gods are not needed.

Comment — Does God really listen to and respond to petitions? Does prayer really work? Are there any double blind studies that prove this? During the genocide in Rwanda on the 15 April 1994 1500 civilians mostly women and children were killed in the church of Nyarabuye — they were all fervently praying, but apparently God was distracted and didn’t hear or perhaps he didn’t care. So there are two logical conclusions – either God doesn’t listen to prayer or He lacks compassion.

Hinduism professes to have 33 million gods and goddesses. They have a separate god for every disease and for every part of the body. They have goddesses who profess to teach a child to suck, to smile, &c. The folly of this is apparent.

Comment — This is over simplification and misrepresentation and confabulation of popular village religion with Vedanta.

It is sometimes said that all the gods are the same, though worshipped under different names.

Take the three principal gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. Their residences, wives, and children are all different. Brahma is said to live in *Satya-loka*, his wife is Savitri; Vishnu lives in Vaikuntha, his wife is Lakshmi; Siva lives in Kailasa, his wife is said to be Parvati. Different dispositions and actions are ascribed to these gods. Several times they are said to have fought with each other.

Comment — Another misrepresentation — the three Gods are the three aspects of ONE reality. Brahma is the creator, Vishnu the preserver and Siva the transformer. Their mythology is a rich psychological tapestry of the various dynamics of these three forces. See Devadutt Pattnaik's work for greater in-depth analysis.

If the 33 million of the Hindu gods are all the same, it may as well be said that the 25 million of people in India with different houses, wives, children, occupations, are all one. If the gods are one, why are they reckoned as amounting to 33 million?

Comment — They are all indeed ONE political entity of India no matter what each and every group may call itself – to outsiders they are all INDIANS.

Bishop Caldwell says:– The Hindus themselves call their religions by the name of the particular deity they worship, as *Siva Bhakti*, *Vishnu Bhakti*, &c. The vast majority would be indignant at the supposition that their own religions, and the detested heresy of their opponents, are after all the same.

Comment — Not true – all Hindus of every sect know and acknowledge the supremacy of the Vedas. Each and every philosophical school acknowledges and accepts that interpretations differ and that there are many ways to view the same idea – hence philosophical schools are known as Darśanas (Views of Reality).

Monotheism. — As already explained, monotheism is a belief in only one God. It differs from pantheism in holding that He is distinct from the universe which He has created. God has existed from eternity, possessing all power and wisdom, infinite in justice, goodness, and holiness. There is no need of any other God. Christians, Muhammadans, and all enlightened nations now believe that there is only one God. Even Hindus admit this, although they combine with it pantheism and polytheism. Which doctrine most honours God? which is most agreeable to reason?

Comment — A number of assumptions are made in this paragraph which need to be proven:—

1. God has existed from eternity
 2. He is distinct from the universe which He has created.
 3. He possesses all power and wisdom.
 4. He is infinite in justice, goodness, and holiness
1. If God has existed from eternity why would he create a world that according to Biblical creationists came into being during 6 days, 5000 years ago and is about to be destroyed (they've been patiently awaiting for the past 2000 years expecting each year to be the last!) What is 10,000 or even 100,000 years compared to eternity? It makes no sense.

2. Science can establish the creation of the Universe from the Big Bang and can accurately account for each and every individual creation, growth and destruction. No proof can be shown of a creator.
3. If the creator has all-power and wisdom why did He create germs and mosquitoes? ± 500,000 people die each year from malaria – 90% of them innocent children. Why cancer and leukemia which kills about 100,000 each year?
4. If He is Just and good and holy (morally perfect) why is there evil and suffering in the world? If He were omnipotent and good and holy He could stop it, but He doesn't interfere at all in the wars, massacres, disasters and epidemics so he is either not omnipotent or indifferent.

Sin of Polytheism. — The British Empire was a very faint emblem of the vast dominions of the great Lord of all. The universe belongs to Him by creation. He spread the heaven above us. He formed the earth beneath us. He is the maker of all things visible and invisible. He first called us into existence. Asleep or awake, we are dependent upon Him for every breath that we draw. It is He who makes the rain to fall and the sun to shine. All that we have is His gift.

Comment — Spreading the heavens above and forming the earth beneath are poetic expressions which have no scientific validity – every school-child knows this. We are not dependent upon God for every breath we draw – we are dependent upon a working set of lungs and the availability of oxygen. If He controls the weather then why is it so erratic? Rain floods where it is not needed causing immense damage and drought goes on for decades in some places causing untold misery, so what evidence do we have of a wise, just and good weather controller? Wouldn't it be more logical to propose that the one who controls the weather is like Indra – selfish, egotistical, whimsical and amenable to prayers and sacrifice to elicit his favours and to do his job properly?

The nature of God's laws is an additional reason for obedience. His commands are “Holy, just, and good.” He enjoins only what is best for ourselves; He prohibits only that which it is our highest wisdom to shun. Our duty and our happiness coincide.

Comment — And what exactly are those commands? How do these commands conform with the previous statement? :-

Deut. 20:10 – 15 ¶ When you march up to attack a city, make its people an offer of peace. If they accept and open their gates, all the people in it shall be subject to forced labor and shall work for you. If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the LORD your God delivers it into your hand, kill all the men in it. As for the women, the children, the livestock and everything else in the city, you may take these as plunder for yourselves. And you may use the plunder the LORD your God gives you from your enemies. This is how you are to treat all the cities that are at a distance from you and do not belong to the nations nearby.

Lev. 26:28, 29. Then in my anger I will be hostile towards you, and I myself will punish you for your sins seven times over. *You will eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters.*

Ex 31:14,14 "Observe the Sabbath, because it is holy to you. Anyone who desecrates it must be put to death; whoever does any work on that day must be cut off from his people.

Deut. 7: 1-6 — ¶ When the LORD your God brings you into the land you are entering to possess and drives out before you many nations — the Hittites, Girgashites, Ammorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites, seven nations larger and stronger than you—

and when the LORD your God has delivered them over to you and you have defeated them, then you must *destroy them totally*. Make no treaty with them, and *show them no mercy*. This is what you are to do to them: Break down their altars, smash their sacred stones, cut down their Asherah poles and burn their idols in the fire. For you are a people holy to the LORD your God. The LORD your God has chosen you out of all the peoples on the face of the earth to be his people, his treasured possession.

Just as the Queen of England forbids any one from setting himself up as king within her empire, so does God forbid the worship of any other than Himself. This is His first command. He cannot permit the creatures whom He made to rise in rebellion against Himself.

Comment — Planet earth is like a mere grain of sand in the Sahara desert — an incredibly vast universe. Human beings are more insignificant than a bugs. Why would an omnipotent, omniscient creator be so demanding of our service and worship? What possible need could He have of our puny adulation? If He is so egotistical why didn't he pre-program every living being to automatically sing his praise. If I choose to call that creator Brahma instead of Jehovah why should He get petulant? When Moses asked him to reveal his identity He refused, so how are we to blame for making up a name for Him?

Ex 22: 20 "Whoever sacrifices to any god other than Yahweh must be destroyed.

2 Thessalonians 2: 11 For this reason God sends them a powerful delusion so that they will believe the lie so that all will be condemned who have not believed the truth but have delighted in wickedness.

He deludes us into believing lies and then condemns us for the same very strange – this Jesus.

God is both our Father and our King. The worship of any other is a defiance of God's authority, a declaration that we will not have Him to rule over us. All the guilt that lies in foul rebellion against the mildest and most merciful of earthly monarchs — in disobeying the kindest and grieving the best of fathers, in ingratitude to a generous benefactor; all this evil, multiplied a thousand times there is in polytheism.

Comment — How do we know this alleged King of the Universe to be Jesus or his father? The only testimony comes from illiterate rustic shepherds and fishermen. There has been so much controversy over 5000 years as to which god is the “true” God, why doesn't he settle the matter once and for all. The biggest event of the world is the World Soccer Finals. Why does he not simply descend on the final day and make a clear statement in front of all the world's news media – all the religious wars would come to an end and all humankind will be saved. This wouldn't be a big ask since he has already created and flooded the entire world, made the sun stand still for Joshua and raised the dead.

The Character of God.

According to Hinduism, Brahma (n), the eternal Supreme Being, in His ordinary condition, is *nirguṇa* – unfettered by action, or without qualities. A hot climate makes labor irksome, and gives an inclination to sleep. Brahma is also said to be *niṣkriya* – inactive.

Comment — Nirguṇa means that the Supreme Being Nārāyaṇa is free from all *negative* qualities like those that we have seen ascribed by the Bible to Jehovah. Niṣkriya means that He is the substratum upon which action takes place. A movie consists of a screen, light and sound. The screen is inactive but without it the action couldn't happen.

He is represented as existing in a state of dreamless slumber: He is said to be *sat, cit, ānanda*. He is pure unconscious Existence (*sat*); he is pure Thought (*cit*) with nothing to think about; he is pure Joy (*ānanda*) with nothing to be joyful about, and only in the sense of being free from the miseries of transmigration. The *nirguṇa* Brahma is a being without love or mercy. He neither sees, nor hears, nor knows, nor cares about any of his creatures; he has neither the power nor the will to do good or evil, — to reward the righteous, or punish the wicked.

Comment — A mischievous misrepresentation by a well educated but deceitful pandit! He is purposefully confusing *nirguṇa* Brahman with *saguṇa* Īśvara for propaganda purposes.

Sat means ‘Being’, *cit* means ‘consciousness’ and *ānanda* means ‘bliss’. The *ānanda* component is also known as *ananta* – infinite and *prīti* – love. For bliss, in order to be perfect, requires infinitude and love. These are the essential attributes of the Supreme Being Srīman Nārāyaṇa who is by definition incomprehensible and inexpressible. But we may identify two modalities — an Absolute one (*nirguṇa*) and a Relative one (*saguṇa*). He is both simultaneously, like a block of ice in water – both are nothing but h₂O but simultaneously existing in two different forms. As *nirguṇa* He is devoid of all negative qualities, and as *saguṇa* He is empowered with every conceivable good quality like compassion, loving kindness, generosity etc. etc.

He is supposed to be like an Indian raja who spends his life in sloth, within his palace, heedless of what is going on throughout his dominions, and leaving everything to his ministers. The more a Hindu is like Brahma, the more selfish will he be, and the less profitable to all around him.

Comment — Does he mean Brahman the absolute or Brahmā the imperfect creator?

The God of the Bible is, in many respect a perfect contrast to Brahma. He has indeed, existed from all eternity. “From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God”. But He is never unconscious; He never slumbers nor sleeps. The care of the universe which He called into existence is no burden to Him. The Creator of the ends of the earth faints not neither is weary. He knows every thing that takes place throughout His vast dominions. Not a hair of our head can fall to the ground without His knowledge; every thought of our heart is known to Him. His ear is ever open to the cry of His children.

Comment — First of all one needs to prove the actual existence of either. Both are simply hypothesis. Christians suffer from a serious cognitive dissonance – on the one hand claiming that every thought of our heart is known to Him and then declaring that He “tests us” through adversity. The two concepts are mutually exclusive. If His ear really is open why does He not respond to the prayers of the suffering faithful? There is no evidence to prove that Christian prayer is more efficacious than Jewish, Muslim, Hindu or Pagan prayer.

But Brahma (n) does not always continue in this state of dreamless repose. After the lapse of unnumbered ages, he awakes. Becoming conscious of his own existence and dissatisfied with his own solitariness a desire for duality arises in his mind. Though himself *nirākāra* without form he in sport, imagines a form. How desire arises in this unconscious being is a question which never has been answered.

Comment — The same question posed to Christians also has not been answered – why would a self-perfect omniscient being, existing solitarily in eternity, create an imperfect human race from dirt, curse them with original sin, command them to be perfect and punish them eternally for failing? All the while knowing exactly what choices they would make, and giving them intelligence to question, He punishes them with the most horrible eternal torments for eternity for coming to the wrong conclusions, and then He calls Himself holy (morally perfect), compassionate and loving?

Prahlada is represented, in the Vishnu Purana, as thus addressing Vishnu:– “Thou art knowledge and ignorance, truth and falsehood, poison and ambrosia.”

Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva are nowhere regarded in the Shastras as holy beings. On the contrary, they are all described as stained with great crimes. The way in which Brahma is said to have taken five heads is too filthy to be described. Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva are said to have been changed into children for their misconduct with Atri's wife. To break the austerities of the wife of Brīgu, Vishnu cut off her head. Brīgu consequently cursed him to seven births among mortals. The conduct of Vishnu as Krishna, is well known. Siva is said to have been

notorious for his drunkenness and love of bhang. He was ready to part with all the merit he had acquired by his austerities in order to gratify his evil desires but once with Mohini.

Comment — This is mythology not theology. Similar accusations can be made of Jesus' father Jehovah. The Hindu gods may fool about and have some fun but the one crime they have never committed is mass extinction, murder and the fomenting of wars, and wholesale and wanton destruction. The difference is that every Hindu knows that the stories of the gods are mythology but to Christians the acts of Jehovah and Jesus are historical!!

1. The creator wipes out the entire creation because of his own botched handiwork.

Gen. 6; 5 The LORD saw how great man's wickedness on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time. The LORD was sorry that he had made man on the earth, and his heart was filled with pain. So the LORD said, "I will wipe mankind, whom I have created, from the face of the earth — men and animals, and creatures that move along the ground, and birds of the air— for I am sorry that I have made them."

Gen. 6;17 I am going to bring floodwaters on the earth to destroy all life under the heavens, every creature that has the breath of life in it. Everything on earth will perish.

Gen. 7;23. Every living thing on the face of the earth was wiped out; men and animals and the creatures that move along the ground and the birds of the air were wiped from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those with him in the ark..

2. The Lord God condemns billions of people to die for the offence of one man.

Rom. 5;12. By one man sin entered into the world, and death through Sin and so death came to all men, inasmuch as all have sinned.

Rom. 5; 17—19. By one man's offence death reigned by one..... by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation..... by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.

3. The Lord God kills 70,000 men for having been counted in a census. 1 Chron. 21; 1 — ¶

4. Yahweh wantonly torments and destroys livestock

Exodus 9; 3 — the hand of the LORD will bring a terrible plague on your livestock in the field— on your horses and donkeys and camels and on your cattle and sheep and goats. But the LORD will make a distinction between the livestock of Israel and that of Egypt, so that no animal belonging to the Israelites will die." The LORD set a time and said, "Tomorrow the LORD will do this in the land." And the next day the LORD did it: All the livestock of the Egyptians died, but not one animal belonging to the Israelites died.

5. The Lord assists in the robbing of the Egyptians

Exo.12: 35 The Israelites did as Moses instructed and asked the Egyptians for articles of silver and gold and for clothing. 36 The LORD had made the Egyptians favorably disposed towards the people, and they gave them what they asked for; so they plundered the Egyptians.

6. The Lord entices prophets as an excuse for murdering them.

Ezekiel 14;9 "And if the prophet is enticed to utter a prophecy, I the LORD have enticed that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand against him and destroy him from among my people Israel.

Power is the great attribute worshipped by Hindus, Just as wicked and cruel despots are feared and honoured, so gods and demons are worshipped whatever may be their character, provided they will refrain from injuring or will confer some benefit on their devotees. The gods of Hinduism act like Indian rajas, contending with each other for power, each favoring his own party, and indulging in every vice or committing any crime his evil heart may desire. Their gods are deified men.

Comment — Another elementary misrepresentation and confounding of two different streams of thought. He is actually writing about *Shakti* which refers to *energy* not temporal power! Science tells us that matter is energy and everything in the universe is nothing but

quantum energy — it is this, which is called *Shakti* in the Sacred Sanskrit literature and is personified as the Mother Goddess.

The worshipping of gods and demons and for material gain and averting of evil is not dissimilar to the Christian practice of praying for grace and blessings and the amelioration of drought, sickness and other cause of suffering. Both sets of prayers are being sent to uncertain addresses and have no sound evidence of ever being answered!

The principle that the gods are not to be condemned for wrongdoing is the opposite of the truth. If a child commit a fault, he is blamed; if an ordinary man do the same, his guilt is greater; if a king does it, the guilt and evil consequences would be still greater. To say that the gods committed sin in sport or as a divine amusement only makes matters worse. Such an idea is blasphemous.

The Christian idea of God is very different. He is a God of truth.

Comment —

2 Chronicles 18; 22 "So now the LORD has put a lying spirit in the mouths of these prophets of yours. The LORD has decreed disaster for you."

1 Samuel 16; 14 ¶ But the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him.

Jeremiah 13:13 then tell them, `This is what the LORD says: I am going to fill with drunkenness all who live in this land, including the kings who sit on David's throne, the priests, the prophets and all those living in Jerusalem. 14 I will smash them one against the other, fathers and sons alike, declares the LORD. I will allow no pity or mercy or compassion to keep me from destroying them."

The Bible says, God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. His most glorious attribute is His spotless holiness. Sin is that abominable thing which He hates. "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of hosts."

Nature of God

Instead of exhibiting, like Brahma, an example of selfishness, He is continually doing good to His creatures; His character is expressed in one word — **God is Love**. Still, it is not the feeling which looks upon good and evil with equal eye. If a king allowed crime to be unpunished, his kingdom would become like a hell. But God's own declaration is, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his evil way and live."

Comment — Jesus may be love but His father seldom demonstrates it, there are more Biblical references to anger as His predominant quality.

Nahum 1;1 - 6 ¶ The LORD is a jealous and avenging God; the LORD takes vengeance and is filled with wrath. The LORD takes vengeance on his foes and maintains his wrath against his enemies. The LORD is slow to anger and great in power; the LORD will not leave the guilty unpunished. His way is in the whirlwind and the storm, and clouds are the dust of his feet. Who can withstand his indignation? Who can endure his fierce anger? His wrath is poured out like fire; the rocks are shattered before him.

Ezek. 8; 18 Therefore I will deal with them in anger; I will not look on them with pity or spare them. Although they shout in my ears, I will not listen to them."

Ezek. 8;5 ¶ As I listened, He said to the others, "Follow him through the city and kill, without showing pity or compassion. Slaughter old men, young men and maidens, women and children, but do not touch anyone who has the mark. Begin at my sanctuary." So they began with the elders who were in front of the temple.

A worshipper becomes like his God in character. It has been shown that the more a man resembles Brahma the more selfish and useless does he become. Would it be right for a man to copy some of the acts of Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, and Krishna? On the other hand, the highest attainment of a Christian is to be pure, loving, and holy like God.

Comment — This claim is not proven by history. Christianity has been directly responsible for more death and destruction in the world than Hinduism. One need only study the conquest and looting of South America by devout Christians. The conquest of North America and massacre and subjugation of the Native Americans cheered on by the protestant clergy! Apartheid in South Africa was supported and validated by the Dutch Reformed Church on the basis of Biblical injunctions. Australia was colonized by devout Anglicans who massacred and subjugated the aborigine population – a people that had lived for 30,000 years was decimated and brought to near extinction in 200 years of Christian administration under the Queen of England.

Which of the above views is the more reasonable? Which gives the more exalted idea of God? It is plain that the 33 millions of Hindu divinities have no existence.

Comment — [Heb 10:31](#) It is a dreadful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

Idolatry.

Idolatry is the worship of God through images. Savages usually worship a stone or some object in its natural condition. The change from a stone to an idol may be very slight. A few chips or daubs of paint suffice to change the rude block into an idol.

In the Vedas idols do not seem to be mentioned; but now it may be said of India, the land is full of idols.” They are found in nearly every Hindu dwelling.” On the other hand, idolatry is strongly condemned in the Bible. The first of the Ten Commandments forbids the worship of any other than one true God; the second forbids the worship of images of every kind.

Hindus admit that Brahma is *nirākāra*, without form. Christians say that God is a spirit. A sculptor may make an image of a man’s body; but can he make a representation of his soul? It is equally impossible to make an idol like God. “To whom will ye liken me or shall I be equal saith the Holy One.” Various excuses are made for idolatry.

Some say that idols are only like photographs, recalling friends to memory. To this it has been well replied:–

It is true that we like to retain photographs of people we love to remind us of their forms and features; but of what sort of Divinity do blocks of stone or hideous images bought in the bazaar remind us?”

If a son kept an image of a pig to remind him of his father, would this be right? Would the father be pleased? It is infinitely worse to make an image of God.

But it is not true to say that idols are only to remind men of God. When a Hindu buys an idol or gets one made, he has the *'prana-pratishtha* ceremony performed, by which he believes that its nature is changed, and that it acquires not only life, but supernatural powers.

Comment — The icons that we worship are our ‘graphical user interfaces’ with the unseen, unknowable energy of the universe. They are like the icons on a tablet when activated allow us entry into all kinds of applications with which we can interact. A statue is just a work of art until it is consecrated properly. God is omnipresent and supremely compassionate so when requested by the devotee, He allows himself to be worshipped through the material medium

chosen by the devotee. By dint of His overwhelming compassion to benefit His devotee He enters, as it were, into the chosen work of art. He is also omniscient and knows the intention of the devotee and does not judge the acts alone! As the learned Pandit has already asserted that “every thought of our heart is known to Him. His ear is ever open to the cry of His children”.

Another excuse is that idolatry is allowable for the ignorant.

