

THE SATANIC VERSES OF BHAGAVAD-GITA

Author

KEDAR JOSHI BSc MA*

This work is released under [Creative Commons license](#): Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported (CC BY-SA 3.0).

* Kedar Joshi asserts the moral right to be identified as the author of this work.

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	3
<i>Abstract</i>	5
The Criticism	
1. Krishna—the preacher of yoga—is himself not a yogi	6
2. Krishna alone is satanic (or evil)	7
3. Krishna is nothing short of a terrorist and the Gita is Hindu terrorism	8
<i>Critical note</i> <i>(Metaphysics & Morality)</i>	9
<i>Abbreviations</i> <i>(As used in the “References & Explanatory Notes”)</i>	10
<i>References & Explanatory Notes</i>	14

Preface

The first version of this work was written (and published on the internet) in 2005 in Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, England.[†]

Let me declare that I am after truth, not politics. Let me also mention that I am not anti-Hindu;[‡] I am in fact an ardent believer and practicer of Hindu astrology and am an impassioned devotee of Lord Rama.^{§1 2} Hindu astrology has appeared to me to be so profoundly and minutely true that I am on the verge of conviction that the ultimate truth is not beyond Hinduism. I consider myself a “weak agnostic” though.^{**} I am not a Christian or a Muslim.^{††}

[†] The second version was written in Pune, India and was published in December 2009; it was republished in April 2012 on Boloji.com. The latest version is available on [SelectedWorks](#).

[‡] One of my most beloved quotations is a quotation by Max Müller on India: “If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered over the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant, I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of the Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw the corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human a life... again I should point to India.” (Source: *India, What Can It Teach Us* (1882) Lecture IV; accessed via the [English Wikiquote page on Max Müller](#), last modified on 25 April 2013, at 11:22). Another one is the one by Henry David Thoreau on the Bhagavad-gita: “In the morning I bathe my intellect in the stupendous and cosmogonical philosophy of the Bhagvat-Geeta, since whose composition years of the gods have elapsed, and in comparison with which our modern world and its literature seem puny and trivial; and I doubt if that philosophy is not to be referred to a previous state of existence, so remote is its sublimity from our conceptions.” (Source: *Walden* (1854), Ch. XVI : The Pond in Winter; accessed via the [English Wikiquote page on Bhagavad Gita](#), last modified on 13 December 2013, at 15:00).

[§] The character portrayed in Valmiki’s *Ramayana*.

^{**} Weak agnosticism is the view that the existence or nonexistence of any deities is currently unknown but is not necessarily unknowable; therefore, one will withhold judgment until evidence, if any, becomes available. (Source: [The English Wikipedia article on Agnosticism](#), last modified on 25 April 2014, at 00:39.)

^{††} However, to some extent, I respect those respective religions. How beautiful and humane the Quranic verse 2:177 is, for example!: “True piety does not consist in turning your faces to the east or the west – but truly pious is he who believes in God, and the Last Day, and the angels, and revelation, and the prophets; and spends his substance – however much he himself may cherish it – upon his near of kin, and the orphans, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and the beggars, and for the freeing of human beings from bondage; and is constant in prayer, and renders the purifying dues; and [truly pious are] they who keep their promises whenever they promise, and are patient in misfortune and hardship and in time of peril: it is they that have proved themselves true, and it is they, they who are conscious of God.” (Source: [The English Wikiquote page on Quran](#), last modified on 22 April 2014, at 09:12.)

Notwithstanding my harshest criticism of the Bhagavad-gita,^{‡‡} I profoundly love the Gita for the very transcendental nature of its metaphysics and the beautiful language in which it has been expressed. If I refer to Krishna as a terrorist, for instance, it is only because I quite frankly and objectively and in a sense mathematically believe that he—especially if certain established metaphysical interpretations of the Gita are to be believed—is a terrorist.

The fact that this work cites relatively^{§§} a great deal of references may give a false appearance that it is a mere compilation or synthesis of previous interpretations of the Bhagavad-gita. This work, on the contrary, relies, discernibly, on none of them for its critical ideas.

Kedar Joshi
Cambridge, Pune.
April 2014

^{‡‡} The word “Bhagavad-gita” is spelled variantly as Bhagavadgita, Bhagavadgītā, Bhagavad Gita, Bhagavad Gītā, Bhagavat Gita, etc. and is also known simply as Gita (or Geeta). It literally means “God’s Poem”.

^{§§} Relative to the size of the main body of the work.

Abstract

This work, “The Satanic^{***} Verses of Bhagavad-gita”, mainly presents a hardcore criticism of the morality (or the ethicality) of the Bhagavad-gita—the Hindu Bible,^{†††} the criticism that the Gita in fact implies that

1. Krishna—the preacher of yoga—is not in the least a yogi himself,
2. Krishna alone is satanic (or evil), and
3. Krishna—for reasons other than the ones for which he is considered evil—is nothing short of a terrorist and the Gita is Hindu terrorism.

And, as a matter of necessity, it attempts to systematically dig into the Gita’s metaphysical foundations, further examining the gravity of each criticism through monistic and dualistic metaphysical interpretations (or perspectives).

Finally, as a matter of example, it also cites some of the verses of the Quran that appear similar in meaning to the Gita’s satanic verses, thereby drawing parallels between the two seemingly antithetical religious texts. The work thus points out that although the Gita may not seem to be as directly and explicitly terroristic as the Quran, terrorism—the one against unbelievers, for instance—is equally inherent in the Gita and the Gita can be fairly interpreted as a book of terrorism.

^{***} In this work, the term “satanic” is meant to be “morally bad and evil”; Ref. A. S. Hornby, Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English, 7th edition. OUP, 2005.

^{†††} as it is usually known as, esp. in the West

The Criticism

1. Krishna—the preacher of yoga—is himself not a yogi

In the Bhagavad-gita, Krishna is hailed several times as not only a yogi but also as the Lord (or the God) of yoga, the great Lord of yoga, etc.³ And he demands Arjuna, and in fact every other mortal, to be a yogi,⁴ while contradictorily enticing him with material prospects and benefits.⁵ Krishna could not be considered a yogi basically because he claims to create the (painful)⁶ manifested world (Vyakta Prakriti),⁷ when, as a yogi, he, as Paramatman (i.e. Supreme Soul or Supersoul),⁸ would quite simply be expected to be content within himself (i.e. to be in the state of self-realization), and not to have any desire,⁹ including the desire for the action of creation, as it seems absurd that there can be a conscious action without any underlying desire whatsoever. **Krishna is not the God of yoga but the "God of desire and hypocrisy"!**¹⁰

In other words, the idea of Nishkam Karma (or desireless action; i.e. conscious action with no underlying desire)—the principal tenet of Karma yoga—seems to be paradoxical and unmeaning. Karma yoga may make sense only to the extent that an aspiring yogi attempts to be as much desireless as possible while doing any conscious (material) action. Once the aspiring yogi becomes a (true) yogi, it would be perfectly meaningful that he has no desire left in him other than the desire for self-realization (*Atma-sakshatkar*) or God-realization (*Krishna-sakshatkar*) and thus performs no conscious action other than the one which is essential for the goal of self-realization or God-realization. The idea that Krishna is a true (or ultimate), self-realized yogi is thus contradictory to the idea that he creates the manifested world as a Karma yogi. Krishna's supposed (conscious) act of perpetual creation of the manifested world cannot be without some underlying desire which is unworthy of a true yogi.

2. Krishna alone is satanic (or evil)

According to the Gita, it is Krishna who does everything, it is he who is responsible for every good as well as evil that exists in the world,¹¹ and yet he proclaims to make it—the prospects of yoga—worse for evil people,¹² asserts to annihilate miscreants,¹³ while contradictorily¹⁴ claiming to be the friend of every being.¹⁵^{***} Krishna alone possesses free-will. Krishna alone creates delusion (or ignorance) and causes (unfathomable) suffering. **Krishna—and Krishna alone—is evil.**

So, for example, the Gita in fact implies that it is Krishna who created Duryodhana, the Mahabharata’s arch-antagonist; it is Krishna who is the actual doer of each of his evil deeds; and it is Krishna, and only Krishna, who prearranged the dreadful Kurukshetra War.

Sometimes it seems to be argued that Krishna lets pain and evil exist so that Man can understand the value of good. I disagree with such argument. First of all, if self-realization or God-realization is the only good, the only thing to be cherished, Krishna, the so called ultimate yogi, should only let the state of self-realization exist (i.e. should only be in the state of self-realization). It would be preposterous for a true yogi to be interested in anything other than self-realization or God-realization. Secondly, it appears impossible to appreciate that the unfathomable suffering in the “fatalistic” world exists just so that few “puppets” can understand the “value” of God-realization. The eternally blissful state of God-realization would in fact entail the understanding of its value irrespective of the way that state is attained. A deterministic world in which a lion, for example, must make a living by killing a weaker animal must be the work of an incalculable evil.

