

The Message of the Punjab Series:- Book No. 1.

The Hindu-Muslim Unity

BY

AN UNKNOWN PUNJABI.

Can be had from:-

The Punjabi Darbar

LYALLPUR. (*Punjab*).

PRICE RE. 1/-



TO

MY AFFECTIONATE PARENTS AND
OTHER DEAR ONES WHOSE LOVE AND
GUIDANCE HAS EVER LED ME TRUE.



PREFACE.

The present book owes its origin to a lecture which I had to deliver before a class of undergraduates. The professor who was presiding over the meeting was a foreigner and was deeply interested in philosophic discussions. He listened to what I said and when he got up to give his own remarks he had the kindness to say that inspite of the fact that he had heard many speeches on the subject of Hindu-Muslim Unity he had learnt something new and decidedly much better that day. He said many things more to show his appreciation of what had been said there. Many of the students also came forward to tell me that the old theory was really the cause of communal discard and disunion. I was encouraged.

That done: and a couple of years have passed since then. All this while I have been trying to test the fallaciousness and the unpsychological plea of communal unity and the practical possibility of the national unity, which God willing, I shall discuss in a separate book. With that end in view I took, at different times, a number of my friends, many of whom were educated and had their own opinions about this problem also. But many of my friends were uneducated and as such, they cannot be said to have studied this problem as minutely as my educated friends had done. I took these gentlemen and without telling them what I was about, I tried, sometimes to advocate communal unity, using all the popular arguments: but sometimes I stood for national unity and observed the mental change which their thoughts exhibited and the physical change which their facial expressions and other gestures

manifested both when communal unity was being supported and when the national unity was the burning topic; and I was really pleased to note that with national unity as the source of inspiration there was greater manliness, greater self-reliance and more trustfulness and more broad-mindedness which these gentlemen showed. But when their minds were being stirred up by communal considerations, even though those considerations were for the sake of unity yet there was actual dwarfedness of their personalities which was evident as much from their facial expressions as from a psychological analysis of their thoughts, and while I was deeply touched by the lowering of their personalities I have always been pleased to notice that national considerations, far from taking away anything from Human Personality, really added a good deal more to it. The present book however is only meant to

f

purge the Indian Polity of the scourge of communalism showing its illogical argument, as well as, its un-psychological nature.

The sooner we set aside communal and other religious considerations from our politics the better. Religion or, as a matter of that communal considerations and Indian Polity are two different things which cannot be put together without endangering the national peace and prosperity.

DEC: 1929.

INTRODUCTION.

The most important, and the most momentous principle of the Indian polity is that of the unity of the two major communities of this land; nay, rather of all the many communities that we find here. For the sake of convenience only it has been called Hindu-Muslim Unity, otherwise in reality it applies to all the communities of India; and its importance can be fully realized from the fact that it has been called, by not a few of the Indian leaders, to be the "cure-all" for the many social and political ailments of our land: and rightly so. With unity in our possession India is one of the strongest powers in the world. But with this gone the millions and

millions of our people are no better than mere chaff which is carried away by wind from place to place. To gain the possession of this gem of the rarest value has been the dream of all those who ever gave a thought to the dire backwardness of India.

2. The antiquity of this problem is evident from its very terminology. But, this problem grew more and more conspicuously important as the Muslim invaders began to settle in India as permanent inhabitants of this land. The conquerors mixed with the conquered and realized in proportion to their political in-sight that unless the Hindus and the Muslims united and had fraternal relations with each other India shall be like a house divided against itself, and shall perish by its latent disease if not by a foreign invader whom it might attract by its divided forces. There are instances in the History of India where

a division in our midst has led to either a civil war or an affray with a fresh invader. It is why all those rulers who have been credited with any political fore-sight have ever tried to keep both these communities in harmony. Akbar is the chief example of this kind. He married hindu wives, being a Muslim himself, and did all in his power to show to the 'parja' that for him the Hindus and the Muslims were alike. Not only this but he started a cosmopolitan religion also and had his converts from the various communities of India.