To this it is replied, how is it that every Muhammadan in Turkey and every Protestant Christian from the highest to the lowest, can worship God without images? The ignorant do not need images to remind them of God. They cannot understand His form for He has none. They can remember their parents when far distant; they can love a benefactor whom they have never seen; they can obey the authority of a Queen-Empress though she never set foot on their soil. They can worship God who is a Spirit in spirit and in truth. Idols are a hindrance, not a help, to true worship. They give most degrading ideas of God.

Comment — The majority of Christians in the world are Catholics and Orthodox all of whom use a plethora of images and icons to great advantage. Even Protestants cannot avoid the use of crosses and crucifixes which are also graven images. The majority of Christians fervently believe that every Sunday a biscuit and wine turn into the body and blood of Jesus and become channels of divine grace. Hindus believe that images of stone or brass can do the same — the belief is the same the medium different.

Folly of Idolatry.— Idolatry has been well compared to child’s play. Little children talk to their dolls as if they had life. They dress them, pretend to give them food, put them to sleep, and so forth. Grown up people do just the same. They treat their idols as living beings. They offer them food, though they cannot eat; they have different kinds of music before images that cannot hear; they have lights before what cannot see. In the cold season they furnish them with warm clothes; in the hot season they fan them; and lest mosquitoes should bite them they place them within curtains at night.

Comment — And what is the harm in this? As long as men are worshipping idols they have no time to make accusations and condemn others for what they are doing didn’t Jesus say “judge not others lest ye be judged?” or is this commandment not one to be followed? Us Hindus don’t worship God in fear and trembling, but play with Him with tender love and affection. The Christians adore God through praise and petition. Hindus adore God through play and entertainment. The adoration is the same the means are different — why should one be superior to the other?

Instead of the idols taking care of their worshippers, it is the latter who have to protect the former. They are constantly afraid lest the hands and feet of their gods should be broken. Robbers sometimes break into temples, and carry off the jewels. Cockroaches sometimes destroy the color of images; rats make holes in them; bats defile them; flies, after sitting upon various unclean things, alight on them. Where is their divinity, seeing they suffer themselves to be thus insulted?

Comment — Symbols and their veneration are part of every culture that has ever existed. Even secular society has its sacred images – statues of Kings, politicians and great men, secular sacred paraphernalia like standards, ensigns and flags – for which people are prepared to die, even the football cult have their icons and symbols and sacred chants all of which have been the source of mayhem and death at some time or the other.

Degrading Effects of Idolatry. — Krishna says in the Bhagavad Gita: The mind by continually meditating on a material object becomes materialized. People who worship

senseless images end by becoming like them. They are deceived and cheated by their religious teachers in every possible way; but they do not see through the fraud.

God is self-existent, unchangeable, infinite in power, wisdom, goodness, and mercy, spotless in holiness. Who are worshipped in His stead? Senseless blocks, blind, deaf, and dumb beasts, birds, and creeping things, the obscene *linga*⁴, and supposed deities stained with every vice.

God's first command is not to worship any other than Himself. His second forbids the worship of idols.

Comment — Becoming like the images worshipped may well be applied to Christianity which, in worshipping a tortured God has committed the most horrific crimes against humanity. The Infamous Inquisition ran from 1250 to 1826 during which thousands of people were tortured and burnt alive by the Church for heresy and witchcraft – including a few scholars who challenged the Biblical view of the geo-centric universe! In the 5000 years of Hindu civilization such events have never taken place.

Educated Hindus and Idolatry. — Many educated Hindus take part in idolatrous rites, pretending that they are harmless customs, kept up by female influence, and that they conform to them simply to avoid giving offence. That idolatry is the very opposite of a harmless custom has already been shown. As well might a man be good-naturedly, guilty of high treason against his sovereign.

Comment — Surely an omniscient sovereign who was also compassionate would understand the devotee's inner state of mind wishing to commune with the Divine. Whatever device a sincere citizen used to represent their sovereign (since we know that the alleged sovereign refused to reveal His real name or form) would surely not give offence to a magnanimous ruler. If a man refuses to give his name why would he take offence if we name him John Doe?

The desire to please parents and relatives, within proper limits, is a praiseworthy feeling; but to break God's first and great command at the wish of any human being is a plea which cannot be sustained for a moment.

Comment — Jehovah gives contradictory commands regarding graven images which is to be followed? Did He forget His previous command?

Exo 20:4 "You shall not make for yourself an image in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. Exo.25:22. And you shall make two cherubim of gold, of cast work shall you make them, on the two sides of the mercy seat.

Exo. 21,8. And the Lord said to Moses, make a fiery serpent of brass and set it upon a pole;

An intelligent educated man countenancing idolatry is guilty in the following respects:

1. *Of cowardly hypocrisy,* — Insincere and faithless observance of the rites of religion must be degrading and destructive to everything that is best and noblest in human nature. Religion is thus made a huge hypocrisy, from the want of courage and honesty.

2. *Of cruelty to his relations and countrymen.* Women are the chief supporters of idolatry in India. Poor creatures they do not know better. Those who are mainly responsible for it and to be blamed are the educated men, who by their example encourage them in error. The women of India are naturally both intelligent and affectionate. If their husbands, instead of behaving

⁴ Linga is a phallic symbol of Lord Siva and denotes the act of creation and generation which on the material plane takes place through the union of the penis and vagina in all species of living beings. Why do Christians find this act of nature so objectionable?

as at present, would lovingly teach them to worship their great Father in heaven instead of idols, the reign of superstition would soon come to an end. The change is so reasonable as easily to be understood. It is so simple that it may be made intelligible even to a child.

Comment — Why should we perforce worship the Sky God instead of the Earth Mother? All male chauvinist monotheists revere this Sky God of which there is not the slightest evidence of his existence and perform the most horrible deeds in his name — the history of the Christian and Muslim depredations around the world are testimony to the results of this worship. Monotheism since its inception by Pharaoh Akhneton has been responsible for untold calamity around the world.

3. *Of high treason against God.*

Comment — The God of the Bible wipes out the entire creation because of his botched handiwork (Gen 6:5, Gen. 6:17, Gen. 7:23), condemns billions of people to die because of the sin of one man (Rom.5:12, 5:17–19). Strikes dead 70,000 men for having been counted in a census (1 Chron.21:1.) Enjoins slave-capturing expeditions (Deut. 20:10 –15.) Commands Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac (Gen 22.2), allows men to sell their daughters into slavery (Exo. 21:7) commands that women and girls may be captured, raped and kept and then expelled when one tires of them (Deut. 21:10 – 14.) commands the murder of babies (Num.31:18) and demands that any one who even picks up sticks on the Sabbath is to be killed (Exo. 31:14, Num 15:32–35) and frequently commands his believers to massacre women and children (Num. 31:1, 31:25, 31:36, Deut 7:1–6, Josh 11:20 etc.) BUT the one unforgivable “sin” that offends Him most is someone worshipping Him as the Supreme Being through the medium of an idol!! And none of the afore mentioned crimes will actually lead one to hell – only the thought-crime of disbelief is the reason for eternal damnation!

Creation.

Creation means calling things into existence out of nothing. In this sense of the word, according to Hinduism there is no creation. Its fixed dogma is *nāvastuno vastu-siddhiḥ*, nothing can be produced out of nothing. God is indeed called *Sarva-karta*, maker of all; but this does not mean that He is the Creator. No Hindu sect believes God to have created anything. Brahmos believe in a Creator, but they learned it from Christianity.

Comment — If something is produced out of nothing it is by definition an *illusion* like a mirage in a desert. A sensible rational person cannot accept that a phantasm and tangible reality can coincide in the same object. Either the world is created from nothing and is thus an *illusion* or it is formed from atoms which are real and eternal.

The Hindu doctrine is that every *Kārya*, effect, must have an *Upadāna Kāraṇa*, a cause out of which an effect is produced, such as clay is to an earthen pot. According to the Nyāya School, the *paramanus*, the atoms of earth, water, fire, and air, gods, animals, and plants are all uncreated, self-existent, and eternal. According to the Sāṅkya system, *prakṛti* is the material cause of the universe, and is, of course, self-existent and eternal. Even Maya, though false, is said to be eternal.

Comment — If one can posit the existence from eternity of an unseen, unknowable God for which there is not the slightest evidence, then why is it so hard to accept the eternity of matter/energy which is very much tangible?

All that Brahma does after every successive dissolution (*pralaya*) is to form the world into its present shape. Hence he is called *Vidhāta*, Arranger. Why does he do this? Only to amuse himself! Another explanation compares God to a gigantic spider who evolves the world out of

his own substance, as a spider does its net. Emanation (a flowing from), not creation is supposed to be the true principle of the universe.

This illustration, false and blasphemous as applied to the great Creator, is the exact truth with regard to many Hindu speculations. They may be well compared to spiders' webs, unsubstantial, fitted to catch flies, but unable to sustain the pressure of human life.

The Christian doctrine on the other hand is that God, infinite in power and wisdom, has always existed, and that the universe and all that it contains was called into being by Him out of nothing.

Comment — The clever Pandit while deriding the Hindu concept of *līla* avoids stating *why* Jehovah created the world! The Christian answer is that *God created the world for His own glory!* Now if God is self-sufficient and perfect why would He have this desperate need to create a vast Universe with billions of Galaxies⁵ and within it, in one galaxy, a tiny speck of earth with some puny creatures called humans that he made from dirt and commanded them to worship Him and Him alone for a few thousand years in order to experience His own glory? And those that didn't would be condemned to burn in a ghastly hell for the rest of eternity! Amazing that such a Being, superlative in every aspect should have a need to glorify Himself in such a petty and trivial manner! And to requite wrong notions about Him and His agenda with such an inhuman and dreadful punishment of hell and yet remain 'holy' and 'loving'!

The fundamental error of Hinduism is to judge God by our own standard. A carpenter cannot work without materials; in like manner it is supposed that God must have formed all things from eternally existing matter.

Comment — The Bible invests the father of Jesus with all the worst characteristic of humankind and which Hindus consider to be “mental filth” — desire, anger, delusion, arrogance, greed and jealousy! Our Brahman projects the world from Himself like a spider but is free from all the negative attributes so effusively and proudly applied to Jehovah.

God is often called *Sarva-śaktimān*, that is, Almighty, in Hindu books, but this is not true in the proper sense of the word. “Ye do err, not knowing the power of God” applies to Hindus as well as those to whom the words were addressed by the great Teacher.

Whether is it more rational to suppose the eternal existence of one Being, the Creator of all things by His omnipotent power, or to imagine that innumerable unintelligent atoms, gods, spirits, animals, and plants have existed from all eternity? Besides the latter, an eternal intelligent arranger is also required.

Maya.

The doctrine of Maya is one great difference between Christianity and Hinduism. According to Vedanta, it is only through Maya, or illusion⁶, that we look upon things as different and really existing. We are supposed to be like men who dream, to whom all things appear real so

⁵ The Milky Way Galaxy is roughly 100,000 light years in diameter, and the nearest sister galaxy to the Milky Way, the Andromeda Galaxy, is located roughly 2.5 million light years away. There are probably more than 100 billion (10¹¹) galaxies in the observable Universe.

⁶ Māyā doesn't mean 'illusion' but rather “appearance” — the doctrine of Māyā claims that the manifest universe is in constant state of flux and transformation and is essentially unsubstantial. Ed.

long as they dream. Christianity, on the other hand, affirms the reality of the universe⁷, and the trustworthiness of our senses.

The following are some of the arguments against Maya:—

1. *The Testimony of our Senses.* — Every one of our five senses — sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch — bears witness to the reality of the objects around us.

Comment — Science has since addressed this issue and established that objects not as real as they appear. All objects are comprised of atoms and more empty space than solid matter.

The reply to this is as follows: A man sees a rope and by misapprehension takes it for a snake: in like manner the ignorant see the world, and suppose it to be real.

A man may, indeed, by misapprehension take a rope for a snake, but only so long as he keeps at a distance from it. Let him come near it, and he will at once see his error.

Another illustration is that the eye is deceived in mirage, fancying water to exist where there is none.

It is true that one sense may mislead us for a time, but the wrong idea is soon corrected by the other senses. The illusion of the mirage is detected by the touch. Kanada has well said, that it is only when the senses are unsound or defective or when some bad habit is contracted, that a person may be deceived.

According to Gotama:— “If all evidence is to be rejected, then the refutation itself is inadmissible.” The fact concerning the mirage is communicated to us through the senses. If the senses are never to be trusted” then how do we know about the mirage?

2. *The doctrine of Maya is incapable of proof.* — If all human beings are under the influence of the eternal Maya who is to find out that they are all deluded? How did the Vedantic philosophers discover it? Are they conscious of such an influence? But, on the supposition of the reign of universal and eternal delusion, is not that consciousness itself delusive? If it be said that the fact has been discovered by divine revelation; must not the perception of that revelation, as well as the comprehension of its import, on the supposition of a universal and eternal delusion, be also delusive?

Comment — The doctrine of the unsubstantiality and flux of the universe is self-evident. Where is the proof that Jesus rose from the dead and flew of into space in his physical body?

3. *If the whole world is Unreal, the Vedas are also Unreal.* — The same applies to the Upanishads and all Vedantic writings.

Comment — The world can be said to be a momentary dreamlike illusion when compared to eternity. Why does *knowledge* of that fact need to be an illusion as well?

4. *The doctrine gives a most dishonoring idea of God.* — According to Vedanta, it is Brahma who has put the whole human race under the universal influence of the eternal Maya, “He has projected a distorted reflection of himself with a view to delude his rational creatures. In consequence of this act he is termed “*māyavī Brahma!*” How unworthy is such an opinion of the spotless and infinitely pure God! Can it be conceived for a moment that He delights in deceiving mankind? Can the idea be entertained in the mind that the holy God, is, like a potent juggler, perpetually deceiving the whole human race as a ““ divine amusement?”

⁷ The *reality* of a universe which has been created from nothing? How is it possible for something real to come from nothing? Only an illusion is created from nothing so before denouncing Maya as the doctrine of *illusion* and therefore false the Christian should first examine his own theory of creation from nothingness.

The doctrine of Maya is pure imagination, utterly opposed to common sense. It has been well said of Hindu pandits, **that the more a doctrine is opposed to common sense, the more they cling to it.** Cicero, a distinguished Roman, said that there is no opinion, however absurd, which has not been held by some philosopher. The doctrine of Maya is a good example of the spider-web theories of Hinduism.

Comment — Tertullian (155-245 A.D.) a pagan philosopher converted to Christianity on the basis of “*credo quia absurdum*” — I believe because it is so absurd! The core paradigm of Christianity is so absurd that no human mind could possibly have conceived of it and therefore it must be of divine origin! Billions of people fervently believe that Jesus was born from a virgin, died and rose from the dead — is this not totally devoid of common sense as well as any biological possibility?

Adṛṣṭha or Karma.

As Hinduism denies the Creation of the world in the strict sense of the word, so it denies its Government by God. All things are supposed to be determined by an irresistible power, called *Adṛiṣṭha* – unseen, because felt and not seen. It stands for fate, merit or demerit on works during a previous state of existence. *Karma*, more commonly used, has the same meaning. It comes from *kri*, to do; it means deeds or actions. According to Karma every action must bring forth its legitimate fruit. Shankar Acharya says, even God cannot alter it any more than He can produce rice out of wheat seed.

The doctrine of Karma has been adopted by Hindus as the only explanation of the unequal distribution of happiness in this world, why some are rich and others poor; why some are healthy and others sickly. If an infant agonize in pain it arises from some great sin committed in a former birth.

Comment — The Christian view of infants agonizing in pain is that God is *testing* the parents or “working in some mysterious way”! Why would an omniscient, omnipotent and holy God allow infants to suffer and die? About 29,000 children under the age of five – 21 each minute – die every day, mainly from preventable causes. Most of these in Christian Africa.

The Hindu idea is that works of themselves produce their own fruits. The Sankhya system unhesitatingly maintains that the performance of Hindu rites and ceremonies leads to happiness after deaths while it denies that there is a God to reward them that diligently seek him. Though most of the other systems acknowledge a God Ishwar, he is only like a steward dispensing his master's goods according to his orders. He has no choice in the matter and the real master is the inevitable law which binds the action and its fruit together. The real god of the Hindu, in the sense of the real master of his fate, is Adṛiṣṭha or Karma.

On inquiry, however, it will be seen that this theory is attended with insuperable difficulties.

Adṛiṣṭha or Karma, is supposed to be endowed with most wonderful influence and qualities. As a judge, its decisions are marked by unerring wisdom, and its awards are inevitably carried out to the letter. They may be stated more in detail as follows: —

1. *It is most wise.* — A judge of the High Court, able to sentence a man to death, needs great wisdom; how much more is, this necessary when the award may be heaven or hell for unnumbered ages?

Comment — Hinduism does not hold with the idea of interminable heaven or hell — both are limited and conditioned states the duration of which is conditioned the enormity of the crime or magnitude of the virtue. Heaven and hell are conceivable only in space and time. Every school child knows that space and time began with the Big Bang.

2. *It is inflexibly just.* — A judge may be wise, but he may be partial. Not so with karma. It renders to every one exactly according to his deserts.

Comment — And what's the problem with justice?

3. *Its power extends to all worlds.* — Through it a person is born in one of 8,400,000 of births in this world, in the world of the gods, or in one of the hells.

4. *It extends to all time.* — Its memory never fails. A man may be in the enjoyment of happiness for millions of years on account of some supposed merit, but at the end of that period he may be born in the lowest hell for some crime in a former birth.

Comment — After experiencing the fruit of action in either heaven or hell one is born again on earth to continue one's spiritual evolution.

5. *It is unalterable.* — The highest gods have no power to avert its effects; they are themselves subject to *adrishta*.

6. *Its object is good.* — To punish vice and reward virtue is an aim of the noblest kind.

Comment — It is not *punishment* but rather the *results* of actions based on motivation. Is cirrhosis a punishment for alcoholism or its result? Is prosperity due to wise investment a reward or outcome? The learned pandit insists of purposefully misrepresenting Hindu doctrines for evangelical purposes.

What is it that Hindus suppose to possess these high attributes? A mere name, something that has no existence. What power is there in an action itself to reward or punish, millions of years after it was performed?

One may well ask how can an act of naïve indiscretion by Adam 6000 years ago affects all of mankind throughout the world forever? And since Adam was created 6000 years ago according to Biblical calculation one has to wonder who created all the other humanoid species that have been around for 200,000 years.

As a rule, there must be some one to give the rewards or punishments due to men's actions. Thus a man is engaged to do a certain work for which he is to receive wages. The work done is the man's karma: the wages to be received is the *phala* or fruit. But how is he to receive this *phala*? Is it to be received from the karma? No. It must be given by some one able and willing to bestow it. Suppose a thief steals many thousand rupees, will he be punished without the intervention of other persons? Were any person to say that for the purpose of punishing the criminal no judge is necessary, that by dement of the crime the man would be flogged without any one flogging him, would any person of common sense believe him? And if such an assertion cannot be received as true respecting the affairs of this world, can similar assertions be received as true respecting the other world?

Comment — On this logic one could also argue that every law of the universe and every natural process is presided and managed by a Divine Being – if this Being is claimed to be the monotheistic God who is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient then He's not doing a very good job! The erratic and unpredictable weather processes as well as the blatant inequality and injustice in the world would testify to either an incompetent or absent creator!

There are other objections to the doctrine of Karma:

1. *It does not explain the origin of things.* — It only removes the difficulty one single step. Hindus have been obliged to go back from Karma to Karma until at last they have been forced to say that the world is eternal. Before there could be merit or demerit, beings must have existed and acted. The first in order could no more have been produced by Karma than a hen could be born from her own egg.

Comment — Correct, ultimately the origin is unknowable and therefore it is called *anadi-karma*. Monotheists have the same problem in explaining who created God – saying that God is self-created and self-existent has the same logical weight as saying that the law of Karma originated with the universe like gravity.

2. *The evil effects of a belief in Karma*, — Hindus consider that they are under the burden of a blind fate, which compels them to suffer for some crime or other of which they are unconscious. That punishment must be borne; they have no help for it; there is no way of escape as long as they live. Hence they are fatalists both in belief and practice.

Comment — Again this is a parody of the teaching on Law of Karma – there are three types of Karma – *sanchita* – cumulative, *prarabdha* – operative karma and *kriyaman* – current actions. Current actions are under our control and therefore can be directed for the greatest benefit of other sentient beings and being dedicated as service to Narayana absolves them of future karmic consequences. Operative Karma which produced this life-span and conditions cannot be changed like a bullet shot from a gun. Cumulative Karma can be destroyed by the Grace of Narayana.

In the Puranas persons guilty of the greatest crimes are comforted on the ground that all was fixed by their karma, that man has no power over that which is to be, and therefore they were not guilty of any fault. The excuse for misconduct is constantly made, “What could we do? It was our Karma.”

Comment — The conditions which we encounter are produced by Karma – the way we deal with those predetermined factors is Dharma — nowhere in Hindu Scriptures is fatalism endorsed. The entire Bhagavagita is a treatise on Karma Yoga — the yoga of active and positive engagement with the world.

The Christian view will now be explained.

God, the Ruler of the Universe. — It has been shown how absurd it is to suppose that a mere word can act the part of the wisest judge in millions of cases every day as is alleged to be done by Karma. On the other hand, all is agreeable to reason if, instead of Karma, we take God, He is eternal, the Creator of all things, having all power, inflexibly just, wise, and merciful. It is most fitting that He, the Lord of all, should be the Judge. “He is Governor among the nations.” He knows every thing. Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God. God will render to every man according to his works.