^{***} **Verses with parallel meaning however seem to exist, for instance, in the Quran (or Koran)—the central religious text of Islam—also.** Please refer to the respective endnotes with text in italics for some of the Quranic verses with parallel meaning. However, the text may not be citing a “complete” verse whenever it is deemed unnecessary.

3. Krishna is nothing short of a terrorist and the Gita is Hindu terrorism

As per the Gita, a lot many modern women would be miscreants and thus would be on Krishna's hit-list—threatened to death by him—since Krishna says that even women, vaisyas (i.e. merchants), sudras (i.e. low-level workers), or any people of sinful birth go to the highest goal, if they take his shelter;¹⁶ he further says that then how much more righteous brahmanas and devout King-sages!¹⁷ which means that Krishna does not consider women to belong to the category of “righteous brahmanas”;¹⁸ so women are either unrighteous brahmanas or not brahmanas at all; if they are unrighteous brahmanas, they are unrighteous anyway, and if they are not brahmanas at all, then the women who do the works of brahmanas—e.g. the works of professional teachers—would be unrighteous, miscreants, for Krishna asks everyone from a division to do work only assigned for their division.¹⁹ It is in fact not only many of the modern women but people of other faiths too—people who do not believe in Krishna—such as atheists, Christians, Muslims, Jews, etc., that could be supposed to be threatened with death by Krishna.²⁰ **Krishna—especially for most of the modern people—is therefore nothing short of a terrorist; and the Bhagavad-gita is “Hindu terrorism”!**^{21 22 23}

Critical note

(Metaphysics & Morality)

1. If the monistic (Advaita) interpretation of the metaphysics (or the cosmology) of the Gita is true, then anything other than God—the Paramatman (or the Supersoul)—is unreal and does not exist. In that case, the last two criticisms would—at least to some remarkable extent—lose their significance.²⁴

2. If the dualistic (Dvaita) interpretation of the Gita’s metaphysics is true,²⁵ there are three possibilities, since there can be three types of relevant²⁶ dualisms.²⁷
 - Type A: Paramatman (i.e. the Supersoul), Brahman, and Atman (i.e. the soul) are ontologically distinct realities.²⁸
 - Type B: Only Paramatman and Brahman are ontologically distinct realities.
 - Type C: Only Paramatman and Atman are ontologically distinct realities.
 - If Type A is true, then all of the criticisms appear pretty significant and valid, and the Gita would be liable to be considered as an intrinsically—if not exclusively—satanic text.²⁹
 - If Type B is true, then whether the Paramatman could be held guilty of deluding the Brahman would depend partly upon the kind of experience the Brahman undergoes, which, on the whole, may either be pleasant or unpleasant.³⁰
 - If Type C is true, then all of the criticisms would obviously have the same significance as they would have if Type A were true.

The normal—or the commonsensical or the common man’s—understanding of the metaphysics of the Gita however appears to be broadly of the Type A, where “God”—i.e. Krishna—and “mortals” are thought to be distinct beings. And therefore it is to that specific understanding that this work would be most perfectly significant.

Abbreviations

(As used in the “References & Explanatory Notes”)

AB. Annie Besant, *The Bhagavad-Gita: The Lord’s Song*. The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Twentieth Reprint 2003.

ISBN: 81-7059-174-0.

AC. A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, (Pocket edition) (English), 30th printing, February 2011.

AN. Anand Neelakantan, *Asura: Tale Of The Vanquished, The Story of Ravana and His People*. Platinum Press, 2012.

ISBN: 978-93-81576-05-2.

AN (2). Anand Neelakantan, *Ajaya: Epic of the Kaurava Clan, Book I: Roll Of The Dice*. Platinum Press, December 2013.

ISBN: 978-93-81576-03-8.

AP. A. Parthasarathy, *Bhagavad Gita*. A. Parthasarathy (www.vedantaworld.org), 2008, 2011.

ISBN: 978-93-81094-03-7.

BD. Bibek Debroy, *The Bhagavad Gita*. Penguin Books India, 2005.

ISBN: 978-0-14-400068-5.

BR. Bertrand Russell, *Why I Am Not a Christian* (1927); accessed via the [Bertrand Russell Society website](http://www.bertrandrussell.org).

BSM. Barbara Stoler Miller, *The Bhagavad-Gita*. Bantam Classic, June 2004.

ISBN: 978-0-553-21365-2.

CEW. Carl E. Woodham, *Bhagavad Gita: The Song Divine*. Pilgrims Publishing, 2003.

ISBN: 81-7769-168-6.

CH. Christopher Hitchens, *God Is Not Great*. Atlantic Books, 2008.

ISBN: 978-1-84354-810-2.

CNB. Christopher N Burchett, *Introduction to the New Edition*, in *Bhagavad Gita* by Charles Johnston. Pilgrims Publishing, 2004.

ISBN: 81-7769-000-0.

CR. C. Rajagopalachari, *Bhagavad Gita*, 22nd Edition. Bhavan's Book University, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 2012.

ISBN: 81-7276-374-3.

DKJ. Dr. K. Jamanadas, [Manusmriti Dahan Din](#). Ambedkar.org, Last modified: March 28, 2000.

DP. Devdutt Pattanaik, *7 Secrets of Vishnu*. westland ltd, 2011.

ISBN: 978-93-80658-68-1.

DS. Dayanand Saraswati, Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Volume 19, Issue 1, year 2002, p. 73; accessed via the [English Wikipedia article on Criticism of Islam](#), last modified on 23 February 2014, at 17:29.

EBV. Encyclopædia Britannica, [Vishishtadvaita](#). Retrieved 16 February 2014.

EE. Eknath Easwaran, *The Bhagavad Gita*. Jaico Publishing House, Fifth Jaico Impression: 2013.

ISBN: 978-81-8495-090-8.

FE. Franklin Edgerton, *The Bhagavad Gītā*. Motilal Banarsidass, 1996.

ISBN: 81-208-1149-6.

GD. Gurcharan Das, *The Difficulty of Being Good*. Penguin Books India, 2012.

ISBN: 978-0-143-41897-9.

GP. Geoffrey Parrinder, *The Bhagavad Gita: A Verse Translation*. Oneworld Publications, 2013.

ISBN: 978-1-85168-988-0.

GPG. Gita Press, Gorakhpur, *Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā*. Sixth Reprint, 2011. (Code 1658).

ISBN: 81-293-1391-X.

GT. George Thompson, *The Bhagavad Gita: a new translation*. North Point Press, 2008.

ISBN: 978-0-86547-744-5.

JDS. John D. Smith, *The Mahābhārata*. Penguin Classics, Penguin Books India, 2009.

ISBN: 978-0-670-08415-9.

JM. Juan Mascaró, *The Bhagavad Gita*. Penguin Books India, 2009.

ISBN: 978-0-670-08416-6.

JMM. J. M. Macfie, *Myths and Legends of India*. Rupa Publications India Pvt. Ltd., Sixteenth Impression 2011.

ISBN: 81-7167-131-4.

JRDL. John R. de Lingen, *The Bhagavad Gita: The Lord's Song*. Sterling Paperbacks, 2009.

ISBN: 978-81-207-4742-5.

- KK.** Kim Knott, *Hinduism: A Very Short Introduction*. OUP, Reissued: 2000.
ISBN: 978-0-19-285387-5.
- LLP.** Laurie L. Patton, *The Bhagavad Gita*. Penguin Classics, 2008.
ISBN: 978-0-140-44790-3.
- MD.** Meghnad Desai, *Who Wrote the Bhagavadgita? - A Secular Inquiry into a Sacred Text*. Harper Element, 2014.
ISBN: 978-93-5136-165-7.
- NA.** Namit Arora, [The Bhagavad Gita Revisited](#). 3quarksdaily.com, 5 December 2011.
- NJD.** N. J. Dawood, *The Koran*. Penguin Classics, 50th anniversary edition: 2006.
ISBN: 978-0-14-044920-4.
- NKG.** Nagappa K. Gowda, *The Bhagavadgita in the Nationalist Discourse*, [Chapter 7: The Gita and Ambedkar](#). OUP, 2011. (Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: September 2012)
ISBN (Print): 9780198072065.
- NP.** Nalini Pandit, [Ambedkar and the "Bhaqwat Gita"](#). *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol. 27, No. 20/21 (May 16-23, 1992), pp. 1063-1065.
- PS.** Patrick Sookhdeo, [The myth of moderate Islam](#). The Spectator, 30 July 2005.
- PSI.** Philip Schaff; Schaff, P., & Schaff, D. S. (1910). History of the Christian church. Third edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Volume 4, Chapter III, section 40 "Position of Mohammedanism in Church History"; accessed via the [English Wikipedia article on Criticism of Islam](#), last modified on 23 February 2014, at 17:29.
- PY.** Paramahansa Yogananda, *God Talks With Arjuna: The Bhagavad Gita*. Yogoda Satsanga Society of India, 2011.
ISBN: 978-81-89535-00-1.
- PY(2).** Paramahansa Yogananda, *The Divine Romance, Volume II*. Yogoda Satsanga Society of India, Fourth Impression: 2011.
ISBN: 978-81-89535-05-6.
- RD.** Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*. Black Swan, 2007.
ISBN: 978-0-552-77429-1.
- RN.** Ramendra Nath, *Why I Am Not a Hindu*. Bihar Rationalist Society (Bihar Buddhivadi Samaj), 1993; accessed via [infidels.org](#).

