

Distortion of Indian History For Muslim Appeasement

Dr. Radhasyam Brahmachari

About the Author

Dr Radhasyam Brahmachari, M. Tech, Ph.D., is a scholar of science, who studied at Vidyasagar College, Calcutta, Rama Krishna Mission Residential College, Narandrapur and the University of Calcutta, with unique academic achievement in his credit. He is now serving the Department of Applied Physics, University of Calcutta, as a Professor.

Despite being a man of science, he is equally conversant in literary, historical and spiritual spheres, including Vedic philosophy, philosophies other Indian schools and the Western philosophy. At present, he is widely acclaimed as an outstanding authority in comparative studies of religions. He is also a well-known author of a large number of highly thoughtful books that are being appreciated by thinking men and women both in India and abroad. He is also a renowned columnist and his masterly writings frequently appear both in Bengali and English print media.

Part 1

The Red Fort in Delhi

Whenever we visit the historical monuments of Delhi and Agra, the guides tell us – this is the fort built by Emperor Akbar, or that is the palace built by Emperor Shah Jahan, or here is the minar made by Sultan Qutb-ud-din and so on and so forth. They try to convince us that all the forts, palaces and other monuments of excellent architecture in Delhi and Agra were authored by the Muslim invaders. We also give them a patient hearing and believe in what they say, as our history books also give similar accounts. Above all, by going through such history books from our childhood, the claim of Muslim authorship of all these edifices has penetrated our mind so deeply that we never apply simple common sense to estimate the credibility of the said claim.

Our history books also tell us that Delhi fell to the Muslim invaders, for the first time in history, in 1192 AD, when Muhammad Ghori defeated Emperor Prithviraj Chauhan in the Second Battle of Tarain. So, it becomes evident that before this incident, Delhi was ruled by the Rajput kings and common sense tells us that Emperor Prithviraj Chauhan and his ancestors also had forts and palaces as dwelling places as well as the seat of their governments. Definitely they did not live in mud houses or thatched cottages. So the question is – *What happened to those forts and palaces and where they have gone?*

Our historians also tell us that after capturing Delhi, Muhammad Ghori conquered the fort at Ajmer (Sanskrit: Ajey Meru) in the same year and thereafter, he entrusted to his slave Qutb-ud-din the conquered territory and left India for Ghazni. Later on, Qutb-ud-din captured the

forts at Gwalior, Meeut, Ranthombhor, Benares, and so on and all these forts belonged to Hindu kings. Again the question arises: In pre-Islamic India, the Hindu kings had so many forts and palaces at so many places, how come then they had none in Delhi? Hence a group of historians believe that the Muslim invaders did not build a single fort or a palace, or any other mansion either in Delhi or in Agra and that all the existing forts and palaces, as we see them today, were originally built by the Hindu kings well before the arrival of the barbaric Muslim invaders. These Muslim aggressors only occupied those forts and palaces by force and utilised them as their dwelling places and as royal courts.

Qutb-ud-din's court chronicler Hasan Nizami in his *Taj-ul-Masir* writes, "When he (Muhammad Ghori) arrived at Delhi, he saw a fortress which in height and strength had no equal nor second through the length and breadth of seven climes".^[1] The question is: Which was the fort Muhammad Ghori saw? Had he seen the Red Fort? There was no other fort that could match the description of Hasan Nizami. But our historians say that Shah Jahan, after ascending the throne of Delhi, decided to set up a new capital to be called Shahjahanabad in Delhi and as a part of that plan he built the Red Fort. They write, "In 1638, Shah Jahan began in Delhi the construction of a new capital, that of Shahjahanabad, to contain within its perimeter a sumptuous palace-fortress for the accommodation of the imperial household and the court. The palace-fortress, the Red Fort as it is known because of the red sandstone fabric of its rampart walls, has been designed on an unprecedented scale with all the amenities of the busy and luxurious life of an imperial house and court provided for within its walls in a regular and systematic order".^[2]

Our historians tell us that it took ten years to build the fort and write, "*The fortress with its halls, palaces, pavilions and gardens was completed in 1648 when on an auspicious day the Emperor entered it ceremonially and formally inaugurated the capital city*".[2] Surprisingly, the same historian writes in another place, "The Diwan-i-am in the Delhi fort, it has to be noted, is also in red sandstone, and it is definitely known to have been the work of Shah Jahan. Behind Diwan-i-am and separated from it by Machchhi Bhavan, stands the Diwan-i-Khas that was erected by, according to the inscription it bears, in 1636-37".[3] The question therefore arises: How could Shah Jahan complete the construction of Diwan-i-Am and Diwan-i-Khas, which were the integral parts of the Red Fort, nearly two years before the commencement of the construction of the Red Fort itself in 1638 AD?

At the same time, our historians say that while the construction of the Red Fort was in progress, Shah Jahan undertook a massive renovation and repair work of the older palaces and write, "Shah Jahan's alteration and replacements in the earlier palace-fortress were carried out on a grandiose scale and apparently inspired by the desire to impart to the palaces and other appurtenances an appearance to suit the prevailing character of the court".[4] They also say that, as a part of that reconstruction work, Shah Jahan built a Naubat Khana near the Diwan-i-Am and had a Persian couplet inscribed- "If there is paradise on the face of the earth, it is this, it is this, it is this", on Diwan-i-Khas.[5] These descriptions make one wonder about Shah Jahan's authorship of the Red Fort. Had the Red Fort, with all its appurtenances, been a new creation of Shah Jahan, how could the need for reconstruction and remodelling of those newly built mansions and palaces arise?

Furthermore, where were the older palaces mentioned above and what was their origin?

So, if we piece together all the information mentioned above, it becomes evident that there was an existing fortress in Delhi, built probably many years before the time of Shah Jahan, and Shah Jahan undertook a massive reconstruction and renovation work, mainly to remove all stone carvings bearing Hindu symbols and possible Sanskrit inscriptions and to convert all Hindu temples inside the fortress into mosques, with a view to giving the entire edifice a Muslim face which our historians describe as an attempt to give the fortress “an appearance to suit the prevailing (i.e. Muslim) character of the court”.

Shah Jahan’s authorship of the Red Fort becomes all the more suspect when one finds that there is an indirect mention of the Diwan-i-Khas in the *Tabaquat-i-Nasisri* by the Muslim chronicler Minhas-us-Siraj. He writes that nearly 400 years before the time of Shah Jahan, Bukhtiar Khilji, the then chief warlord of Bihar, came from Bihar to Delhi to meet Sultan Qutb-ud-din. During this visit Bukhtiar Khilji fought a duel with an elephant which took place in a white marble palace in Delhi. [6] The question is – What other marble place, big enough for holding a duel with an elephant, could be than the Diwan-i-Khas in the Red Fort?[7] The incident conclusively proves that the Red Fort in Delhi, with Diwan-i-Khas as its integral part, existed more than 400 years before the time of Shah Jahan.

Moreover, another Muslim chronicler Zia-ud-din Barni in his *Tarikh-i-Firozshahi* writes, “Towards the end of the year 695H (1296 AD), Alauddin (Khilji) entered Delhi in great pomp and with a large force. He took his

seat upon the throne in the Daulat khana-i-Julus and proceeded to the Kushk-e-Lal (red palace), where he took his abode".[8] To describe the same incident, our historians write, "Ala-ud-din then made his triumphal entry into the capital on October 22, 1296, and took up his residence in the Red Palace of Balban, where he was enthroned".[9] Who was this Balban? He was no other than Ghias-ud-din Balban, whose original name was Ulugh Khan and became a commander under Sultana Razia. Ulugh Khan belonged to the Khakan tribe of Albari in Turkestan, who was captured by the Mongols as a slave and later on sold to Khwaja Jamaluddin in Ghazni, who brought him to Delhi. Ulugh Khan definitely did not bring a red palace from Turkestan and our history books nowhere mention that he built a red palace in Delhi. So, what could that Red Palace (Kushk-i-Lal) be if not the Red Fort?

It has been stated earlier that the fortress, now known as the Red Fort, fell to the foreign invader Muhammad Ghori, for the first time in history, in 1192 AD. Later, several Muslim dynasties used that fortress, built by the Rajput kings, as their royal court and residence. Quite naturally, for some time it went to Ghias-ud-din Balban, alias Ulugh Khan. But it is a pity that despite all such infallible evidences our historians persist in writing that the said Red Fort was built by Shah Jahan.

Today, there are two forts in Delhi, the Red Fort and the Purana Quila and our historians believe that the Purana Quila was built by Sher Shah [10]. So, according to their version of history, Delhi did not have a fort before the time of Sher Shah. Again the question is - Which fort Muhammad Ghori had seen, nearly 350 years before the time of Sher Shah, after setting his feet in

Delhi? And which fort did the Muslim rulers of Delhi, before the time of Sher Shah, use as their royal court and residence? Above all, how could Delhi play the role of the capital of Delhi Sultanate without having a fortress?

From the above discussions, it becomes evident that the real authors of today's Red Fort were the Hindu kings of India, perhaps several centuries before the times of Shah Jahan. But after the defeat of Emperor Prithviraj Chauhan, it fell into the hands of the Muslim invader Muhammad Ghori. Later on, Shah Jahan undertook a massive repairing and renovation work, mainly to remove all stone carvings bearing Hindu symbols and possible Sanskrit inscriptions and to convert all Hindu temples inside the fortress into mosques, with a view to giving the entire edifice a Muslim face, as we see it today.

To settle all the above mentioned disputes, it is urgently necessary for the Government to ask the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) to ascertain the age of the edifice, now known as the Red Fort, through scientific methods. Only such a step can help the truth come out.

References:

[1] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *'The History of India as Told by Its Own Historians'* (in 8 Volumes), Low Price Publications, New Delhi (1996) II, 216

[2] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, 787

[3] R. C. Majumdar (ibid) Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 784-85

[4] R. C. Majumdar (ibid) Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 783

[5] R. C. Majumdar (ibid), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 789

[6] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson (ibid) II, 306

[7] R. C. Majumdar (ibid), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 790

[8] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson (ibid) III, 160

[9] R. C. Majumdar (ibid), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VI, 18

[10] R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, '*An Advanced History of India*', MacMillan & Co (1980), 578

Part 2

What is the utility of studying history? From history, one learns the achievements of his ancestors -- their successes and failures. It enables him to analyse the reasons that brought the said successes and failures and hence helps him take correct steps in present crises. So, if that history is erroneous or distorted, one fails to take proper steps to confront the national problems. There is no doubt that a faulty step in the moment of a crisis may lead to a disaster. From this viewpoint, it becomes evident that **distorting national history is not only a serious offense, but an unpardonable crime.**

Therefore, every citizen of a country must have the right to know the true history of his nation. But in India today, this right is being pitiably denied. They are permitted to know the history which is horribly distorted due to political reasons. Particularly **the history of Muslim conquest and the period of Muslim rule that lasted for nearly eight centuries has been so distorted that it is almost impossible for an individual to salvage the true history from those garbage of lies and deceits.** The most unfortunate part of the episode is that, children after learning this distorted history in their text books, are developing wrong ideas about their past. They are therefore confused to identify or distinguish a friend from a foe.

It has been pointed out earlier that **Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, the prophet of nonviolence, was the originator of the politics of Muslim appeasement in**

India. As we know, he was the most trusted as well as the most loyal stooge of the British Empire; it was not possible for him to demand India's independence. In fact, his real intention was to prolong British rule in India. So, to hoodwink the hoi polloi, he imported a vague and mystical term "*swaraj*" and used to say that he was fighting for that. He further declared that it was not necessary to terminate British rule for bringing his cherished *swaraj*, but Hindu-Muslim amity was the most important precondition for that.

It should be noted that his concept of Hindu-Muslim amity was entirely biased and prejudiced. Only Hindus were to make every sacrifice for the sake of the said Hindu-Muslim amity. To achieve that Hindu-Muslim amity, Gandhi suggested alteration or distortion of Indian history, particularly the period of Muslim rule, and two major guidelines he set for this purpose were, (1) Muslim rulers were not foreign invaders as they lived in India and died in India and (2) the Muslim rule in India was not a colonial rule but a *golden period* of Indian history. And following these guidelines, a group of dirty people called the secular historians set to distort Indian history in a big way.

But what was the real nature of that Muslim colonial rule and what was the nature of Dhimmitude the Hindus had suffered for centuries after centuries? It is best described through a dialogue between Sultan Alauddin Khilji and a qazi called Mughisuddin. The incident has been narrated by Alauddin's court chronicler Ziauddin Barni in *Tarikh-i-Firozshahi*. Barni wrote,

"One day Qazi Mughisuddin visited the court of Sultan Alauddin Khilji and the Sultan asked the qazi, 'How are Hindus designated in the (Islamic) law, as payers of tribute

(Kharaj-gauzar) or giver of tribute (Kharaj-dih)?' The kazi replied, 'They are called payers of tribute and when the revenue officer demands silver from them, they should, without question and with all humility and respect, tender gold. If the officer throws dirt into their mouths, they must without reluctance open their mouths wide to receive it. By doing so, they show their respect for the officer. The due subordination of the Zimmi (tribute payer) is exhibited in this humble payment and by this throwing of dirt in their mouths. The glorification of Islam is a duty. ... Allah holds them in contempt, for He says, 'Keep them in subjection'. To keep the Hindus in abasement is especially a religious duty because they are the most inveterate enemies of the Prophet and because the Prophet has commanded us to slay them, plunder them and make them captive, saying, 'Convert them to Islam or kill them, enslave them and spoil their wealth and property. No doctor but the great doctor (Hanifa), to whose school we belong, has asserted to the imposition of the jizya (poll tax) on Hindus. Doctors of other schools allow no other alternative but 'death or Islam'." (H. M. Elliot & J. Dowson, 'History of India: As Told by Its Own Historians', III, 184)

In the First Part of the article, it has been narrated how the so-called secular historians of India are wrongly projecting the barbaric Muslim ruler Shahjahan as the author of the famous Red Fort of Delhi, which was built by the Hindu Kings several centuries before the times of Shahjahan. In this Second Part, we shall discuss how these secular historians are narrating another cruel, barbaric and lecherous Muslim ruler Akbar as the author of the invincible fortress of Agra.

The Fort at Agra

Like the Red Fort in Delhi, the fortress at Agra also suffers similar misrepresentation. **The invincible fort at Agra, as we see it today, was not built by any foreign**

Muslim invader and its authorship is falsely attributed to Akbar. This marvellous exhibit of Hindu architecture was also built by the Hindu kings well before the arrival of the barbaric Muslim invaders in India. Like the Red Fort in Delhi, the Muslim invaders forcefully occupied it and used it as their royal court and residence. During the time of *Mahabharata*, Agra belonged to the kingdom of Mathura ruled by the oppressive king Kansa, who used the prison at Agra to incarcerate his political rivals. In this regard, the Muslim chronicler Abdulla in his *Tarikh-i-Daudi* writes, "He (Sultan Sikandar Lodi) generally resided at Agra; it is said by some that Agra became a city in his time, before which it had been a mere village, but one of the old standing. The Hindus, indeed, Assert that Agra was a strong place in the days of Raja Kansa, ruled in Mathura, and who confined everyone who displeased him, in the fort at that place, so that in course of time it had become the established state prison".[1]

But in the same work, chronicler Abdulla says that Muhammad of Ghazni captured Agra and reduced it to a heap of ruins and writes, "In the year when the army of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni invaded Hindustan, he so ruined Agra that it became one of the most insignificant villages of the land and after that it improved from the times of Sultan Sikandar, and at length, in Akbar's time, became the seat of the government of Delhi, and one of the chief cities of Hindustan".[1] It is important to note here that the above description admits that before the invasion of Mahmud of Ghazni, Agra was city and not a village.

Another Muslim chronicler Nizmuddin Ahmed in his *Tabaquat-i-Akbari* writes, "In the year 972 H (1565 AD), the command was given by Akbar for building a new fort of hewn stone at Agra, instead of the old citadel, which was of bricks and had become ruinous. The foundation was laid and in

four years the fortress was completed".[2] A Muslim poet named Diwan-i-Salman, who lived during the time of Muhammad Ghori, wrote some poems of historical value. In one of his poems, he said that during the time of Muhammad Ghori, the fortress of Agra was under the control of a Rajput king Jaipal. In the same poem he described the Agra fort and wrote, "The fort of Agra is built amongst the sands like a hill, and its battlements are like hillocks. No calamity had ever befallen its fortification, nor had deceitful time dealt treacherously with it."[3] So, the question naturally arises- Which fort Diwan-i-Salman had seen? The fort he saw was definitely made of stone; otherwise he would not have compared it with a hill. Above all, is it possible to finish the construction of a massive fort made of stone, as we see it today, within a period of 4 years?

It should also be mentioned here that the Muslim chroniclers, who claim Akbar's authorship of the fort at Agra, differ widely regarding the time taken by Akbar to complete the job. According to Abul Fazl, one of the ministers at the Akbar's court, Akbar took 8 years to build the fort. While according to Jahngir, the son of Akbar, he took 15 years to complete the construction. [4] It has been said earlier that according to Nizamuddin Ahmed, the job was done within a shortm period of 4 years.[12] It is important to note here that there are other evidence that suggest that the fort of Agra was there during the time of Babur. Babur set his foot at the fort of Agra for the first time on May 4, 1526, and before that his son Humayun had taken control of the fort. Thereafter, Babur left Agra on February 11, 1527, and proceeded to face Maharana Sangram Singh in the battle of Khanua, leaving the fort in the care of his son Humayun. [5] So, the rational conclusion is that, there was a massive fort,

made of stone, at Agra under the control of a Rajput King Jaipal and Muhammad Ghorī occupied it by defeating Jaipal in the year 1192. Thereafter, when the fort came under the control of the Mughals, Akbar might have undertaken some repair and renovation work of the then existing fort.

Above all, there is no dispute among our historians that, whether it is the Red Fort in Delhi or the invincible fortress at Agra, Hindu style, particularly the Gujarati and Rajasthani style, is very prominent in the construction of the interior palaces, courts, halls and so on. Especially, the pillars and the gateways of these halls and courts bear pure Hindu style of stone carving. It seems amusing when our historians, in their attempt to explain this overwhelming and pervasive Hindu influence, say that the Muslim rulers who, according to their belief, were very sympathetic to the Hindus, deliberately encouraged Hindu style in building their edifices to promote Hindu-Muslim amity. [6]

So, a group of historians, having more rational views, believe that all the historical monuments of Delhi and Agra, the authorship of which is at present being wrongly attributed to the Muslim rulers, were, in fact, built by the Hindu kings well before the arrival of the foreign Muslim invaders. They also believe that in their endeavour to give these monuments an Islamic face, the Muslim rulers, in the name of repair and renovation, removed almost all the Hindu symbols from these monuments and buried them somewhere within the periphery of those monuments. So a thorough scientific and archaeological investigation is urgently called for revealing the truth and settling all such contrary views.