Besides a judge to decide, an agency is necessary to carry out the sentence. While Karma has no power to do this, God is omnipotent; His power extends through all time and to every portion of the universe.

Hinduism denies free agency either on the part of God or man; Christianity affirms it in both. If we sin, it is our own fault.

Comment — How does Christianity explain why one child is born handicapped and another blessed in every respect. There are three possible explanations — (1) God is capricious, (2) God is punishing the child for the sins of the father, (3) God is testing the individual and the family. Any one of these responses compromises what has been declared of God. Capriciousness negates His compassion. Punishment for the sins of the father compromise His justice and the random act of testing compromises His omniscience.

Exodus 20:5 - I the LORD thy God [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me.

And apparently the justice of punishing the entire humanity, present and future for the questionable offence of one man some 6000 years ago is somehow to the glory of the creator who is endowed with one of the worst human characteristics — jealousy?

Rom. 5:12. By one man sin entered into the world, and death through Sin and so death came to all men, inasmuch as all have sinned.

Rom. 5; 17—19. By one man's offence death reigned by one..... by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation..... by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.

Man.

The Hindu idea is that all souls (*ātma*) are exactly alike. Mind (*manas*) belongs not to the soul, but to the body. The human body has considerably more mind connected with it than the lower animals, but the difference is only one of degree.

Hindu speculations regarding the soul differ in several respects. On one point, however, they are nearly unanimous, that the soul is not created by God but eternal, *svayambhu*, self-existent.

The Kathavalli, says: "The wise one (that is the soul) is not born nor does he die; he has not come into existence from any cause, nor has any one (as something distinct from him) come into existence from him. He is unborn, eternal, permanent, the ancient; he is not killed when the body is killed."

On other points there are differences. The Vaisesika school maintains that the soul is diffused everywhere through space. "Ether, in consequence of its universal pervasion, is infinitely great; and so likewise is soul." 7:22.

With this view the Bhagavad Gita agrees. The soul is described as "everlasting, all-pervading, stable, firm, and eternal."

On the contrary, the Svetasvatara Upanishad declares that the soul is almost infinitesimally small:— "If the point of a hair be divided into one hundred parts, and each part again divided into one hundred parts — that is the length of the atma."

In the Katha Upanishad it is said that "Brahma, of the size of the thumb, dwells in the ātma."

The Vedantic idea is that the soul is part of Brahma, and that to Him it returns. A particle of Him for a time is associated with a particle of Ignorance or Maya.

"The common people," says Dr, Kellogg, "speak of the soul as being *a part of God*. It is a portion of the Supreme ruler as a spark is of fire. Yet in the same breath they will affirm" that God is *akhaṇḍa* 'indivisible,' whence it follows that each soul is the total Divine Essence, and that is precisely the strict Vedantic doctrine!

One argument for the eternity of the soul is the supposed axiom:— "Whatever exists must always have existed." As already shown, this denies God's omnipotence. By His will He can create things or call them out of nothing into existence.

Comment — Can god create a stone so heavy that even he could not raise it? God's omnipotence is circumscribed by the laws of science that He has instituted.

Another argument is that "Whatever had a beginning must have an end." This is also a denial of God's power. He can give a future eternal existence to any creature He has called into being.

Comment — So again there is no justice in Jesus' world. A wicked serial killer can be absolved of all his wickedness by simply accepting the bizarre doctrine of the death and resurrection of the sacrificed son of God and getting baptized. Whereas a righteousness and generous person no matter how good they may be will burn forever in a dreadful hell for not accepting this absurd proposition.

According to Hinduism, souls may pass into gods, demons, beasts, birds, reptiles, fishes, insects, into plants, and even into inanimate objects. Who can estimate the number of these eternal essences! Is it not perfectly unphilosophical, because absolutely unnecessary and egregiously extravagant, to assume such an indefinite numbers of eternal essences, when one Supreme Essence is sufficient to account for all things, visible or invisible, material or spiritual? If the soul is a portion of God our relation to Him is that of whole and part. It is not necessary for God to worship Himself. If I am either God or a part of God, why should I worship Him?

Comment — Hinduism is not grounded in duality, in faith and worship but rather in introspection and realization. The problem in Christianity is *ontological* (we are born in sin and are sinful by nature) the problem in Hinduism is *epistemological* (we are ignorant of our true nature as sparks of the Divine.) For Hinduism the ultimate goal is realize and experience God within the depths of our own being, to *know* God, not to worship Him.

If a man denied the existence of his earthly parents, it would be a great sin; but it is a much greater sin to deny that God is our Maker and Heavenly Father. If our souls are eternal and self-existent, we are a sort of miniature gods. Our relation to God is changed. It is only that of king and subjects. His right over us is only that of might. **It is only because He is mightier than we and of His possessing power to benefit and to harm us, that we should be anxious to pay homage to Him.** There is not the love which a child should cherish towards a father. True religion is thus destroyed.

Comment — The Christian motivation to worship is a sense of self-worthlessness and fear. The Hindu motivation is pure love regardless of supposed rewards or punishments in the hereafter!

To any man endowed with a grain of common sense, the opinion maintained by some of the schools that the soul is infinite, like space, must seem the height of absurdity.

Comment — The concept of an immortal soul is strongly contested among Jewish and Christian theologians. The Catholics believe in an immortal soul.

Other views held are scarcely less extravagant, that it is eternal, *svayambhu*, self-existent.

The Christian doctrine is briefly as follows: —

God alone is self-existent, without beginning or end. He is omnipotent, able to call beings or things into existence out of nothing. He gave us a body and a soul. The soul never existed before our present birth. The body is mortal; the soul returns to God who gave it. At the great Day of Judgment, all must appear before God, to answer for the deeds done in the body, whether good or evil.

As already mentioned, it is unphilosophic to maintain that there are innumerable self-existent beings, when one possessed of almighty power is sufficient. The explanation given by Christianity is beautifully simple and meets all the requirements of the case.

Comment — If the soul comes into being with the body – what evidence is there that it continues forever afterwards? Does original sin apply to the body or the soul or both? If both come into being at the time of birth how do they acquire original sin? Who is it that sins? Is it

the soul or body? If the two are one and the soul returns to God then one must believe in the completely absurd doctrine of resurrection on the Day of Judgment. At some time in the future all the dead will arise to be judged and rewarded or condemned. The body is resurrected for punishment in heaven or hell — billions of humans have died since humanity first walked on the planet some 200,000 years ago (according to science) the Day of Judgment is still very far away – 30 billion years according to science. So what are the unjudged souls doing with God? Are they in suspended animation? Such a beautiful and simple explanation indeed!!

Transmigration.

On account of its great importance, this famous Hindu dogma is noticed again, although some of its points have already been considered under Karma.

It is a fundamental doctrine of Hinduism that the fruit of works can be experienced only in the body, and therefore, as long as a man has an atom of merit or demerit unexhausted, he is bound to assume a fresh body, A South Indian poet thus expresses his feelings at the prospect:

—

*“How many births are past, I cannot tell; How many yet to come, no man can say;
But this alone I know, and know full well, That pain and grief embitter all the way.”*

The dread of continued transmigration is the one haunting thought with the Hindus. The great aim is, not to find truth or to be released from the burden of sin, but how to break this iron chain of repeated existences, how to return to complete absorption into pure unconscious spirit.

Comment — The ultimate goal of Vedanta is to be rid of all ignorance and be merged in Consciousness and Bliss not pure unconscious spirit!

Transmigration, like Karma, is supposed to explain why some are born rich, others poor; some healthy, others diseased, &c. All in this life, its feelings and actions, its joys and sorrows, its good and evil deeds, like fruit from a seed, are supposed to be the necessary result of actions performed in a former state of being.

This explanation is purely imaginary and destitute of proof; while, on the other hand, there are several arguments showing that transmigration cannot be true.

Comment — And of course the creation of something from nothing is common sense and can be proven?

1. *Like always produces like.* — Every animal, every plant produces animals and plants exactly like itself. According to transmigration, a man in his next birth may be a lion, a pig, an insect, or a pumpkin. The analogy of nature is a strong presumption against its truth.

Comment — This objection holds in the case of the soul and body being of one essence. The true Hindu view is of evolution – that the conscious component of life evolves and unfolds during subsequent transmigrations into ever ascending life-forms, culminating in human birth. There is no retrogression as the great Pandit erroneously assumes.

2. *No one has the slightest recollection of any previous birth.* — It is the same soul that transmigrates. A traveller who journeys from city to city remembers his native place from which he started, the relations he left there; he recollects, too, the different cities through which he passed, and what happened to himself in each. The body, we are told, is the ‘city of Brahma’ and the soul as it enters new ‘cities’ ought to carry with it a

complete recollection of its past history. But no soul remembers anything that happened to it previous to its present life. The proof then is almost perfect that it never lived before.

Comment — Can any one remember anything of their birth from their mother's womb? Can any one accurately remember exactly what one did as a child? Each of us has vague memories of isolated episodes – and that memory too is unreliable. If that be the case with this life, how could one possibly remember past lives? There is in fact ample evidence of pre-birth experiences in children – one need only look up on the internet.

3. *By transmigration persons virtually become new beings, so that they are in reality punished for the actions of others,* — It is said that at every new birth something takes place by which the remembrance of former things is destroyed. In this case the person on whom it is wrought is no longer the same person. The object of transmigration is to purify the soul by lessons of warning from its past history. This is lost when a person knows not what he did and why he is punished. According to transmigration, one man is really punished for the faults of another of which he is quite ignorant.

Comment — Another erroneous assumption based on a Christian point of view. The conscious Self (atman) initiates the act which results in negative or positive results. The negative acts which cause suffering to others are experienced as suffering by the Self, the virtuous acts which cause joy to others are experienced as joy by the Self – the body is the field in which the results are experienced by the sower. The body by itself is a biological mass of 70% water and various chemicals, it is insentient. It cannot of itself experience anything unless occupied by the sentient Self (atman). The Self in every body is the same as it was in the previous existence and it reaps the results of its actions in whatever body it inhabits.

4. *The doctrine tends to make people earthly-minded.* — The rewards of virtue are only to be enjoyed in bodily life. They are generally supposed to consist in riches, honor, rank, many children, long life, &c. The effect of such a view is to fix people's attention on earthly good things, and to make them regard virtue only as means to that end.

Comment — This is also what the Bible teaches in Deuteronomy 28 —

“And if you faithfully obey the voice of the LORD your God, being careful to do all his commandments that I command you today, the LORD your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth. And all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, if you obey the voice of the LORD your God. Blessed shall you be in the city, and blessed shall you be in the field. Blessed shall be the fruit of your womb and the fruit of your ground and the fruit of your cattle, the increase of your herds and the young of your flock. Blessed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl. Blessed shall you be when you come in, and blessed shall you be when you go out. etc. etc. etc.

5. *Belief in transmigration weakens the inducements to virtue and encourages vice.* — It has been shown that the person who does the acts is neither rewarded or punished. The *phala* may not be reaped till after thousands of births. There is therefore no motive for me to conduct myself so as to obtain that enjoyment or avoid that suffering.

Comment — Previously the Pandit has said that Karma is punishment and reward, now he says that one is neither punished nor rewarded! Consistency is the hallmark of truth! Karma is not about me killing a mosquito and the mosquito killing me in our next incarnation together! Karma is about the quality of one's thoughts and impressions (*samskāras*) which give rise to patterns of behavior (*vāsanās*) which cause either joy or pain to other sentient beings. The imperative is to recognize what the origin of suffering is and to modify one's behaviour so as to mollify current suffering and to avoid future suffering. By living a virtuous

life one is investing in one's future. By living a life of sinful activity one is condemning oneself.

The doctrine tends to annul the office of conscience which God has appointed to shame and reproach us when we do wrong and to encourage us in what is right. The Hindu looks upon the blessings of this life as rewards for meritorious acts in some former state of existence. They are the payment of a just debt, for which no gratitude is due to God. If a man meets with misfortunes, he does not impute them to present misdeeds, for which he should repent, but to some sins in a former birth of which he is not conscious.

Comment — And thus one accepts the inevitability of suffering and happiness and strives to achieve greater moral perfection and wisdom. The Kathavalli which the pandit previously quoted says that Self-realization cannot be accomplished by one who has not desisted from vice.

6. *Happiness does not depend merely on rank or wealth.* — It is generally supposed that a king is happy and a poor man miserable. Often the reverse is the case. There is much less inequality in the condition of men than people think. A king gets accustomed to rich food, and feels no more pleasure in eating it than a poor man when taking his dinner. The sleep of the poor man is sweet; the nights of the great are often troubled. Shakespeare says:— "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown."

Kings are liable to be assassinated. They are tempted to many sins. An Indian proverb says, "The fruit of a kingdom is hell." Where is the blessing of a kingdom if such is its result?

Comment — And how does this rant disprove transmigration?

7. *Happiness or Misery is often traceable to conduct in this life.* — The facts brought forward to prove a prior existence may be, in a great measure, accounted for by differences observable in the world itself, in the actions of men. One man prospers, not on account of his merit in a former birth, but through his industry; another is unfortunate, not from former demerit, but through his laziness. It is foolish to ascribe to Karma what is plainly the result of a man's own acts in this world.

Comment — A facile objection. Leaving aside the obvious teleological process one needs also to ask why do some virtuous people do everything in their power to achieve their goals and are aided by every other factor yet still fail miserably. How is it that some people live decadent and deceitful lives but are attended by every form of material success? The rate of success is very seldom dependent on the degree of effort.

8. *We may look forward as well as backward.* — The strongest argument for transmigration is that it seems to satisfy our sense of justice. This is also done by the Christian doctrine, which is that this world is a state of probation and trial, preparatory to a future state.

Comment — If Jesus and his father are omniscient they know everything past, present and future as previously asserted by the reverend. Why would an omniscient being need to test a puny frail human being who was made corrupt? The outcomes are already known before the probation starts – so where is the justice in this? Before the creation of the world Jehovah knew exactly what would happen, yet still he planted the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the garden of Eden along with the talking snake, knowing full-well the consequences — if a parent were to leave an innocent child alone in the company of a hungry python would he or she not be guilty of child-neglect and be punished with the harshest of sentences were the child to be eaten alive?

We are like the servants of a great king who has allotted to us different duties, and according as we discharge them we shall be dealt with. People are tested in different ways — some by riches, some by poverty, some by healthy some by sickness, some by prosperity, some by adversity. Happiness or misery depends far more upon ourselves than upon outward things.

Comment — First God is testing us because he obviously has no idea of how we will behave under different circumstances, then we are told by the reverend that happiness and misery depend upon ourselves? How are we at all responsible for our circumstances if we had no choice in the matter? Does a black child choose to be born in a crime infested ghetto and a white kid to live in a Beverly Hills suburb surrounded by opulence and opportunity?

Christians, instead of ascribing misfortunes to the consequences of a former birth, refer them either to what they have done in this life or regard them as God's fatherly dealings with them to purify them, just as their earthly parents corrected them to do them good.

Comment — How is the unequal distribution of resources and opportunities, pestilence and war, sickness and disability an evidence of God's fatherly dealings in order to purify us? Could he not have created all humans perfect if he wanted to? The existence of random suffering and evil without just cause are the signs of a psychopathic, evil, despotic creator who toys with his creation rather than a compassionate and well-intentioned 'father' seeking to do us good!

Those who truly love and serve God may always be happy, and can meet even death with joy as a messenger calling them to their Father's house, there to dwell for ever. They have no dread, like Hindus, of unknown future births.

Comment — Hindus are taught to accept with equanimity pleasure and pain, happiness and sorrow as all of these changes pertain to the body/mind complex alone. The true Self is perpetually free from all contamination and is essentially Being, Conscious and Bliss, it is only through spiritual ignorance that we identify with the body and experience suffering. A Christian may be convinced that current suffering will have a greater reward in some future heaven but that too leads to hope for the future and not to focusing on how to improve the situation here and now. A hope which may indeed prove to be vain!

Caste and the Brotherhood of Man.

Caste is the distinguishing feature of Hinduism. A man may be an atheist, pantheist, polytheist, monotheist, he may be a liar, thief, adulterer, murderer; but so long as he observes caste he is recognized as a Hindu and has free admission to its temples.

Comment — Likewise any Christian who commits any number of sins is still admitted to a church and given the Eucharist. Catholics need first to confess to a priest but the Protestants need not.

On the other hand, let him eat with a European, let him go to England for study, or marry a widow, and he is excluded from Hindu society. All beyond the pale of Hinduism are considered impure *Mlecchas*.

Comment — Up until very recently inter-racial marriages were banned in the USA and South Africa and lead to social rejection in Australia. In India and USA separate Churches existed for Europeans and non-European Christians. One generation ago divorce was a cause of social ostracization in most Christian societies.

“The rigid observance of caste,” says Ram-mohan Roy, “is considered in so high a light as to compensate for every moral defect. Even the most atrocious crimes weigh little or nothing in the balance against the supposed guilt of its violation. Murder, theft, perjury, though brought

home to the party by a judicial sentence, so far from inducing a loss of caste, is visited with no peculiar mark of infamy or disgrace.”

Comment — This is simply not true there are many crimes which lead to loss of caste – depending on the caste. A Brahmin by murder, theft, perjury, adultery, gambling and drinking alcohol etc. will lose caste. The lower the caste the lower the threshold. Among Sudras for example food and drink do not cause loss of caste.

Caste has chiefly reference to food. Hence it has been said that *the stomach is the seat of Hinduism*. Other religions may be seated in the mind and soul — but the stronghold of Hinduism is the stomach. A Hindu may retain his faith against all argument, and against all violence, but mix a bit of beef in his food, and his religion is gone! Not that he renounces it, but that, it repudiates him. Let half a dozen Hindus seize one of their own caste, and forcibly thrust forbidden food down his throat, and that man has ceased to have any rights in this world or the next.

Comment — This may have been true in 1893 but is no longer the case – millions of Hindus now live outside of India and eat and drink whatever they want. Even in India today Brahmins eat meat and drink alcohol and all are still embraced by Hinduism.

It is often alleged that caste distinctions are similar to the civil and social distinctions of European and other nations; but there is an essential difference. Indian caste is derived from *birth* alone. It cannot be transferred from one class to another; it cannot be gained as a reward for the highest merit or bestowed as an honorary title by the most powerful monarch. As well might an ass be changed into a horse.

Comment — This was certainly not the case in 1893 – England was absolutely fixated on ‘class’. Throughout the middle ages the Christian peasants and serfs were treated far worse than the Sudras of India with absolutely no chance of class-mobility. Even today class plays a strong role in professions and social mobility in most Anglo-saxon countries.

Civil distinctions in Europe were framed by man; caste claims divine origin. Krishna, in the Bhagavad Gita, says:– “The fourfold division of castes was created by me.”

Comment — The second line of this quote from the Gita goes on to say — “based on inherent qualities and the work one does.” This would be the basis of most social hierarchies that have operated since civilization began.

Origin of Caste. — The sacred books of the Hindus contain no consistent account of the origin of caste; but, on the contrary, present the greatest varieties of speculation on the subject.

The most common story is that the castes issued from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet of Brahma. The Sathapatha Brahmana says that they sprung from the words *bhuh, bhuvah, svah*. The Taittiriya Brahmana says that they were produced from the Vedas. In another place the same book says the Brahman caste is sprung from the gods; the Sudra from the asuras. In one book men are said to be the offspring of Vivasvat; in another his son Manu is said to be their progenitor; whilst in a third they are said to be descended from a female of the same name. The Bhagavata Purana says that in the Krita or Satya Yuga there was but one caste. The Vayu Parana says that the separation into castes did not take place till the Treta Yuga.

When witnesses in a court of justice give conflicting evidence, discredit is thrown upon all their testimony. Writings cannot be inspired which involve self-contradictions.

Comment — Obviously the Pandit converted prior to studying the blatant contradictions that are found in the four Gospels!!

Caste first arose from difference of race. The ordinary names for caste prove thus. *Jāti* means race; *Varna*, color.

The Aryas, coming from a colder climate, were lighter in color than the original inhabitants of India, whom they called “the black skin.”

The first great distinction was between the white and dark races, the conquerors and the conquered, the freeman and the slave. The Sudras undoubtedly were the aboriginal races of India subdued by the Aryan invaders. One of the earliest tribes brought under subjection was called Sudras, and this name was extended to the whole race.

Comment — The Aryan invasion theory upon which this hypothesis is based is highly contentious. Most serious scholars now dispute this theory for lack of archeological and textual evidence.

Difference of *employment* was another cause. In every civilized country there are priests, soldiers, merchants, and men following other occupations. Manu represents the castes to have multiplied by marriages between the four original castes. These mixed castes did not wait for mixed marriages before they came into existence. Professions, trades, and handicrafts had grown up without any reference to caste.

Subdivisions of castes arose from jealousy between rival families, difference in religion &c. The following extracts from Manu’s Code show that caste rules are an invention of the Brahmans to enslave all others.

Brahmins.

Book 1.93. Since he sprang from the most excellent part, since he was the first-born, and since he holds the Vedas, the Brahman is, by right, the lord of all this creation.

Book 1.100. Thus whatever exists in the universe is all the property of the Brahman; for the Brahman is entitled to all by his superiority and eminence of birth.

Sudras.

Book 8.413. But a Sudra, whether bought or not bought, (the Brahman) may compel to practice servitude; for that (Sudra) was created by the Self-existent merely for the service of the Brahman.