- RP.** Ramananda Prasad, *The Bhagavad-Gītā (The Song of God)*. Motilal Banarsidass, 2010.
ISBN: 978-81-208-1390-8.
- RR.** Ranganath R, [*Bhagavad Gita – Another critical perspective to consider adding to its armory of refutation*](#). Nirmukta, January 24, 2012.
- SA.** Sri Aurobindo, *The Bhagavad Gita*. Sri Aurobindo Divine Life Trust, Second Reprint: 2011.
ISBN: 81-86510-03-6.
- SC.** Swami Chinmayananda, *The Holy Geeta*. Central Chinmaya Mission Trust, May 2011.
ISBN: 978-81-7597-074-8.
- SM.** Stephen Mitchell, *Bhagavad Gita: A New Translation*. Three Rivers Press, New York, New York, 2000.
ISBN: 978-0-609-81034-7.
- SPCI.** Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood, *Bhagavad-Gita: The Song of God*. Signet Classics, July 2002.
ISBN: 978-0-451-52844-5.
- SR.** S. Radhakrishnan, *The Bhagavadgita*. HarperCollins Publishers India, 2010.
ISBN: 978-81-7223-898-8.
- SRJA.** Salman Rushdie, *Joseph Anton: A Memoir*. Vintage, 2013.
ISBN: 978-0-099-56344-0.
- TROP.** TheReligionofPeace.com, <http://www.thereligionofpeace.com/quran/023-violence.htm>
- WD.** Wendy Doniger, *On Hinduism*. Aleph Book Company, 2013.
ISBN: 978-93-82277-07-1.
- WDPH.** W. Douglas P. Hill, *The Bhagavadgītā*. OUP, 1973.
SBN: 19 560039 8.
- WJ.** W. J. Johnson, *The Bhagavad Gita*. Oxford World's Classics paperback 2004 (Reissued 2008).
ISBN: 978-0-19-953812-6.

References & Explanatory Notes

¹ Rama, according to the Ramayana (i. 18), is 50% Vishnu—Ref. **JMM.** (Pg. 111, 116).

² **AN.**—in his *Ravanayana*—has, however, presented a quite unconventional viewpoint, with *Ravana* as the hero.

³ E.g. **Chapter 10: verse 17, Chapter 11: verse 4, Chapter 11: verse 9, Chapter 18: verse 78.**

⁴ Ref. **Chapter 6: verse 46** (SR.): The yogin is greater than the ascetic; he is considered to be greater than the man of knowledge, greater than the man of ritual works, therefore do thou become a yogin, O Arjuna. **Chapter 2: verse 45** (WDPH.): The Vedas have three Strands for their province; free from the three Strands, Arjuna, be thou, free from the pairs, abiding in eternal truth, free from all gain and guardianship of wealth, and master of thy soul. **Chapter 2: verse 48** (SR.): Fixed in yoga, do thy work, O Winner of wealth (Arjuna), abandoning attachment, with an even mind in success and failure, for evenness of mind is called yoga. **Chapter 2: verse 61** (WDPH.): Holding all these in check let him sit, controlled, intent on me: for he whose senses are restrained possesses steadfast wisdom. **Chapter 14: verses 24–25** (WDPH.): He to whom pain and pleasure are alike, reliant on himself, holding earth, stones, and gold as equal, holding in level scales things dear and things not dear, a man of wisdom, to whom blame and praise are one; He who holds honour and dishonour equal, equal the friendly party and the foe, abandoning every enterprise—that man is said to have crossed beyond the Strands. **Chapter 6: verse 3** (SR.): Work is said to be the means of the sage who wishes to attain to yoga; when he has attained to yoga, serenity is said to be the means. **Chapter 6: verse 10** (SR.): Let the yogin try constantly to concentrate his mind (on the Supreme Self) remaining in solitude and alone, self-controlled, free from desires and (longing for) possessions.

{Karma-yoga is mere practice to attain to yoga; “the true yoga”—as **SR.** rightly calls it—is Dhyana-yoga, for—quite logically—**without desire, there cannot be any Karma** (or work). In other words, **there is absolutely no reason for someone to do something if they have absolutely no desire related to it.** In a different perspective (or in a more fundamental or theoretical sense), Dhyana-yoga is in fact *a kind of* Karma-yoga. When a Karma-yogi Kṣatriya, for example, has learnt to kill (or to get rid of) all of his desires pertaining to a Kṣatriya, he is no longer a Kṣatriya; the nature of his Duty (or Karma), according to his changed nature (or *svabhāva*), has changed. Other than the work alone the body needs—presuming he would have “desire” to maintain his body—, he would do no work. He, in a practical (or specific) sense, would now be a Dhyana-yogi. If he still thinks that he should do the work/s of a Kṣatriya—maybe because the society of good men he thinks needs his protection—he, that means, has simply not become a true yogi yet, for he is yet to surpass worldly desire/s. The reason Arjuna finally decides to fight the war pretty much lies in **18:59–60** (WJ.): (Krishna says to Arjuna) If, falling into such egoism, you suppose you will not fight, your resolution is quite pointless: your material nature will constrain you. Bound by your own activity, which springs from your own nature, ineluctably, Son of Kunti, you will do precisely what, in your delusion you try to avoid. In **18:73** (WJ.), however, Arjuna says: My delusion has been obliterated, and through your grace,

Achyuta, I have remembered myself. I stand, my doubt dispelled. I shall do as you say. This verse is to be taken to mean that Arjuna's delusion has not been *completely* obliterated; his (Kṣatriya) nature, per **18:59–60**, has not fully changed; and thus **he should fight the war, as a Karma-yogi, only in order to simply learn to get rid of material (or worldly) attachments, to surpass his (Kṣatriya) nature born of *raja guna*, to climb to higher (or true) yoga, which is his true or only duty (or Dharma).** **2:45** (AP.) is perhaps pretty relevant: The Vedas deal with the three *guṇas* (attributes). Be thou free, O Arjuna, from the three *guṇas*, free from the pairs of opposites, remain ever in *sattva* (purity), free from acquisition and preservation and established in the Self. [AP.'s use of the term "*sattva* (purity)" is however not very accurate; please consult WDPH (2:45); he more accurately uses the term "eternal truth".] **18:40** (AP.) is however almost contradictory to **2:45**: There is no being on earth nor even in heaven among the gods who is free from these three *guṇas* qualities born of *prakṛti* matter. **SA.** (Pg. xxi–xxii) says, 'it is a mistake to interpret the Gita from the standpoint of the mentality of today and force it to teach us the disinterested performance of duty as the highest and all-sufficient law.... The Gita does not teach the disinterested performance of duties but the following of the divine life, the abandonment of all Dharmas, *sarvadharmān*, to take refuge in the Supreme alone..' **AB.** (Pg. xi–xii) is thus pretty wrong in saying, 'It [the Gītā] is meant to lift the aspirant from the lower levels of renunciation, where objects are renounced, to the loftier heights where desires are dead, and where the Yogī dwells in calm and ceaseless contemplation, while his body and mind are actively employed in discharging the duties that fall to his lot in life. That the spiritual man need not be a recluse, that union with the divine Life may be achieved and maintained in the midst of worldly affairs, that the obstacles to that union lie not outside us but within us—such is the central lesson of the Bhagavad-Gītā.' **KK.** (Pg. 38) says, 'In more recent times, *karma* and *karma yoga* have again been endorsed. Religious nationalists like Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi recommended *karma yoga* in India's struggle for self-rule and as a path of self-realization for busy, modern Hindus.' Ironically, Tilak and Gandhi themselves, it appears, were not karma-yogis, for just like any other freedom fighters, they always, it seems, *wanted* their country to gain prosperity and independence. In other words, it seems they never even attempted to get rid of that particular *want* (or to be indifferent to their country's state of being); and that, I think, is because they, like many others including KK. herself, did not in the first place know the very basic meaning of yoga itself. **GPG.** (Pg. 3) seems to say quite absurdly, 'Among all scriptural writings of the world, Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā occupies a unique place. As a matter of fact, it is the only book which can be called secular in the real sense of the term. It is a practical philosophy of living an ideal social life...'} }