References:

[1] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *'The History of India, as told by its own historians'* (in 8 Volumes), Low Price Publications, New Delhi (1996) IV, 450

[2] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson (ibid) V, 295

[3] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson (ibid) IV, 522

[4] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press (1982), 76

[5] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson (ibid) IV, 263-64

[6] R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, *'An Advanced History of India'*, MacMillan & Co (1980), 579

Part 3A

Distorted History of Qutb Minar:

The Qutb Minar (also spelled Qutab or Qutub), a tower in Delhi, India, is the world's tallest minaret, made of red sandstone. It is 72.5 metres (238 ft) tall with 379 steps leading to the top. The diameter of the base is 14.3 meters wide while the top floor measures 2.75 meters in diameter. The authorship of this magnificent piece of architecture is attributed to the Muslim invader Qutb-ud-din Aibak and the Indian as well as the Western historians write, "Inspired by the Minaret of Jam in Afghanistan and wishing to surpass it, Qutb-ud-din Aibak, the first Muslim ruler of Delhi, commenced construction of the Qutb Minar in 1193, but could only complete its base. His successor, Iltutmish, added three more stories and, in 1386, Firuz Shah Tughluq constructed the fifth and the last story."^[1, 2]

According to another version, Qutb-ud-din Aibak came to India in 1193 AD, as the ruler of Delhi and laid the foundation of the Qutb Minar in 1206 AD. Before his death in 1210 AD, he could complete the construction of only the first storey of the monument. Later on his son in

law Iltutmish (or Altamash) took up the job and added three more stories, and the topmost storey of the minaret was completed in 1386 by Firuz Shah Tughluq. But, after going through all these narrations, following suspicions crops up in an inquisitive mind. [2]

Firstly, all the barbaric Muslims invaders, like Muhammaf Ghori, Qutb-ud-din Aibak, Firuz Shah Tughluq and their lot, came to India to plunder its wealth and not to erect a minaret, like the Qutb Minar, by spending money. Though the so-called secular historians are projecting these barbaric invaders as great builders and great admirers of art, sculpture and architecture, it becomes hard to believe that those cruel killers and lecherous vandals had any affinity for art and culture. Thirdly, Hasan Nizami, the court chroniclers and biographer of Qutb-ud-din, has narrated so many events of the times of Qutb-ud-din, in his Taj-ul-masir. Then how it comes that he forgot to mention erecting a splendid and magnificent exhibit of architecture like Qutb Minar by his master, in his Taj-ul-masir?

Another Muslim chronicler, Minhaj-us-Siraj, has also narrated lives of Qutb-ud-din and Iltutmish and their times in Tabaqat-i-Nasiri. He also never mentioned in the said work that Qutb-ud-din had begun to build a minaret in Delhi which Altamash had subsequently finished.

So, a group of historians are convinced that the minaret, now known as Qutb Minar, was built centuries before the arrival of the Muslim invaders in India and it is an excellent exhibit of Hindu architecture.[3] We may now turn to these historians to see what evidence they have to establish their claim.

The locality of Delhi where the so called Qutb Minar stands, with its head high penetrating the sky, is known as Meherauli. Where from the name Meherauli has been derived? The reader will be amazed to know that Meherauli is the corrupt of Hindi Mihirwali (Followers of Mihir), and a further investigation would reveal that Hindi Mihirwali was derived Sanskrit Mihiravali. So, it becomes evident that the place was once upon a time linked to a renowned personality called Mihir. Most of the scholars agree that this Mihir was no other than Varaha Mihira, the great mathematician and astronomer who used to grace the Royal Court of Emperor Vikramaditya Chandragupta-II and was one of the nine luminaries (Navaratna), called jewels, of his Court.

In this regard, Wikipedia Encyclopedia writes, "Daivajna Varāhamihira (505 - 587), also called Varaha, or Mihira was an Indian astronomer, mathematician, and astrologer who lived in Ujjain. He is considered to be one of the nine jewels (Navaratnas) of the court of legendary king Vikramaditya (thought to be the Gupta emperor Chandragupta II Vikramaditya). Though little is known about his life, he supposedly hailed from South Bengal, where in the ruins of Chandraketugarh there is a mound called the mound of Khana and Mihir. Khana was the daughter-in-law of Varaha and a famous astrologer herself." [4]. It should be mentioned here that, Chandraketugarh is a place nearly 30 Km away from Kolkata, and it is in the district of 24-Parganas North.

It should also be mentioned here that Varaha Mihira was the author of the famous astronomical treatise Pancha-Siddhantika (dated 575 AD) and the originator of the Hora System of time reckoning where 24 Horas make one day and night (or 24 hours), the system which is now

universally used. It should also be noted that the English “Hour” is nothing but a corrupt of Sanskrit “Hora” [5]

Real History Minaret, Now called Qutb Minar:

According to Hindu records, the place now known as the Qutb Complex, which has now been declared a World Heritage Site by the UNESCO, was a seat of learning or a university, where students used to come from far away places to learn and do research on mathematics, astronomy and astrology. There were several residential buildings for the students and the teachers and 27 temples dedicated to 27 asterisms. In Indian astronomy there was a practice of dividing the ecliptic into 27 equal parts with the help of these 27 asterisms and each part covering 13 degrees and 20 minutes of the ecliptic (the practice is still being used today by Indian astrologers).

The names of these 27 asterisms are Aśvinī (b and g Arietis), Bharanī (35, 39 and 41 Arietis), Kṛttikā (h Tauri). Rohiṇī (a, q, g, d, e Tauri), Mṛgaśira (λ, φ, Orionis). Ārdrā (α Orionis), Punarvasu (b and a Geminorum), Puṣyā (q, d, g, Cancri), Aśleṣā (ε, δ, η, σ Hydrae), Maghā (α, η, γ, ζ, μ, ε Leonis), Pūrva-Fālgunī (δ, θ Leonis), Uttara-Fālgunī (b, 93 Leonis), Hastā (δ, γ, ε, α, β Corvi), Citrā (a Virginis), Svātī (a Bootis). Viśākhā, (g, b, α Librae), Anurādhā (δ, β, π Scorpionis), Jyeṣṭhā (α, σ, τ Scorpionis), Mūlā (λ, ν, χ, θ, η, ζ, μ, ε Scorpionis), Pūrvaṣādhā (δ, ε Sagittarii), Uttaraṣādhā (σ, ζ Sagittarii), Abhijit (α, ε, ζ Lyrae), Śravaṇā (a, b, g Aquilae), Śrāviṣṭhā (β, α, γ, δ Delphini), a.k.a. Dhaniṣṭhā, Śatabhiṣā (l Aquarii), Pūrva-Bhādrapada (a, b Pegasi) and Uttara-Bhādrapada (g Pegasi and a Andromadae). [6]

The pillar or the minaret, now called Qutb Minar, was used by the researchers as the astronomical observation

tower and at that time, it was known as Meru (pole) Stambha (pillar). According to another group of scholars, the other name of this pillar was Vishnu Dhvaj (Banner of Lord Vishnu) and the scholars agree that it was authored by the great astronomer Varaha Mihira. Confusion may arise in the reader's mind - How such a tall pillar did serve the purpose of an astronomical observatory? So, it needs some explanation. Suppose one wants to know the exact altitude of the sun in the sky. He has to measure the length of the shadow of the pillar and dividing it by the height of the pillar, one obtains the tangent of the altitude of the sun. One should notice that, taller the pillar, more accurate would be the results of his measurements.

The reader should notice that this could be done for any heavenly body. In that case, the observer is to move away from the pillar until the tip of the pillar and heavenly body is on a straight line. One should also notice that by measuring the length of the shadow of pillar under midday sun, it is possible to ascertain into which Zodiacal Sign the sun happens to be and thus to ascertain the beginning of a solar month which coincides, according to Hindu system, with the entry of the sun into a new Zodiacal Sign. It has been pointed out above that accuracy of such measurements would increase with the height of the pillar. The reader should also notice that by measuring the length of the shadow, the other parameters of the annual motion of the sun, like ascertaining the days of summer and winter solstice, and vernal and autumnal equinoxes, could also be accurately done.

For example, on 22nd June, or the day of Summer Solstice, when the sun rests on the Tropic of Cancer, it

will be inclined by 5.0 degrees to the south in Delhi, as the latitude of Delhi is 28.5 degrees North and that of the Tropic of Cancer is 23.5 degrees North. So, on that day, the length of the shadow of the Qutb Minar at midday would be 19.7 ft. While on 22nd December, or on the day of Winter Solstice, the sun will be inclined by 52 degrees towards north in Delhi and the length of the shadow of Qutb Minar, at midday, would be nearly 288.0 ft. Hence the difference between the longest (on 22nd December) and the shortest (on 22nd June) shadows would be 268.3 ft. and this facilitates the observer to determine comfortably in which Zodiac the sun is lying.

It should be mentioned here that, like the Meru Stambha in Delhi, Varaha Mihir built a similar pillar in Ghazni, Afghanistan, but with bricks, in stead of sandstone. So, it becomes evident that both the Qutb Minar and the minaret at Ghazni were built nearly seven centuries before the arrival of the Muslim invaders and hence they were superb examples of Hindu architecture. But the renowned historian John Marshall, in his *Monuments of Muslim India*, wrote, "The whole conception of the minar and almost every detail of its construction and ornamentations is essentially Islamic. Towers of this kind were unknown to the Indians, but to the Muhammadans they had long been familiar, whether as mazinis attached to mosques or as free standing towers like those at Ghazni." [7] It should be mentioned here that the said comment of John Marshall is now being profusely used by the so-called secular historians of India to attribute the authorship of the Qutb Minar to Qutb-ud-din Aibak.

In this context, it would be relevant to mention the opinion of another historian, A K Saraswati, who wrote,

“Arthur Upham Pope has ably demonstrated how Indian (or Hindu) ideas in art and architecture migrated to Western Asia and reached concrete forms under the technical ingenuity of the Persian builders. Indeed, many of the fundamental forms of Persian architecture, such as the pointed and trefoil arches, the transverse vault, the octagonal form of building, the dome etc. were originated in India. ... It is through such cultural contacts that art in the West acquired substance and individuality which the establishment of Islam could hardly change or alter.”[8] So, it becomes evident from the above comment of Arthur Upham Pope that the form and style of architecture, which are now being projected as Islamic or Saracenic, are basically Indian or Hindu architecture.

In this connection, it should be mentioned that the famous Tajmahal at Agra is an octagonal edifice and the so-called secular historians highlight this feature to show that the Tajmahal is an example of saracenic architecture, which makes it easier for them to attribute its authorship to Shah Jahan. But, according to Arthur Upham Pope, it is undoubtedly a Hindu style.

It should also be mentioned here that, according to John Marshall, Qutb-ud-din built the Qutb Minar as a part of the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque for giving call to prayer or *azan*.^[7] But this argument is not tenable due to two reasons. Firstly, the Muslims build a minaret as a part of every mosque for giving call to prayers and sighting the moon during Eid-ul-fitr. But the distance in between the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque and the Qutb Minar renders the above argument not only absurd but ridiculous.

Secondly, considering the dimensions of the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque and the Qutb Minar, perhaps no one would be ready to accept that the latter is a part of the

former because in that case, the chip would be tougher than the old block. Thirdly, according to the Muslim chroniclers, Qutb-ud-din built the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque with the raw materials collected from the demolished 27 temples of the Qutb Complex. So, it becomes really difficult to believe that Qutb-ud-din built the main structure, the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque, with the raw materials of the demolished temples while he built the auxiliary structure, the Qutb Minar, with fresh raw materials by spending so much money.

It should be mentioned here that, Sir Syed Ahmed, the founder of the Aligarh Muslim University, used to believe that Qutb Minar had been authored by the Hindus and not by the Muslim rulers. In this context, it should also be noted that General Cunningham, the first Director of Archaeological Survey of India, used to hold the same view.^[3]

References:

[1] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qutb_Minar

[2] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VI, 668

[3] Acharya Bapu Vankar, *Itihas Darpan*, New Delhi, III (1996), ii, 57.

[4] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Varahamihira>

[5] <http://www.scribd.com/doc/507671/Hora-System>

[6] Radhasyam Brahmachari, *System of Time Reckoning in Ancient India*, *Journa of the Asiatic Society*, Calcutta, XLIII (2001), i, 20 (co-author B Basu)

[7] R. C. Majumdar, (ibid), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VI, 669

[8] R. C. Majumdar, (ibid), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VI, 661

Part 3B

Vandalism of Qutb-ud-din:

It has been mentioned above that the Qutb Minar is 238 ft tall and hence can be seen from a far away place. After arriving Delhi in 1193, Qutb-ud-din got extremely fascinated by the beauty and grandeur of the pillar and immediately went to the place with his men. They enquired about the name of the pillar, and someone replied "Meru Stambha".^[1] In Arabic, the word qutb stands for the Pole Star and the interpreter said to Qutb-ud-din that the name of the pillar was Qutb Minar. So, in this way the word qutb was associated with the pillar "Meru Stambha" and it becomes evident that, till then, it was not linked with Sultan Qutb-ud-din. It may be mentioned here that Qutb-ud-din means the *Pole Star of Islam*. It was nearly 200 years after the death of Qutb-ud-din that his name was linked, for the first time, to Qutb Minar by a Muslim chronicler called Shams-i-shiraj ^[2]

Like other diabolical Muslim rulers, Qutb-ud-din was also a monster iconoclast. During his reign, he demolished thousands of Hindu temples. So, his court chronicler Hasan Nijami, in his Taj-ul-masir, writes, "Qutb-ud-din built the Jam-i-Masjid in Delhi and adorned it with the stones and gold obtained from temples which had been demolished by elephants and covered it with inscriptions in Toghra containing the divine cammands (of Koran)" [3]

In 1194, Muhammad Ghori launched a military campaign against Benaras when Qutb-ud-din accompanied his master to play the partner of sodomy. In this context, it may be mentioned that in those days, lecherous Muslim rulers used to purchase young slaves for doing sodomy. However, after occupying Benaras,

Qutb-ud-din ordered his troops to destroy temples and to narrate that destruction Minhaj-us-shiraj in his *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, writes, *"They destroyed nearly one thousand temples and raised mosques on their foundations"*. [4] ... *"Religion (i.e. Islam) was established, the road of rebellion was closed, infidelity was cut off and foundations of idol worship were utterly destroyed."* [5]

In 1196 AD., Kutubuddin Aibak invaded the fort at Gwalior. To describe the incident, Minhaz-us-Siraj in his *Tabakat-I-Nasiri* writes, *"In compliance with the divine (i.e. Koranic) injunction of holy war (jihad), they drew out their blood-thirsty swords before the enemies of religion (i.e. Hindus)"*. [5] To describe the same incident, Hassan Nizami in his *Taj-ul-masir* writes, *"The army of Islam was completely victorious and one lacks Hindus were swiftly dispatched to the hell of fire. ... He (Kutubuddin) destroyed the pillars and foundations of idol temples and built their stead mosques, colleges and precepts of Islam"* [6].

In 1197, Kutubuddin invaded the fort at Naharwala in Gujrat. On the way a battle was fought with the king Karan Singh. Describing the incident, Minhaj-us-Siraj in his *Tabakat-I-Nasiri* writes, *"Nearly fifty thousand infidels (Hindus) were dispatched to the hell by the sword and from the heaps of the slain, hills and the plain became one level"*. [7] Regarding the capture of the Kalinjar Fort by Kutubuddin in 1202, Minhaz writes, *"... fifty thousand men came under the collar of slavery and the plain became as black as pitch with the blood of Hindus"*. [8]

In a similar manner, Qutb-ud-din conducted large scale destruction in the area, now known as the Qutb Complex. He demolished all the above mentioned 27

temples, dedicated to 27 Asterisms and built the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque with the raw materials obtained by the demolition of those temples. Even today, one observes the entire area of the Qutb Complex strewn with remains of demolished buildings and temples.

The History of the Slave Dynasty:

The history books written by the so-called secular historians say that, with the coronation of Qutb-ud-din, the Slave Dynasty came to power in Delhi. The name Slave Dynasty was coined for the fact that Qutb-ud-din was a slave of Muhammad Ghori, and the next ruler Iltutmish was a slave of Qutb-ud-din. Many do not know why Muhammad Ghori nominated his slave Qutb-ud-din as the next king and Qutb-ud-din nominated his slave Iltutmish as the next ruler of Delhi. Why both Muhammad Ghori and Qutb-ud-din nominated their slaves as the kings after their death? The so-called secular historians say Muhammad Ghori had nominated Qutb-ud-din as the former had no son and Qutb-ud-din nominated Iltutmish as the latter was his son-in-law. But there were more important reasons which these dirty historians hide.

It has been mentioned above that Muhammad Ghori purchased young Qutb-ud-din for doing sodomy. At that time, Qutb-ud-din was a very good looking Turkish boy having a nice physique. Minhaj-us-Siraj has given a detailed narration of early lives of both Qutb-ud-din and Iltutmish in his *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*. It says that Qutb-ud-din, for the first time, was sold to a qazi called Faqrudin Abdul Aziz, in the slave market at Naishapur (a corrupt of Sanskrit Naimusharanya). [9] While staying in the house of qazi, Qutb-ud-din studied the Koran, learned horse riding and archery. Later on, a trader purchased

Qutb-ud-din from the qazi and brought him to Delhi and finally Muhammad Ghori purchased Qutb-ud-din from that trader.

Gradually the lecherous Muhammad Ghori became extraordinarily enamoured of Qutb-ud-din and Qutb-ud-din, on the other hand, exploited the opportunity and became the care-taker of the royal stable which provided him the opportunity to join military expeditions. Thus in 1192, he came to India and participated in the Battle of Tarai, against Emperor Prithwiraj Chauhan. Later on, he took part in many other military campaigns and became a mass murderer and a terrible iconoclast. So, before leaving for Ghazni, Muhammad Ghori left his conquered territory in India to the care of his beloved slave Qutb-ud-din, and when Muhammad Ghori was killed by three brave Rajput young men in 1206, Qutb-ud-din declared him the Sultan of Hindustan. Thus the foundation of Dehli Sultanate was laid.