Book 8. 417. A Brahman may take possession of the goods of a Sudra with perfect peace of mind, for, since nothing at all belongs to this (Sudra) as his own, he is one whose property may be taken away by his master.

Book 8.281. If a low-born man, endeavors to sit down by the side of a highborn man, he should be banished after being branded on the hip, or (the king) may cause his backside to be cut off.

Book 4.80. One may not give advice to a Sudra, nor (give him) the remains (of food) or (of) butter that has been offered. And one may not teach him the law or enjoin upon him (religious) observances.

Book 4.81. For he who tells him the law and he who enjoins Upon him (religious) observances, he indeed, together with that (Sudra), sinks into the darkness of the hell called *Asamvrtta* (unbounded.)

According to Manu, if a Sudra sat at a meeting of the National Congress in the presence of Brahmans he should be banished after being branded or mutilated!

Manu’s Code professes to have proceeded from the Self-existent. Let any intelligent Hindu say honestly whether some of the laws which have been quoted could have had such an origin.

Comment — Perhaps in the interests of fairness we should compare the Code of Manu (a human legislator) with the Code of Jehovah (the God)

God's rules of slavery.

Ex. 21:2 "If you buy a Hebrew servant, he is to serve you for six years. But in the seventh year, he shall go free, without paying anything..... 4 If his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons or daughters, the woman and her children shall belong to her master, and only the man shall go free.

Buying and selling of other humans as property has divine sanction.

Lev. 25; 44 "Your male and female slaves are to come from the nations around you; from them you may buy slaves. 45 You may also buy some of the temporary residents living among you and members of their clans born in your country, and they will become your property. 46 You can will them to your children as inherited property and can make them slaves for life, but you must not rule over your fellow Israelites ruthlessly.

Daughters may be sold and never freed.

Ex. 21; 7. And if a man sells his daughter to be a slave, she shall not be freed as the male slaves are.

Slaves may be beaten within an inch of their lives. The most savage beating only merits punishment if the slave dies.

Exo. 21:20 "If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.

Evils of Caste — Caste is founded on a lie. Sir H, S. Maine, in *Ancient Law* justly describes it as, "The most disastrous and blighting of human institutions." Keshub Chunder Sen says in an Appeal to Young India —

"That Hindu caste is a frightful social scourge no one can deny. It has completely and hopelessly wrecked social unity, harmony, and happiness, and for centuries it has opposed all social progress. But few seem to think that it is not so much as a social but as a religions institution that it has become the great scourge it really is. As a system of absurd social distinctions, it is certainly pernicious. But when we view it on moral grounds it appears as a scandal to conscience, and an insult to humanity, and all our moral ideas and sentiments rise to execrate it, and to demand its immediate extermination. Caste is the bulwark of Hindu idolatry and the safeguard of Brahminical priesthood. It is an audacious and sacrilegious violation of God's law of human brotherhood. It makes civil distinctions inviolable divine institutions, and in the name of the Holy God sows perpetual discord and enmity among His children! It exalts one section of the people above the rest, gives the former, under the seal of divine sanction, the monopoly of education, religion and all the advantages of social pre-eminence, and visits them with the arbitrary authority of exercising a tyrannical sway over unfortunate and helpless millions of human souls, trampling them under their feet and holding them in a state of miserable servitude. It sets up the Brahminical order as the very vicegerents of the Deity and stamps the mass of the population as a degraded and unclean race, unworthy of manhood and unfit for heaven."

Comment — An exaggeration and no longer applicable. For the millions of modern Indian Hindus working in a post-industrial society, caste is a much more relaxed institution and for the millions of Hindus living in the west caste is totally irrelevant.

The "Brotherhood of Man" is now claimed as a Hindu doctrine. There is not much "brotherhood" when brothers regard it as pollution to eat with one another. The "Fatherhood of God" is also claimed as taught by Hinduism. Amid the thousand or more names given to

God in the Shastras, father is to be found; but this does not prove it, for the essential feature is wanting. A father is one through whom we receive life; but according to all Hindu sects souls are eternal and self-existent like God Himself.

Comment — Only Christianized Hindus talk of the “Brotherhood of Man” — orthodox Hindus talk of the interconnectedness of all life forms. We are not ‘bothers’ but rather ‘inter-dependent units’— interlinked and inter-dependent – our survival as a species depends on the survival of bees and their habitat. The bees too are our ‘brothers’.

On the other hand Christianity teaches that God gave us life, and continually preserves us. He is therefore our Father in heaven. We are all descended from the same first parents. Climate, exposure to the weather and different modes of life have produced the differences, fitting persons to live in different countries.

Comment — The parents of the child are the ones who give him/her life and Mother Earth sustains it. Life and sustainment are dependent upon the Sun not on some invisible sky god.

The Brotherhood of Man follows from the Fatherhood of God. All people in the world should regard themselves as brothers and sisters of one great family, with God as their Father. It is true that they act very differently; but this arises from their sinfulness.

Comment — What about the Motherhood of the Earth? How is difference related to sinfulness?

Whether is the teaching of Hinduism or Christianity on this point the more consistent with truth and justice?

Comment — We all hope for truth and justice. How just is the condemnation to an eternity of unspeakable suffering for the thought crime of disbelief?

Man’s Duty, or the Aim of Life.

Hinduism makes life a curse instead of a blessing. The body is regarded as the mean lodging-place for vile worms and many diseases; men suffer from their fellow men, from famines, pestilences, from the malignant influence of evil stars, or from the cruelty of demons and hobgoblins. The great object is to cut short the 8,100,000 of births exposed to such calamities.

Comment — Life is neither a curse nor a blessing — life is what it is.

By the *Karma marga*, by ceremonies and virtuous deeds, the Hindu supposes that he may obtain happiness, but it is only temporary. The following illustration is used: —

“We are bound to our existence by two chains, the one a golden chain and the other an iron chain. The golden chain is virtue, and the iron chain is vice. We perform virtuous actions and we must exist in order to receive their reward; we perform vicious actions, and we must exist in order to receive their punishment. The golden chain is pleasanter than the iron one, but both are fetters, and from both should we seek to free our spirit.”

“We must seek a higher end — deliverance from pain and pleasure alike — and look for it by nobler means, by being free from works altogether. Knowledge is the instrument, meditation the means by which our spirit is to be freed. To avoid all contact with the world, to avoid distraction, to avoid works, and to meditate on the identity of the internal with the external spirit till their oneness be realized, is the ‘way of salvation’ prescribed by the higher Hinduism.”

This is pure selfishness. The personal happiness of the individual is the only consideration. His aim is neither to see, hear, nor care about what goes on in the world around him. The people of his nation may be sunk in ignorance, he is not to instruct them; they may be starving

from famine, he is not to provide them with food; they may be dying from pestilence, he is not to give them medicine. With his eyes fixed on the tip of his nose, he is to try to meditate without any object. He is to refrain from all actions, good or bad, till at last he blasphemously thinks that he is God.

Comment — Hinduism prescribes a gradual and integrated process according to the Gita — one must strive for knowledge and meditate (*jñāna yoga*) one must surrender to and worship God (*bhakti yoga*) and at the same time work for the benefit of all beings (*karma yoga*). All acts must be done for the welfare of ALL sentient beings (*loka sangraha*).

Christianity, on the other hand, teaches us to make *God* – not *self* – the center of our thoughts, the end of our existence. A child should love, honor, and obey his earthly father; a subject should respect his rightful king, render to him his just service, and obey his laws, God stands to us in both relations.

To him we are indebted for existence; our parents were, as it were, only the instruments in His hand. He is our Father in heaven. One of the oldest names of God used by the Aryans before they entered India was *Dyaus Pitar*, Heaven-Father. From our birth to the present moment we have been dependent upon Him for every breath we draw; every blessing we enjoy is His gift. We should regard Him as an affectionate child looks upon his father. But God is also our sovereign. He is the rightful Lord of the universe which He has created. His laws are holy, just, and good. To worship any other than Himself, is rebellion. To ascribe to Him human vices, is to be guilty of blasphemy.

Comment — What if the father is unjust, cruel and abusive? What if the rightful King is a despotic tyrant? Should we still love, honor and obey them? The biography of the Christian God as depicted in the Holy Bible itself ascribes him with the worst of human vices.

Yahweh the god of war. Deut. 39 — 42

— the avenger. Deut 32;35, Nahum 1; 2

— the destroyer Zeph. 1; 2

Yahweh's unbridled rage. Deut 32;22 - 25

Yahweh craves vengeance. Ezek. 5; 12 -13

— comes accompanied by epidemics. Hab. 3;5-6

God as a wild beast Lam. 3; 10, Hosea 5;14, Hosea 13; 7-8

God describes himself as a moth and the rot. Hosea 5;

Yahweh — an envious, irascible, indignant god. Nahum 1;1 - 6

— his uncontrollable fury, and lack of poise. Isaiah 34; 2 - 10

Yahweh's lack of compassion. Lam. 2;20

— he remains unmoved by pleas for mercy. Ezek. 8; 18

The Hindu depiction of God Narayana is completely the opposite of the above. He is an ocean of compassion and loving kindness, peaceful and intimate, forgiving without limit and free from every despicable and negative quality like those displayed by the Biblical God.

The first and great commandment of Christianity is to love God with all our heart, and soul, and strength.

Comment — How is it possible to be commanded to love a God who is irascible, jealous, vindictive, vengeful and without compassion as described by the Bible? Love arises from contemplation of the sublime and aesthetic qualities of God — like Narayana.

The second great commandment is, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” It is also expressed in what is called the Golden Rule, “All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”

Our duty may be summed up in *love to God* and *love to man*.

Comment — Why restrict your love to ‘men’? Why not embrace all sentient beings as Hindus do? The history of Christianity is steeped in bloodshed, genocide, imperialism, cultural destruction, exploitation and degradation of the environment. So much for the principal duties of Christians.

While his own happiness is not the aim of the Christian, he takes the surest way to promote it. He seeks it, not in himself, but in God, God is an ocean of happiness, and the more we are like Him, the more shall we be partakers of His joy.

Comment — While the Christians are good at charity work here on earth with the intention of proselytizing the pagans, there is not, nor has there been a single movement in Christendom to abolish hell. Christians will be happy to rejoice forever in heaven while the vast majority of humankind burn for eternity in hell. Christians happily and ardently pray for the most petty things but not one Christian group regularly petitions their God, who reputedly listens to prayer, to abolish hell!!

Sin.

Distinction between Right and Wrong. — Hinduism denies the reality of an eternal and necessary distinction between righteousness and sin. The difference is not inherent, but accidental. The uncleanness or murder which is wrong in me may be right for another person. In the Bhagavat Purana, the worshipper of Krishna is told not to imitate the deeds to the accounts of which he listens. As Brahma(n) is the only real existence and I am myself Brahma(n), it follows that sin and righteousness exist only in my conceptions, and the distinction between them is only imagined under the power of illusion. A song of South India says:—

“To them that fully know the heavenly truth,
There is no good or ill; nor anything
To be desired, unclean or purely clean.
Where God is seen, there can be nought but God,
His heart can have no place for fear or shame;
For caste, uncleanness, hate, or wandering thought.
Impure or pure, are all alike to him.”

As previously shown, in reality both sin and righteousness are alike evil, for the fruit of both must be reaped. Christianity, on the other hand, affirms the eternal distinction between right and wrong.

Comment — Hinduism does not accept the eternal reality of good and evil and the Bible also agrees that God himself created both good and evil. If God is perfectly good and holy he can brook no competitors therefore good and evil are relative only and not absolute values. Good and evil are mutually constitutive of each other, like day and night.

It is admitted, however, that Hindus, in this respect, are better than their creed. Conscience, to some extent, convinces them of sin, and warns of punishment.

Comment — There is no “Hindu creed” and Christians too are mostly good in spite of the Bible not because of it.

What Sin is. — Among most Hindus, breaking the rules of their caste is the chief sin. They believe that if they bathe every day, perform puja, repeat the names of their gods, feed Brahmans, and abstain from certain food, they are righteous, though they may lie, cheat, oppress the poor, and lead immoral lives.

Comment — Another atrocious lie. Hinduism has a very nuanced approach to ‘sin’ which is defined as any act which causes suffering to another, virtue is defined as any act which benefits another sentient being. Much of what the Christians call ‘sin’ we call offences, errors, crimes, transgressions, lapses and so on. None of it is related to God or his laws. All laws in Hinduism are formulated by men and are therefore subject to modification according to time place and circumstance.

The taking of animal life is among Hindus now considered one of the greatest sins. It was not always so. The Rishis who wrote the Vedas killed cows, and ate their flesh. Thus did Vasistha when entertaining Visvamitra, Janaka, and other sages. The present feeling was acquired from Buddhism. According to Hinduism, all life is the same — vegetable and animal. The one may pass into the other. Hence Brahmans are, by Manu, forbidden to cultivate; Buddhist priests should not even break off the leaf of a plant.

Sin is disobedience to God. God’s nature is holy, and He commands only what is right. Sin consists in preferring our own sinful desires to God’s will.

Comment — If God commands rape, murder and ethnic cleansing of even babies as in Num 31:18, Gen 17:13, Num. 31:1,18, Deut 2:30 – 35, Deut 3:3 – 7 *ad nauseum*, wherein lies the sin? In the actual bloodshed, (as Hinduism claims) in the refusal to obey God’s command (as Christians claim)?

All know that to commit adultery is sin; but many do not consider that thoughts may be sinful as well as actions. Thoughts are the seeds of which actions are the fruit. Before a man commits murder, angry hateful thoughts arise in his mind. The great Teacher says that whoever looks upon a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.

Comment — Showing a lack of the knowledge of psychology the reverend doesn’t appreciate that thoughts pop randomly into one’s mind. We are not responsible for the thoughts that we think but rather on acting them out.

A son is disobedient if he does not do what his father tells him, as well as when he does what his father has forbidden. So we may sin in what we leave undone as well as in what we do. A child should love, honor, and obey his parents. If he does not do so, he commits sin. It is our duty, above all, to love, honor, and obey God. If we do not do so, we sin. Have we done so? Alas! no. We have forgotten Him, disobeyed His commands, which are holy, just, and good, and followed our own sinful desires.

Comment — Are all His commands holy, just and good or only a few select ones? Who selects which are valid and which are not? Do we only follow the just and good commands or also the evil ones like — human sacrifice (Lev. 27:28), stoning to death of girls that lose their virginity (Deut. 22:20,21), killing a couple that have sex during menstruation (Lev. 20:18) killing of those who sacrifice to any god other than Jehovah (Exo. 22:20), killing any family member who changes his religion (Deut. 13:6–10), killing a person who breaks the Sabbath (Exo. 31:14) killing a person who disrespects a priest (Deut.17:12) etc. *ad nauseum*. Christians of the protestant sect certainly cherry pick commands from the old Testament but most Christians will say that the Mosaic law was cancelled by Jesus. But Jesus affirms that the law must be fulfilled in its entirety (Matt. 5:17). So which of God’s laws should we obey to avoid sinning? God has certainly not clarified this according to my knowledge.

Man Sinful. — It is generally allowed that man is a fallen being. His inclination to wrongdoing is such that all means employed to counteract it often prove fruitless. Bolts and bars are needed to protect property; bonds and deeds to check frauds; prisons, the lash, and the scaffold, to deter criminals. In a world of virtue such would have no place. Man, also, is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards.

According to Hindu philosophy, what is the cause of man's debasement? *Ajñāna*, ignorance. By *ajñāna* is not meant ignorance of God, but ignorance of the identity between the soul and Brahma(n).

Christianity traces man's degradation to sin. He has broken God's laws, and he is suffering the consequences. All are guilty before God:— "There is none righteous, no, not one."

Comment — We have already demonstrated with exhaustive quotes from the Bible that there is no objective criteria for what is righteous and what is sinful. Holy Lord God commands massacres, cattle raids, looting of land and property, rape of young virgins, human sacrifice and even demands that his own begotten son should be sacrificed to appease Himself so that He may forgive sin which He himself is guilty of. He punishes the whole of humankind for the sin of one man, and anyone who is intellectually incapable of believing in this being will be condemned for all eternity to suffer excruciating pain.

The argument put forward here is the same as was used to refute karma. How can I be guilty of breaking God's laws when I don't know what those laws are? How can I be punished for breaking laws that I didn't know existed?

There are some remarkable Hindu acknowledgments of man's sinfulness. The following confession ought to be repeated daily by Brahmins:—

Pāpo'ham papa-karmā'ham pāpātma papa-sambhavaḥ:

The meaning is: I am sin; I commit sin; my soul is sinful; I am conceived in sin.

Comment — This is a self-effacing hyperbolic statement not an ontological theological position. It is a popular confession but not mandated by any Vedic text. Most of us do not recite this!

We are born with a sinful nature. Our parents are sinful, and we inherit their disposition. Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one. This is shown by the conduct of mere infants. Before they are able to speak, they sometimes try to beat their mothers.

Comment — Who created us with a sinful nature? Did not God create us in his own image? What an atrocious doctrine — that all humanity is wicked and sinful by nature! What a monstrous doctrine to teach young children! Hinduism is so sublime as it takes a very positive view of humanity – we are all essentially sparks of the divine! Through selfishness, delusion and greed we may commit selfish acts but we are not inherently evil.

The holiest men are the first to admit their own sinfulness. Most people compare themselves with their neighbors, and are satisfied if they come up to their standard. Sometimes they contrast themselves with persons notoriously wicked, and are proud because they think themselves better. Truly good men compare themselves with what God's law requires, and their confessions — "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags."

Comment — We have yet to establish on Biblical texts this alleged *holiness* of the Christian God.

The two great sins chargeable against every human being are *ungodliness* and *selfishness*.

Comment — And the charges which can be laid against the God of the Bible are legion! Narcissism and mass murder being His specialty!

Excuses for Sin. — The blame is often laid upon God or Karma, “We must do whatever Brahma has written on our heads.” Men, in their dealings with each other, do not accept such an excuse. Does a thief get off because he said that Brahma had written on his forehead that he was to steal? We know that he was not forced to steal, but did it of his own free will, and that he deserves to be punished.

Suppose a wicked son laid the blame of his misconduct on his wise and good father, saying that he had only done what he made him do; would such an excuse be accepted? It would be known to be false, and, instead of lessening his guilt, would only increase it. So it is a great sin to lay the blame of our bad actions upon God who is of spotless holiness and abhors sin. Our consciences tell us that our sins are our own, and not God’s or fate’s.

Comment — Again the use of the word *sin* is vague and nonspecific. If by *sin* we mean a crime like murder, theft, cheating, robbery, rape etc. Then it is definitely the choice of an individual compelled by circumstances. The circumstances are determined by *karma* but the choice of action is based on free-will. If by *sin* we mean worshipping of idols, dancing or having sex or getting drunk as long as no one is hurt then there is no problem.

While Christians have invented this spurious concept of sin as a real infection and the source of all evil, Hinduism sensibly declares that all wrong doing in the world can be attributed to 6 factors:— selfishness, anger, delusion, arrogance, greed and envy. All of these are simply human traits and have nothing to do with “sin”. All living beings are programmed to be selfish for self-preservation and self-propagation — it is biological conditioning not spiritual infection.

Punishment of Sin.

All admit that good conduct deserves approval, and that wrongdoing should be followed by punishment. A just king bestows honors on faithful servants, while he punishes those who break his laws and are traitors against his Government. This is the case, in some measure, even in this life, but only to an imperfect extent. In another world, all will be rectified.

Future punishments, according to Hinduism, are explained in Manu’s Code, the Vishnu Purana, &c.

The following are some of them. Manu says: —

As many times as (are) the hairs on the beast, so many times in the next world does one who in vain slaughters beasts obtain a violent death from birth to birth. 5. 38.

According to the Vishnu Purana, a horse dealer falls into the *Taptaloha* (red-hot iron) hell. He who eats by himself sweetmeats mixed with his food, and those who rear cats, cocks, goats, dogs, hogs, or birds fall into the *Puyavaha* (where matter flows) hell. Fishermen go to the *Kudhirandha* hell (whose wells are of blood). Shepherds, hunters, and potters go to the hell called *Vahnijwala* (or fiery flame). The student of religion who sleeps in the day and adults who are instructed in religion by their children go to the *Swabhojana* hell where they eat dog’s flesh. As numerous as are the offences that men commit, so many are the hells in which they are punished. Book II. Chap. 6.

Any intelligent man reading the foregoing will see that they are mere inventions. Why should a horse dealer fall into a red-hot iron hell?

Comment — All these accounts are not taken literally by any educated pandit — they are called *arthavada* which means they are mentioned to discourage negative behaviour and

encourage good behavior. Horse-dealers are frequently deceitful as well as cruel to their horses and training horses often includes cruelty. Horse racing is being banded in many places around the world today because of the suffering endured by horses. But it needs to be mentioned that nowhere in the extensive descriptions of the Hindu hells is there any punishment for disbelief in the gods or atheism.

It has been mentioned that some of the Hindu gods committed sin *in sport*; according to Christianity sin is the abominable thing which God hates. The Bible declares that “the wages of sin is death” This includes not only the death of the body but punishing in hell.

Comment — We have already demonstrated the flexible opinion on what constitutes sin for the God of the Bible. Christians are so vague on the exact nature of sin that they cannot be taken seriously. Why is the Christian hell any more real than the Hindu, Buddhist or Islamic hell? In the old Testament there is no mention of hell, so where did this idea originate? Did God make it up later? Or did his believers invent the idea?