⁵ Ref. **Chapter 2: verse 2** (SR.): Whence has come to thee this stain (this dejection) of spirit in this hour of crisis? It is unknown to men of noble mind (not cherished by the Aryans); it does not lead to heaven; (on earth) it causes disgrace, O Arjuna. **Chapter 2: verses 32–37** (WDPH.): Happy the Kṣatriyas, O son of Prīthā, who find a fight like this, that comes without their seeking! It is heaven's gate thrown wide! But if thou wilt not wage this war, as duty bids, then wilt thou cast aside thy duty and thine honour, and gather to thee guilt. Yea, and the world will tell of thine imperishable dishonor: and for a knight of fame dishonour is worse than death. 'Tis fear has held thee from the battle—so will the lords of great cars think; and where thou hast been

highly honoured thou wilt come to light esteem. And many words ill to speak will they speak who wish thee hurt, and mock thy prowess. What can cause greater pain than this? Slain, thou shalt win heaven; victorious, thou shalt enjoy the earth; therefore arise, O son of Kuntī, with no uncertain spirit for the fight! **Chapter 11: verse 33** (WDPH.): Therefore arise, win glory, defeat thy foes, enjoy wide sovereignty! I have already slain these men; be thou no more than a means, left-handed bowman!

{It is almost funny how purely **2:32–37** are contradicted by **2:38**! [**2:38** (WDPH.): Hold equal pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat; then gird thyself for the battle; thus shalt thou not gather to thee guilt.]}

⁶ Ref. **Chapter 8: verse 15** (FE.): Having come to Me, rebirth, Which is the home of misery and impermanent, Do not attain the great-souled men That have gone to supreme perfection. **Chapter 9: verse 33** (SR.): How much more then, holy Brahmins and devoted royal saints; Having entered this impermanent sorrowful world, do thou worship Me. **Chapter 5: verse 22** (FE.): For the enjoyments that spring from (outside) contacts Are nothing but sources of misery; They have beginning and end, son of Kuntī; The wise man takes no delight in them.

⁷ Ref. **Chapter 9: verses 7–8** (FE.): All beings, son of Kuntī, Pass into My material nature At the end of a world-eon; them again I send forth at the beginning of a (new) world-eon. Taking as base My own material-nature I send forth again and again This whole host of beings, Which is powerless, by the power of (My) material nature. **Chapter 14: verses 3–4** (WDPH.): For me the Great Brahman is a womb; therein I lay the germ; thence comes the birth of every being, Bhārata. Whatever forms take birth in any womb, O son of Kuntī, of these the Great Brahman is the womb, and I the Father that gives the seed.

{Citing **9:7–8** & **14:3–4**, as references, is apparently contradicted by **4:14**. [**4:14** (WDPH.): Works do not stain me, nor in me is there longing for fruit of works; who recognizes this to be my state, he is not bound by works.] However, the appearance of the contradiction vanishes when the falsity in **4:14** becomes apparent: that **without any longing for fruit of works a creator would not do work that creates a creation**. The same would be true about **9:9**. [**9:9** (SR.): Nor do these works bind Me, O winner of wealth (Arjuna), for I am seated as if indifferent, unattached in those actions.] **Why would he at all create a creation—Vyakta Prakriti—if he, to that work, is unattached and indifferent?** Similarly, in **3:22** (WDPH.), Krishna says, ‘For me, O son of Prīthā, is no work at all in the three worlds that I must do; nor aught ungained that I must gain; yet I abide in work.’ In **3:23–24** (WDPH.), he says, ‘For if I were not, tireless, to abide ever in work—my path men follow altogether, son of Prīthā—Did I not work my work, these worlds would fall in ruin, and I should be the worker of confusion, and should destroy these creatures.’ **3:23–24**, however, contradict **3:22** in that in the former Krishna makes it almost explicit and clear that there is something that he must do; that there is a desire in him, the desire that the three worlds should not fall in ruin, that the creatures should not be destroyed. **AP.**, like **SPCI**. (Pg. 157–159), seems to argue that the creation of the manifested world (Vyakta Prakriti) is not a deliberate process born of desire but a mere automated or necessary process. He (Pg. 555), in the commentary on **9:8**, says, ‘Manifold beings emanate repeatedly in the world. *Brahman* (Kṛṣṇa) declares Itself as the source of emanation. This phenomenon

resembles the emanation of waves in the ocean. A bucket of water produces no waves in it. Nor does a pond of water. But the ocean of water automatically produces waves. That is the nature (*prakṛti*) of the ocean. Waves arise naturally from the ocean. The ocean can rightly declare that the waves emanate from it helplessly over and over again. So does Brahman declare that beings emanate from It endlessly. Brahman’s inherent nature (*prakṛti*) is to produce them.’ The absurdity in the analogy is however almost evident, since it is not the nature of the ocean to produce waves, but it is usually “wind” that causes them. In other words, it is *not necessary* for the ocean to produce waves. In even other words, it is not the inherent nature of the ocean to produce waves; something external, something *that is not the ocean* is required for the production (or emanation) of waves. AP. further says, ‘Imagine a rope being mistaken for a snake. The snake arising from a rope is an illusion. The illusion is a misapprehension of the rope. The ‘misapprehension’ arises because of the ‘non-apprehension’ of the rope. When you do not apprehend the rope as a rope, the non-apprehension of the rope becomes the cause for creating several misapprehensions out of it. You could mistake the rope for a snake or any other creature. The rope can declare that the potential for non-apprehension lies in it. As long as a rope exists one may not apprehend it as a rope. The potential for non-apprehension lies in the rope itself. The moment the rope is not apprehended, such non-apprehension becomes a source of misapprehensions. This potential of non-apprehension inherent in the rope is considered its nature (*prakṛti*). Like the snake projected on a rope, the deluded project this illusory world upon the Reality, *Brahman*. Just as one does not apprehend a rope, people do not apprehend *Brahman*. Thus, the possibility of non-apprehension of *Brahman* lies in *Brahman* Itself. Hence, *Brahman* declares non-apprehension, referred to as *prakṛti*, as Its own nature. The non-apprehension of *Brahman* produces several misapprehensions. The kaleidoscopic patterns of beings appearing in the world are mere misapprehensions of *Brahman*. These illusory projections will last as long as you do not apprehend *Brahman*. But the moment you apprehend *Brahman*, all misapprehensions disappear, the worlds vanish.’ Again, the flaw in the analogy becomes evident when it is understood that it does not appear to be necessary for the manifested world (Vyakta Prakriti)—whose existence necessitates the existence of the state of delusion (or non-apprehension or misapprehension)—to at all actually exist, even though the potential (or the possibility) may ever exist. The existence of the manifested world seems to be an act of deliberate creation per **9:7–8** & **14:3–4**. If it is not an act of deliberate creation, however, then God (i.e. Krishna) would be reduced to some sort of a mere helpless machine lacking any freewill.}

⁸ Ref. **Chapter 13: verse 22** (FE.): The onlooker and consentor, The supporter, experience, great Lord, The supreme soul also is declared to be The highest spirit, in this body. **Chapter 15: verses 17–18** (FE.): But there is a highest spirit, other (than this), Called the Supreme Soul; Which, entering into the three worlds, Supports them, the undying Lord. Since I transcend the perishable, And am higher than the imperishable too, Therefore in the world and the Veda I am Proclaimed as the highest spirit.

⁹ Ref. **Chapter 2: verse 55** (FE.): When he abandons desires, All that are in the mind, son of Pṛthā, Finding contentment by himself in the self alone, Then he is called of stabilized

mentality. **Chapter 6: verse 18** (SR.): When the disciplined mind is established in the Self alone, liberated from all desires, then is he said to be harmonized (in yoga).

¹⁰ **RR.** says, ‘Anyone who makes a comparative study of the current state verses of the Gita, devoid of religious blinkers, will find the character of Krishna coming across as very cynical, evasive, inconsistent, shifting philosophical stances according to convenience, mixing ideas of differing schools of thought at will (Sankhya, Yoga, Vedanta) without any care or regard for their cogency and coherence. How such an opportunistic and willful entity (seen together with his role in the Mahabharata) be passed off as a God and that too raised to the towering heights of religious and devotional frenzy, may forever remain one of the greatest enigmas of Hindu culture.’