In a similar manner, the next Sultan Iltutmish (or Altamash) also began his career as a slave. *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, in this regard, says that young boy Altamash looked very nice and his envious brothers stealthily sold to a horse trader. The said horse trader had brought him to Bukhara and sold him to a man called Haji Bukhari and the latter sold to another man called Jamal-ud-din Chast. According to the narration of *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, the buttocks of Altamash were fleshy and well built and hence he was extremely attractive for the sodomites. So, when Jamal-ud-din Chast brought him to Ghazni, the news spread like wild fire among the sodomites of the city, including Muhammad Ghori who rushed to the spot immediately but became disappointed when Chast claimed 100 gold coins as the price for Altamash. But the

dejected Ghori at once issued a notice that nobody in Ghazni would be allowed to buy Altamash. [10]

At that hour Qutb-ud-din came to Ghazni with immense spoils he gathered from plundering Gujarat and Nahrwala. The news of Altamash reached this lecher as soon he set his feet at Ghazni and rushed to his master to seek his permission to buy Altamash. But his master Muhammad Ghori declined. At this stage, Jamal-ud-din Chast, at his instigation, brought Altamash to Delhi and Qutb-ud-din bought him. It is to be noted here that the sodomite Qutb-ud-din, like his master Muhammad Ghori, gradually became extraordinarily addicted to Altamash and never hesitated to fulfill his any desire. In this way, Altamash ultimately asked for the hand of Qutb-ud-din's daughter and Qutb-ud-din fulfilled that desire of his beloved slave too. Finally, Qutb-ud-din nominated his slave cum son-in-law as the future Sultan of Hindustan, after his death. [10]

It has been mentioned earlier that the so-called secular historians portray Qutb-ud-din and Altamash or Iltutmish as great admirers of art and architecture. It is left to the reader to assess, from the above narrations, how much admiration these cruel killers and lecherous vandals could have for art and architecture.

Qutb Minar, a Hindu Architecture:

However, we may now turn our attention to the evidence that conclusively prove that the pillar, now known as the Qutb Minar, was built by the Hindus, long before the arrival of the barbaric Muslim invaders in India. One finds a stone inscription, written in Nagri and placed in position in Vikram-Samvat 1504 (1147 AD). It has been mentioned that, Muhammad Ghori occupied Delhi in 1192, by defeating Emperor Prithwiraj Chauhan

in the Battle of Tarai. So the said epigraph conclusively proves that the Qutb Minar was there, at least 45 years before the arrival of Qutb-ud-din in Delhi. [11]

To reject this evidence, our secular historians say that the Qutb Minar was built with the raw materials collected by demolishing several temples and buildings and the said epigraph had been carried to the Minar along with those raw materials. But it has been pointed out earlier that not even a single Muslim chronicler has ever mentioned that Qutb-ud-din had built the Qutb Minar with the raw materials collected from demolished temples. On the contrary, they never hesitated to mention that Qutb-ud-din built the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque and the Jam-e-masjid with raw materials obtained by demolishing temples. And hence their argument does not seem to be tenable and the said edict proves conclusively that **the Qutb Minar existed before the coming of Qutb-ud-din in Delhi**. Furthermore, anyone, after inspecting the said edict, would refuse to admit that it had been carried to the spot as a raw material but carefully installed on the wall of the Minar with a definite purpose. [11]

It has been mentioned earlier that an article by Acharya Bapu Vankar, published in the Itihas Darpan in 1996 contains many information regarding the history of the pillar, now called Qutb Minar. Furthermore, Varahamihir Smriti Granth, a book in Hindi, written by Kedarnath Prabhakar, published in 1974, from Saharanpur, India, contains real history of Qutb Minar and many other very important information. It is important to note that the edict of 1147 AD has been mentioned in Varahamihir Smriti Granth, where it has been said that a major renovation and repair work of the

Minar was undertaken in 1147 AD, and the names of the skilled Rajput workers, who carried out the job, had been inscribed on the epigraph. [12]

In the above mentioned work, the author Kedarnath Prabhakar writes that Emperor Vikramaditya Chandragupta-II (380 AD - 413 AD) built the Minar in the fourth century AD. It is well known that there is another pillar, made of iron, just beside the Qutb Minar. Regarding this Iron Pillar, Kedarnath Prabhakar writes that there is an inscription on this Iron Pillar, written Sanskrit, using Brahmi alphabet. Most importantly, there is mentioning of the Qutb Minar in that inscription. Here the Qutb Minar has been called the "Prapanshu Vishnudhwaj." [13]

Kedarnath Prabhakar also writes that this Great Creation of Emperor Vikramaditya was erected by exemplarily killed Rajput workers under the direct supervision of legendary astronomer Varaha Mihir. And in the great ashram he established at Indraprastha (original name of Delhi), called Mihiravali, there were 27 temples on one side and on the other side he built another temple dedicated to Kalkadevi. These 27 temples were about half a mile away from the pillar Vishnudhwaj, which Qutb-ud-din demolished. [14] On the western side of the pillar, on a hillock, there was the Kalkadevi's temple. The spot is now known as Surajki Thikri. He also writes that, that Emperor Vikramaditya erected a similar pillar in Gandhar (today's Afghanistan) and its name was Vedhmaru. For want of skilled Rajput workers, Varahamihir built this pillar with bricks and mortar. It is now known as Minar-e-Jam and Giasuddin bin Sam Ghori, the elder brother of Muhammad Ghori, in the name repair and renovation, removed all the

Hindu signs and inscriptions from the Vedhmaru and gave it Islamic look by adding Koranic inscriptions on it.[15]

In this context, it should be mentioned that, though the Qutb Minar does not contain any edict by Qutb-uddin or Iltutmish, it bears a stone epigraph by the above mentioned Giasuddin Ghorī. So, it may be speculated that, in the name of renovation and repair, Giasuddin Ghorī removed all Hindu signs and inscriptions from the Vishnudhwaj, and gave it a purely Islamic look by ornamenting it with Koranic inscriptions.

There is another stone edict on the wall of the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque that reads, in Sanskrit, - *sūryyamēru prthwīḥ yantraiḥ mihirāvalī yantreṇ* - using same Brahmiscrit as used in the inscription on the Iron Pillar. Scholars believe that this edict originally was on one of the 27 temples that Qutb-ud-din had demolished and brought to the Qutb-ul-Islam mosque as raw material. However, the text of the edict conclusively proves that the place was, once upon a time, known as Mihiravali and it was used for making astronomical observation, particularly for the sun, using instruments.

I have written a book in Bengali titled *Mithyar Aborane Delhi Agra Fatehpur Sikri* (History of Delhi Agra and Fatehpur Sikri under the Shroud of Falsehood) and I used to talk to my students about distortions of Indian history during leisure times. In one occasion, a group of my students went to visit Delhi, Agra and some other places of historical importance, as a part of an educational tour. On their return they came to me and said, "Sir, what you have written in your book is absolutely correct. We have discovered many Hindu symbols in every palace, in every fort and monument.

But you have missed a very vital point in your book. We have discovered, with the help of a torch light, an image of Lord Ganesh, in the Qutb Minar, which you should mention in future edition of your book.” Perhaps the reader would admit that, it was not possible for either Qutb-ud-din or Altamash to install an idol of Lord Ganesh in the Qutb Minar, had they been the author of the same.

References:

[1] The word Meru stands for the (North) Pole and the word Sthambha stands for a Pillar

[2] P N Oak, *Islamic Havoc in Indian History*, Published by A. Ghosh (1996), p-120

[3] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, ‘The History of India, as told by its own historians’ (in 8 Volumes), Low Price Publications, New Delhi (1996) II, 222

[4] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 223

[5] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 227

[6] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 215

[7] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 230

[8] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 231

[9] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 299

[10] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 320

[11] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VI, 669

[12] Kedarnath Prabhakar, *Varahamihir Smriti Granth*, Saharanpur (1974), 127

[13] Kedarnath Prabhakar, *Varahamihir Smriti Granth*, Saharanpur (1974), 157

[14] Kedarnath Prabhakar, *Varahamihir Smriti Granth*, Saharanpur (1974), 146-147

[15] Kedarnath Prabhakar, *Varahamihir Smriti Granth*, Saharanpur (1974), 152

Part 4

Glorification of Sher Shah

Sher Shah Suri, "The Tiger King", founder of the Suri Dynasty, was born at Narnaul in Punjab in 1486 and died on May 22, 1545 at Kalinjar. His original name was Farid Khan. His father Hasan was a Jagirdar at Sasaram, Bihar. Ill-treated by his stepmother, he left home at an early age. He went to Jaunpur where he set himself to serious study and there he acquired good command over the Arabic and Persian languages. Because of his abilities, he was soon appointed by his father to manage the family Jagir at Sasaram.^[1]

Farid Khan exploited this opportunity to accumulate riches by highway robbery and plundering the wealth and riches of the Hindus, taking their women and children as captives and selling them as slaves, following the foot steps of Bakhiyar Khalji, the famous warlord of Bihar, who lived in early 13th century AD. In one occasion, Farid succeeded to kill a tiger and hence earned the title "Sher (tiger) Khan". The money that Sher Khan accumulated by Criminal means helped him raise a small army and hence to begin his political career. Later on, Sher Khan could consolidate his power by gaining the possession of the Chunar Fort by marrying the widow of Taj Khan Sarang-Khani, the Governor of Ibrahim Lodi.

It may be mentioned here that Chunar is in the Mirzapur District of Uttar Pradesh state, India. Though a small town, Chunar has a great influence in Indian history. The Chunar Fort was built by Maharaja Vikramaditya, the King of Ujjain, in honour of the stay of his brother Raja Bhrithari. As per Hindu records, Chunar is the corrupt of Sanskrit Charanadri as Lord Vishnu had

taken his first step here in his Vaman incarnation. The place was also well known as Nainagarh.

However, Sher Khan gained considerable strength after defeating the combined army of Bengal and Hamayun with his own Bihari army and some Pashtun tribes men, in 1537. Then he defeated Humayun at the Battle of Kanauj on May 17, 1540, and ascended the throne of Delhi with the title Sher Shah. His reign barely spanned five years, but the so-called secular historians of India, who are not prepared to miss even a single opportunity to glorify the Muslim invaders, portray it as a landmark in the history of the Sub-continent. They project Sher Shah as a rare genius and say that he made many brilliant additions and improvements to the existing system of administration.^[2]

They narrate Sher shah as an outstanding military genius, a great civilian administrator and, according to them; he left not even a single area of administrative system where he had not set up reforms. But to an unbiased reader, all such narrations appear to be nothing but cock-and-bull stories. According to these spineless slave historians, Sher Shah had revolutionized the revenue system which Akbar later on copied. But according another group of historians, Todar Mal, a Rajput minister of Akbar's court, had implemented all such reforms connected to revenue administration, which are now being wrongly attributed to Sher Shah.^[2]

Road Building Enterprise of Sher Shah

The most interesting part of the episode is that, these spineless historians are projecting Sher Shah as a great builder, particularly a road builder. From their childhood, the students of India are being taught that Sher Shah Suri had built the road which is now known as

the Grand Trunk Road (G.T. Road). But how far is this correct? Let us read further to find more information on this matter.

During the days of undivided India, the said G.T. Road ran from Sonargaon near Dhaka (now in Bangladesh) up to the bank of River Indus in Punjab. Historian R.C. Majumdar writes, "*Length of the road was 1,500 kos or 3,000 miles (4,800 km).*"^[3] According to another historian, Shri Atul Chandra Roy, the length of the road was 1,400 miles or less than half of R C Majumdar's figures.^[4] Moreover, R.C. Majumdar holds that the champion road-builder, Sher Shah, undertook construction of three more roads and completed them in his lifetime. "One road from Agra towards south up to Burhanpur (600 miles), the second road from Agra via Chittor up to Jodhpur (200 miles) and the third road from Lahore to Multan (100 miles)."^[5]

Thus, according to the estimate of R. C. Majumdar, the total length of all the roads, built by Sher Shah, stands at 3,900 miles or 6,240 km. These historians also say that Sher Shah planted trees on both sides of these roads to provide shades for the travelers and, in addition to that, he set up sarais (inns) at an interval of 2 kos [1 kos=2 miles] along the roads where the travelers could take rest. In these sarais, Sher Shah provided separate accommodation facilities for the Hindus and the Muslims. He also employed Brahmin and Muslim cooks for preparing the meals of the Hindu and Muslim visitors. The reader should keep in his mind that all these things Sher Shah did within 5 years, despite his hectic military activities.

It has been mentioned above that the history books also tell that Sher Shah ascended the throne of Delhi on

May 17, 1540, by defeating Humayun in a battle near Kannauj and in the same year organised a military campaign to suppress the revolt of the Gakkars in Punjab. He moved east, the next year, to suppress a similar revolt in Bengal in March, 1541 AD. The next year, he moved against the Rajput kings in central India and conquered Malwa. The very next year (i.e. in 1543 AD), he organised a campaign against the Hindu king Puran Mal and took control of the fort at Raisin and then moved against the Rajput king of Marwar. In 1544 he subdued the Rathore king, Maldev and in the subsequent year, he died in an accident in 1545 AD, in Kalinjar.

So, the rule of Sher Shah lasted only for five years and out of these five years, he spent nearly one year to gain control over the fort of Kalinjore. [6] During the rest of his reign, he was on hectic movement from east to west and north to south for suppressing revolts or conquering new forts. It should be mentioned here that the period under consideration was a period of political chaos and lawlessness and to restore order, Sher Shah had to fight many battles and that too with partial success. Thus the question naturally arises-Was it possible for Sher Shah (or any other ruler of that time) to build such long roads within such a short span of time? Furthermore, is it possible to make roads, nearly 6,240 Km long, today using modern technology, within a period of 4 or 5 years? The real story is that, Abbas Khan, a court-chronicler of Sher Shah had written some lies to please and glorify his master and our historians took those narrations at their face value, without applying their common sense to estimate the credibility of those blatant lies.

A close scrutiny of events, during the time of Sher Shah, also reveals that, despite his vast efforts, he did not succeed in bringing the vast stretch of land, from Dhaka in Bengal and River Indus in Punjab, under his control. So, how could Sher Shah carry out such a gigantic project like making a road from Bengal to Punjab, when the territory in question was not under his supreme control?

A Muslim chronicler, Sheikh Nurul Haque, most probably honest, who mentioned in his *Zubdatut Tawarikh*, the road-building endeavour of Sher Shah, and wrote, "Sher Shah made the road which now runs from Delhi to Agra, by cutting trees in jungles, removing obstacles and built serais. Before that time people had to travel through the doab between these two places." [7] This description seems plausible and Sher Shah could have built a road, 300 Km long, within his reign of 4 years. It is important to note that this chronicler did not mention a single word about building a road from Bengal to Punjab by Sher Shah.

However, regarding the road building activities of Sher Shah, Abbas Khan, a court chronicler of Sher Shah, in his *Tarikh-i-Sher Shah*, writes, "May glory and blessings be upon his eminent dignity! For the convenience in traveling of poor travelers, on every road, at a distance of two kos, he made a sarai (inn); and one road with sarais he made from the fort which he built in the Punjab to the city of Sunargaon, which is situated in the kingdom of Bengal, on the shore of the ocean. Another road he made from the city of Agra to Burhanpur, which is on the borders of the kingdom of the Dekhin, and he made one from the city of Agra to Jodhpur and Chitor; and one road with sarais from the city of Lahore to Multan. Altogether he built 1700 sarais

on various roads; and in every sarai he built separate lodgings , both for Hindus and Musulmans, and at the gate of every sarai he had placed pots full of water, that any one might drink; and in every sarai he settled Brahmans for the entertainment of Hindus, to provide hot and cold water, and beds and food, and grain for their horses; and it was a rule in these sarais, that whoever entered them received provision suitable to his rank, and food and litter for his cattle from Government."[8]

"Villages were established all round the sarais. In the middle of every sarai was a well and a masjid of burnt brick; and he placed an imam and a muezzin in every masjid, together with custodians (shahna), and several watchmen; and all these were maintained from the land near the sarai. In every sarai, two horses were kept, that they might quickly carry news. I have heard that Hussain Tashtdar once, on an emergency, rode 300 kos in one day. On both sides of the highway, Sher Shah planted fruit-bearing trees, such as also gave much shade, that in the hot wind travelers might go along under the trees; and if they should stop by the way, might rest and take repose. If they put up at a sarai, they bound their horses under the trees", Abbas Khan continues.[8]

Sher Shah's Mausoleum at Sasaram

From what has been said above, it becomes evident that Abbas Khan wrote darkest lies in his Tarikh-i-Sher Shah, to please and glorify his master and our historians simply copied those narrations without considering the credibility of those narrations. To any unbiased reader, it would appear utterly impossible for Sher Shah to build such long roads, even if he would have devoted his 5 or 4 years of rein entirely for road building setting his

military and political aspects aside. However, it is a shame that the spineless secular historians of India, to glorify the foreign invaders, believe in these cock and bull stories which, perhaps, even a donkey would refuse to admit.

As a matter of fact, India is a great country and its civilization is oldest in the world. And it is needless to say that such a grand civilization could not have developed and sustained without extensive trade and commerce, and without good roads such large scale trade and commerce could not have been possible. So, simple common sense tells us that there were networks of good roads in existence throughout the country from very ancient times, centuries before the arrival of the Muslim invaders. One should remember that, in those days, military campaigns among the Hindu kings were very common affair. How could these military campaigns have been possible without good roads? It means that there were good roads, wide enough for chariots drawn by four horses, even in very ancient times. For example, the epic Mahabharata describes how kings from remote corners of this country had assembled at Kurukshetra with their army to participate in the war. Did they come to Kurukshetra through jungles?

Other Credits Attributed to Sher Shah

According to our historians, Sher Shah was not only a champion road builder but "Sher Shah planted shade-giving trees on both sides of the roads and sarais or rest houses at an interval of 2 kos, where separate arrangements were provided for the Muslims and the Hindus." [9] How could Sher Shah do all these things within a period of about four years? **No sane man would**

believe in this garbage of lies except the secular historians of India.

To glorify Sher Shah, our historians write, "Sher Shah was indeed a striking personality in the history of medieval India ... His military character was marked by a rare combination of caution and enterprise, his political conduct was, on the whole, just and humane; his religious attitude was free from medieval bigotry; and his excellent taste in building is well attested, even today, by his noble mausoleum at Sasaram. He applied his indefatigable industry to the service of the state, and his reforms were well calculated to secure the interests of the people." [10]

What Sher Shah really was:

But, in reality, Sher Shah was a Muslim Pathan from Afghanistan, and like any other Muslim invaders, he was equally treacherous and cruel to the Hindus. His court chronicler, Abbas Khan, in his *Tariq-i-Sher Shah*, says that in 1543, Sher Shah invaded the kingdom of the Hindu king, Puran Mal, and put his Raisin fort under siege which compelled the Hindu army to surrender. Puran Mal sought a safe passage for his royal family and army. Sher Shah agreed. So Puran Mal and his army came out of the fort and took shelter in a pre-arranged camp provided by Sher Shah, just outside the fort.