3. But before the political Head of India could appreciate the necessity of unity the spritual Heart of the land had fully realized that a division amongst the Hindus and the Muslims shall not only result in the political decadence but shall also lead to the moral and spritual degradation of the whole of India. And we find that at this stage a sect of

“Faqirs” and “Sadhus” came forward from both the communities and tried to preach the gospel of unity by laying importance on the one-ness of God, His universal love and His boundless compassion and charity. They derided the differences of caste and creed by calling them unnecessary appendages of the one important quality Love, which alone they called the True Religion. The Sikh religion was born and brought up in the cradle of this necessity of unity and its founder was successful to a very appreciable extent in uniting the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the Hindus and the Muslims by the bonds of Divine love and charity. The torch of Love which was lighted by Guru Nanak was kept aglow by a number of his successors.

4. But this was not all so far as the Punjab was concerned. Out of the darkness and Nazareth of this land, there dawned the light of many other Sufies

and Sadhus of Christ-like qualities. They preached a rebellion against the Pandits and the Maulvies, as well as, formalities of Religion with the result that in this province, at least, an atmosphere was created in which social comrade-ship of some sort became possible. The love had over-ruled the formal differences and the value of toleration began to be appreciated.

5. What happened in the Punjab, happened, also, in the rest of India. Sufies and Sadhus tried their level best to diffuse the light of Love and fellow-feeling wherever they went. They succeeded to some extent in spreading a spirit of toleration and mutual love, so that when the British came they found India divided, not on religious ground, as we find it to-day; but the division was based on the jealousies of the various ruling chiefs of the land—a natural thing all over the world. The British themselves were not.

safe from that evil at that time. They are hardly safe even now.

6. But is the mere spirit of toleration really equal to Unity as such? Did the Sadhus and the Sufies, on the one hand, and the rulers, on the other, really succeed in finding out a permanent solution for the problem of the Hindu-Muslim Unity? The answer is simple. The cry for Hindu-Muslim Unity is as loud as ever; rather, it is louder than ever before. Do we see any reasons to believe that the Hindus and the Muslims are drawing nearer to each other in love and fellow-feeling or do we find on the contrary that they are going apart? The answer is once again very simple.

7. The leaders of the middle ages did succeed in gaining a temporary and partial victory so far as the spirit of toleration was concerned. But the modern leaders, unfortunately, however have not attained that much even. They

have only roused in us a consciousness of the points where we differ and not so much where we meet. The little social unity that we found even up to the end of the last century has disappeared, or is fast disappearing now inspite of the exhortations of our leaders to the contrary. A modern leader might stand up and say that the previous preachers succeeded because there was no third party to interfere and that at that time the state itself was doing its utmost to supplement the work of the Sufies and the Sadhus. Quite right: but still the question remains to be answered how far India was united at that time even, with all those favourable circumstances? Was it really unity which we got as a result of the arduous preaching and the living example of the leaders of that time or was it only the toleration of the differences that could be seen in those days also. Without going too much into the discussion we

are inclined to believe that it was not the former but the latter that we could attain with the best of circumstances and with the utmost of labour: and the proof is that as soon as those favourable circumstances ceased to exist and the sophistry of the teachings of the Sufies and the Sadhus came in contact with the modern education it disappeared even as all such teachings disappear when they are studied with the help of Reason.

8. An other point to consider is that the need of religious toleration only proves the presence of religious differences. But to be fair it is simply impossible to kill the religious differences as long as the religions continued to be different. But if we compare the methods of the leaders of the middle ages and of our own times we find that the leaders of the middle ages were trying to usher in a new religion embodying in it the good points of both Hinduism and Islam. This was

the chief note of the leaders of that time, though here too we must say that the teachings of most of them were self-contradictory in as much as they, sometimes, tried to keep up Islam or Hinduism in a place of prominence instead of preaching any new religion. So to put their methods in concrete terms we shall have to say that these leaders sometimes tried to attain unity by killing the very source of differences by becoming prophets of a new religion which was a sort of compromise between Hinduism and Islam, and sometimes tried to attain unity by reforming Islam and Hinduism as the case may be. Their method lacked the oneness of mind and purpose. That is why even at their best they could neither succeed in accomplishing the one, nor could they succeed in killing the other. The only thing that they attained was toleration and that too of not of a permanent nature. But as has been

suggested before the need of communal toleration only reveals the presence of communal differences; and so long as that stage continues the fine texture of toleration ever lies in the danger of being ruptured. Toleration is not the state of oneness—unity—but is only a very distant view of Love: and that is what the leaders of the middle ages attained.