According to Christianity, there are no future births. At death the condition of man is determined forever. The righteous enjoy everlasting happiness; the wicked suffer everlasting misery.

Future punishments will differ. Some will be beaten with “many”, some with “few stripes.” What the exact nature of the punishment will be we do not know. Conscience will gnaw like an undying worm. Milton makes Satan say, “myself am hell.” Some think that the wicked will be purified in hell and afterwards received into heaven. Why do they think so? The tendency of punishment is rather to harden than to soften the heart. So long as men go on sinning, so long must they suffer.

Comment — And this is the Christian idea of *holy justice* — a brief lifespan of 100 years — the circumstances of which are arbitrarily determined by God, in which choices are limited and one is created sick and commanded to be well determines an everlasting career of happiness or misery with no chance of a reprieve! And such a God is called Holy, Righteous, Good and the God of Love!!! The Bible even says that some are predestined for heaven, so what is the point of even making any effort to please him?

Eph. 1:4—5 For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy and blameless in his sight. In love he predestined us to be adopted as his sons through Jesus Christ, in accordance with his pleasure and will—

But even according to Hinduism, sin involves intense suffering in various hells for countless ages. One great object should be to escape this terrible fate, to obtain, if possible, the pardon of sin.

Comment — According to Hinduism suffering for crimes in hell is limited by the enormity of the crime done – it is not interminable. Once the moral balance has been requited one is born again on earth and given another chance for as long as it takes! The solution is *insight* not pardon!

Pardon of Sin.

The feeling is universal, that man is a sinner, and that sin deserves punishment. The most momentous inquiry that can agitate the human breast is, “How can I, a consciously guilty, sin-polluted being, be delivered from this load of evil, obtain forgiveness, and be restored to the Divine favour?”

Comment — That man is by definition a *sinner* is only a Christian concept – even the Jews whose Bible they hijacked do not believe in original sin or the sinful nature of humankind.

Why free Pardon impossible. — It may be said, that as an earthly parent forgives a repentant child, so we may be pardoned by our Heavenly Father. But a very important distinction has already been pointed out. God is our Sovereign as well as our Father. If a king were to pardon offenders upon their repentance, his laws would soon be disregarded, and his whole realm would be deluged with crime. And there are other reasons.

The relation in which God stands to His intelligent creatures is that of a moral Governor, who has given them a law — to the transgression of which He has attached the heaviest of penalties. What this law commands is eternally right; and what it forbids is eternally evil. Penalty, as attached to transgression, is not a mere expedient to deter men from committing it, and so to prevent the injury to His creatures which would result from its prevalence. First and foremost is penalty designed to mark sin as in itself vile and hateful, and to do homage to the eternal law that wrong-doing deserves to suffer.

Comment — There is a constant harping on ‘sin’ and ‘laws’ but nowhere are these laws defined or even mentioned. A benign and just king would make clear all his laws and would not arbitrarily and whimsically change them without fully informing his subjects. As we have previously pointed out there are 613 laws given in the Old Testament, there are also 10 commandments. To which of these does the learned pandit refer? If only to the 10 – what of the others? When did God rescind them?

Among people of all nations, there is a tendency to believe in the necessity of some atonement for sin. Can the instinct of almost the whole human race be wrong? Hinduism has always been full of self-made atonements.

Hindu ideas of the Pardon of sin. — These are contradictory. According to the doctrine of karma every sin must have its punishment: even Brahma cannot interfere with this law. On the other hand, it is taught that the greatest sins may be removed by the most inadequate means.

Comment — Again the learned reverend confuses *results* with *punishment* in regard to Karma. *Sins* are of different kinds and the means of atonement are accordingly varied. There are offences against other devotees for which forgiveness is asked from the one offended. There are ceremonial offences which are rectified through various offerings and mantras and there are offences against the gods which are also rectified through ceremonial means. The worst of offences are those against the teacher and parents. Crimes such as theft, murder, rape etc. are crimes and are punishable by the state.

Some trust to almsgiving. It is our duty to assist the deserving poor, and God commands us to do it. But much of Hindu charity is given to able-bodied beggars, too lazy to work, and given up to vice. In any case almsgiving will not atone for sin. If a thief is brought before a judge, will he be pardoned because he has given some coin to beggars?

Comment — But if the thief accepts that an innocent man has been tortured and sacrificed for him to appease an angry God then that will suffice? What of the moral stature of a person who allows another to pay the penalty for his crimes?

Going on pilgrimages is another supposed way of obtaining pardon of sin. Instead of sin being thus decreased, it is increased. At great places of pilgrimage, sins are committed which the fear of discovery would prevent at home. Water may cleanse the body, but it cannot purify the soul. Pilgrimages neither atone for sin, nor make the heart holy.

Comment — So why are pilgrimages so popular among Christians? For 2000 years Christians have made the arduous journey to Nazareth, Bethlehem and Jerusalem. Taking great pains to bathe in the river Jordan. How does the water of baptism differ from the sacred

waters of India? If baptism in the river Jordan or any river for that matter is efficacious in rectification before God why should a dip in the Ganges or any other holy river of India be any different? This seems to be a case of – the waters of my river are blessed by God and those of your river are blessed by the Devil!

Torturing the body, such as suspending one's self with the head downwards, sitting in circles of fire, &c., is practiced by some to obtain, the pardon of sin and acquire merit. Do these persons become holy? Pride is one of the greatest sins a creature can commit. Yet persons who practice austerities are filled with pride. And not only so. It is notorious that many sanyasis are addicted to some of the worst vices.

Comment — Only a tiny minority of ascetics engage in these practices which have been condemned by the Gita itself. It is worthy to note that a large number of Christian clergy have also been indicted in the most horrendous of crimes — pedophilia!

Other modes of obtaining pardon, mentioned in the Shastras, are equally useless.

Among the heinous sins requiring *prayaschitta*⁸ is that of going to England⁹. Giving a widowed daughter in marriage or marrying a widow are crimes equally great.

Comment — Giving a widowed daughter in marriage or marrying a widow are both sanctioned by some law-givers such as Parashara, so for a “learned pandit” to declare them a crime is either a blatant lie or a demonstration of ignorance.

The great means of purification is swallowing the five products of the cow, and giving presents to Brahmins. The last is indispensable, and will cover all sins, if sufficient in amount.

Comment — For Christians the great means of purification is to symbolically (for Protestants) and actually (for Catholics¹⁰) engage in cannibalism of Jesus – by eating his flesh and drinking his blood in the form of a wafer and wine. In addition giving generous donation in the collection plate.

Brahmos virtually adopt the Buddhist doctrine of Karma, which has no idea of mediation, of satisfaction, of propitiation. Neither in heaven nor in earth can man escape from the consequences of his acts; hence forgiveness and atonement are ideas utterly unknown.

This Brahmist dogma is put in a quasi-logical form; but it consists of groundless assertions. Instead of being a “self-evident intuitive truth,” it contradicts the testimony of religious consciousness. Men instinctively believe in the forgivableness of sin, and instinctively pray for pardon.

Comment — Why is the forgivableness of sin a “self-evident intuitive truth”? Of course any offence against anyone can be forgiven if the offended party chooses to forgive — this is simply a social contract.

Why is an ignorant erring mortal to limit the power of the Almighty? Has he such a thorough knowledge of the Divine administration of the universe to warrant him in proclaiming the unforgivableness of sin? To suppose this is to describe God as weaker than man. An earthly king can pardon an offender, why should this prerogative be denied to the King of kings?

⁸ Atonement. Ed.

⁹ Not only going to England but crossing the seas in general is a cause of loss of caste in a Brahmin because he would be unable, while on the ocean, to perform his obligatory thrice daily rituals. Ed.

¹⁰ Catholics believe in the doctrine of *transubstantiation* in which the wafer and the wine become transformed into the *real* flesh and blood of Jesus.

Brahmists hold the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. An earthly father can forgive the offences of his children; why may not our loving Father in heaven do the same? The Brahmist dogma is opposed to our deepest and tenderest feelings.

Comment — Religious dogmas are best based upon evidence and logic not deep and tender feelings. Humankind are easily led astray by relying on their “feelings” which are irrational at best. The omniscient King of the universe knows our thoughts, motives and actions – and being omnipotent He can certainly do as He pleases; forgive or not to forgive. But if we ascribe to Him absolute compassion then He can forgive without us asking.

The way in which Christianity teaches that sin may be forgiven will now be explained; but before doing so, it is necessary to consider the subject of Incarnations.

Incarnations.

In all ages the hope has been more or less entertained that God would become man to lighten the burden of pain and misery under which the world is groaning. Among Hindus the most celebrated incarnations are those of Vishnu. They are usually considered ten in number, although the Bhagavad Purana makes them numberless. Conflicting accounts are given of their origin.

The Hindu idea, though very imperfect, is nearer the truth. Krishna’s life on earth, as given in the Bhagavata Parana, cannot be said to have been for the establishment of piety; it was rather for the encouragement of vice.

Comment —

1 John 3:8 “He who does what is sinful is of the devil, because the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the devil’s work.”

Apparently Jesus’ reason for coming was a failure since the devil is still at work – everything good in the world is attributed by Christians to God, and all evil to the devil! A neat way to avoid personal responsibility — “the devil made me do it!”

Very different was the conduct of the Christian Incarnation. He came also — not for the destruction of sinners – but to save them. A short account of Him will now be given.

Comment — It is important to note that both the lives of Krishna and Jesus are mythological accounts unsubstantiated by any historical or archeological evidence. The difference is that educated Hindus accept the mythological nature of Krishna’s stories whereas educated Christians, in spite of the lack of evidence, contradiction and scientific impossibility still cling blindly to the ‘historical’ nature of the Jesus myths. Hinduism is grounded in philosophy and the mythology can be discarded without compromising the essential doctrines of Vedanta. Christianity has no philosophy and is grounded in myths and if these are discounted the whole edifice collapses.

The first promise of the true Incarnation was made by God Himself about six thousand years ago. God created man holy; but man, yielding to temptation, fell into sin. God, when He condemned man, graciously gave him the promise of a Savior. The time when the *true* Incarnation occurred was nearly 1,900 years ago.

Comment — The Biblical myth of the origin of man is fraught with scientific, theological and ethical difficulties. Firstly there are two different accounts given in Genesis. God creates Adam and Even from dust. They are naïve without life experience as innocent as newborn babes. God leaves them alone in a garden with a wily, talking snake which has created, and a tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He forbids them to eat of the fruit of the tree upon

pain of death. The snake talks Eve into eating of the fruit and she in turn seduces Adam. They both become aware of their nakedness and hide – God takes a stroll in the evening and looks for them, he realizes what they have done, becomes enraged at their disobedience and curses them. Adam and all his descendants will have to work hard at farming to earn their living and Eve and all women are cursed with labor pains and the travails of childbirth, and the wily snake is cursed to crawl on it's belly and to eat dust as its food. The miserable couple are then banished into the world without any tools, seeds, instructions or guidance on how to protect themselves from the animals and to begin food production! The couple then have two sons, Cain and Abel, Cain kills Abel and then goes to the land of Nod to seek a wife and settle down. Nowhere in this silly story is sin actually mentioned and this is the founding myth of Christianity which is complimented by the Jesus myth.

The problems raised are:–

1. In modern society, any parent that left their children alone with a wily snake, talkative or not would be charged with child-neglect and punished severely – the children would be taken away by community services!
2. The talking snake is another scientific problem. Apparently it had some other means of mobility prior to the final curse, snakes also do not eat dust!
3. Why would an omniscient God plant a tree as a temptation to a naïve couple of children and command them *not* to eat from it – knowing full well that they would do so? And then the God of Love curses them and all their descendants for this act of *rebellion* or in this case simply yielding to temptation!
4. What is the problem with knowing right from wrong? Surely that is the desired outcome of all spiritual instruction – yet somehow in the beginning this realisation incurred the wrath and curse of the creator! But later on this distinction becomes the basis for religion and determination of eternal life or punishment!
5. In this story the snake spoke the truth and Jehovah lied. Jehovah said they would die if they ate the fruit and the snake said they would live – and live they did. Some Christians say that God didn't lie – he changed his mind out of love. If he were omniscient then why did he say what he knew he would not do? Does this principle also apply to all the other promises as well? Perhaps he will perhaps he won't save souls.
6. Banishment of an unprepared young couple into the wilderness to survive on their own is an horrendous thing for any parent to do and would rightly bring social and judicial condemnation in modern society for child-abuse.
7. The 'eternal' curses only lasted until the industrial age. Men in general do not earn their living by the sweat of their brow farming inhospitable land and battling inclement weather and women no longer need to suffer the pangs of childbirth with modern medicine.
8. The land of Nod is a particular problem — if Adam and Eve were the first humans then who created the people in the land of Nod? They already had a settlement and women of marriageable age – so it seems they were created before Adam and Eve.
9. The learned scholar actually believes that the world was created 6000 years ago! Science has established that homo-sapiens has been around for 200,000 years!!

To become the Savior of men, the true Incarnation must be man as well as God. If He had been born of woman in the ordinary manner, He would have inherited our sinful nature. He was therefore born from the womb of a pure virgin by the power of God.

Comment — Another scientific impossibility and an absurd proposition with no precedent whatsoever. Even the verse used to justify this impossibility is mistranslated:– In Isaiah it is said “behold a young woman (*almah*) will bear a child and his name will be Emmanuel.” *Almah* in Hebrew simply means a young woman who could be virgin, but the specific word for virgin is *betulah*. *Almah* was translated into the Greek as *parthenos* – virgin and hence the dogmatic error. Also Jesus was never called Immanuel in the Gospels. Why is natural birth a sinful contamination? And why did the Holy Spirit impregnate a married woman — wouldn’t this be considered as adultery? Why didn’t he choose an unmarried virgin to impregnate?

The good reverend has already drawn a sharp distinction between God and Man – God is Holy and man is sinful – yet God now incarnates and blends the two opposite qualities in Himself as Jesus. But we are told that Jesus was not born in sin like all other descendants of Adam, since His mother was the Immaculate Conception. So what does it mean to be *human* when he is the exception to the rule?

Jesus Christ lived at a place called Nazareth, supporting Himself and His mother by working as a carpenter till He was 30 years of age. From that time He began to teach, and to show by many wonderful works that He was the Son of God. He went about from city to city, and from village to village, doing good. He healed the sick, cleansed the lepers, opened the eyes of the blind, made the deaf hear, the tongue of the dumb sing, and the lame man leap like a hart. In the desert He fed many thousands with a few loaves and fishes. He raised the dead to life; amid the raging of the sea, He said to the winds and waves, “Peace; be still,” and at once there was a great calm.

Comment — Interesting that the reverend pandit rejects the fantastic mythology of his ancestors but wholeheartedly accepts the mythology of backward Palestine! Making the blind see, healing lepers, driving demons out of epileptics, raising the dead and feeding the thousands, calming the waves, walking on water, the trial and sacrifice and the resurrection etc. are all mythical events none of which have any independent verification.

Though Jesus lived a life of spotless purity and went about doing good, wicked men hated Him, because He reprovved them for their sins. He came down from heaven to this world to die for our salvation:– hence, although He had all power, He allowed Himself to be put to the cruel death of the cross. With nails driven through His hands and feet, He hung on it till He died. He was then buried in a tomb; but on the third day He rose out of it alive. Revealing Himself to His disciples, He commanded them to go into all the world, and make known salvation through Him to every human being. Lastly, ascending through the air in the presence of His disciples. He returned to heaven from which He came.

Comment — More myth purveyed as historical truth. The central salvific motif of Christianity is absurd. God is angry with sinful human beings who have been on the planet for 200,000 years. For 198,000 years He does nothing and then decides to incarnate himself by impregnating a human virgin by himself as a ghost in order to be born so that he may serve as a human sacrifice to himself to appease himself so that he may forgive the sinful nature of mankind which was a result of his curse in the first instance! Forgiveness could be given in an instant with the bat of an eyelid.

Jesus was asked what the signs of his messiahship will be – he said like Jonah was in the belly of the fish for 3 days and 3 nights – I will be in the heart of the earth 3 days and 3 nights.

Jesus thus confirms the Jonah myth – it is impossible for any human being to be in the belly of a fish – Even if the alleged resurrection did occur as described by the New Testament authors then Jesus did not fulfill his promise either as far as the space or time factor is concerned. He was laid in a sepulchre not a grave and therefore was not "in heart of the

earth". He was entombed on Friday evening, and allegedly rose before dawn on Sunday morning, thus he was only in the sepulchre for one day (Saturday) and two nights. Jews reckon the day from sunset to sunset.

Lastly – what does it mean to rise up bodily into heaven? The earth is round and any movement upwards from Jerusalem would be sideways! So where is heaven?

The Objects of Christ's Incarnation.

As already mentioned, the feeling is universal that man is a sinner, and that sin deserves punishment. Hence sacrifices have existed during all ages and among all nations.

Comment — The idea that ‘man is a sinner’ is a doctrine unique to Christianity alone – it is certainly not universal!

The idea that pervades sacrifice is *substitution*. The sacrificer sometimes laid his hand on the head of the victim saying, “I give thee this life instead of mine.” He acknowledged his guilt, but hoped that God would accept the sacrifice in his stead.

Comment — The idea of sacrifice is rather the giving up of one thing to achieve another. Giving up play to study for example. The idea of vicarious suffering is immoral. To transfer your guilt to an innocent animal or innocent human being and then to kill that other is against all sense of justice!

Sacrifices prevailed largely among the old Aryans. “The most prominent feature of the Vedic religion,” says the Rev. K. S. Macdonald, is its sacrifices. Scarcely a hymn is found in which sacrifice is not alluded to. The very first verse of the very first hymn runs:– “I glorify Agni the purohit of the sacrifice.” Another hymn says, “Do thou lead us safe through all sins by the way of sacrifice.”

Comment — Sacrifice in the Vedic sense is a poor translation of *yajña* — which refers generally to the making of offerings of various substances into the sacred fire to nourish the gods. Among the items offered were animals. The animals in *yajña* were not guilt offerings as demanded by Jehovah in the Bible.

The *Tandya Maha Brahmana* of the Sama Veda says of sacrifice, “Whatever sins we have committed, knowing or unknowing, thou art the annulment thereof. Thou art the annulment of sin.”

Comment — This refers to mistakes and lapses performed in the offering of oblations of ghee into the fire. Extra offerings are made to atone for these whereby the errors are rectified.

The same Brahmana contains the remarkable statement that – “Prajapati, the Lord of creatures, offered himself a sacrifice for the benefit of the devas.”

Comment — The idea of the “sacrifice of God (Purusha)” in the famous Purusha Sukta is not about vicarious death for the remission of sin but rather about Pantheism — how the various parts of the sacrificed Purusha or Prajapati became the various elements of the world. The self-sacrifice was made in order to provide a universe in which he himself could play.

Sacrifices were appointed by God to show that sorrow for sin is not enough; that, without shedding of blood there is no remission. But animal sacrifices were only like a shadow of the great sacrifice that was to be offered, and their chief object was to keep it in remembrance. After the death of the Divine Incarnation, they were to cease.

Comment — The association of shedding blood and the remission of sin is an entirely Jewish idea and one of bloodthirsty Jehovah's greatest vices! In Hinduism the remission of sins is associated with *water* never blood, which Hindus consider most polluting!

God created man holy. He was bound to obey God's laws; if he broke them, the penalty was death. Adam, the first man, disobeyed God; all his descendants inherit his sinful nature, and have sinned numberless times in thought, word, and deed. Since man has broken God's holy laws, he must either suffer or some one must suffer in his stead. God wished to save men, but He could not do so, consistently with His justice, without an atonement.

Comment — Another wickedness consistent with Jehovah's depraved character – in order to show compassion and to forgive, He demands the blood a victim either the sinner or a substitute! How is it that the Hindu gods can forgive so freely – even a simple gesture is enough to open the floodgates of compassion. A man who even by mistake repeats the name of Narayana will immediately by the recipient of His loving grace and compassion. Why would a Hindu abandon the God of Compassion for the God of Vengeance?

God, in His great love to men, as it were, proposed that His only begotten Son should become their substitute, and suffer in their stead. The Son gladly consented, saying, “Lo, I come”, “I delight to do Thy will.”

Comment — The son and the father are one we are told. This is very confusing – either they are one or they are different. If they are *one* what sense does it make for God to sacrifice himself to himself in order to be appeased? If Jesus is separate and also divine, then how is the Trinity not polytheism?

The objection may be raised that it is unjust that the innocent should suffer for the sins of the guilt. To this the following reply is made.

“It would indeed be most unrighteous in any earthly ruler, were he to seize an innocent person, and make him suffer the sentence of the law, while the culprit himself was allowed to escape. Supposing, however, the purposes of law were equally accomplished, by an innocent person voluntarily submitting to death on behalf of a large multitude of offenders who must otherwise have died, there would be no departure from justice; neither would any alarm be caused to the innocent, by the expectation of being themselves compelled to suffer for the guilty. But if, by such voluntary transference of suffering, those offenders were also reclaimed and made good citizens — and if moreover he who became their substitute, were restored to life, and as the result of his mediation, were raised to higher honour than before, not only justice would be satisfied, but benevolence would rejoice. So with the sacrifice of Christ, He, the righteous, suffered; that we, the unrighteous, might escape. But the act was voluntary. The suffering of Christ was brief while his triumph is everlasting.”