In the meantime, the Pathan army started massacring the Hindus and to describe the wholesale slaughter, Abbas Khan writes, "While the Hindus were employed in putting their women and families to death, the Afghans on all sides commenced slaughtering of the Hindus. Puran Mal and his commanders, like pigs at a bay, failed to exhibit valour and gallantry, and within the twinkle of an eye, all were slain. Such of their wives and

families, as were not slain, were captured. One daughter of Puran Mal and three sons of his brother were taken alive and the rest were all killed. Sher Shah gave the daughter of Puran Mal to some itinerant minstrels (bazigars) that they might make her dance in the bazaars, and ordered the boys to be castrated, so that the race of the oppressors (i.e. the Hindus) might not increase." [11]

At that time, the Rohtas fort in Bihar was under the control of the Hindu king, Hari Krishna Roy, who was a friend of Sher Shah. In 1537, Humayun launched a military campaign against Sher Shah and proceeded to attack the fortress at Chunar. Sher Shah had 1,000 women in his harem in the said fort at Chunar. Apprehending the fall of Chunar fort, Sher Shah requested Raja Hari Krishna Roy to provide a safe place for his harem in the Rohtas fort. Once upon a time, the Raja had given, in a similar crisis, shelter to Mia Nazim (younger brother of Sher Shah) and hence Sher Shah could request the Raja for a similar benevolence. At first, King Hari Krishna was hesitant.

However, on Sher Shah's promise by touching the Quran, the Raja agreed to give shelter, but could smell a rat. As soon as Raja Hari Krishna agreed, Sher Shah hatched a plan to capture the fort. About 1,200 dolis (palanquins) were made ready overnight and two Afghan soldiers, clad in burqas, occupied each doli. The security staff in the fort checked the first few dolis and failing to detect the conspiracy, allowed the rest to enter the fort. Nearly 2,500 Pathan soldiers succeeded in entering the fort and in the mid-night they started killing the Hindu security guards and thus occupied the fort. King Hari Krishna somehow managed to escape the fort through a secret passage. [12] Our spineless historians

describe this incident as exhibit of exemplary military acumen and bravery of Sher Shah. [13]

But Hari Krishna Roy did not know that the Koran instructs the Muslims that they can enter into any agreement with the kafirs and break that agreement in the opportune moment, for the benefit of Islam. Moreover, Allah designates such a treachery with the kafirs as taqiyah or holy deception and attaches merit for such treacherous activities.

This kind of treachery is still going on today and an incident may be cited in this context. When Indian Prime Minister A B Vajpayee and Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharf were having peace talks at Rawalpindi in 1998, the Pakistani army, at the instigation of Nawaz Sharif, was crossing the Line of Control (LOC) between India and the Pak occupied Kashmir (POK) and occupying the military bunkers on the Indian side at Kargil.

However, our so-called secular historians carefully avoid all these aspects in their versions of history and prefer to follow two fundamental guidelines, as mentioned above, to glorify the Muslim rulers.

How Farid Khan became Sher Shah

It has been mentioned earlier that the so-called secular and Marxist historians distort the Muslim colonial period of Indian history following the guidelines-

1) The period of Muslim rule in India was not a colonial period as the Muslim rulers, though came from outside, stayed back in this country.

2) The said Muslim period of Indian history should be mentioned as a golden period of Indian history, not a colonial period.

3) The ugly face of Islam is to be suppressed and it should be projected as a noble, generous, extremely tolerant and socialistic religion, and religion of universal brotherhood.

4) The Hinduism is to be exposed as a base religion infected with the inhuman institution like casteism and full of despicable superstitions.

5) The foreign Muslim rulers are to be narrated as highly civilized, generous, polished and valorous people and they were far superior to the Hindus in military skill and bravery.

6) During the Muslim rule, the Hindus and Muslims lived in peace as good neighbours and the present enmity and hatred between the two communities was created later on by the British colonialists.

7) It should never be mentioned that the Muslim rulers had massacred the Hindus in hundreds of thousands, demolished thousands Hindu temples or converted them into mosques.

It should never be mentioned that the Muslim rulers converted the Hindus at the point of sword. On the contrary, it should be said the low caste Hindus, being oppressed by the high caste Hindus and attracted by the generous and socialistic ideals of Islam, accepted Islam in droves and so on and so forth.

According to the set guidelines as mentioned above, the so called secular historians are projecting Sher Shah as a great ruler, a rare genius free from religious bigotry and by any similar lofty word the might find in the dictionary. They also say that exemplary military skill, keen foresight, extreme diligence and prudence helped Sher Shah rising from humble Farid Khan and ending up

ultimately as the Sultan of Hindustan. But the real story is quite different.

In an earlier article, it has been pointed out that Islam has nothing like human resource development program and it has no plan to develop its followers as wealth creators. On the contrary, the Koran inspires the Muslims to acquire wealth by criminal means such as theft, robbery and plunder of the kafirs by waging jihad against them. Most importantly, their Prophet taught his followers this easy means for acquiring wealth by killing and driving away the Jews from Medina and confiscating and distributing their wealth and the riches among the believers. It is needless to say that these teachings of Islam have made its followers, though poor in creative intelligentsia, expert in criminal activities.

As a Muslim, Farid Khan also utilized that celebrated criminal path to accumulate wealth while he was serving his father to manage his jagir. He used to conduct raids on Hindu villages, plunder the wealth and riches of the Hindu subjects of his father's jagir, to become rich. As a procedure, he used to encircle a Hindu village, kill the adult males and sell the women and children as slaves and confiscate their properties. He also used to bring false allegations against the Hindu landlords and occupy their wealth and properties after killing them en masse or driving them out of the jagir.

To narrate such a raid in a Hindu village, Abbas Hasan in his *Tarikh-i-Sher Shahi*, writes, "His horsemen he directed to patrol around the villages, to kill all men they meet and to make prisoners of the women and children, to drive in cattle to permit no one to cultivate the fields, to destroy the crops already sown and not to

permit any one to bring anything in from neighbouring parts." [14]

To describe how Farid Khan attacked and plundered the wealth of the Hindu zamindars, Abbas Hasan, in his *Tarikh-i-Sher Shahi*, writes, "Early in the morning, Farid Khan mounted and attacked the criminal zamindars, and put all the rebels to death, and making their women and children prisoners, ordered his men to sell them or keep them as slaves and brought other people (i.e. Afghan Muslims) to the village and settled them there." [14]

While commenting on such oppression of the Muslim rulers on the helpless Hindus, H M Elliot writes, "Under such rulers, we cannot wonder that the fountains of justice are corrupted; that the state revenues are never collected without violence and outrage; that villages are burnt and their inhabitants mutilated or sold to slavery; that the officials, so far from affording protection, are themselves the chief robbers and usurpers; and that the poor find no redress against the oppressor's wrong and proud man's consumely." [15]

He also writes, "The few glimpses we have of Hindus slain for disputing with the Muhammadans, of prohibitions against processions, worship and ablutions, and of other intolerant measures, of idols mutilated, of temples razed, of forcible conversions and marriages of proscriptions and confiscations, of murders and massacres, and of the sensuality and drunkenness of the tyrants who enjoined them, show us that this picture is no overcharged, and it is much to be regretted that we are left to draw it for ourselves from out of the mass of ordinary occurrences, recorded by writers who seem to sympathize with no virtues and to abhor no vices." [16]

But it is a shame that the so-called secular historians of India are portraying oppressive and jihadi rulers as extremely kind hearted, generous, tolerant and polished people free of religious bigotry. It is needless to say that, by such false portrayal of those diabolical rulers, they are committing an unpardonable crime.

References:

- [1] <http://www.storyofpakistan.com/person.asp?perid=P055>
- [2] R.C. Majumdar, H.C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, '*An Advanced History of India*', Macmillan & Co (1980), 428-429
- [3] R. C. Majumdar (General Editor), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 volumes), Mumbai (1996) VII, 87
- [4] Atul Chandra Roy, *Bharater Itihas* (in Bengali), Maulik Library, Calcutta (1985), I, 84
- [5] R. C. Majumdar, H.C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, '*An Advanced History of India*', Macmillan & Co (1980), 434
- [6] Atul Chandra Roy, *ibid*, Maulik Library, Calcutta (1985), I, 27
- [7] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *The History of India -As Told by Its Own Historians* (in 8 volumes), Low Price Publication, Delhi (1996) IV, 488
- [8] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, (*ibid*) Low Price Publication, Delhi (1996) IV, 417-418
- [9] R. C. Majumdar et al (*ibid*) Macmillan & Co (1980), 434
- [10] R.C. Majumdar et al (*ibid*) Macmillan & Co (1980), 435
- [11] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson (*ibid*) IV, 403
- [12] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson (*ibid*) IV, 361
- [13] Atul Chandra Roy, *ibid*, Maulik Library, Calcutta (1985), I, 25
- [14] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson (*ibid*) IV, 316
- [15] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson (*ibid*) I, xx
- [16] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson (*ibid*) I, xxi

Part 5A

Akbar the Great (?) Monarch:

It is really amazing and ridiculous that not only the so-called pseudo secular and the Marxist historians of India but also the Western historians portray the Mughal emperor Akbar as a great monarch. But are there sufficient grounds to project him as a great man? The Indian historians, according to the guideline set by the ongoing politics of Muslim appeasement, have to glorify each and every Muslim ruler including Akbar as a compulsion. But it is really incomprehensible why the historians of the West are also in the race in glorifying Akbar, who in reality was a foreign invader and came to India to plunder this country. Above all, Akbar was a Muslim and, like each and every Muslim, he possessed three basic Islamic qualities - *treachery, lechery and butchery*. In several occasions, Akbar played vile treachery with the Hindu kings. Akbar was a cruel killer, who butchered innocent Hindus in millions. As a lecher, Akbar maintained a harem of 5000 women, most of whom were abducted Hindu housewives. So it is necessary to make a fresh estimate of Akbar to assess his greatness.

Abul-Fath Jalal-ud-din Muhammad Akbar was born on 23 November 1542 at Umarkot Fort in Sind and died on 27 October 1605 at the age of 63 at Fatehpur Sikri, Agra. His father was Nasiruddin Humayun and his mother's name was Nawab Hamida Banu Begum Sahiba. At birth Akbar was named Badruddin Mohammed Akbar, because he was born on the night of a badr (full moon). After the capture of Kabul by Humayun his date of birth and name were changed to throw off evil sorcerers. His name was changed to Jalal-ud-din

Muhammad Akbar and his birthdate was officially changed to October 15, 1542. He was given the name Akbar at birth after his maternal grandfather, Shaikh Ali Akbar Jami.^[1]

He succeeded his father Humayun as ruler of the Mughal Empire from 1556 to 1605. He was the grandson of Babur who founded the Mughal dynasty in India. On the eve of Akbar's death in 1605, the Mughal Empire spanned almost 1 million square kilometers.^[1]

Akbar, widely considered the greatest of the Mughal emperors, was only 14 when he ascended the throne in Delhi, by defeating the Hindu king Samrat Hem Raj Vikramaditya, also called Himu at the Second Battle of Panipat. He was descended from Turks, Mongols, and Iranians – the three peoples who predominated in the political elites of northern India in medieval times. He consolidated his power during first two decades of his reign and brought parts of northern and central India into his realm. He also reduced external military threats from the Pashtun (Afghan), the descendants of Sher Shah, by waging wars against Afghan. He also solidified his rule in India by pursuing diplomacy with the powerful Rajput rulers of northern part of the country, and by admitting Rajput princesses in his harem. [1]

Akbar spent a part of his early life in the Princely State of Rewa (in present day Madhya Pradesh) where Akbar grew up in the village of Mukundpur. Akbar and prince Ram Singh who later became the Maharaja of Rewa grew up together and stayed close friends through life. Humayun was the eldest son of Babur. For some time, Akbar was raised by his uncle Askari and his wife in the eastern country of Persia and Afghanistan. He spent his youth learning to hunt, run, and fight, but he never

learned to read and write. The so-called pseudo-secular and Marxist historians paint Akbar as a generous, kind hearted tolerant king free from religious bigotry, and a genius with refined tastes in the arts, architecture, music and literature. But it is to be seen how far their portrayal is true.

It has been mentioned earlier that Sher Shah ascended the throne of Delhi on May 17, 1540, by defeating Humayun in a battle near Kannauj and he died in an accident in 1545 AD, in Kalinjar. After his death, anarchy appeared again. The nobles made Jalal Khan, the second son of Sher Shah, the Sultan of Delhi, depriving the eldest Adil Khan as the latter was incompetent, lazy, and ease-loving. After ascending the throne, Jalal Khan assumed the title of Islam Shah. Soon after, a group of nobles made a conspiracy to murder Islam Shah and put Adil Khan on the throne. But the plan divulged and Islam Shah put all the conspirators to the sword.

Chaos after the Death of Sher Shah:

On November 22, 1554, Islam Shah, after ruling for 9 years and 6 months, died and his nobles put his minor son Firuz on to the throne. But after a few months, Mubariz Khan, a cousin of Firuz, murdered him and ascended the throne assuming the new name of Muhammad Adil Shah. But he was unsuitable as a ruler. On the other hand, the news of Islam Shah's death inspired Humayun to invade India and recover his lost territory. At this juncture, Bairam Khan came to Humayun's help that enhanced his strength considerably and enabled him to re-conquer Kabul, News of these developments made Adil Shah very shaky and he gave up all the responsibilities to his most trusted employee Himu, a Hindu officer, and this incident facilitated Himu

to raise himself as the most important man in North Indian politics.

This was the time when the star of Himu's fortune shone brightest- Adil Shah appointed him the Wzir (Prime Minister) and the incident initiated his rapid rise. But most of the Muslim historians did not like an infidel to hold the highest post in the court of a Muslim king and hence they tried to blacken his character it every opportunity.

Who this Himu was? Historian R. C, Majumdar, in this regard, writes, "Himu was born in a poor family of Dhansar section of the Baniya caste, living in a town in the southern part of Alwar".[2] Muslim historian Badayuni has described him as a resident of a small town called Rewari in the taluk of Mewat, and according to him, Himu began his life as a green vendor.[2] Others believe that Himu was a hawker in the town of Mewat.[2] However, at a certain stage, he succeeded to draw the attention of Adil Shah, who appointed him the Superintendent of the Delhi market. But by dint of his sincerity and sense of responsibility, he became a favourite of Adil, who started to elevate him to more and more responsible posts. When Adil Shah died, Himu was the Chief of the Intelligence Department and, at the same time, the Head of the Postal Department (Daroga-i-Dak Chowki).

To introduce Himu, the Muslim historian Ahmmad Yadgar, in his *Tarikh-I-Salatin-i-Afghana*, writes, "There was a man named Himu, who was a weighman in the bazar, who found means to approach the King on different affairs, and in whom he daily reposed more and more confidence. By degrees he became very powerful

and influential, so that he managed the business of the State". [3]

At that time, Junaid Khan, the governor of Bayana, and his son, the phaujdar of Ajmir rebelled. Adil Shah sent Jamal Khan against him with a large force. But in a severe battle at Kanulapur, Junaid became victorious. The incident made Adil Shah very depressed. Then Himu said, "O Lord of the World, if you will trust me with a small force, I will either overcome Junaid Khan, or perish in the attempt". [4] The King yielded to his solicitations and sent Himu with 3000 or 4000 horsemen and four war-elephants. Junaid deputed his assistant Daulat Khan to defend Himu. A battle was fought and Daulat Khan was defeated and slain.

Then Junaid himself advanced with 8000 strong cavalry to confront Himu, while Himu had only 3000 horses. So he decided to attack the enemy in the darkness of night and Ahremad Yadgar, in his *Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afghana*, writes, "The enemy remained on the alert during the three watches of the night; but in the last watch they grew negligent and fell asleep. The soldiers of Adil Shah fell furiously on them on all sides. Himu did not give the time to put enemy their armour and the Afghans, sword in hand, passed through their enemy slaughtering all they met." [5] Himu then went to the court of Adil Shah and Yadgar writes, "He (Himu) then stood with folded hands in front of the throne. Adil Shah honoured him with a purple khilat (garment), the collar and the skirt of which were covered with jewels". [6]

At that time, Ibrahim Khan, a cousin of Adil Shah and the governor of Agra, rebelled. Adil Shah sent a detachment against him, but Ibrahim routed them. Then Ibrahim marched towards Delhi and ultimately occupied

the city. Inspired by the success of Ibrahim, Ahmmad Khan Sur, the governor of Lahore and brother-in-law of Adil, assumed the name Sikandar Shah and rebelled. In the east, Muhammad Khan Sur, the governor of Bengal revolted and assumed the title of Shamsuddin Muhammad Ghazi. So the empire of Sher Shah got divided into four parts, Delhi and Agra went to Ibrahim Khan, Punjab went to Sikandar Shah, Bengal to Shamsuddin Muhammad and the remaining part under the control of Adil Shah.

Meanwhile, in 1555, Sikandar Shah invaded Delhi, in a severe battle he defeated Ibrahim and thus Delhi went under the control of Sikandar. On the other hand, the rivalry among the Afghans provided a great opportunity for the Mughals to recover their lost empire. In November 1554, Humayun left Kabul, advanced towards Lahore, and in February 1555, gained control over the city almost without any resistance. Then Sikandar Shah marched against Humayun with a 30,000 strong cavalry. A severe battle took place at Machhiara near Ludhiana and Sikandar Shah suffered a complete defeat. Sikandar then marched again against Humayun with 80,000 horsemen, but he was again defeated in a battle near Sirhind and fled to Sivallk Hills.

Ascendency of Himu:

In that hour of crises, Adil Shah Appointed Himu the Wazir, or the Prime Minister of his court and handed over civil, military, finance and, in fact, every other responsibility to him. It is really surprising that Adil Shah, a Muslim king, selected a Hindu kafir for the highest position of his government, and there is no doubt that had Adil could find Muslim candidate suitable for the post, he would certainly not have selected an infidel

like Himu for the post. The incident shows that the competency of Himu, for the post, was beyond any dispute.