9. The lot of the modern leader is some-what sadder than the leaders of the middle ages. Unlike them he is not preaching any new religion by boldly saying, "I am neither a Hindu nor a Muslim." Unlike them he does not even deride in the clearest terms the various religious differences calling them useless and unnecessary appendages of religion. Rather he tries to accomodate them by means of Pacts and Round-table conferences and would like unity to come in India in that way. Of course sometimes we do hear, "Down with Communalism,"

“Away with Communalism,” but not bothering ourself with the negative virtue which these slogans preach we only want to refer to the fact that we are not told by the modern leader positively how to do that even. It is a form without any content which the modern leader places before us. Unlike the leaders of the middle ages the leaders of the present day do not place any practical programme of “doing away with communalism.” They do not even say in concrete terms what communalism really consists in: and, perhaps, it is because they do not have the courage to say what its divorcement would really mean. All that they say, and say at the top of their voice is that the Hindus and the Muslims should unite if at all they want to attain Swaraj. It is, also, important to note here that while the leaders of the middle ages preached unity as a virtue in itself the present-day

leaders are preaching it as a means to an end—Swaraj: so that while with the leaders of the middle ages unity itself was a great virtue with the present day leaders its morality has been greatly lowered in becoming a means to an end. "Hindu-Muslim unity for the sake of Swaraj" this is the only thing they say and this is all they want. How much they have succeeded, it is for the readers to say.

10. But we would be unfair to the modern leaders if we did not say that they agree with the leaders of the middle ages, at least, in one point. As we have said above the leaders of the middle ages sometimes preached a new compromised religion and sometimes they upheld the old religions and tried only to reform them. The modern leader agrees with the old leaders in the latter part of their mission in as much as they also use the old established religions for attaining

unity among the Hindus and the Muslims. The agreement lies in the fact that both preach Unity through Religion. But it is the humble--contention of the writer of these lines that this method of attaining unity is unpsychological method on the one hand and a fallacious arugument on the other and, as such, can never, never lead to the unity of India.

The Unpsychological Method.

11. We have seen in the introduction that according to their method of heralding in unity among the people of this land the leaders of thought in the middle ages, as well as, in our own times have sought the assistance of Religion. They kept high the banner of Religion and it was through Religion, also, that the various communities of India were to be united into one nation. They work in two ways—firstly by preaching a new compromised religion and secondly by only preaching an appreciable amount of toleration towards the men of other creeds. This has been the method ever since the History of India began to be written by the mutual relations of both the major communities of this land. The kings, the priests and other leaders of thought mission tried this but as is evident from old establishments of their deeds their efforts

have never been crowned with success which could be really called so. Millions of words have been used in lectures and hundreds of anxious thoughts have been entertained by those who have been dreaming dreams of a united India; but to no purpose. India could not be united in the past and is not united even now. As a matter of fact, as we have humbly observed in the foregone lines, the method employed is itself responsible for the division in our ranks: and this division shall probably never disappear as long as we continue using this method of attaining unity.

12. Let us briefly analyse the present theory of Indian unity. "Hindus and the Muslims should unite," what does this statement connote? The first thing that we find after a moment's reflection is this. Before India is called upon to unite the whole of the population is first divided into two parts Hindus and

Muslims. India is not looked upon as a unit—as a nation—but a division is first regarded as its essential characteristic and then taking division to be granted it proceeds to bridge over that gulf by means of unity. Or in other words this theory first divides what it afterwards tries to unite, and as such, try however we may, so long as this theory holds sway, we cannot rise above a “divided state” even if we could claim to have attained the apple of our eye—Unity; because under the circumstances, and, as the matters stand, we cannot, for a moment, believe that when India shall be united the two major communities or, as a matter of that, any other community shall disappear. Hindus and Muslims shall live on as communities for the centuries that are yet to come even as they have existed for the long, long ages that have gone by. Consequently so far as this theory is concerned, for the years to

come the unity of India must of necessity have a divided consciousness as it bed-rock and it must always and always have a divided state of the population at hand to bridge over with the result that the struggle for unity shall be an endless struggle. The point here to note is not this that unity proceeds from a divided state of mind and man but rather the point to consider is that this divided state is regarded to be an essential characteristic of the Indian population; and hence of the Indian Unity. But this is certainly not the worst of this theory, the worst is yet to be explained.