Comment — It is commendable that one man should offer to suffer and die for millions still to come but ludicrous, in that already trillions upon trillions of people have died over the past 200,000 years of human existence on earth. What happened to them? Were they saved? If they were, then the vicarious suffering of one god-man 2000 years ago is meaningless! If Jesus is God then how could a god suffer? And if He *is* God how could He be raised to an higher honour than before? Surely He was God before, God during, and God after, or are there grades of godhood in the Holy Trinity? What significance does 3 hours of suffering have in relation to timelessness and eternity? Surely this whole concept is a massive fraud!

Another object of Christ's Incarnation was to work out for us a perfect righteousness by keeping the law which we had broken. To enter heaven it is not enough for a man to be without sin. A stone has that quality. Righteousness is also required. A beggar in filthy rags cannot appear at the durbar of a great King. Our best actions are like them and clothed in

them we cannot appear before God in heaven. Jesus on earth perfectly obeyed God's holy law and His righteousness He gives as a "garment of salvation" to those who accept Him as their Savior.

Comment — Incoherent nonsense.

A third object of Christ's incarnation was to teach us, and set before us a holy example. His wonderful instructions will be found in the New Testament, and the best way of carrying them out is to seek to follow His steps, to copy His conduct.

Comment — What wonderful instructions has Jesus given which normal sensible people could not figure out for themselves? Love our neighbor? Do good to them that hate you? What about the stupid teachings?

Jesus instructs his followers that self-mutilation is a great virtue.

Matt. 5: 29 If your right eye causes you to sin, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to be thrown into hell. 30 And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to go into hell.

Jesus suggests castration as a method of attaining heaven.

Matt. 19; 12 For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from [their] mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs, who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive [it], let him receive [it]..

Christians are taught not to save, invest, insure or in anyway provide for the future.

Matt. 6: 19– 34 ¶ "Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal.

"Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more important than food, and the body more important than clothes?

Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not much more valuable than they?

And why do you worry about clothes? See how the lilies of the field grow. They do not labour or spin. If that is how God clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and tomorrow is thrown into the fire, will he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?

So do not worry, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?'

For the pagans run after all these things, and your heavenly Father knows that you need them.

But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.

Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own.

What about Jesus' family values?

Matt 10:34 Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.

Matt 10:35 For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law

Matt:10:37 He that loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.

The Christian Method of Obtaining Pardon of Sin.

The great difference between Christianity and all other religions is, that the former teaches salvation by grace; the latter salvation by works. Grace here means the undeserved favour of God. Some Hindus talk of salvation by grace; but it has already been shown that, by their creed, this is impossible. Karma is said to be unalterable even by Brahma. There is no such thing in Hinduism as God's showing favor to any one without his meriting it, and though God is called *dayalu*, or merciful, this is but an empty sound.

Comment — This is untrue —the Bhagavad-Gita as well as Katha and Svetasvatara Upanishads teach the doctrine of Divine Grace. Srivaishnavism has a theology of Divine Grace which over-rides cumulative Karma. Operative Karma cannot be changed.

Interesting that when the Hindu God is called *merciful* it is an empty sound but when the Christian God is called the same it is a gospel of perfect truth!

A criminal after he has undergone the punishment prescribed by law is set free; but this is not called an act of mercy. According to Hinduism, *jñana* alone is the cause of salvation, and the effects of works cannot be effaced even by *jñana*. *Jñana* is not a gift from God, but what a man works out for himself. In all these ways man tries to be his own Saviour, to get to heaven, either on account of his supposed good works or his *jñana*.

Comment — Had the pandit taken a little time to study only one Hindu Scripture — the Bhagavad Gita we would know that there are four ways to Liberation. 1. *Karma Yoga* – good works which are dedicated to God, 2. *Bhakti Yoga* – devotion to God, 3. *Jñāna Yoga* – which is the path of wisdom and meditation and 4. *Sharanagati* – surrendering to God and his irresistible Grace.

Those who reject the offer of Jesus Christ and wish to pay their debts themselves, must take the consequences. Their case is far more serious than that of those who never heard of a Savior, and who will be judged differently.

The Christian looks for salvation to Christ alone — not to any of his own supposed good deeds. Salvation in this manner is fitted to promote two feelings of the utmost importance — *humility* and *love*.

The Sufficiency of Christ as a Savior.

If a man worship an idol believing it to be God, will his faith make it God? If a man believes that bathing in the Ganges will wash away his sins, he believes what is untrue and his sin remains.

Comment — A man worships an idol believing that God is omnipresent and therefore also present in the idol. Seeing that we cannot relate personally with an all-pervading awareness we choose to worship Him in a specific object. He out of boundless compassion accepts that devotion and love. If a man believes that being dipped in some water of baptism will wash away his sins and transform him does he believe what is true – and what differs between the two waters? It is belief alone. Which belief is founded on truth?

In worldly matters men are not such fools as to believe that faith is sufficient. Our first inquiry should therefore be, is our faith placed on a proper object?

Hindus may be divided into two great classes, — those belonging to the *Vishnu Bhakti* and the *Siva Bhakti*, Where did the Hindus learn about them? From the Puranas and other Shastras. It has already been shown that it is a great sin to suppose that God would have acted in the manner in which Vishnu and Siva are said to have done, that he would have been guilty of lying, theft, adultery, and murder.

Comment — We have already shown that the God of the Bible is guilty of all the above even adultery!

The Puranas are also full of false geography and astronomy. They assert that there is a Mount Meru in the middle of the earth, 672,000 miles in height, on which there are trees 8,800 miles high, with fruit as large as elephants. There are said to be 1000 islands formed by the 60,000 sons of King Sagar, born in a pumpkin, when they were digging down in search of the horse! Eclipses of the sun and moon are said to be caused by the severed head of the Asura Rahu seeking to seize them.

No intelligent man believes such stories. What the same books contain about Vishnu and Siva is equally fabulous. There are no such beings, and faith in them is vain.

Comment — The Bible is full of nonsense as well, talking snakes and donkeys, towers reaching heaven, seas parting, the sun stopping, fabulous animals, flying four-legged animals, unicorns, satyrs, God fighting with sea-monsters, people living ridiculous life-spans – for up to 969 years, the whole earth being flooded with water, an ark, the dead rising to life, disease caused by demons etc. etc. The *true* geography of the Bible is a flat earth with four corners created in 7 days 6000 years ago. Heaven above and hell beneath, water above and water beneath. The day and night being created before the Sun. The book of Revelations is more weird than any Hindu Purana. Descriptions of a dead lamb with seven eyes and seven horns standing on a throne and having a wedding. Weird warrior locusts with human faces as big as horses in armour. A war in heaven between angels and a dragon, the dragon transfers his authority to a bizarre 7-headed leopard from the sea. Pious beasts covered in eyes incessantly repeating the praise of the lord etc. The difference is one of degree – the Hindu stories coming from a jungle civilization are much richer and varied, the Bible stories from a desert culture are fewer but just as ridiculous. The difference is that the stories of the Hindus are not necessary for salvation. The stories are all allegories, entertainment, parables etc. They are myths. The Bible for the Christians is *history* and thus real as stated. No man of science could believe such rubbish – and any faith based on them is also vain.

A Savior must have both the power and the will to help. Jesus Christ is “mighty to save.” It was necessary that He should become man, for it was man who had sinned. Jesus Christ often called Himself the “Son of Man.” But He is also the Son of God. This does not mean that He is a Son born in the ordinary way. The supposition were blasphemy. The language is figurative, and only that part of the figure is used which is suitable to the occasion. The human relation of sonship is the nearest explanation that can be given to us. God the Father and the Son are the same in nature, and knit together by the tenderest love.

Comment — The same in nature, of one essence, but different. A father and a son are one in terms of their DNA but different in terms of their biological status. It still doesn't make them ONE. Christians are still walking on a tight rope trying to explain away their inherent polytheism!

The Gospel of John begins by referring to the pre-existence of Christ. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” A word is that by which we communicate our thoughts. The Son of God may be called “the Word,” because by Him God makes known His will to men. John here declares His divinity: “The Word was God.” He afterwards mentions His incarnation. “The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us” (and we beheld His glory” the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.

Comment — Here John is obviously referring to the word OM which Hindus realized first! Again we refer to the nonsense of an eternal Son of God incarnating out of eternity, becoming

a man for 30 years and influencing the rest of eternity — impossible to believe in a modern scientific age given the vastness of time and the universe.

Jesus Christ showed His divinity by His wonderful works already described. It may be said that in the Shastras far more wonderful miracles are related; as Hanuman putting the sun under his armpit and Krishna poisoning the mountain Govardhana for seven days on his little finger. The difference is that the last are fictions, like Mount Meru. Jesus Christ, as God, is omnipotent to save all who come to Him. His willingness to save is equally apparent. For this purpose He left the glories of heaven, to dwell as a poor working man upon earth, without a home of His own, exposed to calumny, reproach, and persecution, while fully aware of the painful death upon the cross which was awaiting Him. See how kindly He received all who came to Him! It is frequently said of the sick who sought His help, He healed them all. When the disciples wished to send away mothers who brought their children to Him, He said. “Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not.”

Comment — Stories of the Hindus are myths and the stories of the Christians are truth. This being so, let’s review some more of His pastimes. The debut of the Saviour of the World was accompanied by the first *great* miracle – turning water into wine¹¹! Couldn’t he rather have announced a cure for malaria instead – or something which would benefit humanity? The Son of God then chats to devils and evicts them¹². He then brings one demon out of a man and sends the evil spirit into 2000 pigs that then commit suicide!¹³ Jesus then appoints 72 exorcists who are all successful¹⁴. The pre-existent, disappointed God curses a fig tree and kills it for not having fruit to appease his hunger¹⁵. A fish is caught which produces money to pay Jesus’ taxes¹⁶. The resurrected Jesus eats some fish and then physically shoots into space¹⁷. Corpses rise from their graves and wander about in the city and are seen by many people.¹⁸

Mediation.

Mediation comes from a word meaning *middle* or between two. A mediator is a friend of both. He may act merely in a case of ordinary business; but often it is his duty to try to make peace between parties who are at variance with each other. Mediation is one of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. There are traces of it in Vedic Hinduism. In the Rig-Veda Agni is praised as the messenger of the gods the mediator between gods and men. The doctrine, however, is generally opposed by educated Hindus.

In the Bible, the pure spirits before God’s throne are represented as crying, “Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts.” Sin is the greatest abomination in His sight.

Comment —

Rev 4: 6 – 8 And around the throne, on each side of the throne, are four living creatures, full of eyes in front and behind: ⁷ the first living creature like a lion, the second living creature like an ox, the third living creature with the face of a man, and the fourth living creature like an eagle in flight. ⁸ And the four living creatures, each of them with six wings, are full of eyes all around and within, and day and night they never cease to say,

“Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come!”

¹¹ John 2:6

¹² Mark 1:23

¹³ Mark 5:2

¹⁴ Luke 10:1

¹⁵ Matthew 21:18

¹⁶ Matthew 17:27

¹⁷ Luke 24:39

¹⁸ Matthew 27:52

The Bible says, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." The Lord Jesus Christ has every qualification necessary on the part of a mediator. One sinner cannot intercede for another; Jesus Christ is sinless. A mediator should be able to enter into the feelings of both parties. Jesus Christ possesses this quality in perfection, for He is God as well as man. He knows how God regards sin and the transgression of His law, and what He requires for its forgiveness. Jesus Christ, as man, is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, having been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

Comment — The Hindu doctrine of mediation is based on the concept of Justice and Compassion complimenting each other. Narayana represents absolute Justice whereas Lakshmi the goddess being mother of the universe is the embodiment of compassion. The mother is the best one to intercede and mediate on behalf of her children, not a son. The mother is the only one to love her children unconditionally, whereas the father is intent on discipline and justice.

The Lord Jesus Christ took upon Himself our sins, and bore the punishment. Pardon is freely offered to all who accept Him as their Saviour, and ask it in His name. Such confess that they have no merit in themselves, and seek forgiveness only through a Mediator.

Comment — The learned pandit trashes the idea of Karma but easily accepts the idea that the effects of a crime/sin can be transferred to another and that too, to a human who was sacrificed 2000 years ago merely through the acceptance thereof.

God, the Father, has appointed Jesus Christ to be the mediator between Himself and man. Persons who have never heard of Jesus Christ cannot offer their petitions in His name, and God will deal justly with them. It is different, however, with others who know about Jesus Christ, but pass Him over, and offer their requests in their own name. This shows pride on their part, and is an insult to God.

Comment — So those who have not heard of Jesus will be saved, but those who have heard and rejected the notion of human sacrifice as ransom for a sin that is unproven will be condemned for all eternity. A mediator in order to be genuine must be accepted by both parties. If one does not accept the proposed mediator because of his lack of credibility then how is this transaction just and worthy of such a mighty and holy God? Jesus spoke 3 great lies.

- (1) He promised to be in the grave for 3 days and 3 nights and stayed there only one day and two nights.
- (2) He promised that the thief crucified with him would be with him in paradise that very day but himself ascended bodily into heaven 40 days later. (One also wonders how the thief was fast-tracked to heaven while everyone else has to wait patiently to be resurrected on the future day of Judgment!)
- (3) When asked when the end of the world and final judgment would happen he said – very soon! Matt. 16; 27-28 For the Son of Man is going to come in his Father's glory with his angels, and then he will reward each person according to what he has done. I tell you the truth, some who are standing here will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." (see Mark 9; 1, Luke 10:27.)

The Intercession of Christ.

The work of the Lord Jesus Christ for the salvation of His people did not end with His ascension to heaven. The Bible says of Him, "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever lives to make intercession for them." *Intercession* means *going between*, pleading for another.

Comment — Jesus tells us that we can worship God directly — [Luke 4: 8](#) Jesus answered, "It is written: 'Worship the Lord your God and serve him only.'

Jesus has all power, and is able to save to the uttermost. In the 17th Chapter of the Gospel of John in the New Testament, we see how Jesus prays for His people that they may be kept from the evil that is in the world, that they may love one another, that they may be purified from sin, and share in His glory.

Faith and Repentance.

The Hindi word for faith is *vishvas*. The word *bhakti* includes something of what Christians mean by faith, but it means rather devotion to some particular god.

Comment — The word used by Hindus is *sraddha* which means accepting the teaching of Scripture and the Guru using logic and reason. Faith for Christians is a firm belief in something without evidence.

Faith in an idol or in a being that has no existence, is worthless. On the other hand, the Lord Jesus "Christ is the mighty God."

Comment — What is the scientific proof of the existence of God, Jesus, sin or salvation?

The Bible says, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. Faith is the clinging of the soul to Christ for salvation. We are, as it were, sinking in the deep waters of sin, and in danger of perishing. Jesus Christ throws a rope to us. If we lay hold of it, we are saved by Him. Faith is the act of union to Christ.

Comment — But Jesus also asks us to have faith in God ([Mark 11:22](#) "Have **faith in God**," Jesus answered.) So should we have faith in God or in Jesus?

Where there is true faith there will be *repentance*. The word in the Bible for repentance means a *change of mind*. It includes sorrow for sin, but chiefly a turning from it and by doing so no more.

Comment —

[1 John 3:9](#) No-one who is born of God will continue to sin, because God's seed remains in him; he cannot sin, because he has been born of God.

How come so many clergy and other members of the Church have been and are being convicted in secular courts of the most atrocious crimes of child abuse etc.? This Biblical assertion has been falsified countless times over.

True repentance denotes a turning away from sin as in itself an evil, as hateful to God, and not merely from the fear of punishment.

Faith and repentance are represented in the Bible as the gift of God, but they are to be obtained if sought in the proper way.

Comment — So God is capricious and choses for salvation whoever he wants without any objective criteria.

[Isa 44:18](#) They know nothing, they understand nothing; their eyes are plastered over so that they cannot see, and their minds closed so that they cannot understand.

[John 6:44](#) "No-one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him, and I will raise him up at the last day.

The Trinity.

Hinduism has its triads, or threes united. In the Vedas, Agni, Vayu, and Surya, are sometimes associated. A later triad, or *Trimurti*, consists of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, denoting the creative, preservative, and destructive principles.

The Christian doctrine, however, is altogether different from this. Rightly known, it is seen to be most honouring to God and comforting to man.

Our own existence is a mystery. We cannot tell how the mind acts upon the body. It is reasonable to suppose that the nature of God is far more mysterious.

Comment — The Upanishads also declare that God is unknowable and indescribable — no Hindu scholar would therefor ever make definitive assertions of the Mysterious One. Yet Christian scholars are incredibly definite about what they say about God – they seem to know his mind better than him and make judgments on his behalf and then talk about pride and arrogance being sins!

The Bible, especially in the Old Testament, declares the absolute unity of God, The Lord our God is one Lord. The same doctrine is taught in the New Testament, as "God is one;" but as has been shown, divinity is also ascribed to Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

Comment — This is one of the many contradictions in the Bible

[John 10:30](#) I and the Father are one."

[John 14:28](#) I go unto the Father; for my father is greater than I.

Before Jesus Christ left His disciples, He said to them, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." This implies that the Divine nature, from which men were to draw their spiritual life and nourishment, is threefold. Accordingly Christians, from the beginning, have ascribed divine honors and a divine name equally to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Comment — We hear so much about father and son but who or what exactly is this Holy Ghost? It is some kind of a mediator between the father and son – the one who impregnated the virgin Mary who was the wife of another man. Does impregnation of the wife of another constitute adultery or not?

There may seem to be a contradiction in saying that God is one and yet three. It may be asked, how can one be three and three one? This objection might be valid if the terms were understood in the same sense in each case. But an illustration will show that a living being may be one in one sense and three in another, Man is a unit, yet he consists of body, soul, and spirit. While the comparison is by no means parallel, and can, in no degree, assist us in comprehending the Trinity, it shows that it does not involve any contradiction.

Comment — This same logic can be applied to the Hindu trinity as well with more accuracy Brahma is the creative energy, Vishnu the preservative energy and Shiva the transformative energy — three aspects of one universal force. Christians always deny the validity of the reasoning of others while affirming the validity of their own reasoning — they having a monopoly on Truth!

The Father so loved the world that He gave up His only Son; the Son so loved us as to die for us; the Holy Spirit bears with our innumerable provocations and seeks to purify us. Well may it be said, "Who is a God like unto Thee?" "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"

Comment — A God of Perfection, Holiness and Omnipotence could have forgiven sins without demanding a ransom or a human sacrifice – out of motherly affection alone.

Means of Purification.

Hindus rely mainly upon bathing in the Ganges or other waters as a means of purifying from sin. The worthlessness of this is apparent. How many shopkeepers, living on the banks of the Ganges, go daily from its waters to their shops to lie and cheat their customers in every possible way.

Comment — How many shopkeepers living in Jerusalem or Rome in proximity to the holy sites of Christendom do the same? How many of so-called Holy Relics are genuine?

The Mahratta Brahmans, living far away from the Ganges, claim the superior sanctity of the Narbada. “One day's ablution in the Ganges,” say they, “frees from all sin; but the mere sight of the Narbada purifies from guilt.” Pilgrimages, smearing with sacred ashes, swallowing the live products of the cow, &c., are equally vain.

Comment — This is hyperbolic eulogy and not meant to be taken literally. In South India they say the Kaveri river is superior — there are altogether 7 sacred rivers in India. For Christians the Jordan is sacred, for Muslims the Zam-zam waters are sacred. Sacred is whatever common consensus makes sacred and not because of some mystical properties in the waters.

The means prescribed by Christianity are very different. These will now be explained, but it is to be remembered that it is the Holy Spirit who gives them efficacy. It is He who is ever present with His people, guiding them, and bringing them at last without spot or blemish to the purity and blessedness of heaven.

Comment — So the Holy Spirit/Ghost is the all-pervasive aspect of the Godhead — so God is all-pervasive as well as transcendent and an incarnation all at the same time. The same statement of Hindus is rejected as being false while the Christian claim is endorsed as Truth. Double standards perhaps?

1. *The Daily Study of the Scriptures,*

Hindus believe that the mere reading, or even hearing of their Shastras, whether understood or not, is meritorious. The Vishnu Purana says, “Hearing this Purana but once is as efficacious as the offering of oblations in a perpetual fire for a year.” Reading stories of unholy gods cannot purify those who hear them — rather the reverse according to the proverb, *yatha devah tatha bhaktah* – As is the god so is the worshipper.

Comment — When Hindus read their Shastras they are in sinful when Christians read their Bible they are righteous. Somehow reading stories of the psychotic outbursts of a petulant, vengeful God who delights in blood, massacres and human sacrifice is somehow more elevating than reading stories of Krishna stealing butter and playing with milk-maids and defeating demons.

The Bible should be read with prayer. Say, “O God, open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law. Open, Lord, my understanding that I may understand the Scriptures. Write Thy laws upon my heart.”

The object should be, not to get over so many verses, but to dwell upon the meaning and bearing of what is read. A little, well thought out, is better than a great deal gone over carelessly. We should meditate on what we read till the truth which is in it becomes our own, and promotes our spiritual growth. We should apply what we read to the regulation of our lives.