After assuming the new responsibility, Himu at once marched against Ibrahim and defeated him twice, first at Kalpi and then at Khanwa. To narrate Himu's victory, Nizamuddin Ahmad in his *Tabakat-i-Akbari*, writes, "Adil now sent, the bakkal, who was the Wazir, with a large force, and with 500 war-elephants and artillery, against Agra and Delhi. When Himu reached Kalpi, he resolved to dispose of Ibrahim first and hastened to meet him. A great battle followed, in which Himu was victorious, and Ibrahim fled to his father at Bayana, Himun followed and Invested Bayana, which he besieged for three months".[7] Himu then marched against Muhammad Shah and a battle was fought at Chhapparghatta , a place 20 miles away from Kalpl. Muhammad Shah was defeated and Himu gained control over Bengal.[8]

Following the chaos over the succession of Islam Shah (Sher Khan Suri's son), as mentioned above, Humayun reconquered Delhi in 1555, with the help of an army partly provided by his Persian ally Shah Tahmasp. But a few months later, on January 26, 1556, Humayun died and Bairam Khan, the guardian of Akbar, cleverly concealed the report of Humayun's death in order to prepare for Akbar's accession to the throne. On February 24, 1556, Akabar, a 13 year-old boy, was proclaimed *Shahanshah* (Persian for "King of Kings") of Hindustan by Bairam Khan at Kalanaur (Gurdaspur, Punjab).

At that time, Himu sought permission of Adil to attack Delhi. Ahmmad Yadgar narrates, "Himun went in front of the throne and said, "O King, the case is this; he

(Akbar) is now a child of ten years old, who has lost his father, and the Mughal army is not yet firmly established. It is easy to root up a small plant". Adil Shah derived confidence from his speech and prepared a powerful force. He sent 7000 horsemen and 20 war-elephants with Himun, who went march by march to Gwalior".[9] From Gwallor, Himu advanced towards Agra and Adil Shah, on the other hand, went to the safe place at the fort of Chunar.

As Himu got closer to Agra, frightened Iskandar Khan, the Mughal governor of the city, fled to Delhi. So Himu occupied Agra practically without resistance and then the victorious Wazir marched towards Delhi. Alikuli Khan, the Mughal governor of Delhi, also prepared a strong force to confront Himu and a fierce battle followed. Ahmmad Yadgar, to narrate the incident, writes, "When Himu saw that the Mughals were in good spirit and the Afghans disheartened, he advanced with his own division and routed them. They (Mughals) were unable to rally, and as they were utterly defeated, they took to flight. Himu pursued them and slaughtered many ... So much plunder of Mughal army fell into Himun's hands that it was impossible to take an account of it -160 elephants, 1000 horses of Arab breed and an immense quantity of property and valuables". [10]

Then victorious Himu entered Delhi and Nizamuddin Ahmmad, in his *Tarikh -i-Akbari*, writes, "Himun had greatly vaunted his achievements at Delhi and had taken to himself the title of Raja Bikrsmjit".[11] To narrate the same victory, Ahmmad Yadgar, in his *Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afghana*, writes, "Himun rejoiced this victory, sent an account of his success, together with the Spoils captured

from the Mughals, to Adll Shah, who was exceedingly pleased when he received it,...He (Adil Shah) gave a great festival and sent Himun a dress of honour, adorned with jewels and worked with gold threads"[12] Ahmmad Yadgar continues to write," ... he (Himu) entered Delhi, raised the Imperial Canopy over him and ordered coins to be struck in his name. He appointed a governor (of Delhi) of his own and brought the Delhi territory and the neighbouring parganas under his control and in order to console the King, he sent an account of the victory in these words,"Your slave, by the royal fortune, has routed the Mughal army, ... but I hear that Humayun's son commands a numerous force and advancing against Delhi".[13]

Himu's Misfortune:

The news of defeat of the Mughal governor of Delhi and the skill and braveiy of Himu reached the Mughal prince Akber in time. Nearly 10 months later, Akbar, with a great force of 26,000 horsemen under the command of Bairam Khan marched towards Delhi. So Ahmmad Yadgar, in his *Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afghana*, writes, "He (Akbar) marched without halting, with Bairam Khan ...When they reached Thanesar, a census was taken of the army, which was found to consist of 26,000 horsemen" [14] And to describe Himu's army, Nizamuddin Ahmmad in his *Tarikh-i-Akbari*, writes, "He (Himu) had gathered under his command a mighty force and had 1600 war-elephants. With those, he hastened to meet the Imperial (Mughal) army". [15]

The battle began in the morning on 5th November, 1556, at Panipat and to describe the same, Nizamuddim Ahmmad writes, "Himun then advanced with his elephants, and made such a determined charge on the

Imperial army that the left wing was shaken.... Himu then drew off his forces, and made an assault upon the centre, which was under the command of Khan-Zaman. He led all his elephants against the Khan's men, who received him with shower of Arrows. An arrow pierced the eye of Hemun, and came out at the back of his head. When those who were fighting under him saw his condition, their hands were paralyzed, and they broke. The Imperial forces pursued them, and cut many of them, to pieces." [16] According to Abul Fazl, Himu had divided his army into three divisions and he himself was leading the central division with 500 elephants and 20,000 Afghan and Rajput horsemen. [17] So, many believe, when Himu was on the verge of winning this battle, the accident occurred, leading to his defeat.

Ahmad Yadgar had tried to invent a reason for Himu's defeat, which is extremely incredible. He writes, "The evening preceding the day on which he (Himu) expected the battle, he went to the sanctified mausoleum Kutub-ul-Aktab of His Highness Kutb-ul-Hakk, (the pole-star of religion of Islam),and placing the head of entreaty on the august threshold, vowed that, if he were destined to conquer Delhi, if the throne of Delhi were granted to him, he would become a Musulman on his return to Delhi, and diffuse the religion of Muhammad" [18] Yadgar continues, "The Almighty (Allah) gave them (Mughals) victory. But he (Himu) perjured himself, and did not become a Musulman, or forsake his heathen prejudices; nay, he even persecuted the Musulmans. But at last he saw, what he did see". [18]

Yadgar also writes that, on the previous night, Himu became extremely disheartened after a dream of bad omen. He writes, "...he (Himu) beheld in a dream, a

torrent come down and carry away the elephant on which he was mounted. When he was nearly drowned, a Mughal came and cast a chain round his neck, and drew him out". On the next day, an interpreter said, "The torrent which you saw is the Mughal army ... and the chain signifies the blood which will flow from your body when you are wounded." [18] This made Himu much frightened, but he said, "The very reverse of the dream will happen". [18]

But, in fact, it was Akbar who got frightened by observing the valour of Himu and his mighty force, and Bairam Khan, to inspire him, said, "This is the commencement of His Majesty's reign. This infidel has routed the whole Mughal army, and is now making preparations against us. If you do your best in this business, with one heart and soul, Hindustan is yours. I place my trust in Allah. If we fail in this, you, whose homes are at a distance of 500 kos (1000 miles), will not be able to find an sylum". [19]

However, the military skill and bravery that Himu displayed in the battle field on November 5 could not have been ignored by even the Muslim historians. So Ahmmad Yadgar writes, "Himu, having made himself ready for action, came out into the plain, and seated himself in a howda on an elephant in order that he might be able to overlook and superintend his troops Bairan Khan also drew up the people of Chaghatai to the right and left in battle array... Bairam Khan placed Akbar Mirza's own private tent in an elevated position, and left 3000 horse to guard him, ... Himu was excessively arrogant on account of his troops and elephants. He advanced, fought, and routed the Mughals, whose heads

lay in heaps, and whose blood flowed in streams. He thus at first vanquished the Mughals..." [20]

But fortune was not with Himu and his victory turned into a defeat due to an accident and Ahmmad Yadgar writes, "...by the decree of the Almighty, an arrow struck Himu in the forehead. He told his elephant driver to take the elephant out of the field of battle, and then the Afghans saw that the animal was retreating, they believed that Himun was flying. ... as no benefit is ever derived from disloyalty, he Sustained a complete defeat". [20]

To narrate the same incident, Vincent Smith writes, "On November 5, Himu succeeded in throwing both the right and the left wings of his opponents into confusion, and sought to make his victory decisive by bringing all his mountain-like elephants to bear on the centre of the enemy, commanded by Khan Zaman. Probably he would have won but for the accident that he was struck in the eye by an arrow which pierced his brain and rendered him unconscious" [21]

Akbar's Display of Greatness:

After the battle was ended, in accordance with the ghastly custom of the times, a tower was built with the heads of the slain. This "tower of heads" tradition and ceremony was religiously observed by the "magnanimous" Akbar, like his ancestors.

According to Yadgar, Alikuli Khan could trace the elephant of Himu in the forest, brought it back and placed Himu before Bairam Khan, and writes, "Bairam Khan ... caused Himu to descend from the elephant, after which he bound his hands, and took him before the young and fortunate Prince, and said, "As this is our first success, let your Highness's own august hand smite this

infidel with the sword". The Prince, accordingly, struck him, and divided his head from his unclean body". [22]

Nizamuddin Ahmmad, to describe the incident, writes, "Shah Kuli Khan... drove the elephant, along with several others which had been captured in the field, to the presence of the Emperor. Bairam Khan Khan Kanan then put Himu to death with his own hand." [23] So, according to Nizamuddln Ahmmad, Bairam Khan executed himu with his own hand. And similar was the view maintained by Badayuni, Abul Fazl and Faizi. So, Badayuni writes, "Bairam Khan said, "This is your first war (ghazd), prove your sword on this infidel, for it will be a meritorious deed", Akbar replied, "He is now no better than a dead man, how can I strike him? If he had sense and strength, I would try my sword". Then, in the presence of them all, the Khan, the warrior of the faith, cut him down with his sword. Himun's head was sent to Kabul, and his body to Delhi, to be exposed over the gates". [23]

But according to Vincent Smith, Akbar himself struck Himu with his sword to earn the title of Ghazi, and writes, "Bairam Khan desired Akbar to earn the title of Ghazi, or slayer of the infidel, by fleshing his sword on the captive. The boy naturally obeyed his guardian and smote Hemu on the neck with his scimitar. The bystanders also plunged their swords into the bleeding corpse. Hemu's head was sent to Kabul to be exposed, and his trunk gibbeted at one of the gates of Delh". [24]

He also writes, "Akbar, a boy of fourteen cannot be justly blamed for complying with the instructions of Bairam Khan... The official story, that a magnanimous sentiment of unwillingness to strike a helpless prisoner already half dead compelled him (Akbar) to refuse to

obey his guardian's instructions, seems to be the late invention of courtly flatterers, and is opposed to the clear statement of Ahmed Yadgar and the Dutch writer, van der Broecke, as well as to the probabilities of the case". [24] That was the pathetic end of the saga of a great son of Mother India, who tried his best to restore independence of this ancient country, our beloved motherland, by defeating the Muslim invaders and occupiers, but did not succeed only due to a mere accident. Furthermore, it is a matter of great regret that the people of this country have forgotten that great Hindu hero and the fascinating story of his life, achievements and sacrifice.

Akbar's Subsequent Display of Greatness:

But the tale of Himu did not end with his death. Intelligence came to Akbar that Himu's father, his widow and other members of his family were living in Alwar, with their properties and wealth, and, on the pretext of a possible revolt by Haji Khan, the governor of Alwar, he sent a detachment to Alwar, under the command of Nasir-ul-mulk, a.k.a, Pir Muhammad. The Mughal has brought the Mewat region under the rule of Delhi and Pir Muhammad executed Himu's father. To narrate the incident, Abul Fazl, in his Akbarnama, writes, "Himu's father was taken alive, and brought before Nasir-ul-mulk, who tried to convert him to the faith (of Islam); but the old man said, "For eighty years, I have worshipped God in way of my own religion; how can I forsake my faith? Shall I, through fear of death, embrace your religion without understanding it?" Maulana Pir Muhammad treated his question as unheard, but gave an answer with the tongue of the sword". [25] Immense treasures were taken with the family of Hemu whose aged father was executed." This "tower of heads"

tradition and ceremony was religiously preserved by the “magnanimous” Akbar.

Historian R. C. Majumdar, while offering his respect to Himu, writes, “Such was the noble end of the family of a great Hindu who was born in a humble life, but made his way to the throne of Delhi by dint of sheer ability and military skill – a unique episode in the history of India during the Muslim rule” [26]

Almost all the Muslim chroniclers have tried to paint Himu a traitor and disloyal, because he ascended the throne of Delhi, in stead of offer-ing the same to his master Adil Shah. But, in this context, R. C. Majumdar writes *“No one today can reasonably claim to know the thoughts in Himu’s mind. But a little reflection will show that there was nothing unreasonable or immoral in the aspiration of Himu. No doubt, personal ambition played a great part, but it may not be altogether wrong to think that he was also inspired by the idea of founding a Hindu Raj. This is supported by his assumption to the title of Vikramaditya”*.^[27] And, perhaps, most shameful as well as most deplorable is the role of the so-called secular and the Marxist historians, the most despicable group of people of independent India who, like the Muslim historians, are continuing their efforts to blacken Himu’s character by portraying him a betrayer to his Muslim Master.

So, the historian R. C. Majumdar, in this context, writes, *“Unfortunately, Himu’s history has been written almost wholly by his enemies who dreaded him most, and, far from doing justice to his greatness, they have tarnished his name with unmerited odium. It is time to resuscitate the memory and give a true account of the life of Hemchandra, a really great hero, whose dreams and achievements have been forgotten by his countrymen”*.^[26]

So, it is really unfortunate that our so-called secular historians, following their sinister political guideline of Muslim appeasement, are glorifying the foreign Muslim invaders, including Akbar, by concealing their demonic activities, while projecting a real patriotic fighter, like Himu, as a villain. These people, guided by the said policy of Muslim appeasement and motivated by allurements, are going on writing distorted history of this country and thus depriving the people and their posterity from getting acquainted with their real history.

The Muslim rulers who massacred hundreds of thousands of innocent Hindus within a single day in umpteen occasions, these historians are projecting those killers as honest and benevolent rulers. Those blood-thirsty Muslim rulers who, by coercion and torture, converted hundreds of millions of Hindus to Islam at the point of sword, these despicable sub-humans called secular historians are portraying those Muslim despots as noble hearted magnanimous kings. The foreign Muslim invaders who demolished hundreds of thousands of Hindu temples or converted them into mosques, these historians are describing them as generous people liberal in the matter of religion. The abominable and lecherous Muslim invaders, who carried hundreds of thousands of Hindu women and children as captives to the Middle East to be sold as slaves, these wicked historians are painting them as kind and soft-hearted rulers. Those foreign Muslim invaders, who forcibly occupied the forts and palaces of Hindu kings and did not lay a single brick, these historians are highlighting them as great admirers of architecture or great architects, and we fools are cramming those narrations year after year, without assessing the realities of those narrations.

But we, the citizens of free India, have every right to know their true history. They have every right to know, who this Himu was and what were his achievements. We have the right to know the spectacular life of this great son of India, a great patriot who sacrificed his life to defend the foreign occupier Akbar. And, had not by an accident, an arrow pierced Himu's eye and rendered him unconscious on November 5, 1556, the day on which the Second Battle of Panipat was fought, the people of India would have a different history to read- the chapter of Mughal Dynasty would have been replaced by the Hindu Dynasty of Vikramaditya Heraraj. And at same the time, the hour has arrived to decide who was really Great, Akbar or the Emperor Vikramaditya Hemraj, who now being slighted as Himu.

References:

- [1] <http://www.culturalindia.net/indian-history/akbar.html>,
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tomb_of_Akbar_the_Great,
<http://www.boloji.com/history/011.htm>
- [2] R. C, Majumdar, *'The History and Cultures of the Indian People'*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 Vols), VII, 97
- [3] H. M. Elliot and J, Dowson, *History of India; As Told by Its Own Historians*, Low Price Publications, Delhi, (in 8 Vols), V, 48,
- [4] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 48
- [5] H. M, Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 50
- [6] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 51
- [7] H. M. Elliot and J, Dowson, *ibid*, V, 244
- [8] H. M. Elliot and J- Dowson, *ibid*, V, 490
- [9] H. M. Elliot and J, Dowson, *ibid*, V, 59
- [10] H. M. Elliot and J, Dowson, *ibid*, V, 61
- [11] H. M Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 252
- [12] H. M Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 60,

- [13] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 61-62
- [14] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 62
- [15] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 252
- [16] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 252
- [17] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 252-53
- [18] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 63
- [19] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 64
- [20] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 65
- [21] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press,
38
- [22] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 66
- [23] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, V, 253
- [24] V. A. Smith, *ibid*, 39
- [25] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, VI, 21
- [26] R.C. Majumdar, *ibid*, *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan*, VII, 100
- [27] R. C. Majumdar, *ibid*, *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan*, VII, 101

Part 5B

Akbar was a cruel killer:

There are umpteen incidents to show that, like all other Muslim rulers, Akbar was a merciless cruel killer. It has been mentioned earlier how Akbar beheaded helpless Samrat Vikramaditya Hemraj to earn the title of *Ghazi* (the slayer of infidel). It has also been mentioned how the so-called pseudo secular historians are trying to distort the history and conceal Akbar's inhuman cruelty. It should be mentioned here the opinion of the renowned historian R C Majumdar in this context. He writes, "In this helpless condition, Himu was put to death, according to some, by Bairam, on the refusal of Akbar to kill him with his own hands and, according to others, by Akbar himself at the instigation of his protector." [1] But

still there are some historians, though very rare, who do not hesitate to expose the truth.

Such a historian, Mr S Roy, writes, "Akbar accordingly struck Himu with his sword and Bairam Khan followed him. The story of Akbar's magnanimity and refusal to kill a fallen foe seems to be a later courtly invention. The humane and liberal emperor of Hindustan who preached 'sulh-i-kull' (universal toleration) was not born but made." [2]

In this context, an incident may be described to expose Akbar's mindless cruelty. The incident has been narrated by Asad Beg in his Wikaya. It reads, "At that time the Emperor used to retire for a long interval, after evening prayers, during which time the servants and courtiers used to disperse, assembling again when they expected His Majesty to re-appear. That evening he (Akbar) happened to come out sooner than usual, to hear the news from the Dakhin, and at first found none of the servants in the palace. When he came near the throne and couch, he saw a luckless lamplighter, coiled up like a snake, in a careless death-like sleep, close to the royal couch. Enraged at the sight, he ordered him to be thrown from the tower, and he was dashed into a thousand pieces." [3] One would be extremely frustrated if he tries to discover such an act of cruelty by a Hindu king, because Hindu kings were human beings.