13. We have referred to the fact that according to the present method the fight for unity has got to be an endless fight. But for a moment let us believe that by some miracle or on account of the operation of some pent-up psychological forces, this method unites the Indian people into, say, one nation as it

did during the very brief period of Non-co-operation. Let us analyse the psychological state of that period of unity and find out to what energies, if any, the intensive operation of this national cry can give rise to.

14. The most essential characteristic of the Indian population to which this theory gives credit is the communal phase of our people. Consequently when the various communities are called upon to unite the most natural question that arises in a communal or as a matter of that, in any mind is to what extent and in what manner have we to unite with our sister communities? Is our unity to be so complete as not to show the separate characteristics of the various component parts of the unit, or, are the component parts to unite only in such a way as to let their distinctive qualities remain intact? Are the Hindus and the Muslims to unite with each other and

other communities to such an extent as to lose their personalities as separate communities, as the custodians of separate cultures and as the advocates of separate civilizations; or, are their distinctive personalities to remain intact even when they become united somehow? In short, the question of the communal personality is the most important question which arises before us when we begin to take this theory seriously. So the first thing that we notice even when we begin to regard this theory seriously is a state in which suspense, doubt, and suspicion tend to play a very great part: and these are the very things which generally lead to most catastrophic results. During the very brief regime of Non-co-operation, on account of the spell of Mahatma Gandhi's personality, as well as, the various psychological forces that had been released as a result of the cessation of the Great War India not only took this

theory seriously, but we find actual signs of its operation in this land. But how long did that last? Our fall was indeed as great as any thing and for the cause we have only got to refer to what we have already said above. This method itself is not only the best breeding place of communal consciousness but is also its strongest defence in as much as by repeatedly crying "Hindus and Muslims" it keeps up the communal mind at a high pitch of consciousness. Consequently when it was asking, during non-co-operation days, the Hindus and the Muslims to unite it was, also, stirring up the question of thier communal personalities. Was the essence of the Hindu and the Muslim communities to be lost while mixing or uniting with each other? Were their separate cultures and civilizations to be destroyed for ever? These were some of the questions, some of the doubts and suspicions that were troubling the com-

munal mind which this theory was trying to unite. The repeated cry of Hindu-Muslim unity only added to the suspense. How this state of suspense and doubt was removed from the communal mind, or rather how the communal mind relieved itself of this taxing state is evident from what happened just after the short regime of Non-co-operation. Movements and institutions cropped up in India with the one aim of defending and safe-guarding the various communal ~~ways~~ their ways, civilizations from destruct. existence as a from any other commun. thought that Sangathan and the Mulim Tanz^{tians} were only two that we name here. ^{ir} religion them were started with the one ^{run} the defending the one community against a big other. We have named only two, ^{as,} one can find more than two dozen of such communal institutions as had sprung up right in the wake of Non-co-operation with influential men at the helm to

steer the boat of the various communities safely through what was regarded to be a stormy sea.

15. There was still the same cry for the Hindu-Muslim Unity present in the mouths of the political leaders but inspite of their top-voiced exhortations suspicion and doubt went on increasing as a result of this un-defined connection between the various communities. Islam it was regarded to be in the danger of high pitch of war. This is what the Muslim when it was as Hindus regarded it as a tion days, the moment for their communitiy. unite it was a life and death question for the of thier community that had lived and been essentially keeping its civilization and comire well intact for the centuries and centuries that had gone by. The outlook of almost all the communities changed atonce and each community launched a very imposing programme for its reconstruction. But it may be remarked here

that this desire of communal reconstruction was not due to any internal development; and nor was it the result of the birth of any reformer of a most dynamic personality. The cause of this desire was only an external one. It was the objective growth of the lowest kind that the various communities were suffering from. It was due to the fact that each community became highly suspicious about almost all the other communities and began to regard not only their ways, but virtually their very existence as a menace to it. The Hindus thought that the Muslims and the Christians were trying to deprive them of their religion and that they had already begun the offensive for their extinction. A big programme for self-defence, as well as, communal reconstruction was started. Shudhi was a result only of that suspicion. The Muslims thought that the Hindus had already made their community