¹¹ Ref. **Chapter 3: verse 27** (SR.): While all kinds of work are done by the modes of nature, he whose soul is bewildered by the self-sense thinks ‘I am the doer’. **Chapter 13: verse 29** (SR.): He who sees that all actions are done only by nature (prakṛti) and likewise that the self is not the doer, he verily sees. **Chapter 3: verse 5** (SR.): For no one can remain even for a moment without doing work; every one is made to act helplessly by the impulses born of nature. **Chapter 3: verse 33** (WDPH.): As is a man’s own nature, so he acts, even a man of knowledge; all creatures follow Nature; what will restraint effect? **Chapter 9: verse 10** (SR.): Under My guidance, nature (prakṛti) gives birth to all things, moving and unmoving and by this means, O Son of Kuntī (Arjuna), the world revolves. **Chapter 18: verse 61** (FE.): Of all beings, the Lord In the heart abides, Arjuna, Causing all beings to turn around (As if) fixed in a machine, by his magic power. **Chapter 15: verse 15** (WDPH.): And I am seated in the heart of all; from me are memory, knowledge, and removal of doubt; by all the Vedas am I to be known; and I am he who made the Vedas’ Ends, and know the Vedas. **Chapter 10: verses 4–5** (WDPH.): Discernment, knowledge, freedom from delusion, long-suffering, truth, restraint, tranquillity, pleasure and pain, existence, non-existence, fear and fearlessness, Harmlessness, an even mind, contentment, austerity, beneficence, fame, and infamy—such are the states of beings, severally dispensed by me alone. **Chapter 7: verse 12** (WDPH.): Know that those states of Purity, of Energy, and of Darkness are from me alone; but I am not in them; they are in me. **Chapter 13: verses 21–22** (WDPH.): For the Person, abiding in Nature, experiences the Strands born of Nature; his attachment to the Strands is the cause of his birth in good or evil wombs. The Supreme Person in this body is called the spectator, the approver, the sustainer, the experiencer, Great Lord, and also Highest Self.

[WDPH. (pg. 48) says, ‘Freedom, in the Gītā, is an illusory liberty of choice, working within the bounds of an ultimate determinism’. **GD.**, however, like quite a few others not mentioned in this work, seems to (wrongly) believe in human freewill in the Gita. He (Pg. 208) says, ‘I believe that the problem of evil exists only if one believes that God is all-powerful and benign. This may not hold true in the *Mahabharata*. Krishna seems to be suggesting that all of life is subject to the law of karma. A person is free to act, but once the deed is done, no one can stop its relentless consequences. Even God cannot interfere.’ **EE.** (Pg. 67) too wrongly says, ‘the Gita places human destiny entirely in human hands. Its world is not deterministic, but neither is it an expression of blind chance: we shape ourselves and our world by what we believe and think

and act on, whether for good or for ill. In this sense the Gita opens not on Kurukshetra but on *dharmakshetra*, the field of dharma, where Arjuna and Krishna are standing for us all.' **DP.** (Pg. 181) seems to be mistaken too. He says, 'Krishna does not fight in this war. He serves only as charioteer and guide. He can only encourage; action is left to the Pandavas. It is their battle, their action, their decision.' And so does **PY(2).** He (Pg. 306–07) says, 'you are born with about seventy-five percent of your life predetermined by you past. You will make up the remaining twenty-five percent. If you yourself, through your own free choice and effort of will, do not determine what that twenty-five percent will be, the seventy-five percent will make the twenty-five percent for you, and you will become a puppet. That is, you will be ruled absolutely by your past, by the influence and effects of your past tendencies.' **KK.** (Pg. 39) says, 'It is easy to be fatalistic about this state of affairs, and many Hindu teachers, following Krishna's example in the *Bhagavad-gita*, have offered spiritual recipes for tackling it. Arvind Sharma's contemporary solution goes as follows. To think fatalistically about *karma* is unhelpful when, in fact, as human beings we have the power at any moment to change our own behaviour, and thus its consequences for our future. Free will rather than fatalism characterizes the operation of *karma*.' It well might be *free will* that characterizes *karma*, but it is not *human free will* but *the divine one*, for the former does not seem to exist according to the Gita.]

The Quranic verses with parallel meaning: NJD. (Pg. 59): *God has sovereignty over the heavens and the earth. God has power over all things.* **NJD.** (Pg. 12): *Indeed, if God pleased, He could take away their hearing and their sight: God has power over all things.* **NJD.** (Pg. 78): *God has knowledge of all things.*

[*The meaning is perhaps not so parallel in this particular case though, since these verses do not necessarily indicate ultimate determinism.*]

¹² Ref. **Chapter 7: verse 15** (WDPH.): Not in me take refuge evildoers, fools, lowest of men; bereft of knowledge by delusion, turned to Devilish estate. **Chapter 7: verse 25** (WDPH.): Veiled by my power of delusion, I am not light to all; deluded is this world, and does not recognize me as unborn, immutable. **Chapter 9, verse 12** (WDPH.): Vain of hope are they, vain of work, vain of knowledge, void of wit; they enter the delusive nature of Monsters and of Devils. **Chapter 16: verses 19–20** (SR.): These cruel haters, worst of men, I hurl constantly these evil-doers only into the wombs of demons in (this cycle of) births and deaths. Fallen into the wombs of demons, these deluded beings from birth to birth, do not attain to Me, O Son of Kuntī (Arjuna), but go down to the lowest state.

[In **4:36** (SR.), Krishna (contradictorily) says, 'Even if thou shouldst be the most sinful of all sinners, thou shalt cross over all evil by the boat of wisdom alone'. In **9:30–31** (SR.), he similarly says, 'Even if a man of the most vile conduct worships me with undistracted devotion, he must be reckoned as righteous for he has rightly resolved. Swiftly does he become a soul of righteousness and obtain lasting peace. O son of Kuntī (Arjuna), know thou for certain that My devotee perishes never'. Well, does Krishna at all give them any chance?]

The Quranic verses: NJD. (Pg. 11–12): *As for the unbelievers, it is the same whether or not you forewarn them; they will not have faith. God has set a seal upon their hearts and ears; their sight is dimmed and grievous punishment awaits them.... There is a sickness in their hearts which God has aggravated: they shall be sternly punished for the lies they ever told.... God will*

mock them and keep them long in sin, ever straying from the right path.... They are like one who kindled a fire, but as soon as it lit up all around him God put it out and left him in darkness: they do not see. Deaf, dumb, and blind, they will never return to the right path. **NJD.** (Pg. 38): As for the unbelievers, their patrons are false gods, who lead them from light to darkness. They are the heirs of the Fire and shall abide in it for ever.... God does not guide the evil-doers. **NJD.** (Pg. 39): God does not guide the unbelievers. **NJD.** (Pg. 76): It is God who has sealed their hearts, on account of their unbelief. They have no faith, except a few of them. **NJD.** (Pg. 195): God will not guide those who disbelieve God's revelations. Woeful punishment awaits them.... God does not guide the unbelievers. Such are those whose hearts and ears and eyes are sealed by God; such are the heedless. In the life to come they will surely be the losers. **NJD.** (Pg. 75): The hypocrites shall be cast into the lowest depths of the Fire: there shall be none to help them. **NJD.** (Pg. 77): God will not forgive those who disbelieve and act unjustly; nor will He guide them to any path other than the path of Hell, wherein they shall abide for ever. Surely that is easy enough for God. **NJD.** (Pg. 75): Those who accept the Faith and then renounce it, who again embrace it and again deny it and grow in unbelief – God will neither forgive them nor will rightly guide them.... God will surely gather in Hell the hypocrites and the unbelievers all.... The hypocrites seek to deceive God, but it is He who deceives them.... You cannot guide the man whom God has confounded.

[NJD. (Pg. 83): Those that make war against God and His apostle and spread disorder in the land shall be slain or crucified or have their hands and feet cut off on alternate sides, or be banished from the land. They shall be held up to shame in this world and sternly punished in the hereafter: except those that repent before you reduce them. For you must know that God is forgiving and merciful.... But whoever repents after committing evil, and mends his ways, shall be pardoned by God. God is forgiving and merciful. **NJD.** (Pg. 129): Tell the unbelievers that if they mend their ways their past shall be forgiven...]

¹³ Ref. **Chapter 4: verse 8** (FE.): For protection of the good, And for destruction of evil-doers, To make a firm footing for the right, I come into being in age after age.

The Quranic verses: **NJD.** (Pg. 54): If you have suffered a defeat, so did the enemy. We alternate these vicissitudes among mankind so that God may know the true believers and choose martyrs from among you (God does not love the evil-doers); and that God may test the faithful and annihilate the infidels.