Humayun, Akbar's father, blinded his elder brother Kamran so that he could never pose a threat to the throne and Akbar assassinated Kamran's son for the same reason. To describe this cruelty of Akbar, Vincent Smith writes, "Executing Kamran's son [namely, Akbar's own cousin] at Gwalior in 1565, Akbar set an evil

example, initiated on a large scale by his descendents Shahjahan and Aurangzeb.” [4]

There is no doubt that Akbar inherited such inhuman and brute cruelty from his forefathers. As a matter of fact, Akbar’s ancestors like Babar and Humayun were barbarous and vicious killers, and so were his descendants like Aurangzeb and others’ down the line. “Akbar was born and brought up in an illiterate and foul atmosphere characterized by excessive drinking, womanizing and drug addiction.” [5] The so-called secular historians of India are trying to project Akbar as the greatest of all Moghals, righteous in his deeds and noble in character. He is being portrayed as the only and truly secular Emperor of the times, very caring and protective of his subjects. And, above all, he is being projected as a divine incarnate. But Vincent Smith in his *‘Akbar – The Great Mogul’* writes, “Intemperance was the besetting sin of the Timuroid royal family, as it was of many other Muslim ruling houses. Babur (was) an elegant toper ... Humayun made himself stupid with opium ... Akbar permitted himself the practices of both vices. Akbar’s two sons died in early manhood from chronic alcoholism, and their elder brother was saved from the same fate by a strong constitution, and not by virtue.” [6] “With such an atmosphere to nourish Akbar’s thoughts, it is rather usual for Akbar to become “devil incarnate”, rather than a divine incarnate. [5]

Babar, Akbar’s grandfather, was diabolic killer and a terrible iconoclast and Guru Nanak was an eye-witness to the treatments meted out to the people by Babar when he invaded India in 1521. “Nanak was at Sayyidpur, now called Eminabad, 80 kilometres from Lahore, in the Gurjanwala district. Babur ordered a general massacre of

the people and thousands of persons were taken as prisoners. The barbarous treatment of prisoners, in the camp, particularly pitilessly lashing of women and children, broke tender heart of Nanak. In his agony he even took God to task." [7] Guru Nanak said, "Thou, O Creator of all things, takest to Thyself no blame: Thou hast sent Yama disguised as the great Moghal, Babar. Terrible was his slaughter; loud were the cries of the lamenters. Did not this awaken pity in Thee, O Lord? [8]

It has been said above that like all other diabolic and infernal Muslim rulers, Babar was also a terrible iconoclast. Babar's barbarism desecrated and demolished thousands of Hindu temples and converted several thousands into mosques. "Babar converted famous Jain temple at Chanderi and the Lord Shiva temple at Sambhal into mosques. By the order of Babar, his general Mir Baqi partially pulled down the Ram Janmabhumi Temple at Ayodhya and converted the same into a mosque. Babar also demolished the famous Jain temple near Ubhar." [9]

But our historians to narrate Babar, write, "Babur was the best of the rulers of his times. He had eight great qualities, such as prudence and foresight, great personal ambition, skilled warrior, skilled and generous administrator, a man free from religious discrimination and the quality to gain the hearts of the army. Beside that, he was a great admirer of art, music and learning. He was also a poet and could write good poetry in Persian language" [10]

A few words should be said in this context about composing poetry by Babar. While at Ghazni, the lecherous and sodomite Babar became extremely addicted to young boy called Babri and it was the subject

matter of Babar's poetry, with which he enriched his autobiography. Gradually he became so enamored of Babri that he lost interest in his wife Ayesha. "At that time I used to meet her at an interval of 10, 15 or 20 days. ...Before this I never had conceived a passion for anyone, and indeed never been so circumstanced as either to hear or witness any words spoken, expressive of love or amorous passion. In this situation, I composed a few verses in person of which the following is a couplet -

"Never was a lover so wretched, so enamored, so dishonoured as I,

And my fair never be found so pitiless, so disdainful as thou," Writes Babar in his autobiography.

In another similar verse, Babar wrote -

"I am abashed whenever I see my love,

My companion looks at me while I look to the other way.

... ..

I had neither strength to go nor power to stay,

To such distraction you have reduced me

Oh, my (male) sweetheart"

It has been mentioned earlier that Muhammad Ghori, Qutb-ud-din Aibak and Altamash, all of them were sexual perverts and lascivious sodomites and Babar naturally followed that legacy..

After defeating Rana Sangram Singh at the Battle Khanua, Fatehpur Sikri, Babar massacred nearly 100,000 prisoners of war and another 100,000 civilians and raised two towers with the slain heads of the victims. Akbar seems to have preserved this great legacy of erecting minarets with slain heads of the Hindus in several

occasions, as is obvious from the accounts of battles he fought, particularly at Chittore Fort.

Humayun, Akbar's father, had a similar legacy of cruelty, slaughtering Hindus in thousands and taking Hindu women and children as captives. Many believe that he was even more degenerate and cruel than his father. After repeated battles, Humayun could ultimately capture his elder brother Kamran and subjected the latter to brutal torture. A detailed account is left by Humayun's servant Jauhar and is quoted by Smith, which says, "He. (Humayun) had little concerns for his brother's sufferings. One of the men was sitting on Kamran's knees. He was pulled out of the tent and a lancet was thrust into his eyes. Some lemon juice and salt was put into his eyes." [12]

One can imagine the cruelty and torture that Humayun was capable of inflicting on others when he subjected to his own brother to such atrocities. Humayun was also a slave to opium habit, engaged in excessive alcohol consumption and a lecherous degenerate when it came to women. He is also known to have married a 14 year old Hamida Begum by force. The cruelties perpetrated by of Akbar's descendants (Jehangir, Shahjahan, Aurangzeb, etc.) are not entirely different from those of his ancestors. Having brought up in the company and under the guidance of a lineage of drug addicts, drunkards and sadists, it is rather anomalous that Akbar held such a gentle and noble character. Even assuming that he fancied nobility, it is amazing that Akbar let his contemporaries and Generals, like Peer Mohammad, loot and rape the helpless citizenry that he was ruling! It would however be interesting to observe

the incidents in Akbar's reign and evaluate his character.
[13]

After defeating Muzaffar Shah, the ruler of Ahmedabad, in November 1572, "Akbar ordered his opponents to be trampled to death by elephants. Hamzaban, commander of Akbar's forces laying siege to Surat in 1573 A.D. was barbarously punished by Akbar by excision of his tongue. Masud Hussain Mirza, a near relation of Akbar, who had risen in revolt, had his eyes sewn up after capture ... Some of them (300 supporters) were executed with various ingenious tortures. "It is disgusting to find a man like Akbar sanctioning such barbarism which he inherited from his Tartar ancestors", says Smith." [14] Such were the acts of Akbar's barbaric cruelty.

Akbar's Savagery and Barbarism at Chittor:

In 1567 AD, Akbar advanced with a large army against Rana Uday Singh, the son of Rana Sangram Singh, of Mewar and put the Chottore Fort under siege. But even after 4 months, no indication of surrender was visible from the other side. On the contrary, the Mughal army continued to suffer large scale casualties due to occasional Rajput attack under the leadership of brave Rajput generals Jaimal and Patta.

At last, Akbar ordered to dig two Sabats (a trench covered with leather is called a Sabat) from a far away places to the wall of the fort. Then explosives in large quantities were dumped at the walls of the fort and a severe blast collapsed the wall. Expecting imminent fall of the fort, nearly 300 Rajput women sacrificed their lives in Jauhar (self immolation in fire). When the Mughal army entered the fort, nearly 800 Rajput soldiers were alive and all of them were put to the sword.

Next morning, victorious Akbar entered the fort riding an elephant. The Emperor was not so pleased as he had to face a lot of hardship in occupying the fort. At that time there were nearly 40 thousand civilians in the fort and this civilian population had assisted the Rajput army to inflict damage to the Mughal army. And hence they became the target of Akbar's wrath. To narrate the event, Vincent Smith writes, "The eight thousand Rajput soldiers who formed the regular garrison having been jealously helped during the siege by 40,000 peasants, the emperor ordered a general massacre, which resulted in the death of 30,000." [15] Col Tod, to describe the incident as, writes, "The emperor's proceedings were marked by the most illiterate atrocities." [16]

But our secular historians are trying hard to hide Akbar's cruelty and guilt. So R C Majumdar, to describe the incident, writes, "*Akbar then gave order for mass execution of 30000 non-combatants, for which all modern historians have condemned him. According to Kaviraj Shyamadas, however, out of 40,000 peasants who were in the fort, 39,000 had died fighting and Akbar ordered the remaining 1000 to be executed.*"[17] But historian A K Roy writes, "Thirty thousand were slain; among them was gallant Patta, who fell after he had displayed prodigies of valour." [18] While another historian writes, "According to Abul Fazl, 30,000 persons were slain, but the figure seems to be highly exaggerated." [19]

However, it was not possible to ascertain the exact figure of the victims who fell to Akbar's sword or rather it was not manually possible to count the large number of the corpses. According to Abul Fazl, the figure was 30,000, but it is needless to say that he did not count the dead bodies but only made a rough estimate. The actual

figure could be 50,000 or 80,000; or 100,000 or more than that. It is really astonishing that, most of our historians have reluctantly avoided the concluding part of the episode.

Akbar had a curiosity to know the actual number of Hindus slain. As it was impossible to manually count the heaps of dead bodies, Akbar ordered his men to collect the sacred threads from the corpses. The order was carried out the sacred threads collected were weighed. What was the result of weighing? Vincent Smith, in this regard, writes, "The recorded amount 74½ mans of eight ounce each." [20] Many believe that Smith was wrong to estimate the weight of a sacred thread and it should exceed 3 ounce each. Man or Maund is an old unit of weight, which is nearly equal to 37 Kg. So, by easy calculations, one can get an idea how many Hindus were slain on that day.

It is being said that Aurangzeb, the grand grand son of Akbar, promulgated an order that he should be presented 1¼ of maunds of sacred threads daily, collected from slain Hindus. Simple calculations show that 24,000 sacred threads, 3 ounce each, make 1¼ of maunds. So, it can be said that, nearly 24,000 Hindus were slain daily during the times of Aurangzab.[xx] (P N Oak 576) These fanatic Muslim rulers used to maintain that, more the number of Hindus slain, better would be the place they occupy in jannah or Islamic Paradise.

However the Rajputs, to make the above incident immemorial, treat the number 74½ as cursed and an evil omen. Still today, if someone writes 74½ on the cover of a letter, none but the addressee opens that letter. They believe that if someone opens that letter, his life would also be cursed. .

It has been mentioned above that when Akbar occupied the Chittor Fort, more than 300 Rajput women jumped into fire (Jauhar) so that they may not be abducted to Delhi and dumped into the hell called Akbar's harem to spend the rest of their lives as prostitutes and sex-slaves. Akbar, the devil incarnate, possessed an inordinate lust for women, just like his ancestors and predecessors. One of Akbar's motives during his wars of aggression against various rulers was to appropriate their women, daughters and sisters of the defeated Hindu kings. That was the reason, the Rajput women of Chittor preferred "Jauhar" (self immolation) than to be captured and disrespectfully treated as servants and prostitutes in Akbar's harem. [5]

However, according to the Islamic faith, killing so many kafirs and drenching the Chittor Fort with kafirs' blood, Akbar had undoubtedly done a great service to Allah and Islam and to seek blessings for this great service, Akbar went to Fatehpur Sikri, bare footed, to his religious guru Salim Chisti. It is needless to say that his guru was extremely delighted after hearing this good news from Akbar. It should be mentioned here that Salim Chisti was a Sufi darbesh and the incident was sufficient to expose the true colour of the Sufi saints.

History of Jauhar and Sati:

This was not a new phenomenon and the ritual began in 711 AD, as soon as barbaric Muslim invaders set their foot on the Indian soil. In 711 AD, Muhammad bin Qasem invaded Sind, by the sea through the city port of Karachi. At that time, it was called Devalay (or the abode of the God). There was a big and tall temple at the sea shore which could be seen from a long distance. The Hindu King Dahir was the ruler of Sind.

King Dahir had 500 Muslim Arab soldiers in his army. In the mid-night, these Arab Muslims treacherously opened the gate of Dahir's fort and the army of bin Qasem entered and occupied the fort by massacring the security guards of the fort. When the news of fall of the fort reached the women of the fort, including the women of the royal family, they decided to end their lives by consuming poison. At that moment a minister of Dahir's court came running to them and said that the Muslims were so lecherous that they rape even the dead body of a kafir woman. So, the Hindu women of the fort immediately decided to destroy their bodies by jumping into fire. Then a great fire was made and all the women burnt themselves to escape humiliation and sexual assault of the lecherous Muslims. The practice was, later on, called Jauhar.

It is well known that, during the Muslim period of Indian history, thousands and thousands of Rajput women sacrificed their lives in Jauhar to save their honour and respect. There was another practice prevalent among the Muslim rulers. On the event of death of a Hindu fighter of their army in a battle, they used to bring the wife of the dead warrior into their harem. But the reluctant Hindu widows chose to burn themselves in the fire of their husbands' pyre to avoid to be captured and live the rest of the life as sex slaves in the harems of the lecherous Muslim rulers. The practice was known as Sati (or Suttee). The term is derived from the original name of the goddess Sati, who self-immolated because she was unable to bear humiliation of her husband Shiva. The term sati also stands for a chaste woman. However, the Muslim rulers were against this practice as it meant snatching away the prey from the predator.

The so-called secular historians of India, to glorify Akbar, say that Akbar was so great and generous that he wanted to ban the practice of Sati. But the incident they project as a proof of their claim tells a completely different story. Jaimull was a cousin of Bhagawandas (probably a minister of Akbar's court) and his wife's beauty attracted the attention of Akbar's lust. One day Akbar sent Jaimull to a distant place on a false pretext and before he commenced his journey, Akbar's men poisoned him. So Jaimull died on his way. Jaimull's wife could apprehend Akbar's trick and decided to burn herself on her husband's pyre to avoid living as a prostitute in Akbar's harem.. Akbar, on the other hand, lost no time to send his men to capture the widow and those who accompanied her. Thus Akbar succeeded to drag the unwilling widow of Jaimull into his harem. [21]

However, the practice of Sati, or voluntary co-cremation with the dead husband, continued even in the British period. Later on the custom got corrupted and in most cases, unwilling widows were burnt by the relatives of the deceased husband to grab his properties and riches. And thus, Sati, once a noble practice, became infamous. The first formal British ban on Sati was imposed in 1798, in the city of Calcutta only, by the effort of Raja Rammohan Roy and Lord William Bentinck, the then Governor General of the British East India Company.

However, after that tragic incident, the Chittorgarh Fort was abandoned for ever and none of the descendants Rana Uday Singh set his foot on the Chittor Fort. All the Kings of Mewar, including Rana Pratap Singh, used Udaypur as their capital the Udaypur Fort as

the seat of the government. So, the Chittor Fort gradually turned into a desolate thicket.

References:

- [1] R.C. Majumdar, H.C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, '*An Advanced History of India*', Macmillan & Co (1980), 439
- [2] R. C, Majumdar, '*The History and Cultures of the Indian People*', Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 Vols), VII, 106
- [3] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *The History of India -As Told by Its Own Historians* (in 8 volumes), Low Price Publication, Delhi (1996) VI, 164
- [4] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 50
- [5] 'Akbar the Great: A Tyrannical Monarch' -
www.hindunet.org/hindu_history/modern/akbar_ppg.html
- [6] V. A. Smith, *ibid*, 294
- [7] R C Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 308
- [8] R C Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 306
- [9] R C Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 307
- [10] C Roy, *Bharater Itihas* (in Bengali), Maulik Library, Calcutta (1985), I, 16
- [11] *Babur's Memoirs*, Tr by John Leyden and William Erskine, Revised by Sir Lucal King, p 125-126 (as quoted by P N Oak, *Islamic Havoc in Indian History*, *ibid*, 268)
- [12] V.A. Smith, *ibid*, 20
- [13] Shelat J.M, *Akbar*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, 1964, Bombay, 27
- [14] P N Oak, *Islamic Havoc in Indian History*, *ibid*, 305
- [15] V.A. Smith, *ibid*, 90..
- [16] P N Oak, *Islamic Havoc in Indian History*, *ibid*, 302
- [17].R C Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 334
- [18] R C Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 122
- [19] .R C. Majumdar, H.C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, *ibid*, (1980), 443

[20] V.A. Smith, *ibid*, 91

[21] V.A. Smith, *ibid*, 103

Part 5C

What Akbar really was:

When the Part 5A of the current series of articles *"Distortion of Indian History for Muslim Appeasement"*, was posted on the FFI, a reader commented, *"Historians cite two historic rulers of India as 'the great'. One is Buddhist Asoka. The next is Muslim Akbar. The subcontinent has been the abode of Hindus throughout history, but why has there not been a single Hindu ruler who could earn the honorific 'The great'? Why couldn't Hinduism produce one? What is wrong with Hinduism?"* In this context, I would request the reader to note that **Hindus do not write Holy Vedas, Holy Upanishads or Holy Bhagavadgita and so on, because the Hindu religious scriptures are really holy.** In a similar manner, **almost all the Hindu kings were great and hence it is unnecessary to tag them as 'great'.** We should quote the comment of another reader, in this regard. He writes, *"Unfortunately the Indian History was written by the British colonialists and they wanted to show that British Empire was the best thing for India and after independence Leftist took over. In fact, there were innumerable great Hindu kings ... Alexander although was able to defeat Porus, a Hindu king, but the fight was so frightening that his soldiers revolted for any further attack on India and thus he started moving backward from there to Greek."* In this context, it should be said that **Alexander was badly defeated by King Porus at the Battle of the Hydaspes River. Particularly, the Greek army failed completely to defend the attack by trained elephants of Porus. Moreover, Alexander suffered a mortal wound in that battle which caused his**

death at Babylon. The Hollywood film *Alexander*, directed by Oliver Stone, confirms this fact.