impotent in almost all of its functions as a community. They launched a programme for the Tanzim and went so far as to preach a social boycott of the Hindus. In short, if one studies the communal consciousness of India, right after the non-co-operation days, he cannot but admit that suspicion reigned supreme in it. Added to that was the evil system of communal electorates. It only added to the fire and the whole of India was ablaze as if it were a big jungle and no one was near to extinguish the conflagration. Rather the more the remedy of Hindu-Muslim unity was suggested the greater was the chagrin of the unfortunate patient. India was never so disgracefully divided as after it had united for a short while during the days of Non-co-operation.

16. This is, then, what on psychological grounds this theory of Hindu-Muslim Unity can mean. In the first place it

divides the Indian consciousness itself: and that division is of the communal type. But having sown the seeds of division it tries to reap a harvest of unity. And lastly this theory succeeds less in uniting India and more in setting it apart. Rather unity acquired by the help of this method is, and shall always be only the beginning of a renewed communal war. The most magical quality of this method is that it unites only to divide again and in doing that it puts a lot of suspicion, nay actual mistrust into the communal mind which leads to actual communal madness.

17. India can never, never be united through any theory based on Religion.

Such a theory does not only lead us towards an unpsychological method but it is, also, an illogical argument. The un-psychological part of this method ^{is} in the fact that by loudly crying "Hindus are the best and the truest Muslims" it succeeds in giving a ne

and strength to the communal consciousness and as such to a natural desire for the glory and the success of the community in all its functions. It is to such a consciousness that the appeal for unity is made with the result that is not hid from anybody.

The Fallacious Argument.

18. We have said in the foregoing chapter that according to the present method of uniting India the population of the land is first divided religion-wise into different communities; and, when that is done, then all these various communities are called upon to unite and resolve once again into one nation. That is to say *division* precedes *unity* and it is out of *division* that the Hindu-Muslim unity is supposed to come out. The advocates of the present method of uniting India may, or, may not, agree with this interpretation: but that is exactly what the theory of Hindu-Muslim Unity means in concrete terms. In a poetic sense it might be right but when we look upon this theory from the view-point of philosophy and science it falls to the

ground. It is certainly wrong philosophy and highly unscientific to think that a *part* is more primary and prior to the *whole*, for even if we regard that it is the *part* which comes before the *whole* then that *part* itself shall be a *unit* and as such, the theory that *division* precedes a *unit* shall be rebutted of itself; and we shall have to admit that it is the *unit* and not the *division* which comes first. In the same way if in the case of the Indian nation we give preference to the various communities of which the nation is made up, then it means that the various communities are themselves so many *parts* which have been regarded as being more primary and prior to the *whole* which is the Indian Nation. But we must see very clearly that there is a *part* because there has been a *whole* to which it could belong. Without the existence of a *whole* it would have been out of question

to think that there is a *part* of that *whole*. The existence of a part is conditioned by the existence of a *whole*. Consequently it is impossible to think that a *part* could have an existence without being related to any *whole*. As such it is not the *whole* which get life out of the *part*, as this theory would have us believe, but it is the *part* which gets its existence from the *whole*. Similarly a *unit* which, in fact, is the *whole* cannot be preceded by *division* which in reality indicates so many *parts* of the *unit*: for it is *division* which comes out of the *unit* and not the *unit* which gets life from the the *division*. Rather, to be more particular, it is the life of the *unit* itself which goes out into the various *parts* and makes them potential also. Similarly in the case of India, the various communities are but so many *parts* of the *whole* which is the Indian Nation. Under these circumstances, to say

that the Hindus and the Muslims should unite is really to say that the *parts* should make up the *unit* which is certainly a wrong philosophy. These are not the communities which are more primary than the nation, rather, it is the nation itself which comes first. But if for a moment we could say that a community is more primary and prior to the nation then it should be also possible for us to say that a community can have many nations in it which again is the very denial of facts. The thing is that it is not a community which comes first but a nation. A nation is determined by all the forces of Nature working together. It is created in the right sense of the term and, as such, cannot be altered, or changed. But, on the other hand, a community gets its name because of the co-operation of one or two natural forces to bring a certain type of men together. In the formation of a community Thought plays the major

part, while in the formation of a nation it is the whole *life* which is brought into operation. Consequently while Nature gives birth to a nation, a nation gives birth to a community or many communities. The existence of a community is conditioned by the existence of a nation. Destroy a nation and all the various communities are destroyed automatically. But if you destroy one community the whole nation is not destroyed though it may suffer a good deal because of the destruction of one of its factors.