Comment — But above all the devout Christian should never apply logic or literary criticism or do any textual comparison of the text under study. Discovering logical absurdities,

contradictions, scientific inaccuracies etc. may lead to doubt, and doubt is the enemy of faith! Hinduism on the other hand has a rigid system of hermeneutics or rules of interpretation consistent with logic and rationality which needs to be applied when reading scripture. Christians can read and self-interpret scripture in whatever way they are “moved by the Holy Spirit!” So a text means whatever they want it to mean and when inaccuracies or inconsistencies are pointed out they reply — “Scripture must be read with *faith* to truly understand the mysterious ways of the Lord!” Another way of saying all intellectual analysis must be suspended!

2. *Private Prayer.*

The prayers of the Hindus are chiefly for temporal blessings. The petitions in the Rig Veda are for rain, cattle, horses, male children, the destruction of enemies, &c. There are only a very few hymns to Varuna in which pardon of sin is sought; and even these generally end with a request for wealth.

Comment — The request for temporal blessings is so that they can be used for the welfare of all sentient beings. In the Gita Krishna says that all our actions should be directed towards the benefit of all beings. Hindus are the only ones who pray for peace for the entire world and all living beings.

Varuna is no longer worshipped and prayers for holiness cannot be offered to Vishnu or Siva.

Comment — Prayer for holiness *aka* moral perfection and increase of Dharma are very common to Vishnu and Siva.

The prayers of Hindus often consist merely in the repetition of the names of their gods. If a son kept crying, Father, father, father, and said nothing more, he would be thought to be mad. The father would say, "tell me what you want." Jesus Christ condemns such vain repetitions.

Comment — Our highest spiritual aim is to realize God and not ask him for stuff. Repetition of the Holy Name leads to mindfulness of God and you become what you think.

While Christianity sanctions prayer for temporal blessings, its main petitions are for the pardon of sin, holiness, and the spread of God's kingdom. The disciples of Jesus Christ when he was on earth, said to him, Lord, teach us to pray." His reply was: — After this manner pray ye:—

“Our Father which art in heaven. Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever, Amen.”

Comment — this is one of the silliest prayers ever conceived — inappropriate for the Living God Jesus to have composed!

Our Father which art in heaven. — so God is transcendent and absent from the world – heaven it seems is a place where God dwells – sitting on his throne.

Hallowed be Thy name. — which name are we referring to? Many names are given in the Bible when referring to God. When the Hindus praise a variety of Holy Names they are in error.

Thy kingdom come. – Jesus specifically said the Kingdom of God is within. So why do we need to pray for it to come? Are we praying for the inner spiritual Kingdom or a temporal earthly Kingdom?

Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. — Why do we need to tell God how to rule the world?

Give us this day our daily bread. — Our daily bread is earned by our own efforts. Why should we trouble God to feed us? Why address such petty prayers to God? We have never yet seen God moving to alleviate a famine any where in the world. Usually it is NGO's that do it – not God! Why do we not rather ask God to abolish hell and to grant salvation to all beings without reserve? Why not pray for wisdom? Or a cure for cancer? If we really think that God gives us our daily bread surely he would abolish hell if all Christians asked for it.

And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.

Instead of a *quid pro quo* attitude wouldn't a more noble sentiment be that of forgiving others for the sake of compassion and kindness rather than for eliciting the forgiveness of God?

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

Does God lead us into temptation or is it our own evil nature?

1 James 17:14 but each one is tempted when, by his own evil desire, he is dragged away and enticed.

James (the brother of Jesus) seems to think that temptation should be welcome.

James 1:2 My brethren count it all joy when you fall into divers temptations.

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever, Amen."

Prayer has been called the "breath of the Christian." A man can no more be a true Christian without prayer than he can live without breathing. There should be at least morning and evening prayer; but often throughout the day the heart should be lifted up to God. Any temptation specially calls for Divine help.

Comment — In Hinduism we do not call on Divine help for curbing temptation. Temptation arises from desire and anger — instead of troubling God we should work on eradicating our negative desires.

Of all petitions, the most earnest should be for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Every other blessing follows in its train.

Comment — In Hinduism the Grace of God is freely given — all we need to do is be receptive to it and prepare ourselves by decreasing selfish-desire, anger and greed.

Prayer is the desire of the heart. It is best expressed in our own words, and in the language with which we are most familiar.

Comment —

Matt. 21; 22 If you believe, you will receive whatever you ask for in prayer."

Mark 11; 24 Therefore I tell you, whatever you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours.

John 14; 13-14 And I will do whatever you ask in my name, so that the Son may bring glory to the Father. You may ask me for anything in my name, and I will do it.

Christians all over the world have prayed for rain in times of drought in vain; millions of sick and suffering have prayed for relief in vain; uncountable numbers of people have pleaded with the "true and living" God to alleviate their poverty and suffering and distress to no avail. So this promise of the Messiah has been totally falsified. If he has not kept this promise how are we to be sure that he will keep his promise of salvation?

3. Public Worship,

Hindu and Christian public worship are very different from each other. In Vedic times Hindu worship consisted of offerings and sacrifices. The products of the cow were offered — milk, curds, and butter. Grain was offered, fried, boiled, or as flour balls. Sacrifices included goats, sheep, cows, buffaloes, horses, men — the last two being considered of the greatest value. The intoxicating Soma juice was the most common offering.

Comment — In Biblical times sacrifices were also offered, goats, sheep, cattle, pigeons, bread, wine all culminating in the ultimate human sacrifice of Jesus. Christian worships centers of a cannibalistic ritual — eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the victim. There is no evidence that the Hindus ever actually sacrificed men in their Vedic rituals.

Modern Hindus who now worship the cow, can scarcely believe that their Aryan forefathers sacrificed her and ate her flesh. But times without number, the Vedas refer to ceremonies called *Gomedha*, in which the cow was sacrificed. A thick-legged cow was sacrificed to Indra, a barren cow to Vishnu, a red cow to Rudra, &c.

Dr. Rajendralala Mitra thus describes the daily worship, consisting of no less than 22 ceremonial acts: —

- (1) At the first appearance of dawn, bells are rung to rouse the deity from his slumbers;
- (2) a lamp with many wicks is waved in front of the stone;
- (3) the god's teeth are cleaned by pouring water and rubbing a stick about a foot long on the stone;
- (4) the deity is washed and bathed by emptying several pitchers of water on the stone;
- (6) the god is dressed by putting clothes on the stone;
- (6) the first breakfast is offered, consisting of grain, sweetmeats, curd, and coconuts;
- (7) the god has his principal breakfast, when cakes and more substantial viands are served;
- (8) a kind of little lunch is offered;
- (9) the god has his regular lunch;
- (10) the mid-day dinner is served, consisting of curry, rice, pastry, cakes, cream, &c., while a priest waves a many-flamed lamp and burns incense before the stone;
- (11) strains of noisy discordant music rouse the deity from his afternoon sleep at 4 p. M., the sanctuary having been closed for the preceding four hours;
- (12) sweetmeats are offered;
- (13) the afternoon bath is administered;
- (14) the god is dressed as in the morning;
- (15) another meal is served;
- (16) another bath is administered;
- (17) the full dress ceremony takes place, when fine costly vestments, yellow flowers, and perfumery are placed on the stone;
- (18) another offering of food follows;
- (19) after an hour's interval the regular supper is served;

(20) five masks and a Damaru, used in dancing, are brought in and oblations made to them;

(21) waving of lights before bedtime;

(22) a bedstead is brought into the sanctuary and the god composed to sleep.

Lastly, the god is sometimes told, "Parvati awaits you." The worship of Vishnu is much of the same character, but no animal food is offered.

Bishop Caldwell says:— "The duties of life are never inculcated in any Hindu temple. The discharge of those duties is never represented as enjoined by the gods, nor are any prayers ever offered in any temple for help to enable the worshippers to discharge those duties aright."

Comment — This is untrue. While the sanctums of the temple are reserved for the ceremonial worship described, there are adjacent pavilions in the temple compound where discourses are held and scriptures read and duties explained and discussed.

While there is nothing in Hindu public worship fitted to purify in some cases there is much having a contrary influence. Connected with many of the temples in South India, there are dancing girls called *devadasi* handmaidens of the gods. Thus avowed prostitutes take a prominent part in Hindu religious worship. According to the Madras Census of 1881, the number of female dancers in the Presidency was 11,573. It was the same with Greek worship in ancient times. The indignant words of Bishop Lightfoot may be applied to India; —

"Imagine, if you can, this licensed shamelessness, this consecrated profligacy, carried on under the sanction of religion and in the full blaze of publicity, while statesmen and patriots, philosophers and men of letters, looked on unconcerned, not uttering one word and not raising one finger to put it down."

Comment — In ancient India prostitutes were highly respected for their learning, singing and dancing skills. The Devadasis were highly skilled professional women who were totally free from any male domination and had prominent roles to play in the temple liturgy. It was they who kept the ancient arts alive. So what if they had male patrons with whom they had sex. These comments were made during the Victorian era when sexual hypocrisy was at its height. Nowadays the sexual abuse of the Christian clergy has been exposed.

Public worship among Christians consists in united prayer, the reading of the Bible, singing hymns, and a sermon or address. The form varies somewhat. To give a better idea of it, a short account will be given of the religious service at which the Queen Empress of India is present every Sunday. First a verse of the Bible, like the following, is read:—

"I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him. Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son."

The people are then invited to confess their sins in the following words: —

"Almighty and most merciful Father, we have erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have offended against Thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us. But Thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare Thou them, O God, which confess their faults. Restore Thou them that are penitent according to Thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord. And grant, O most merciful Father, for His sake, that we may hereafter live a godly, righteous, and sober life, to the glory of Thy holy Name. Amen,"

Comment — A sample of Hindu prayers is as follows:—

May all beings enjoy auspiciousness. May all beings enjoy wellbeing. May all beings enjoy peace. May all beings enjoy wholeness. May all beings enjoy auspiciousness. May all beings be happy. May all beings be free from maladies. May all beings achieve what is good for them. May no being experience sorrow.

Passages are read from the Bible, teaching the people what they are to believe and do. The Minister stands up, and, in the name of God, enjoins the worshippers not to steal, not to bear false witness, not to commit adultery, not to commit any of the four offences against God or of the six offences against man forbidden in the Ten Commandments, and then after each proclamation of a commandment, he joins with the people in asking God to have mercy upon them, and to give them grace to keep that commandment better in future. There is no such teaching of morality as this by any Brahmin or priest in any temple in all India.

Comment — Let us now turn our attention to an examination of these Commandments.

And God spoke all these words, saying, I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery.

This introduction itself invalidates the authority giving them. There is absolutely no archeological evidence of the Israelites ever having been slaves in Egypt. After 150 years of intensive and painstaking research not a single shred of evidence either in the writings of the Egyptians or in terms of tangible objects has been found to validate this myth.

1. You shall have no other gods before me.

Please note that Jehovah doesn't deny the existence of other gods – he merely states that they should not be worshipped before him – because he is a jealous god.

2. You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them or serve them, for I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and the fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments.

This commandment has never been followed in the 2000 years of Christian history and Jehovah himself has breached it by telling Moses to carve angels out of wood and other decorations for the temple in Jerusalem. Some say that it is not against art in general but only the making of idols.

3. You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain.

This is an injunction against blasphemy or swearing an oath using the name of the Lord — again one of the more commonly broken commandments which is so trite and insignificant as to be meaningless.

4. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your male servant, or your female servant, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.

One wonders why the omnipotent Lord felt weary and needed to rest, especially since the world was created from *nothing*! I doubt that this commandment has ever been observed in its entirety and certainly no Christian pays any attention to it in the modern world.

5. **Honor your father and your mother**, that your days may be long in the land that the Lord your God is giving you.

Jesus did not honour his parents and so the so-called guiltless savior is not so guiltless after all. His disrespect for his mother, the blessed virgin who gave birth to him is related in Matthew 12:46-50 (Mark 3:31-35. Luke 8:19-21) where she comes to talk to him and he refuses to even see her. He is also shockingly insulting to her, calling her “woman” (John 2:4, *“Jesus said to her, Woman, what have I to do with you?...”).* There is no mention of his father Joseph or his relationship with him.

Furthermore is there a single person on the earth whose life was ever lengthened by the honouring of parents?

6. **You shall not murder.**

Except if God tells you to do it:—

Num. 31:18. Now therefore murder every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that is not a virgin. But all the female children, who are still virgins, keep alive for yourselves.

Violence and killing in general is not proscribed – only murder.

7. **You shall not commit adultery.**

Adultery is defined as sex with a married woman. Men can have as many wives and concubines (sex-slaves) as they like. Abraham the patriarch had one wife Sarah and a sex-slave named Hagar. Solomon one of God’s chosen kings had 700 wives and 300 sex-slaves. David another of God’s anointed ones had many wives 6 and more. Nowhere in the Bible is it permissible for women to have more than one husband.

God himself uses adultery as a punishment.

2 Samuel 12:11 "This is what the LORD says: `Out of your own household I am going to bring calamity upon you. Before your very eyes I will take your wives and give them to one who is close to you, and he will lie with your wives in broad daylight.

Jeremiah 8:10 Therefore I will give their wives to other men,

8. **You shall not steal.**

Unless God tells you to —

Num 31:36 — The half share of those who fought in the battle was: 337,500 sheep, of which the tribute for the LORD was 675; 36,000 cattle, of which the tribute for the LORD was 72; 30,500 donkeys, of which the tribute for the LORD was 61; 16,000 people, of which the tribute for the LORD was 32.

Deut. 2; 30 — But Sihon king of Heshbon refused to let us pass through. For the LORD your God *had made his spirit stubborn* the LORD our God delivered him over to us and we struck him down, together with his sons and his whole army. At that time we took all his towns and completely destroyed them — *men, women and children. We left no survivors.* But the livestock and the plunder from the towns we had captured we carried off for ourselves.

9. **You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.**

Perhaps the only serious injunction but not one that needed divine revelation — every civilization has this same law. But it also needs to be pointed out that there is no injunction against lying, cheating or untruth in general – only in a court of law it is a sin/crime!

10. **You shall not covet** your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his male servant¹⁹, or his female servant, or his ox, or his donkey, or anything that is your neighbor's.

Seriously! Covetousness a major human issue? The gentle reader will note that there are far more serious crimes than covetousness. No mention of rape or pedophilia, people trafficking (slavery is actual endorsed by the Holy Lord God), counterfeiting, smuggling, drunkenness, domestic abuse etc. etc. Does any intelligent person really believe that the omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient Lord of the Universe couldn't come up with a more serious list of cosmic commandments? Please also note that the wife is included among the man's possessions — his house coming first in importance followed by his wife and slaves then his stock.

In contrast to this let us now review the 10 commandments (*yamas & niyamas*) as given in the Yoga Sutras by the sage Patanjali. 1. Non-violence, 2. Truth, 3. Non-stealing, 4. Chastity, 5. Non-grasping (non-possessiveness), 6. Cleanliness (hygiene), 7. Contentment, 8. Study, 9. Simple-living/meditation (*tapas*) and 10. Surrender to the Lord.

Surely any intelligent person would prefer the Hindu version than the Biblical one. Perhaps the learned reverend was so enthralled with the European missionaries that the claim that their version was *God-given* perforce made it superior to the Sage's version – no matter how silly it is!

The singing of hymns is an important part of Christian worship.

Comment — Here is an example of the more Divinely inspired misanthropic prayers found in the Bible:—

- Psalm 109:7 When he is tried, let him be found guilty, and may his prayers condemn him.
 8 May his days be few; may another take his place of leadership.
 9 May his children be fatherless and his wife a widow.
 10 May his children be wandering beggars; may they be driven from their ruined homes.
 11 May a creditor seize all he has; may strangers plunder the fruits of his labour.
 12 May no-one extend kindness to him or take pity on his fatherless children.
 13 May his descendants be cut off, their names blotted out from the next generation.
 14 May the iniquity of his fathers be remembered before the LORD; may the sin of his mother never be blotted out.
 15 May their sins always remain before the LORD, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth.
 16 For he never thought of doing a kindness, but hounded to death the poor and the needy and the broken-hearted.
 17 He loved to pronounce a curse— may it come on him; he found no pleasure in blessing — may it be far from him.

Let any intelligent honest Hindu contrast Christian public worship with that of Hindu temples, and say which is preferable. The Bramhos have adopted much the same form; but it was borrowed from Christianity.

Comment — The reverend is being deliberately deceptive. There are different forms of public worship for Hindus – temple ceremonies and festivals, congregational singing of hymns (*bhajans*), public discourses (*kala-ksepam*) etc.

¹⁹ The Hebrew terms used are '*aved*' which means male slave and '*amah*' which means a bondwoman or female slave.

Besides public worship, Christians join in the observance of what is called the Lord's Supper, in memory of Christ's death, showing their unity with each other and with Him and as a means of spiritual nourishment.

Comment — The Lord's Supper is ritual cannibalism — the wafer represents the flesh of Jesus and the wine represents his blood. What a disgusting way to achieve spiritual nourishment – by eating one's savior! Hindus also have a sacramental meal which is some delicious food item which is offered to the deity and then consumed by the devotees. Let any reasonable person decide which is more salutary!

4. *The due observance of Sunday or the Lord's Day.*

The influence of the Christian Sabbath is very considerable in promoting the happiness and civilization of a community. But it is of chief advantage as an opportunity of moral and religious culture. It calls the thoughts away from merely secular employments, and invites us to the contemplation of those higher truths which concern our eternal wellbeing.

Comment — The spiritual effects of the Sabbath are still to be realized! In all Christian today the Sabbath is the day of shopping and recreation.

5. *The Reading of suitable Christian Books.*

While the Bible should be the chief study, some other books may be read with advantage. A good *Hymn Book* should perhaps rank next to the Bible.

Comment — Reading of the Bible from cover to cover may lead one to lose faith when encountering all the nonsense that is found there.

6. *Intercourse with Christian Friends.*

Provided they are of the right stamp, few means are more profitable. Prayer, the study of the Scriptures, and conversation on the Christian life, should occupy such little gatherings.

Comment — Good company is always commendable. Hinduism lays great stress on *satsang*.

7. *Self-Examination and Meditation,*

Most men live at random. Their actions are guided by the impulse of the moment. The man who does not use his reason is scorned as a fool. It is still more inexcusable to act without consulting conscience beforehand. There should also be careful consideration afterwards.

Commune with your own heart on your bed and be still said the Psalmist.” But this is not enough. The prayer of the Psalmist should also be ours:— “Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.”

Comment — The highest prayer of the Hindus is not for daily bread but for *enlightenment* which is the gist of the Gayatri Mantra.

8. *Watchfulness against Temptation,*

The Lord Jesus Christ, shortly before His death, gave this caution to His disciples, “Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation.” This caution is especially necessary in the case of the young. Ungodly companions and bad books are to be carefully shunned. Some temptations we must meet, and blessed is the man that endures temptation. When called by duty to trial, there should be special watchfulness and prayer.

Comment — But the Lord's prayer requests God not to lead us in to temptation. So what is the cause of temptation? Is it God or is it Devil or is it due to our own desires?

9. *Abiding in Christ.*

Sad experience teaches Christ's followers the truth of His words, "Without me ye can do nothing."

Comment — Another facile nonsense! Humans have existed on this planet for 198,000 years before Christ and ever since and have been achieving amazing things without him. In fact the greatest advances in science are made when religion and particularly all reference to Jesus is excluded!

Prospects at death.

The only thing a human being knows with certainty about his future lot is, that he must die. To every one must come that Inevitable Day.

What are the prospects of a thoughtful Hindu at death? According to the doctrine of Karma, there is no forgiveness of sin. He has not merely the transgressions of this life to answer for, but those of countless former births. Numbers, it is true, die like brutes heedless of the future or indulging vain hopes on account of their supposed merit; but a thoughtful Hindu may well meditate terror. Suppose even that he has good deeds, what are his prospects? Such a man, however, dies with a lie in his right hand; he is only self-deceived. Instead of being taken up to heaven, he will be dragged down to hell.

Comment — All religions have their heavens and their hells — no one can prove that their heaven or hell is the *real* one and others are not! It's like saying — I believe in the spaghetti monster and you believe in the lasagna monster. My monster is *real* and yours is false! Childish and irrational.

Jesus Christ said to the thief on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."

Comment — And this was a lie. The thief may have bypassed the day of resurrection and been fast-tracked to heaven by His grace and favour, but Jesus Himself only arose bodily into heaven 40 days later! This is not an assurance that can be trusted from the historical evidence!

The very day the true Christian dies, he is happy with Christ. Which prospect is the more comforting in a dying hour? Reader, what is your hope?

Comment — I'd rather stick with belief in the Justice of Sriman Narayana and compassion of Mother Lakshmi than in the failed promises of Jesus.

Future State.

The great aim of Hinduism is to cut short the 8,400,000 of births, to arrive at *mukti* or absorption. "Just as rivers falling into the sea lose their names and forms, so wise men, losing their names and forms, attain the *Paratpara Purusha*."

As already mentioned, illustration with Hindus passes for argument²⁰. Rivers mixing with the sea is no proof that men may be absorbed into the Divine being. Only substances of the same kind mix. But God is different from any other being; there is none like Him. How, then, can any other be absorbed in Him?

Comment — This is the difference between the two systems. The Hindu may also ask how can a thing created from dirt, infused with life, dies and is resurrected, dwell physically in proximity to Divinity for all eternity?

²⁰ A strange statement for a scholar who wrote a treatise refuting the theological claims of Christianity based on the Hindu rules of argument and debate (nyaya)

Granting, however, that absorption does take place, what does it amount to? Brahma(n) is said to exist in a state of dreamless sleep, without any more thought than a stone. Hindu absorption is practically the same as the Buddhist *nirvana* or annihilation. "Not to be," says Professor Wilson, is the melancholy result of the religion and philosophy of the Hindus.