However, it should also be mentioned that the history of India, which we read in the history books, has been written according to the guidelines set by the British occupiers and those British rulers were Hindu bashers. But somehow or rather, they could not ignore the greatness of Emperor Ashok. It is to be noted here that the so called secular historians of India try to project Akbar even greater than Emperor Ashok. While commenting on this aspect, V A Smith writes, *“Akbar would have laughed at the remorse felt by Ashok for the miseries caused by the conquest of Kalinga, and would have utterly condemned his great predecessor’s decision to abstain from all further wars of aggression.”*^[1]

We should quote here the comment of another author regarding the greatness of Akbar. He writes, “The personality and nature of Akbar has been nicely summed up by the Editor of Father Monserrate’s Commentarius. The editor’s introduction states, “In the long line of Indian sovereigns, the towering personalities of Ashoka and Akbar (because of his dread) stand high above the rest... Akbar’s greed for conquest and glory and his lack of sincerity form a marked contrast to Ashoka’s paternal rule, genuine self-control and spiritual ambition. Akbar’s wars were those of a true descendent of Timur, and had all the gruesome associations which this fact implies. ... His character with its mixture of ambition and cunning has now been laid bare. He has been rightly compared to a pike in a pond preying upon his weaker neighbours.” [2] He also writes, “With his treacherous nature and the unlimited power than he wielded over a vast region qualifies him to be one of the foremost tyrants and

sadists in India's history, or perhaps, even world history. He was no less cruel a tyrant than any of his ancestors." [2]

The so called secular historians of India also assert that, since Akbar was born and died in India, he must be accepted as an Indian monarch. In this context, V. A. Smith writes, "*Akbar was a foreigner in India. He had not a drop of Indian blood in his veins.*" [3] To elaborate this point, P N Oak writes, "*Akbar was a direct descendant in the 7th generation on his father's side from Tamerlain (or Taimur) and on the mother's side from Chengiz Khan.*" [4] He also writes, "Intemperance was the besetting sin of the Timuroid royal family, as it was of many other ruling Muslim houses ... Babur was an elegant toper ... Humayun made himself stupid with opium ... Akbar permitted himself the practice of both vices." [5]

Whosoever has studied even a bit of Islam has seen that the concepts like nationality, nationalism, patriotism or love for the motherland etc are absent in Islam. On the contrary, Islam imposes the concept of Millat and Kufr and divides the entire humanity into two groups, namely Momems (or Muslims) and Kafirs. The aggregate of all the Muslims is called Islamic Umma. As a result, Muslims have no loyalty to the country where they live. They have loyalty to the Islamic Umma and to the Islamic holy places, Mecca and Medina. From this view point, even the converted Muslims, who live in India, are not Indians. They have no loyalty to India and to its history and culture, and that is the reason, they refuse to sing India's National Song "Vande Mataram" (I worship my motherland). They are loyal to Allah, loyal to Islam and Islamic Umma, and loyal to Mecca and Medina. They can be called resident non-Indians but not Indians.

So it is not difficult to understand that Akbar's Indian-ness is a myth.

Another reader has expressed a completely different view. He writes, "Why would historians paint Akbar good to please Muslims doesn't make sense, because, Akbar was not a Muslim himself. He was the follower of Din e Elahi, a religion founded by himself which had elements of Hinduism and Islam in it. Just because he had a Muslim name doesn't make him Muslim." In this context, it should be said that Akbar preached his religion at the fag end of his life and hence through most of his life, he was a Muslim. If a robber commits robbery throughout his life and abandons it just before his death, should he be called a robber or an innocent gentleman? Despite his preaching of his new religion Din-i-Ilahi, many believe that "Akbar was born a Muslim, lived like a Muslim and died as a Muslim; that too a very fanatic one." [2]

At this point, it should be made clear that, Akbar preached his new religion Din-i-Ilahi not out of his respect for other religion, but for his personal glorification. He wanted to be a prophet, like Muhammad, by inventing and floating this new religion. "He understood the trick of Muhammad and wanted to be another Muhammad with a new religion din-i-Ilahi", says a commentator. In this context, we should mention another aspect of Akbar's life that reflects his intense desire to project himself as a religious personality. Xavier, a Jesuit in Akbar's court, gives a typical instance of Akbar's perfidy in making people drink water in which his feet had been washed. [2] While commenting on this aspect, V. A. Smith writes, "Xavier writes, Akbar posed "as a Prophet, wishing it to be understood that he

works miracles through healing the sick by means of the water in which he washed the feet.” [6]

To lure the Hindus to his new religion, he proposed to repeal Jejya (Poll Tax) and pilgrimage tax and ban of cow slaughter. But they were never implemented. So the author of Akbar: The Great Tyrannical Monarch writes, “The infamous Jiziya tax, which is special tax exaction from the Hindus, was never abolished by Akbar. Time and time again different people had approached seeking exemption from Jiziya. Everytime the exemption was ostensibly issued, but never was actually implemented.” [2]

Many believe that Akbar, who might be a lecher and a diabolic killer, not an iconoclast and he did not demolish Hindu temples. As a matter of fact, Akbar was mainly concerned with his personal glorification, money and women and hence might not have found much time to concentrate on the matter of desecrating Hindu temples and breaking Hindu Idols.

However, Akbar’s hands were not clean from this sin. While commenting on this aspect of Akbar, Col Tod writes, “Not only that he forcibly annihilated innumerable humans, he also had no respect for temples and deities and willingly indulged in destruction of such places of worship.” [7] “Throughout Akbar’s reign, temples used to be razed to the ground or misappropriated as mosques and cows were slaughtered in them, as happened in the battle at Nagarkot. No symbol of Hindu origin and design was spared from the iconoclastic wrath of Akbar.” [2]

While commenting on this aspect of Akbar, V. A. Smith writes, “*The holy Hindu cities of Prayag and Banaras were plundered by Akbar because their residents were rash*

enough to close their gates! No wonder Prayag of today has no ancient monuments; whatever remain are a rubble! It is rather obvious that Akbar had no respect and reverence for cities considered holy by Hindus, let alone esteem for human life and property. Also, it is evident from this instance that Akbar's subjects were horrified and scared upon the arrival of their king into their city. If at all Akbar was so magnanimous, why then did not the people come forward and greet him?" [8]

Monserrate, a contemporary of Akbar, writes, "The religious zeal of the Musalmans has destroyed all the idol temples which used to be numerous. In place of Hindu temples, countless tombs and little shrines of wicked and worthless Musalmans have been erected in which these men are worshipped with vain superstition as though they were saints. Not only did the Muslims destroy the idols, but usurped the existing temples and converted them into tombs of insignificant people." [9]

He further continues, "Akbar has neither any love nor compassion for Hindus as is apparent from the above examples. Hindus were openly despised and contemptuously treated under Akbar's fanatical rule as under any other rule. Akbar was only one of the many links of the despotic and cruel Moghal rule in India, and enforced the tradition of his forefathers with sincerity and equal ruthlessness." [9]

Akbar's shameless court flatterers, to please their master, have painted him as the most handsome man on the earth and our secular and Marxist historians are also following those flatterers. But Akbar's physique was anything but handsome. Historian V A Smith, in this regard, writes, "Akbar (in mid-life) was a man of moderate stature, perhaps 5'7" in height, broad-chested, narrow waisted and long armed. His legs were somewhat bowed inward and when walking he slightly dragged the left leg, as if he were lame. His head drooped a little toward the right shoulder ...

The nose was rather short, with a bony prominence in the middle and nostrils dilated as if with anger. ...and his complexion was dark.”^[10] So a commentator writes, “Not only was this guy a barbarian; he was also very ugly.”

Akbar’s Lechery:

It has been said earlier that Akbar was mainly concerned with personal glory, money and women and his wars and conquests were aimed to achieve these three goals. So, the author of Akbar, the great tyrannical monarch, writes, “Akbar possessed an inordinate lust for women, just like his ancestors and predecessors. One of Akbar’s motives during his wars of aggression against various rulers was to appropriate their women, daughters and sisters.”

[2]

Some historians try to project that Akbar practiced monogamy throughout his life. While commenting on this aspect, V.A. Smith writes, “*That Akbar remained monogamous throughout his life is indeed history falsified myth.*”^[11] He also writes “Akbar, throughout his life, allowed himself ample latitude in the matter of wives and concubines! ... Akbar had introduced a whole host of Hindu women, the daughters of eminent Hindu Rajahs, into his harem.”^[12] Historian Dr A L Srivastava has given a detail account in his Akbar the Great, how Akbar coerced the rulers of Jaipur for sending his daughters to Akbar’s harem^[2]

Historian J M Shelat writes, “After the “Jauhar” that followed the killing of Rani Durgawati, the two women left alive, Kamalavati (sister of Rani Durgawati) and the daughter of the Raja of Purangad (daughter-in-law of the deceased queen) were sent to Agra to enter Akbar’s harem.”^[13] “It should also be observed that admittance into Akbar’s harem was available mainly to virgins and

others' were "disqualified". In spite of such disgusting and lewd personal affairs, inducting women of abducted or killed Hindu warriors into his harem as slaves and prostitutes; it is bewildering that Akbar is hailed as a righteous and noble emperor."^[2]

To describe Akbar's uxorious character, V A Smith writes, "Abul Fazl never tires of repeating that Akbar during his early years remained 'behind the veil'. What he means thereby is that Akbar used to spend most of his time in his harem."^[14] Akbar habitually drank hard and used to have, for the most of the day, licentious relations with women of his harem. There is no doubt that, both drinking and engaging in debauched sexual activities was inherited by Akbar from his Tartar ancestors.^[2]

To describe Akbar's infinite lewdness, Abul Fazl in his *Ain-i-Akbari*, writes, "His majesty has established a wine shop near the palace ... The prostitutes of the realm collected at the shop could scarcely be counted, so large was their number.. The dancing girls used to be taken home by the courtiers. If any well known courtier wanted to have a virgin they should first have His Majesty's [Akbar's] permission." [15] He also writes that His Majesty [Akbar] himself used to call these prostitutes and ask them who had deprived them of their virginity. "This was the state of affairs during Akbar's rule, where alcoholism, sodomy, prostitution and murderous assaults were permitted by the king himself. The conditions of the civic life during Akbar's life were shocking!" [16]

"Whole of India was reduced to a brothel during the Moghal rule and Akbar, one of the Emperors, is being glorified as one of the patrons of the vast brothel. The above instances may suffice to convince the impartial

reader that Akbar's whole career was a saga of uninhibited licentiousness backed by the royal brute." [2] Who were these so called prostitutes? Wherefrom did a whole army of prostitutes suddenly descend on Akbar's realm, like swarm of locusts? "The answer is that these ever-increasing prostitutes were none other than decent Hindu women whose homes were daily raided and plundered and their men-folk were either massacred or converted, were haplessly left to fend for themselves and exposed to the mercy of the sex hungry Mussalman courtiers." [16]

Akbar had made it a pernicious custom to demand choicest women from the household of vanquished foes. Thus all the women in territories conquered by Akbar, whether a commoner, or of noble or royal descend, were at Akbar's mercy. According to this custom, all the Rajput kings who had submitted to Akbar were forced to send their daughters or sisters to Akbar's harem, where they had to live as sex-slaves. Raja Man Singh of Jaipur had to offer his sister to Akbar. Akbar's cruelty towards the Hindu women, kidnapped and shut up in his harem, were staggering and his much vaunted marriages, said to have been contracted for communal integration and harmony, were nothing but outrageous kidnappings brought about with the force of arms. It has been mentioned earlier, how the Rajput women of the Chittor Fort sacrificed their lives in Jauhar to avoid this disgrace and humiliation.

Only in one occasion, the said custom was slackened and when the Treaty of Ranathambhor between Akbar and the chiefs of Bundi (who owned the fort) was made, the first condition of the said treaty read that the chiefs of Bundi be exempt from the custom, degrading to a

Rajputs, of sending a 'bride' to the royal harem. To narrate the incident, V A Smith writes, "A treaty was drawn up on the spot, and mediated by the prince of Amber [Jaipur], which presents a good picture of Hindu feeling. [The terms were] (1) that the chiefs of Bundi should be exempted from that custom, degrading to a Rajput, of sending a dola [bride] to the royal harem; (2) exemption from jizya or poll-tax; (3) that the chiefs of Bundi should not be compelled to cross the Attock; (4) that the vassals of Bundi should be exempted from the obligation of sending their wives or female relatives 'to hold a stall in the Mina bazaar' at the palace, on the festival of Nauroza [New Year's Day] and so on. [17]

In the middle of Jan 1562, Akbar made a pilgrimage to the tomb of Khwaja Mainuddin Chisti of Ajmir. On the way, Raja Bihari Mal of Amber entered a peace treaty with Akbar and according to the said custom Raja Bihari Mal offered him the hand of his daughter in marriage to Akbar. However, the princess later on became the mother of Emperor Jahangir.

Even the Muslim women were not safe from Akbar's lust. In 1564, Akbar compelled one Shaikh of Delhi to divorce his wife in his favour. [18] Akbar had an eye on Bairam Khan's wife and married her soon after Bairam Khan was murdered. Akbar did not hesitate to have caused this violent and tragic end of his erstwhile guardian for the satiation of his lust. In this context, it should also be mentioned that, in 1558, when Bairam was more than 50, he married his 19 year old cousin Salima begam. Meanwhile, Bairam was sacked and Akbar asked him to go to Mecca and on his way to Mecca, Bairam Khan was assassinated on 31st January, 1561, at Patan by some Afghans. Akbar was then 19 year old and hence

Akbar and Salima Begam were of the same age. [19] This is a fine example of fight between two lechers, just like fighting of dogs in their mating season.

In this way Akbar, with the army of forcefully abducted women, created a harem of 5000 inmates, in the capital city of Agra. While commenting on it, V A Smith writes, "The imperial harem constituted a town in itself. No less than 5000 women dwelt within the walls, and each of them had a separate apartment. The maintenance and control of such a multitude of women necessitated a carefully devised system of internal administration and the organization of adequate arrangements for discipline. The inmates were divided into sections, each under a female commandant (daroga), and due provision was made for the supply from the ranks of clerks to keep the accounts. A strict method of check was applied to the expenditure, which was on a large scale." [20] Smith further continues, "The inside of the enclosure was protected by armed female guards. Eunuchs watched on the outside of it, and beyond them again were companies of faithful Rajputs, while troops of other classes posted at a greater distance gave further security." [20]

Though, following Abul Fazl, Smith wrote above that 'each of the inmates of the harem were provided with a separate apartment', but in Agra there is not even a single building with 5000 separate rooms. So, the above conclusion is a lie. One can, therefore, easily understand in what wretched condition these unfortunate women were condemned to live. Itmad-ud-daula, the father-in-law of Jehangir, has thrown some light on some other features of the inmates of this harem. If someone had given birth to a female child, she was saved because in future she could be used as a sex-slave. But, if anyone

happened to give birth to a male child, he used to be murdered or blinded as in future he could never pose a threat to the throne. It may be mentioned here that, another lecher Ferozshah Tughloq, used to get the private part of the women of his harem sewed, to be sure that they were not having sex with other man.

However, Akbar's lechery was not confined to his harem of 5000 women and P N Oak, while commenting on this matter, writes, "Despite an exclusive harem of 5,000 women, and all the virgin prostitutes of the realm whose virginity, as Abul Fazl tells us, was at Akbar's exclusive royal command and could not be violated without special permission by any courtier, the honour of the wives of noblemen and courtiers was itself always subject to Akbar's sexy pleasure." [21] Akbar did not spare even the wives of the ministers and nobles of his court, if they happened to draw attention of Akbar's lust.

To highlight this point, Abul Fazl writes, "Whenever Begams or wives of nobles, or other women of chaste character, desire to be presented, they first notify their wish to the servants of the seraglio and wait for reply. From thence they send their requests to the officers of the palace after which those who are eligible (sic) are permitted to enter the harem. Some women of rank obtained permission to remain there for a whole month." [2] The above passage is a clear admission that Akbar used to compel wives of courtiers and noblemen, toward whom he felt sufficiently attracted to remain within his harem at least for a month at a time.

To expose another feature of Akbar's lechery, V.A. Smith writes, "*Grimon's statement that Akbar had confined himself to one wife and distributed his other consorts among the courtiers is not directly confirmed from other sources.*"

[22] “This adds a new dimension to Akbar’s lechery because it reveals how women were considered as mere chattel to be freely exchanged among Akbar and his courtiers in a continuous round of sex-traffic.” [19] “Then there was the notorious institution of Meena Bazar, according to which on New Year’s Day, the women of all households had to be paraded before Akbar for his choosing.” [19]

It has been mentioned earlier that Muhammad Ghori, Qutb-ud-din and Iltutmish were sodomites. It has also been mentioned that Babur, Akbar’s grandfather, has given a lengthy description of this sodomic infatuation for a male sweetheart in his auto-biography. Humayun was no different. Therefore, sodomy was also a precious service of Akbar’s own family... Though, perhaps, Akbar did not engage in sodomy, but many believe that he allowed” it to be practiced by his servants, courtiers and sycophants. Abul Fazal in *Ain-e-Akbari* provides accounts of some such acts which are too disgusting to even mention. Such perverse gratification was prevalent during the entire Mughal rule, including Akbar’s times.

References:

- [1] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 32
- [2] ‘Akbar the Great: A Tyrannical Monarch’
www.hindunet.org/hindu_history/modern/akbar_ppg.html
- [3] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, *ibid*, 7
- [4] P N Oak, *Islamic Havoc in Indian History*, Published by A Ghosh, 298.
- [5] P N Oak, *Islamic Havoc in Indian History*, *ibid*, 294.
- [6] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, *ibid*, 189
- [7] J Todd, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, 2 volumes, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1957, II, 259.

- [8] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 58
- [9] S J Monserrate, "The Commentary," translated from original Latin by J.S. Hoyland, annotated by S.Banerjee, Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, London, (1922), 27
- [10] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 242
- [11] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 47
- [12] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 212
- [13] J M Shelat, "Akbar," Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, 1964, Bombay, 90
- [14] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 31
- [15] Blochmann, H., "Ain-e-Akbari," translation of Abul Fazal's Persian text, 2nd Edition, Bibliotheca Indica Series, published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal., 276
- [16] P N Oak, Islamic Havoc in Indian History, *ibid*, 300.
- [17] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 99
- [18] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 47
- [19] P N Oak, Islamic Havoc in Indian History, *ibid*, 301.
- [20] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 359
- [21] P N Oak, Islamic Havoc in Indian History, *ibid*, 300.
- [22] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 185

Part 5 D

The Distorted History of Fatehpur Sikri:

It has been said earlier how the authorship of the massive fortress in Agra is being falsely attributed to Akbar. In a similar manner, Akbar is being projected as the author of another fort-palace complex, a excellent example of Hindu architecture, at Fatehpur Sikri, nearly 37 Km away from the city of Agra .

The so-called pseudo-secular and the Marxist historians are propagating the idea that the place was originally called Sikri and it was a small village surrounded by deep forest infested with wild animals. In

that village, a Sufi saint called Shaikh Salim Chisti began to live in a small hut in 1537. At that time, Akbar was mentally upset as he did not have a male child.