19. This is, in brief the philosophy of a community and, as a matter of that, of the theory of the Hindu-Muslim Unity. According to this theory the various communities, which are the out-come of different religious thoughts, are called upon to unite giving the Indian nation a united look. But, as has been stated above, this is a wrong philosophy. The Indian nation is a *unit*, if it is a nation

at all; and, as such, the various divisions of it—the various communities—should not be regarded more primary than the unit itself. But, if, for the sake of argument we place the various communities above and before the Indian nation then, in concrete terms, it only means that the various Indian communities themselves are strong enough to be called separate nations: and unfortunately that word is being used these days for the Hindu and the Muslim communities: and some people actually say that they are hindus or muslims first and Indians afterwards. Under these circumstances the question of the Hindu-Muslim Unity or, as a matter of that, of the Unity of India is really the question of the unity of all the nations of the world because here in this land you find all the religions of the world having a community of their own which, for argument's sake, we have regarded, and as this theory would have us regard, as

separate nations: and if there is a chance for the nations of the world to unite and live in peace and have freternal feelings towards each other before the Millennium then there is some chance for the unity of India to be accomplished; but if on the other hand, the present and the past history of the world does not show any record to predict a peaceful future then, God forbid, India is going to be a battle field of all the various nations of the world till this Universe is destroyed and a new one is raised in its place. But, as we have said above, this theory of the Hindu-Muslim Unity itself is based on wrong philosophy. It is a fallacious argument and the fallacy consists in the imperfect connection between the *whole* and the various *parts* that constitute it.

20. But there is another point also which crops up from a deep study of the terminology of this theory. It need not be repeated here that this theory aims at

uniting India through Religion. In other words the advocates of Unity, whether of the old school or of our own times, somehow, think that an appeal to religious sentiments of the people shall be more effective than any other appeal. They think that Religion as such is strong enough to unite man to man since there is an inherent tendency in men to defend their religion even at the cost of their lives. So that, according to the notions of our leaders, when the idea of unity becomes as deep-rooted as the idea of Religion itself, through which the idea of unity is sent down their sentiments, then people would remain united and would even die for their unity even as they die for their religion. But this is some-how or the other not the result. Since many centuries unity has been preached, not through a theory based only on religious considerations, but sometimes as Religion itself: and yet our "El Dorado" is not within sight.

The fault is not of the people but of the method that has been applied so far. It is due to the fallacious argument which lurks in the idea of this Hindu-Muslim Unity. This idea is based on the supposed potentiality of Religion to be able to unite people of different faiths into one whole where not only peace and harmony could exist but where a united action against internal and external wrongs could also be possible. But, if we study the philosophy and the history of Religion as such, we shall find that these very things have seldom been accomplished by Religion. The problem of the Indian Unity is somewhat different from the rest of the world. Here you do not have a people who have, at least, the name of one religion. But even if you take up a country or a community where there is the name of at least one religion you will find that Religion has seldom succeeded in giving them perpetual unity. Of course

they have the best chance of being able to execute a united action. But, if you study the nature of this united action also, you would see that, so far as this united action is concerned with internal or external objects which have an intimate-relation with religion, it could hardly be called united. It is united only against objects where Religion as such is not very much concerned. For example it would be successful if the Muslims or the Hindus were to fight with any other people with whom they have no religious concern. But as soon as this action is directed towards an object which is most intimately related to Religion then, even if it is directed against a people who have the name of the same religion, you would find that the tenacity of this united action is minimised a good deal: and it is in keeping with the spirit of Religion also. Take up any religion and you find that behind

the outer one-ness of the name the religion has not been able to patch up the hundreds and hundreds of sects that have cropped up under its own shadow. It is not also difficult to trace out from History that these sects, though they had a common religion, have seldom been at peace even on religious grounds. Religion, far from being able to unite or give permanent harmony to peoples of different faiths, has not so far been able to unite and give perpetual peace to the followers of one nation even. Christ has rightly said "Think not that I am come to send Peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword. 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 the mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." When Christ was saying this he knew what Religion meant as the most potential