Comment — The great difference between the two ideologies is the concept of time. For Christians, time is different to space and is linear, starts nowhere and proceeds in straight line to nowhere. For Hindus time/space is circular and relative. The ultimate reality or state of being (*mukti/nirvana*) is union with the Divine beyond space and time. It is inconceivable and unconceptual.

Some Hindus, it is true, look for a future conscious existence with Vishnu or Siva; but there are no such beings. Belief in them is based on the same Puranas which teach the existence of Mount Meru, The one is no more true than the other. What intelligent man can believe in a god supposed to have had wives and children and to have been stained with crime?

Comment — What intelligent person could believe in a bachelor god who impregnates the wife of a carpenter, in order to be born and die to appease himself for the sins committed by human beings who he infected with original sin. Who destroys the whole creation through a flood for his botched handiwork, allows himself to be tempted by a devil, is confused about his own role by his final declaration on the cross – "My Lord why have you forsaken me?"

Christianity denies the doctrine of transmigration, and teaches that the future state of each man is fixed at death. The wicked are for ever miserable, the righteous are for ever happy. So long as man sins, he must suffer; and we have no reason to believe that in a future state a man will repent.

Comment — Christianity guarantees (without evidence) that a life of 80 years live on earth under conditions that were predetermined will decide what happens for the rest of eternity. A single momentary flash in time determines an eternity of suffering or happiness – and Jesus is described as compassionate and loving! How could a Loving God and his righteous saints abide in heaven knowing that the majority of human beings were suffering in hell? NGO's here on earth do a better job of alleviating suffering than Jesus. Medical staff selflessly give their lives for helping others in Africa and elsewhere but dying as non-believers guarantees hell for them. A very sophisticated, just and sublimely comforting belief system indeed!

The other state is one of unending joy in the presence of God. It can be described only in the language of earth. It is said of the righteous:— "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, and God shall wipe away all tears from their tears." Heaven is compared to a city whose streets are of pure gold, as it were transparent glass. Those who enter it are represented as having crowns on their head palms in their hands, and golden harps to sing the praises of Him who redeemed them. The great happiness of heaven is that it is eternal. There is no passing from heaven to hell as according to Hinduism. Those who enter there shall be for ever with the Lord. The Christian does not get to heaven by his own merit, but as a gift of God, and hence he has no fear of his merit being exhausted, and that he will have to fall down again to this world of sin and sorrow.

Comment — Again we ask how is this heaven more real than that of the Muslims with their 72 virgins and fried chicken? Or Indra's paradise, or Valhalla, or the Celestial Hunting Grounds? Which one of these is true and on what basis? All descriptions of heaven are based upon human models of what the greatest material desire is. All heavens are nothing but spiritual materialism. Only returning to our source and merging with cosmic conscious from whence we have arisen is sensible.

Comparative Effects of Hinduism and Christianity.

“By their fruits ye shall know them,” is an excellent test. A religion from God, the fountain of goodness, should increase the worldly prosperity of those who embrace it, promote education, give equal rights to all, check vice, encourage virtue, and give ennobling ideas of its author. The effects of a religion are best shown not by its results on individuals, but by its influence on nations. India and England may be taken as standards in this respect.

For three thousand years Hinduism, in different forms, has been the religion of India, What are the results?

There are great complaints about the poverty of the country. Hinduism has increased it by making manual labor degrading, by hindering foreign commerce, by encouraging idle vagrants, by its indiscriminate charity, its fatalism. The people, like children, squander their money on jewels and idle show, instead of turning it to good account.

Comment — India was the richest country in the world – that’s why all the nations, Persians, Arabs, Huns, British, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch all wanted to loot and rape her! After 800 years of pillaging by Muslims and 200 years of British exploitation what does one expect?

Two thousand years ago the inhabitants of the British Islands were little better than barbarians. In the south a little grain was raised; in the middle, the people subsisted chiefly on their flocks and herds; in the north, they were in a savage state, living on wild fruits, by hunting and fishing. England is now one of the richest countries in the world.

Comment — Richest why? Obviously the reverend didn’t take time to study history. The England became rich because of imperialism, because of exploitation of the resources of others, because of the advantage of guns, steel and germs. The slaughtered native peoples, stole their land and enslaved them.

Has Hinduism promoted education? The Brahmans jealously sought to confine knowledge to themselves. The Vedas were not written, lest the other castes should read them. Education and religious instruction were denied to Sudras. There is a proverb that the sayings of wisdom in the mouth of a Sudra are as butter in the mouth of a dog. Even at present, only one in five of the people can read.

Comment — Education has always been provided in the skills that one needed for a trade. This is one of the benefits of the caste system; it guaranteed skills and employment. Fair enough the British did make education universal but having an education does not guarantee a job!

Two thousand years ago the ancient British were without a written language; now education is universal and England has produced some of the greatest writers that have ever lived.

Comment — The Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Chinese, Indians all had great writers, poets, philosophers, thousands of years ago, why is England special in this regard?

When Christian Missionaries came to India, one of the first things they did was to open schools — not for certain castes, but for all — for the most degraded. Hinduism has taught women to regard their husbands as their gods; it has denied them education and religious instruction; it has fostered early marriages; it has originated the cruel treatment of widows; it encouraged widow-burning. Women have been degraded, and they have dragged the men down to their level.

In England, women are educated and have the same religious privileges as men. It is this which has largely contributed to raise England to the high position she at present occupies.

Comment — This promotion of women’s rights is *in spite* of the Biblical injunctions not *because* of them! The struggle of western women for their rights is an on-going saga. We do not have space to enter into this subject.

The social and legal position of an Israelite wife was inferior to the position a wife occupied in the great countries round about... all the texts show that Israelites wanted mainly sons to perpetuate the family line and fortune, and to preserve the ancestral inheritance... A husband could divorce his wife; women on the other hand could not ask for divorce... the wife called her husband Ba'al or master; she also called him adon or lord; she addressed him, in fact, as a slave addressed his master or subject, his king. The Decalogue includes a man's wife among his possessions... all her life she remains a minor. The wife does not inherit from her husband, nor daughters from their father, except when there is no male heir. A vow made by a girl or married woman needs, to be valid, the consent of the father or husband and if this consent is withheld, the vow is null and void. A man had a right to sell his daughter. Women were excluded from the succession." -Roland de Vaux, archaeologist and priest

<http://www.nobeliefs.com/DarkBible/darkbible7.htm>

Has Hinduism given equal rights to all? Its chief feature is caste, which it stamps with Divine authority. It has sought to exalt some as *Bhu-devas*, gods on earth, while it has degraded others beneath the brutes. It has crushed individual liberty, and made the people the victims of the most abject social and religious tyranny. Hindu disunion by caste, has made the country an easy prey to foreign nations.

Comment — Caste does have its disadvantages as well as its advantages. Suffice to say that the class-system in English-speaking countries is just as rigid and oppressive as the caste-system. The plight of coloureds in America in the 21st century is worse than the caste system ever was.

The second great Commandment of Christianity is, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” that is, we should treat others as we wish them to act towards ourselves, Christianity teaches the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, that we are all descended from the same first parents, that we should look upon all men as brethren, and seek to do them good.

Comment — Again a very selective recommendation. What about the 200 years of slavery which was sanctioned by law in the British Empire? Where fellow human beings were treated as stock and transported under the most inhumane conditions and sold like cattle and forced to work like donkeys! All supported by the Church on Biblical injunctions and practiced by devout Church-going farmers. In the slave colonies even separate churches were built to accommodate the slaves. Intermarriage was of course against the law! Sudras in India have never been treated so badly. Let’s not mention the vile treatment of the Jews as outcasts in England.

It is true that there are a number of wicked people in England, who know nothing of Christianity; and even of those who do know, many prefer to follow their own selfish and evil desires. There is, however, this difference between Englishmen and Hindus; a bad Englishman is acting contrary to his religion; a bad Hindu is only imitating the example of his gods. But, taken as a whole, Christianity has had a great effect in raising the moral character of the people of England.

Comment — Amazingly bigoted for a “scholar”. Remember it was Christians that fought against Christians in the 30 years of religious wars and then the hundred years of religious wars. What about the crusades, the inquisition, the 2 great world wars and countless other conflicts around the world. All executed by Christians in the name of Christianity. Hindus have never been so engaged.

What ideas has Hinduism given of God? It has taught the people to combine pantheism and polytheism, its deities numbering 33 crores; it has made the land full of idols, and encouraged the worship of brutes, beasts, stocks, and stones. "As is the god, so is the worshipper." The people, though possessing excellent natural abilities, have, in some respects, become as unintelligent as the objects of their worship. Like the lower animals, they are mainly guided by custom, and are the easy victims of priest craft, believing the most extravagant fables, and accepting the most contradictory statements. Christianity teaches monotheism, and presents the loftiest conceptions of God in every respect: it strictly forbids all image worship.

Comment — We have already responded to these vain and pernicious claims.

Hinduism is a religion only for Hindus, People must by birth belong to the four castes. Christianity is a universal religion, welcoming the whole human race.

Comment — Another amazingly ignorant pronouncement by an alleged "scholar"! Hinduism spread over the whole of South-east Asia, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia etc. The largest Hindu temple in the world is in Cambodia!

It is true that great crimes, such as religious persecution, have been perpetrated in the name of Christianity; but they are abhorrent to its spirit. They are the remains of the old heathen spirit which made the king of Babylon threaten to throw into a fiery furnace all who would not worship the golden idol he had set up.

Comment — Abhorrent to its spirit in a most parochial way — if we just take the saying of Jesus to love your enemies and turn the other cheek. But the justification of all the persecution of heretics, sectarian wars, witch burning etc, slave-trade and imperialism was all purely Christian in its inception and practice based entirely on Biblical directives.

The desire for reform which now animates some educated Indians has been derived from Christianity, while the Reactionists are inspired by Hinduism. It is cheerfully allowed that in some Hindu books there are, here and there, sublime descriptions of God, but they are neutralized by others of an opposite character. A learned writer on the Nyaya philosophy begins his book with the adoration of Krishna, whom he calls, at once, "the seed of the tree of the universe," and the stealer of the clothes of the young Gopis."

Comment — The author is graciously condescending. Hindus have no problem with accepting good guidance from others and we are cheerfully indebted to Christians for taking the lead in social work. The Christians at one call Jesus the God of Love and his Father a jealous and angry tyrant. Complimentary characteristics?

Summary.

While Hinduism and Christianity agree on some points, such as the need of a revelation and man's sinfulness; there are many most important differences. A summary of the contrasts is given below.

Comment — Wrong! Hinduism rejects the idea of man's sinfulness in toto!

God.

The chief Hindu system teaches pantheism, that nothing else exists but God. Its watchword is *ekamevadvityam*, one only without a second, or, *Sarvam khalvidam Brahma* all this is Brahma(n). Christianity teaches that God and the universe which He has created are distinct.

Hinduism teaches polytheism, the doctrine of many gods, as well as pantheism, its divinities varying from thrice-eleven to 33 crores. Christianity teaches monotheism or, that there is only one God.

Comment — One may well ask what monotheism as a belief has contributed to the benefit of the world? Monotheism was first invented by Pharaoh Akhenaton but it brought only discord and conflict. All the greatest contributions to the benefit of the world came from polytheistic societies. Art, architecture, mathematics, algebra, engineering, philosophy, medicine, the legal system, democracy etc. — all came from the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Chinese, Hindus, Maya and Incas. The Jews were the most backward tribe of the Roman Empire and the Christians started off as slaves. Christianity has been the enemy of progress for 2000 years. Monotheism of the Jews, Christians and Muslims has brought nothing but war, conflict, and cultural destruction.

Hinduism represents Brahma(n) in his usual state as *nirguna*, in a dreamless sleep; Christianity teaches that God is never unconscious. Hinduism represents Brahma(n) in his *saguna* condition as possessing *rajas*, passion, and *tamas*, darkness, as well as *sattva*, truth:

Comment — Deliberate obfuscation. Hinduism teaches that only Brahman really exists since the world cannot be created from nothing. Therefore *pan-en-theism* is the only sensible doctrine. Brahman is qualified by consciousness (*cit*), being (*sat*) and bliss (*ananda*). Dreamless sleep is a state of the individual Self but does not apply to the totality of Being — Brahman. In fact the entire universe is nothing but the dream-play of the Divine.

Christianity declares God to be light without darkness at all, to be spotlessly holy.

Comment — Christianity believes in a devil that is the embodiment of evil — who created the devil?

Man.

Christianity teaches that God created man, that He is our Father in heaven.

Hinduism affirms that souls are eternal. Hence our relation to God is not that of Creator and creature, father and child, but of beings co-eternal and mutually independent; or, according to Vedanta, of portions to the whole.

Christianity teaches that we did not exist before our birth in this world: Hinduism, that we have passed already through countless births, and will do the same in future. Hinduism teaches that all life is the same — that a man may become in a future birth a beast, a fish, an insect, or a vegetable.

Comment — The first part is correct the second part deceptive. Hinduism does not teach that all life is the same but rather everything is pervaded by consciousness. Consciousness evolves through various life forms culminating in the human. Once having attained a human birth one does not then devolve into lower species.

Christianity teaches that man is and ever remains distinct from every other creature. Christianity teaches the Brotherhood of man.

Comment — In what way are we different from other creatures? All creatures eat, sleep, copulate and defend their families and territory. Animals experience and display a variety of emotions and animals also learn and teach others. Some animals even display altruistic acts. How is consciousness in a dog different from consciousness in a human being? In Hinduism consciousness is a symptom of the Self or *atman*. Apparently consciousness has nothing to do with the soul in Christianity.

Hinduism teaches the brotherhood of all living beings.

Hinduism teaches that God has divided Indians into four castes while all others are impure *Mlechhas* or outcastes.

Comment — Monotheism is always accompanied by *two humanities*. It divides all humans into believers and non-believers, the chosen and the rejected, the “saved” and “damned” — the saved will enjoy God’s rewards and the damned — the majority will burn in everlasting hell. Even among themselves Christians are hostile. Catholics vs Protestants. All Hindus pray in the same temples. Christian of different denominations will not pray in each others’ churches or take communion together.

Sin.

Hinduism denies the eternal distinction between right and wrong. Christianity affirms it, and declares that it would be far worse for God to sin than for man. Hinduism thinks so lightly of sin that the gods are said sometimes to commit it as a divine sport Christianity declares it to be that abominable thing which God hates.

Comment — What Hinduism does deny is that right and wrong are absolutes — both are relative. In Hinduism there is absolute morality – aggression and hatred are always wrong and compassion and generosity are always good. For Christians only that good that is done by a Christian is counted good – any good done by heathen is evil. We have already amply shown the sinful nature of the Christian God – no Hindu deity has ever commanded mass murder of men, women and children!

Christianity teaches that man is a free agent: Hinduism, that his fate has been “written by Brahma on his head” and that it is unalterable.

Comment —

Rom. 9; 15 - 20 For he says to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion." It does not, therefore, depend on man's desire or effort, but on God's mercy..... 18 Therefore God has mercy on whom he wants to have mercy, and he hardens whom he wants to harden. One of you will say to me: "Then why does God still blame us? For who resists his will?" But who are you, O man, to talk back to God? "Shall what is formed say to him who formed it, 'Why did you make me like this?'"

The only sin which a Hindu regards as unpardonable is to break the rules of caste: Christianity teaches that sin is to break the laws of God. A Hindu may be guilty of lying, theft, oppression, adultery, murder, without losing caste; but let him eat with a European or a man of a different caste, or marry a widow, &c., and he is expelled. Christianity teaches that a man is defiled, not by what he eats, but by evil thoughts, words, and actions.

Comment — This is complete rubbish. The only sin for which there is no pardon is ingratitude! Any act which causes suffering to another living being is sin and any act which brings joy and happiness to another living being is virtue. The rules of caste are morally irrelevant.

Salvation.

Salvation, according to Hinduism, usually means deliverance from future births and absorption into Brahma(n); according to Christianity, it is deliverance from sin, and an eternal conscious existence full of joy in heaven.

Hinduism is self-contradictory with regard to the pardon of sin. According to Karma, it is impossible to escape the fruit of former deeds; but the common belief is that the worst sins may be washed away by bathing in the Ganges or even by taking the name of some god. Christianity teaches that God can pardon sin; but asserts the worthlessness of all human methods for its removal.

Comment — Hinduism teaches a number of ways in which crime/sin can be removed – through enduring the proper punishments, through undergoing austerities, through fasting, through asking forgiveness and through going on pilgrimages and performing acts of charity.

Christianity teaches that man's highest duty is to glorify God and do good to his fellow-creatures: Hinduism, that it is to refrain from all actions, good, bad, or indifferent, and obtain absorption into Brahma(n).

Comment — The highest duty is to serve Lord Narayana and all living beings which are his manifestations. All acts are to be done for the welfare of all beings (*loka sangraha*) renouncing attachment to the fruits (*nishkama karma yoga*). This is what the Gita teaches in its entirety not inaction! It is amazing that the reverend could have been considered a scholar of Hinduism without ever having absorbed the fundamental teaching of the Gita!

Christianity and Hinduism have both their incarnations; but Christ and Krishna are as different as light and darkness.

Hinduism teaches that man is to be his own savior: Christianity, that God alone can save him.

Comment — Hinduism actually teaches that one can try to save oneself but the path is long and arduous, surrender to and reliance upon Lord Krishna is easier.

Hinduism teaches that a man is rewarded in heaven according to his meritorious works: Christianity teaches salvation by grace, without any merit of man's own.

Comment — This is also a controversy with the Christian cults.

1 Peter 1:17 And if you call on the Father who is impartial and who judges every man according to his works. Gal. 2:16 know that a man is not justified by observing the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ.

Scriptures

Christianity has its Bible for all; Hinduism its Shastras for Brahman men only; but as they are contradictory, they cannot both be true.

Comment — Hinduism has a whole library! Some shastras like the Vedas are for educated Sanskrit knowing brahmin men only, and Puranas, Mahabharata, Ramayana etc. for all others. As far as contradictions go, the Bible also is replete with them so this charge is duplicitous. Jesus also said:– "Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? (Matthew 7:3)

Hinduism teaches that the mere hearing of its Shastras is meritorious;

Comment — Hinduism does *not* teach this. It is a common saying in order to glorify the act of listening with attention. All scriptures are written with the intention of them being understood and practiced.

Christianity requires the Bible to be read with understanding and prayer.

Comment — And the suspension of all critical analysis and reason.

Worship.

Christianity forbids the worship of any other than the one true God:–

Comment — Again we humbly request the irrefutable evidence of this “true” God.

Hinduism allows the worship of any thing in heaven above or in the earth beneath, even brute beasts, reptiles, plants, and stones.

Comment — The whole of creation is manifested and pervaded by the Divine – so any object that is inspiring and reminds one of the Divine can be worshipped.

Hinduism teaches that the mere repetition of God's name is prayer:

Comment — Because the repetition of the name brings about mindfulness of God.

Christianity, that prayer is the desire of the heart.

Comment — There is no evidence that the desires of the heart revealed through prayer are ever answered.

Hinduism attaches the greatest virtue to austerities:

Comment — Hinduism attaches the greatest virtue to serving God and all sentient beings.

Christianity teaches that they are worthless for man's salvation.

Comment — Hinduism also teaches that austerities cannot bring Liberation.

Hinduism has its mark on the forehead or branding of the body: Christianity has baptism, denoting the need of cleansing from sin.

Comment — This is because Hindus mark the individual as a manifestation of the Divine essence. Christians have an extremely low opinion of humankind.

Comparative Effects.

Hinduism and Christianity may be contrasted by their effects in India and England.

India is one of the poorest countries in the world; England is one of the richest.

Comment — Because England looted the wealth of India and its other colonies.

In India women are kept in ignorance and denied religious instruction; in England, they are educated, and have the same religious privileges as men.

Comment — Women were *never* denied religious instruction, women listened to and memorized large sections of the Ramayana and Mahabharata – nowadays literacy has greatly improved and with the advent of modern mass media the least of people know more about the world than the most educated of Nehemiah's time.

In India, Hinduism is the great enemy of reform; in England, Christianity takes the lead in all real improvement.

Comment — Not true – history shows us that the Church resisted and still resists every possible scientific advancement.

Conclusion.

Let any thoughtful Hindu compare the two systems, and say which is more in accordance with reason and conducive to the good of the human race. Let him also choose the better way and walk in it. National feeling should not decide the question. The Indian would be an idiot who urged his countrymen to stick to the national conveyances, palanquins and bullock-carts, and refuse to travel by the "foreign" invention of railways. What is true is PATRIOTIC.

Comment — I think the good reverend would be turning in his grave to know that the majority of those born Christian in the west have rejected the faith, and that Science now gives answers to questions that only religion dealt with. He would be disappointed at the number of Hindu temples that are now going up in 'Christian' countries and the proliferation of Hindu subjects like Yoga, Ayurveda, Jyotish, Vedanta etc. He thought that Christianity was the progressive force and science its assistant. Little did he know that Science is a force of its

own and has no need to religion. All the benefits that are being experienced by humanity today, health, wealth and education are all delivered by science without any reference to Christianity except in India where they are used as incentives to convert the poor and uneducated.