¹⁴ **FE.** (Vol. 2; Pg. 91) rightly says that the Gītā makes no attempt to be logical or systematic in its philosophy. **GT.** (Pg. xlvii) says that the text [the Gītā] contains so many apparent layers and internal contradictions. **RR.** says, 'I was struck by the following inconsistencies that were fairly predominant in the scripture [the Gita]: Repetitiveness and redundancy of many of its verses; Contradictions in many of its verses, with some verses in the same chapter contradicting each other and verses in one chapter being negated by verses in another chapter; Lack of coherence of narrative between the verses in a chapter, verses disconnected from or having no relation to the primary idea of a chapter; Lack of orderliness in the sequencing of chapters, where one gets a feeling that the current Chapter IV should have come before Chapter III; Inclusion of verses that are repugnant to human values even going by old primitive standards (verses 9.11, 9.32

and 9.33).’ **MD.** (Pg. 80) says, ‘It is my argument that the Gita as it finally came to us is the result of many additions to what could have been a small original fragment, if there was one at all.’ **MD.** (Pg. 132) also says, ‘a) There are probably multiple authors of the Gita as shown by stylistic changes and the frequent shift of subject matter; b) There was probably an original short, sharp lesson for Arjuna by Krishna assuming that these were historical characters as described in the Mahabharata’. **WJ.** (Pg. x) says, ‘The *Mahabharata*, the great Epic which provides the *Gita* with its literary context, has no single author (if one discounts the mythical Vyasa). It belongs to an oral tradition that may have its origins in the eighth or ninth century BCE. Succeeding generations of reciter-poets added to, expanded on, and elaborated the basic material, which tells of a cataclysmic war between two branches of the same family and their followers. Like a snowball, the epic picked up and incorporated all the important religious, philosophical, and social changes through which it passed, often juxtaposing layers with little or no attempt at reconciliation. Nevertheless, certain themes, because they had come to preoccupy Indian religion and culture generally, began to dominate its ‘poetical history’: the question of what constitutes Dharma or the Law (the way things really are and therefore the way they should be), how men and women can acquire knowledge of that truth, and how they should act in relation to it.’ **BD.** (Pg. xii–xiii) says, ‘There is no reason to presume that the *Gita* had a single author. The *Gita* is a text that synthesizes and incorporates many teachings of the *Upanishads*. In fact, many *shlokas* from the *Upanishads* are found in the *Gita*, with minor changes. Attempts have been made to detect internal inconsistencies across parts that represent *bhakti* or theism and parts that draw on Vedanta and are pantheistic. Or between parts that draw on Vedanta and others that draw on *sankhya* philosophy. However, these attempts are not terribly convincing. And there are also some *shlokas* that are clearly old, because they follow grammatical norms that would later have been regarded as not quite correct.’ **JM.** (Pg. 23), however, says, ‘Scholars differ as to the date of the *Bhagavad Gita*; but as the roots of this great poem are in Eternity the date of its revelation in time is of little spiritual importance. As there are no references to Buddhism in the *Gita* and there are a few archaic words and expressions, some of the greatest scholars have considered it pre-Buddhistic, i.e. about 500 B.C. The Sanskrit of the *Bhagavad Gita* is, on the whole, simple and clear, like the oldest parts of the *Mahabharata*. This could be added as an argument for an early date; but the value of a spiritual scripture is its value to us here and now, and the real problem is how to translate its light into life.’ **SM.** (Pg. 29–30), with apparent wisdom, says, ‘The most profound sacred texts have a way of self-destructing. They undermine their own authority and gleefully hoist themselves with their own petard. Because they don’t confuse what they are with what they are about, they encourage us to see them as, in the end, disposable.... We need to take these sacred texts with ultimate seriousness. But the tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao. If we take them too seriously, they become obstacles rather than means of liberation.’ **JRDL.** (Pg. xxii) seems to be clearly mistaken in saying ‘It is marvellous that with this variety of stratification, the Unity of the GITA should be so perfect. It is no less wonderful, that ancient as it is, and touching as it does on a great range of subjects, there is in it no discoverable error – be it cosmological or other.’

CH. (Pg. 133) says, ‘As might be expected, it [Islam] contains many internal contradictions. It is often cited as saying that “there is no compulsion in religion,” and as making reassuring noises about those of other faiths being peoples “of the book” or “followers of an earlier revelation.”’

PS. says, ‘By far the majority of Muslims today live their lives without recourse to violence, for the Koran is like a pick-and-mix selection. If you want peace, you can find peaceable verses. If you want war, you can find bellicose verses. You can find verses which permit only defensive jihad, or you can find verses to justify offensive jihad.’

¹⁵ Ref. **Chapter 5: verse 29** (WDPH.): Knowing that it is I whom sacrifice and austerity affect, great Lord of all the worlds, the friend of every being, he reaches peace. In **Chapter 9: verse 29** (SR.), Krishna again contradictorily says, ‘I am the same in (alike to) all beings. None is hateful nor dear to Me. But those who worship Me with devotion they are in Me and I also in them.’

The Quranic verses: NJD. (Pg. 39, 40): God is munificent and all-knowing. **NJD.** (Pg. 71): Surely God is forgiving and merciful. **NJD.** (Pg. 76): God is forgiving and all-powerful. **NJD.** (Pg. 74): God is munificent and wise.

DS. says, ‘Had the God of the Quran been the Lord of all creatures, and been Merciful and kind to all, he would never have commanded the Mohammedans to slaughter men of other faiths, and animals, etc. If he is Merciful, will he show mercy even to the sinners? If the answer be given in the affirmative, it cannot be true, because further on it is said in the Quran “Put infidels to sword,” in other words, he that does not believe in the Quran and the Prophet Mohammad is an infidel (he should, therefore, be put to death). (Since the Quran sanctions such cruelty to non-Mohammedans and innocent creatures such as cows) it can never be the Word of God.’

¹⁶ Ref. **Chapter 9: verse 32** (SR.): For those who take refuge in Me, O Pārtha (Arjuna), though they are lowly born, women, Vaiśyas, as well as Sudras, they also attain to the highest goal.

¹⁷ Ref. **Chapter 9: verse 33** (FE.): How much more virtuous brahmans, And devout royal seers, too! A fleeting and joyless world This; having attained it, devote thyself to Me.

¹⁸ **SM.** (Pg. 35) says, ‘The poet of the Gita, on the other hand, was writing mostly for priests (brahmans) and warriors; according to his cultural preconceptions, rebirth as a woman is a stroke of rotten karma, which can indeed be overcome, but only with wholehearted devotion. (The literal meaning of 9.32 is “Those who take refuge in me, Arjuna, / even if they are born in evil wombs / as women or laborers or servants, / also reach the supreme goal.”)’

The Quranic verses: NJD. (Pg. 33): Women are your fields: go, then, into your fields whence you please.

¹⁹ Ref. **Chapter 18: verses 47–48** (WDPH.): Better a man’s own duty, though ill-done, than another’s duty well-performed; if a man do the duty his own nature bids him, he incurs no stain. One’s innate duty, son of Kuntī, should one not abandon, imperfect though it be; for every enterprise in imperfection is involved, as fire in smoke.

²⁰ [Ref. **Chapter 16: verses 6–9** (WDPH.): There are two orders of created beings in this world, the Divine and the Devilish; the Divine order has been described at length; of the Devilish, O son of Prithā, hear from me. Neither action nor inaction do Devilish men know; cleanness is not in them; nor even right conduct nor truth. ‘Without truth, without basis, is the universe,’ they say, ‘and without Lord; born of mutual union, caused by lust—naught else!’ Holding this view, lost souls of feeble judgement, they come forth with cruel deeds as enemies to destroy the world.]

Now, as we have seen previously, according to **4:8** (FE.), for protection of the good, and for destruction of evil-doers, to make a firm footing for the right, Krishna comes into being in age after age. Thus, this is how Krishna has threatened, with death, the atheists, i.e. the ones who say that the universe is without Lord, the ones who, according to him, come forth with cruel deeds as enemies to destroy the world. Further, Krishna, in **9:11** (WDPH.) says, ‘Fools scorn me when I dwell in human form: my higher being they know not as Great Lord of beings.’ In **9:12** (FE.), he says, ‘They are of vain aspirations, of vain actions, Of vain knowledge, bereft of insight; In ogrish and demoniac Nature, which is delusive, they abide.’ In **9:13** (SR.), he says, ‘The great-souled, O Pārtha(Arjuna), who abide in the divine nature, knowing (me as) the imperishable source of all beings, worship Me with an undistracted mind.’ Thus are threatened with death the remaining ones, i.e. Christians, Muslims, Jews, etc., who do not believe in Krishna, who he would consider to be of demoniac nature, the evil-doers, and per **4:8**, would be annihilated age after age!