factor of the Human Personality. Religion, as is ordinarily understood, is the path which one individual follows to attain the salvation of his soul. Three words explain the whole philosophy of Religion "individual" "salvation" and "soul." Religion deals with the sentiments and the ideas which lie deep in one's own personality. It is primarily for an individual and is perhaps, the most personal thing which we could think of in this world. Consequently, speaking with the utmost exactitude, perhaps, no two persons in the world can have the same religion because no two persons can have the same sentiments and the same ideas in this world. Permanent and absolute harmony, for the same reason, cannot be had through Religion which in its very essence is expected to deal with the differences of the Human Personality. No nation has ever attained permanent union and harmony and no nation, perhaps, shall

ever attain them by an appeal which is made absolutely through Religion. Nevertheless here we are trying to unite permanently, not the people of one religion only, but of different, rather contrary creeds, a feat which we have not been able to accomplish for so many centuries and which, perhaps, we shall never be able to accomplish even in future. The argument, as has been pointed above, is fallacious and the fallacy consists in the violation of the principles of definition and consequently "imperfect conception of the force of terms employed." This fallacious argument may, for a short while, succeed in attaining the semblance of unity, as is always the case with all clever fallacies, but it cannot stand long.

21. The fallacy that we have referred to above is due to the defective definition; hence it consists more in the terminology of the theory. But when you talk to the

advocates of this idea of Hindu-Muslim Unity you find that they do not use defective terms only but even when they explain their ideas they hardly fare better. They are as fallacious in the use of terms as they are in their explanation. The modern leader is often heard to argue.

“The best men of all the religions are really above all considerations of caste and creed. You see, A and B—one is a Hindu and the other a Muslim—they are above caste and creed. Therefore Hindus and Muslims can unite.”

He has still another argument to prove the validity of his idea hardly knowing that this one which he has already given is itself a very fair example of the fallacy called Non-Sequitur which is committed when the conclusion is not the necessary consequence of the premises. His second argument when explaining the

idea of Hindu-Muslim Unity is by saying that unity can be attained through Religion referring to the virtues which all religions preach. Then he goes on to say that A, B & C are various religions in India; therefore unity can be attained even through A, B & C. But as all students of Logic know this, too, is a fallacy which is committed by assuming without proof a proposition which requires proof. (Petitio Principii) It requires proof to establish that unity can be attained through Religion.

22. There is, however a very funny argument which the writer of these lines had the opportunity to hear in a public meeting. The speaker while trying to establish the need of unity argued that if any body (Hindu or Muslim) cannot be expelled he must be befriended. He then went on to say that the Hindus and the Muslims could not expel each other from India. Therefore they must befriend each

other. Not dwelling upon the trash morality that this argument preaches we only refer to its fallaciousness. The fallacy again is due to the "imperfect conception of the terms employed". In short, whether you take the terms of the theory or you go into its connotation; you cannot get away from its fallaciousness; and if a fallacious argument can be effective permanently then there is hope that India shall be united but if a fallacy cannot have a perpetual sway on us then through Religion India can never be united; no never, never, never.

23. If Indians are a nation the appeal must be made directly to them as a nation. That is what philosophy wants, that is what science says; and in short, that is what the whole Nature cries from its house-top. Religion must be left alone, otherwise, when on account of the force of world-circumstances need for unity increases on the one hand and

on the other Religion stands in the way of national life then the former is sure to be divorced in favour of the latter. But the moment Religion is depreciated then the whole nation shall stand in the danger of being de-moralised. There is, however, one and only one way to secure a real National Unity and also due respect for Religion; and that is by keeping both Religion and Politics apart. The national-cry of "Hindu-Muslim Unity" is really to mix up Politics with Religion and, as such, try however we may, we shall, either not succeed in accomplishing the one, or we shall succeed, only by debasing the other. Religion and Politics have not proved a favourable mixture anywhere in the world but they shall prove even dangerous in the case of India.

THE END

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

On account of very great hurry it has not been possible for this edition to be free from mistakes. In the next edition, however, these mistakes shall be rectified.