The Quranic verses: NJD. (Pg. 129): *Make war on them [the unbelievers] until idolatry shall cease and God’s religion shall reign supreme. NJD.* (Pg. 133): *When the sacred months are over slay the idolaters wherever you find them. Arrest them, besiege them, and lie in ambush everywhere for them. NJD.* (Pg. 131): *Let not the unbelievers think that they will ever get away. They have not the power so to do. Muster against them all the men and cavalry at your command, so that you may strike terror into the enemy of God and your enemy, and others besides them who are unknown to you but known to God. NJD.* (Pg. 127): *God revealed His will to the angels, saying: ‘I shall be with you. Give courage to the believers. I shall cast terror into the hearts of the infidels. Strike off their heads, strike off the very tips of their fingers!’*

TROP. says, *‘The Quran contains at least 109 verses that call Muslims to war with nonbelievers for the sake of Islamic rule. Some are quite graphic, with commands to chop off heads and fingers and kill infidels wherever they may be hiding. Muslims who do not join the fight are called ‘hypocrites’ and warned that Allah will send them to Hell if they do not join the slaughter. Unlike nearly all of the Old Testament verses of violence, the verses of violence in the Quran are mostly open-ended, meaning that they are not restrained by the historical context of the surrounding text. They are part of the eternal, unchanging word of Allah, and just as relevant or subjective as anything else in the Quran.’ PS.* says, *‘So the mantra ‘Islam is peace’ is almost 1,400 years out of date. It was only for about 13 years that Islam was peace and nothing but peace. From 622 onwards it became increasingly aggressive, albeit with periods of peaceful co-existence, particularly in the colonial period, when the theology of war was not dominant. For today’s radical Muslims — just as for the mediaeval jurists who developed classical Islam — it would be truer to say ‘Islam is war’. One of the most radical Islamic groups in Britain, al-Ghurabaa, stated in the wake of the two London bombings, ‘Any Muslim that denies that terror*

is a part of Islam is kafir.' A kafir is an unbeliever (i.e., a non-Muslim), a term of gross insult. In the words of Munder Badr Haloum, a liberal Muslim who lectures at a Syrian university, 'Ignominious terrorism exists, and one cannot but acknowledge its being Islamic.' While many individual Muslims choose to live their personal lives only by the (now abrogated) peaceable verses of the Koran, it is vain to deny the pro-war and pro-terrorism doctrines within their religion.' **RD.** (Pg. 58) says, 'Several centuries later, Muhammad and his followers reverted to the uncompromising monotheism of the Jewish original, but not its exclusiveness, and founded Islam upon a new holy book, the Koran or Qur'an, adding a powerful ideology of military conquest to spread the faith. Christianity, too, was spread by the sword, wielded first by Roman hands after the Emperor Constantine raised it from eccentric cult to official religion, then by the Crusaders, and later by the conquistadores and other European invaders and colonists, with missionary accompaniment.' **[PSI.,** however, says, 'Mohammedanism conquered the fairest portions of the earth by the sword and cursed them by polygamy, slavery, despotism and desolation. The moving power of Christian missions was love to God and man; the moving power of Islâm was fanaticism and brute force.' **BR.,** though, popularly says, 'I say quite deliberately that the Christian religion, as organized in its churches, has been and still is the principal enemy of moral progress in the world.')

My point is that although the Gita may not seem to be as directly and explicitly terroristic as the Quran, terrorism is equally inherent in the Gita and the Gita can be fairly interpreted as a book of terrorism.

²¹ This, of course, does not mean that anyone who preaches the Bhagavad-gita is necessarily a terrorist (or an accomplice of a terrorist), for they may be completely unaware of the terroristic message hidden in the Gita. If addressing Krishna as satanic (or evil or a terrorist) and the Gita as terrorism however offends anybody or hurts anyone's sentiments or feelings, then I would like to say that addressing cigarette smoking, for example, as bad or dangerous or evil may in the same way hurt some cigarette lover's feelings; and it—i.e. addressing cigarette smoking as such—is nevertheless found legally and socially acceptable and is justified if the addresser could be presumed to have no ultimate intentions to hurt anyone's feelings.

²² **JDS.** (Pg. xiii) says, 'Nowadays most Hindus would probably identify the *Bhagavadgītā* (the name is often shortened to just *Gītā*) as their most inspirational scripture...' **GP.** (Pg. vii) says, 'The Bhagavad Gita, the Song (Gita) of the Lord (Bhagavat), is the most famous Indian poem and scripture. To many Hindus it is their chief devotional book, and in modern times interest in its religious and philosophical teaching has spread across the world.' **BSM.** (Pg. 1) says, 'The *Bhagavad-Gita* has been the exemplary text of Hindu culture for centuries, both in India and in the West.' **CNB.** (Pg. 3) says, 'The Bhagavad-Gita, also termed as the Bible of the Hindus, has been an eternal source of inspiration for the people of India for centuries.' **BD.** (Pg. ix) says, 'If there is one text that captures the essence of Hinduism, it is the *Gita* or, more accurately, the *Bhagavad Gita*.' **PY.** (Pg. xvii) says, 'The Bhagavad Gita is the most beloved scripture of India, a scripture of scriptures. It is the Hindu's Holy Testament, or Bible, the one book that all masters depend upon as a supreme source of scriptural authority.' **SC.** (Pg. 1) says, 'This great handbook of practical living [the Geeta] marked a positive revolution in Hinduism and inaugurated a Hindu

renaissance for the ages that followed the *Puranic Era*.' **RP.** (Pg. xxii) says, 'The Lord Himself resides where Gītā is kept, read, chanted, or taught.' **LLP.** (Pg. xxx–xxxii) says, 'In America, Europe and Africa, too, the *Gita* has also had a powerful influence among Hindu diaspora communities, and is understood as a foundational guide for life. Most Hindu students in classrooms today have encountered the *Gita* at home. Many of the Hindu temples that decorate the diaspora landscape, especially in urban centres such as London, Atlanta, Pittsburgh and Birmingham, regularly hold classes on the *Gita*'s message for today. Many such temples also hold *Gita* recitation contests for young students.' She (Pg. xxxiii) further says, 'India and the *Gita* now occupy a place on the global technological and economic stage. 'Hindu' readers are not simply Indian readers, but also American, British, Kenyan, Trinidadian, Canadian and South American readers, just to name a few. Students within diaspora settings do not go about their lives with a Hindu culture around them; frequently, the *Gita* is one of their few vehicles for learning Hindu perspectives.' **CR.** (Pg. 9), however, says, 'It is a matter for great regret that the young men and women of our Universities know very much less about the *Gita* and the principles of Hindu religion than the undergraduates of European Universities know about the Bible and the principles of the Christian faith.'

²³ B. R. Ambedkar—who is widely hailed as *the father of the Indian Constitution*—had, it appears, strong views against the Gita. **NKG.** says, 'Ambedkar always felt that the Gita could never form the moral foundation of the nation. To him, the Gita espoused violence and the varna system. Instead he proposed Buddhism as the alternative to the Gita.' **NP.** says, 'According to Ambedkar the *Bhagwat Gita* is neither a book of religion nor a treatise on philosophy. What the *Bhagwat Gita* does is to defend certain dogmas of religion on philosophic grounds. It is a philosophic defence of the counter-revolution.' B. R. Ambedkar also seems to be known for publicly burning Manusmṛti. **DKJ.** says, 'Today is Christmas, 25th of December. It is celebrated all over the Christian world as the birth of Jesus Christ. But for the whole world of Dalits, it is an important day as "Manu Smṛti Dahan Din", as it was on this day in 1927 that Manusmṛti was publicly burned by Dr. Ambedkar, during the "Maha-Sangharsha" of Mahad Satyagraha, and is an important mile stone in Dalit struggle against Brahmanism. Let us all remember this day with pride.' In 1990, B. R. Ambedkar was posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna—India's highest civilian award. (Ref. [List of Recipients of Bharat Ratna](#), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.)

NA. says that the Bhagavad Gita is an overrated text with a deplorable morality at its core. **MD.** (Pg. 166) says, 'India's many problems need an all out effort on social, cultural and political levels by its citizens. Indians need to cultivate an ethics of equal respect for all human beings and mutual respect for all. We need to be concerned about the welfare of our neighbours and fellow citizens rather than just ourselves. We need to guard against philosophies, no matter what sources they may claim to emanate from, which guide us towards selfish and socially irresponsible behaviour. It may be time to read the Gita more critically than we have done hitherto.' On the back cover of the **MD.**'s book, the publisher says, 'In *Who Wrote the Bhagavadgita?*, economist and public intellectual Meghnad Desai offers a humanist critique of the Gita. Its message, he argues, is casteist and misogynist, addressing only men in the top two varnas and referring to women only in passing and then in scorn, and as such profoundly in

opposition to the spirit of modern India. Provocative and scholarly, this book challenges every popular notion of the Gita.’ **LLP.** (Pg. xxix) says, ‘During one period of resistance to colonial rule, anyone with more than one copy of the *Gita* in his possession was considered a terrorist against the state.’—though this is probably quite irrelevant to the essential argument of this work. **WD.** (Pg. 123) says, ‘he [Swami Vivekananda] believed that physical culture, of the European variety, was essential for Indian youth, and he is said to have held the view that one can get closer to god through football than through the *Bhagavad Gita*.’

RN.—about Hinduism, in general—says, ‘Slavery is not peculiar to India or to Hinduism, but carrying it to the extremes of untouchability, and granting it divine and religious sanction is peculiar to Hinduism. Similarly, some Hindus may be tolerant, just as some of them are intolerant, but Hinduism or Hindu religion is not tolerant at all, either socially or intellectually. Manusmriti, for example, clearly says that anybody who argues critically and logically about dharmashastras ought to be ostracized. Non-believers, including freethinkers, rationalists and Buddhists, are not to be entertained respectfully as guests; though, mercifully, they may be given food. The families of non-believers are destroyed sooner than later according to Manu. A state with a large number of Shudras and nastikas soon meets its destruction. Manusmriti is full of abusive epithets for freethinkers and non-believers. The unorthodox (nastikas) are sometimes equated with the Shudras, sometimes with the Chandalas, sometimes with thieves and sometimes with lunatics! Such is the generosity of Hindu dharma.’ **AN (2).** (Pg. 7)—about Mahabharata, in general—says, ‘...It made me rush home to revisit the *Mahabharata*, an epic that has inspired countless writers over the centuries. Once I started viewing the Kaurava Prince through the eyes of the villagers of Poruvazhy, a different picture of Duryodhana began to emerge – far removed from the scheming, roaring, arrogant villain of popular television serials and traditional retellings. Instead, here was a brutally honest Prince, brave and self-willed, willing to fight for what he believed in. Duryodhana never believed his Pandava cousins to be of divine origin; and to modern minds, their outlandish claim now sounds chillingly similar to present-day political propaganda used to fool a gullible public.’ **SRJA.** (Pg. 354)—about Hindu extremism—says, ‘In India, extremist Hindus destroyed one of the oldest mosques in India, the Babri Masjid at Ayodhya, built by the first Mughal emperor. The destroyers claimed that the mosque was built over the ruins of a Hindu temple marking the Ramjanmabhoomi, the birthplace of Lord Rama, the seventh avatar of Vishnu. Mayhem was not the prerogative of Islam alone. When he [i.e. Salman Rushdie himself] heard the news of the destruction of the Babri Masjid he was possessed by a complex grief. He was sad that religion had again revealed that its power for destruction far exceeded its power for good, that a series of unprovable propositions – that the modern Ayodhya was the same place as the Ayodhya of the Ramayana where Rama was king at an unknowable date in the remote past; that the alleged birthplace was the true birthplace; that gods and their avatars actually existed – had resulted in the vandalism of an actual and beautiful building whose misfortune was to have been constructed in a country that passed no strong laws to protect its heritage, and in which it was possible to ignore such laws as did exist if you were sufficiently numerous and claimed to be acting in the name of a god.’

²⁴ According to the monistic interpretation, the world is nothing but a dream of God. When a mortal living being, a man, for example, suffers, it is in fact God who, in his dream, suffers. When, at the same time, some other living being, some other man, for example, rejoices, it is in fact God who rejoices. I, Kedar Joshi, am thus nothing but one of the dreams God is having at present. And the Gita would ask me, i.e. the soul dwelling in Kedar Joshi's body—which, the body, is a miserable and ephemeral unreality—to get out of the dream, i.e. to understand its true nature, to know that it, the soul, is the same as the permanent reality called the Supersoul, i.e. God. And this knowledge or understanding is called self-realization. In that way, though the God in the Bhagavad Gita is responsible for causing unfathomable grief and suffering, he could not be held responsible for making anyone else suffer, since no one else in fact at all exists. And therefore the God in the Bhagavad Gita looks less like a Satan and more like a madman, for causing himself so much unhappiness for no rational reason. Let me explain it in a different way. Suppose you are having an experience of seeing a blue coloured thing and a red coloured thing simultaneously in your dream. According to the Bhagavad Gita, whatever experience any living being is having at any given time is in fact nothing but a part of what God is experiencing in his dream. In other words, one man having an experience of seeing a blue coloured thing and another man having an experience of seeing a red coloured thing at the same time in what is normally thought to be “reality” is actually nothing but God's experience of seeing a blue coloured thing and a red coloured thing simultaneously in his dream. The ephemeral world is thus nothing but God's dream. God creates a world just by deliberately going into a dream and destroys it by coming out of the dream. He then creates another world by going into another dream, and so on. God is therefore unlikely to be considered morally blemished or “satanic”, since each and every painful and evil experience that ever exists in reality is God's own experience alone, not of anyone else, as no one except God exists. **[It would have to be conceded though that if God were a yogi, there would be no pain, since no painful state/s of consciousness would ever exist. God is therefore blamable for letting the unfathomable pain exist.]** However, whether God, i.e. the God in the Gita, could be considered “sane” or “insane” in doing all this is probably a highly interesting and open question though. And it is very essential to understand that the God in the Bhagavad Gita is the non-spatial “Supersoul”, not any “spatial”—of or relating to space—entity such as Krishna or Vishnu. The Supersoul only imagines or thinks of itself as Vishnu in its dream state. Vishnu is thus not a reality but a mere part of the divine dream or illusion. The Supersoul is the only real thing that exists; and it has freewill, the mechanics of which appears to be inconceivable to mankind. Individual souls are nothing but mere states of consciousness that altogether constitute the Supersoul's dreaming experience.

²⁵ which, per **8:20–21** and **15:17–18** appears to be likely. **8:20–21** (SR.): But beyond this unmanifested, there is yet another Unmanifested Eternal Being who does not perish even when all existences perish. This Unmanifested is called the Imperishable. Him they speak of as the Supreme Status. Those who attain to Him return not. That is My supreme abode. [For **15:17–18**, please consult Note 8.]

{However, the meaning of these verses does not have to be literal; it could be metaphorical; and hence the terms “Brahman” and “Atman” may still be purely conceptual, meant merely as abstractions.}

²⁶ There is an (irrelevant) dualism which holds that Nature (or the material world) is an ontologically distinct reality. It is “irrelevant” because since Nature has no capacity to feel or to have any state/s of consciousness [it is the soul (or the Person) that in fact supposedly does (Ref. **13:20**)], whether it—the material world—is real or unreal is not pertaining to a criticism that criticizes “moral” foundations. This irrelevant dualism appears to be false too, for in **2:14–16** (WDPH.), Krishna says, ‘The touching of the world of sense, O son of Kuntī, which bring cold and heat, pleasure and pain—these come and go, impermanent; endure them, Bhārata. For he whom these do not disturb and to whom pain and pleasure are alike, that steadfast man, O prince of men, is fit for deathlessness. Of what is not there is no being, and no not-being of what is; and of these two is seen the boundary by seers of the truth.’

²⁷ In a broader and technically more accurate sense, Type A is in fact “pluralism”.

²⁸ **AC.** (Pg. 16), however, says, ‘It is also explained in the *Gītā* that impersonal Brahman is also subordinate to the complete Supreme Person (*brahmaṇo hi pratiṣṭhāham*). Brahman is more explicitly explained in the *Brahma-sūtra* to be like the rays of the sunshine. The impersonal Brahman is the shining rays of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Impersonal Brahman is incomplete realization of the absolute whole, and so also is the conception of Paramātmā. In the Fifteenth Chapter it shall be seen that the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Puruṣottama, is above both impersonal Brahman and the partial realization of Paramātmā.’ **CEW.** (Pg. xi) says, ‘Nonetheless, in their confusion some assert that *Bhagavad-gīta* teaches that the soul and God are one. In fact, throughout *Bhagavad-gīta* Krishna distinguishes the two but explains how the individual soul may choose to link with God in a loving relationship.’

²⁹ In **10:20** (FE.), Krishna says, ‘I am the soul, Guḍākeśa, That abides in the heart of all beings; I am the beginning and the middle Of beings, and the very end too.’ Krishna is thus not only supposed to be the Supersoul but the soul as well, which would apparently make this seeming dualism—which is in fact known as Vishishtadvaita (Ref. **EBV.**)—as immune to the last two criticisms as the monistic interpretation is. The appearance is however hollow, and the best analogy to explain it might be that of the human body (analogous to Krishna), where the brain could be held morally responsible if it consciously tortures any of the rest of the organs (analogous to the soul) for no good reason.

³⁰ For a metaphysical understanding of this statement, please consult Note 24, which attempts to describe the metaphysics of monism.