To narrate the situation, Nizam-ud-din Ahmad in his *Tabakat-i-Akbari*, writes, "The Emperor had several sons born to him, but none of them had lived. Shaikh Salim Chisti, who resided at the town of Sikri, twelve kos from Agra, had gladdened him with the promise of a son. The Emperor went to visit the Shaikh several times, and remained there ten or twenty days on each occasion. ... When one of the Emperor's wives became pregnant, he conveyed her to the dwelling of the Shaikh, and left her there. Sometimes he stayed there himself, sometimes at Agra. He gave the name of Fathpur to Sikri, and built a bazaar and baths there." [1] "Salim, the old saint, had settled among the rocks and wild beasts as a hermit in A D 1537-8 (A H 944), and in the year following had constructed a monastery and school-house." [2]

In this regard, historian V.A. Smith, in his Akbar '*The Great Mogul*', also writes, "Akbar resolved at this time to press his scheme for converting the obscure village of Sikri into a great city. His reasons, or some of them, for doing so may be stated in the words of Abu-l Fazl: - Inasmuch as his exalted sons [Salim and Murad] had taken their birth in Sikri and the God-knowing spirit of Shaikh Salim had taken possession thereof, his holy heart desired to give outward splendour to this spot which possessed spiritual grandeur. Now that his standards had arrived at this place, his former design was passed forward, and an order was issued that the superintendents of affairs should erect lofty buildings for the use of the Shahinshah." [3]

He further continues, "A wall of masonry was built round the town, but never completed, and dwellings of all classes were constructed, as well as schools, baths, and other public institutions, the indispensable gardens not being neglected. The Emperor, after the conquest of Gujarat, gave it the name of Fathabad (town of victory), which was soon exchanged in both popular and official use for the synonymous Fathpur." [2] V. A. Smith continues, "The language of Abu-l Fazl in the above passage quoted might be understood to mean that Akbar did not begin his extensive programme of building at Fathpur-Sikri until 1571, but that is not the fact. The design had been formed in his mind and his had actually been begun in 1569." [2]

But most of the historians believe that Akbar began the so called construction of Fatehpur Sikri in 1571, and hence the historian R C Majumdar writes, "From there (Punjab) he returned to Ajmer (corrupt of Sanskrit Ajeya Meru) by way of Hissar and on 9th August, 1571, arrived at Sikri which he now decided to make his capital as the auspicious place where his two sons Salim and Murad had been born. The resources of his expanding empire and the artistic genius of India and Persia were employed to convert the petty, quiet hamlet into a crowded proud metropolis which even in its lost glory was regarded by Fitch in 1585 as much greater than Elizabethan London." [4] From the above statement it implies that Akbar began the so called construction of Fatehpur Sikri in 1571 and it is not clear, from the above statements, when the job was completed. Smith also says that **Akbar built the Buland Darwaza to commemorate his conquest of Gujarat in 1575-76.** [5]

But many hold the view that Akbar finished the construction in 1585. So, a general notification, in this regard, reads, "Fatehpur Sikri was built during 1571 and 1585. ... This town was built by the Mughal Emperor, Akbar. He had planned this city as his capital but shortage of water compelled him to abandon the city.. ... Fatehpur Sikri is one of the finest examples of Mughal architectural splendour at its height." [6] The Wikipedia Encyclopedia, in this context, says, "Fatehpur Sikri is a city and a municipal board in Agra district in the state of Uttar Pradesh, India. The historical city was constructed by Mughal emperor Akbar beginning in 1570 and served as the empire's capital from 1571 until 1585, when it was abandoned for reasons that remain unclear." [7]

One should notice that the statements quoted above are terribly inconsistent. According to Smith, Akbar began the construction of the city in 1571 (or 1569) and before that the place was a small village. According to R C Majumdar, in 1571, Akbar decided to use the auspicious place as the capital of his empire. But according to the Wikipedia Encyclopedia, "Akbar started to use the place as the capital of his empire from 1571 and continued to use the place as the capital up to 1585." The question naturally arises - How many years Akbar took to convert the small village Sikri into a city? Was it possible for Akbar to shift his capital to Sikri before the completion of the said construction? The most ridiculous part of the episode is that, according to Wikipedia Encyclopedia, Akbar started to use Sikri as his capital in the same year the construction of the city had begun. So, it implies that, Akbar, in 1571, had shifted his capital from the city of Agra to a desolate village called Sikri, surrounded by jungles.

The reader might have noticed another anomaly in the above narrations. According to some authors, the construction of the city was completed in 1585, and in the same year it was abandoned due to scarcity of water. As if the so called scarcity of water fell, all on a sudden, from the sky without giving any prior hint and no body could foresee that. Most importantly, these contradictory statements lead one to conclude that Akbar the fool spoiled so much money for setting up the new city in vain.

There are other anomalies as well. It has been mentioned above that, according to V. A. Smith, Akbar built the Buland Darwaza as a commemoration of his conquest of Gujarat in 1575-76, while an epigraph inscribed on the Buland Darwaza says that it was built in 1601, when Akbar returned from Daccan. But it has been said above that the city of Fatehpur Sikri was abandoned in 1585. So, it becomes unacceptable because in that case it should be concluded that Akbar built the Buland Darwaza in the abandoned city of Fatehpur Sikri. According to another version, it is said that, Fatehpur Sikri was finally abandoned in 1604 and the Buland Darwaza was erected in 1601. [8]

However, to sum up the above narrations, Akbar began the construction of the city of Fatehpur Sikri in 1571 and the construction was completed in 1785. Or, Akbar took 14 years to complete the job.. But whosoever has visited the site would refuse to believe that such a massive construction, containing the invincible fort and innumerable palaces therein with fine stone carvings, could be constructed within 14 or 15 years. To make this unbelievable story believable, the so-called pseudo-secular and Marxist historians of India resort to treachery

and lie, and say, "The work was pushed on with such phenomenal speed that, as if by magic palaces, public buildings, mosques and tombs, gardens and baths, pavilions and water courses were called into being beneath the barren sandstone ridge of Sikri." [8]

In this context, it should be mentioned what absurd Jahangir, son of Akbar, has written in his autobiography, regarding the construction of Fatehpur Sikri. He writes, "In course of fourteen to fifteen years, that hill full of wild beasts became a city containing all kinds of gardens and buildings, lofty edifices and pleasant places attractive to the heart." [8]

It has been pointed out above that historians believe that Akbar built the Buland Darwaza (the Great Portal) in 1601 as a monument after the conquest of Gujarat. In this regard, our historians write, "The southern entrance to the Jam-i-Masjid at Fatehpur Sikri was considered to be suitable position, and the original entrance was replaced by the construction of a massive portal. This was known as the Buland Darwaja." [9] It is important to note here that originally there was a gate where the Buland Darwaza stands today. Common sense tells us that the said gate was very old and hence Akbar found it suitable to demolish that worn out gate and make a new one. Had this older gate been built by Akbar, hardly 15 years ago, he would have certainly not shown any interest to demolish the same to be replaced by the new gate called Buland Darwaza.

The True History of Fatehpur Sikri:

We now may pay heed to what another group of historians, known as nationalist historians, have to say in this regard. These historians are convinced that the authorship of the fort-palace complex at Fatehpur Sikri is

being falsely attributed to Akbar. According to them the city, now known as Fatehpur Sikri, was a thriving and prosperous city from very older times. Once upon a time, during the times of Babar, Akbar's grand father, the fort-palace complex at Fatehpur, was under the occupation of Rana Sangram Singh of Mewar. In 1527, a battle was fought between Babar and Maharana Sangram Singh, known as the Battle of Khanua, in a field close to the fort of Fatehpur. In that battle Babar defeated Rana Sangram Singh and thus the occupation of the fort went to the Mughals.

There are many references to show that fort at Fatehpur (or Fathpur) was there even centuries before the times of Akbar. The Muslim chronicler Yahya bin Ahmad, in his *Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi*, writes, "On the 19th Jumada-l awwal, 808 H (12th November, 1405 AD), a battle was fought between them (Khizr Khan and Iqbal Khan). At the first charge, Iqbal was defeated and fled. ...(Later on) He was killed and his head was cut off and sent to Fathpur." [10] The statement is sufficient to prove that, at least 150 years before the times of Akbar, Fatehpur Sikri was a place of political importance, not an isolated village surrounded by jungle.

Yahya bin Ahmad also writes, "Sikri, which is now known as Fathpur, was entrusted to Malik Khairu-d din Tuhfa. His Majesty (Mubarak Shah) then proceeded towards Gwalior ." [11] This statement conclusively proves that the city which is now known as Fatehpur was originally known as Sikri. It has been said earlier that the Battle of Khanua was fought between Babar and Rana Sangram Singh in a field close to Fatehpur Sikri. Babar, in his autobiography *Tuzak-i-Babri*, has given the description of the battle. The *Tuzak-i-Babri* says that

Babar left Agra on 11th February, 1527 AD and advanced towards Fatehpur to meet Rana Sangram Singh. Babar writes, "After marching a kos, we found that the enemy had retreated. There being a large tank on our left, I encamped there, to have the benefit of water." [12]

At that hour, Babar sent an advanced team of 1000 men, under the care of Abdul Aziz and Mollah Apak, to assess the situation and collect prior intelligence. To describe the situation, Babar writes, "... without taking any precautions, he (Abdul Aziz) advanced as far as Kanwahah, which is five kos from Sikri." [13] But a troop of 4000 or 5000 Rajputs routed them and compelled them to return to their base.

It is to be noted here that, Rana Sangram Singh was the most famous Hindu warrior at that time and he carried 82 scars on his body. So, naturally, Babar's army was visibly nervous. Just on the day, previous to the battle, Babar held meeting with his nervous generals. To comment on the result of the discussions, Babar writes, "At this time, as I have already observed, in consequence of the preceding events, a general consternation and alarm prevailed among great and small. There was not a single person who uttered a manly word, nor an individual who delivered a manly opinion." [14]

As mentioned above, Babar camped outside the wall of Sikri, near a big tank and the Rajput camp was inside the wall. The chief Rajput generals were Rawal Udai Singh, Medini Ray, Bhamal, Varmadev and Siladitya, the caretaker of the Raisin Fort. Beside that, there were a few Afghan generals in the Rajput army and the most prominent among them were Hasan Khan and Sikandar Lodi. After being thrashed at Kanwahah, the Mughal

army became extremely frightened and advised Babar to retreat.

So, from the above facts, it becomes evident that, if the Rajputs continued their attack from the incident of Kanwahah, the Mughal army would have defeated and dispersed. But Sangram Singh took time and gave the Mughal army an opportunity to re-assemble. In this context, we should note another development. Babar had initiated a dialogue with Sangram Singh through Siladitya, but later on he succeeded to bribe Siladitya to bring him to his side. This enabled Babar to gather some vital military secrets of the Rajput army.

However, on 17th (or 16th) March, 1527 AD, the battle took place at the field of Khanua, close to Sikri and 37 Km from Agra . As soon as the battle began, Siladitya changed side with his men and in addition to that, the Afghan generals Hasan Khan and Sikandar Lodi and their army preferred not to fight against the Mussalmans of Babar's army and remained, more or less, silent spectators. The actual strength of the Rajput army was not properly recorded, but according to Col Tod, there were 80,000 horses and 500 elephants in the Rajput army. [15]

The fierce battle began in the morning and continued for ten hours. When the victory was under the control of the Rajputs, Sangram Singh suffered a severe wound and had to leave the battle field. The incident made the Rajput army disappointed and they began to disperse, and thus victory went to the hands of the Mughals. To describe the incident, Babar writes, "Having defeated the enemy, we pursued them with great slaughter. Their camp might be two kos distant from ours. On reaching it, I sent on Muhammadi and some other officers, with the

order to follow them in close pursuit, slaying and cutting them off, so that they should not have the time to re-assemble." [16]

Babar continues, "The battle was fought within the view of a small hill, near our camp. On this hillock I directed a tower of the skulls of the infidels to be constructed. ... Immense numbers of the dead bodies of the pagans and apostates had fallen in their flight, all the way to Bayana, and even as far as Alwar and Mewat." [16] After entering the fort, Babar ordered general massacre and Muhammadi and other Mughal generals cut down the civilians of the city of Sikri en masse. There are no proper records of how many Hindus were slaughtered on that day. The so called secular and Marxist historians always try to keep the figure low. It has been mentioned that there were 80,000 strong cavalry and 500 elephants in the Rajput army. Hence, many believe that, including the foot-soldiers, the Rajput army was 200,000 strong, and nearly 100,000 of them were taken prisoners and slaughtered on that day. In addition to that, about another 100,000 civilians were massacred in the city.

It has been mentioned earlier that after the mass-massacre of the Hindus in the Chittor Fort by Akbar, Rajput Kings abandoned the fort and thereafter, they used the fort at Udaipur as their residence and the seat of the government. In a similar manner, the Rajput kings had abandoned the Fort of Sikri after the mass-massacre by Babar, as mentioned above. And, as a result, the city of Fatehpur Sikri gradually turned into a desolate jungle. Later on, Akbar perhaps took an initiative to revive the city by clearing the jungle and our dishonest historians are portraying that as Akbar's creation of the new city of

Fatehpur Sikri. A study of the history of Fatehpur Sikri, it appears that, Akbar might have built a minutely small part, the Buland Darwaza, of the entire edifice and nothing else. And later on, he might have built the tomb of Shaikh Salim Chisti.

Another point of vital importance should be highlighted in this context. Anyone, whosoever has visited the Fort-Palace complex at Fatehpur Sikri, it must not have escaped his notice that all the palaces and buildings reveal overwhelmingly Hindu style of architecture and stone carving. According to experts, they are either of Rajasthani or Gujarati style. This is due to the simple reason that the Rajput Hindu kings were the real authors of those buildings and palaces. But to hide the true history, the despicable creatures, called secular and Marxist historians, say that Akbar engaged both Hindu and Muslim artists of Persia for building the palaces and stone carving. They also say that Akbar was so generous that he had no hesitation to accept Hindu style of architecture. But all these lies are going to be exposed very soon as the real history of Fatehpur Sikri has started to reveal due to fresh archaeological discoveries. We expect to deal that aspect in the next installment.

References:

[1] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *The History of India -As Told by Its Own Historians* (in 8 volumes), Low Price Publication, Delhi (1996) V, 332-333.

[2] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 105.

[3] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, *ibid*, 104-105

[4] R. C, Majumdar, *'The History and Cultures of the Indian People'*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 Vols), VII, 125.

- [5] V. A. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, *ibid*, 107
- [6] (www.taj-mahal-india-travel.com/monuments-places-to-visit/fatehpur-sikri.html)
- [7] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fatehpur_Sikri)
- [8] R. C, Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 760.
- [9] R. C, Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 763.
- [10] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 40.
- [11] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 62.
- [12] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 268.
- [13] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 267.
- [14] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 269.
- [15] R. C, Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 36.
- [16] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 272

Part 5E

Appearance of the Light of Truth:

It has been mentioned earlier that, according to the pseudo-secular and Marxist historians of India, Sikri was a small village surrounded by deep forest infested with wild animals and Akbar raised a fort-palace complex, an excellent exhibit of architecture, and thus converted the desolate hamlet called Sikri into a city within 14 or 15 years. [1] [2] [3] As it was impossible to build a city like Fatehpur Sikri, as it is today, within a short period of 14 to 15 years, Jahangir in his autobiography has written that, all buildings, fort, gardens etc were built as if by magic [4] To make this cock and bull story believable, our historians say, "The work was pushed on with such phenomenal speed that, as if by magic palaces, public buildings, mosques and tombs, gardens and baths, pavilions and water courses were called into being beneath the barren sandstone ridge of Sikri." [4]

Picture of Jodhabai Palace, Fatehpur Sikri

But it is not difficult for a visitor to detect that all the designs of buildings and palaces inside the fort complex and the style of stone carvings overwhelmingly reveal Hindu style of architecture. Particularly, the buildings like Dewan-i-khas, Dewan-i-am, Jodhabai Palace, palaces of Tansen and Birbal, Navratna Sabha, etc depict either Rajput or Gujarati style architecture and stone carvings. Experts agree that the stone carvings of lotus, chains, bells etc.on the walls of Akbar's harem are indeed pure Hindu style of stone carving. The palace called Panch Mahal with its 84 pillars is a pure example of Hindu architecture. Particularly, the 56 pillars in the second storey of the same are pure exhibits of Rajput style of stone carving. [5]

Experts also agree that the sitting arrangement on pillars in the Dewan-i-khas in Fatehpur Sikri, called Ibadat-Khanah, which Akbar used to preach his new religion Din-i-Ilahi, is a pure example of Jain architecture. [5] All such evidence lead one to conclude that the fort-palace complex at Fatehpur Sikri was definitely authored by the Hindu Kings. But despite all these infallible evidence, the so called secular and the Marxist historians are projecting Akbar as the author of the city of Fatehpur Sikri.

It has already been mentioned that to explain the overwhelmingly Hindu style of architecture of these buildings and palaces, the so called secular historian present some extremely ridiculous and absurd arguments and say that the Muslim rulers used to engage Hindu architects and artisans and hence Hindu style prevailed in these buildings and palaces. For example, to explain the pure Hindu style of architecture in the Jodhabai palace, historian S K Saraswati writes, "It

is apparent that persons traditionally familiar with the indigenous (i.e. Hindu) architectural practices were responsible for the (Hindu) conception and construction of the beautiful (Jodhabai) palace.” [6]

But it not difficult to understand that all such arguments, fabricated by these historians, are entirely baseless. It is well known that Islam is a cult that propagates intense hatred towards the non-Muslim kafirs and the foreign Muslim invaders, indoctrinated by the said hate-cult called Islam, possessed immense hatred towards the Hindus and their culture. Hence, it is not difficult, even for a commoner, to understand that had the Muslim rulers created those buildings and palaces, they certainly would not have allowed any hateful Hindu style of architecture in those buildings. There is no doubt that, in that case, they would have brought architects, artisans and artists from Turkey, Iraq or Iran, or from any other Muslim country. As they were not the authors of these buildings and palaces, they had to compromise despite their intense hatred for Hindu culture, including its architecture.

But it is a good news that, the light of truth has started to come out to destroy the darkness of lies. In August, 1999, Dr Dharamveer Sharma, an archaeologist of Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), arrived Fatehpur Sikri, with his three assistants Ramesh Mulimani of Karnatak, Kamei Athailu Kabui of Manipur and R K Tiwari, and began archaeological excavations at Birchhabili-Tila (Mound), which is hardly 2 Km away from the fort . [7] After working hardly for two months, they could discovered many artifacts of immense importance, including the idols of Jain Tirthankars (Saints) and Jain Srutidevi Saraswati. But the heads of all

those idols of Jain Saints were broken. According to inscriptions on the idols of the Jain Saints, Dr Sharma is convinced that the idols of Jain Saints and the Jaina Srutidevi Saraswati were of 1010 AD, and hence they are older than the times Akbar by over 500 years.

Later on, Dr Sharma wrote a book, *Archaeology of Fatehpur Sikri*, published by Aryan Books International, containing all his discoveries. In the Preface of the book, Dr Sharma writes, "The *Archaeology of Fatehpur Sikri-New Discoveries* is a fundamental research work on medieval archaeology. It contains results of excavations at Birchhabili-Tila and exploration of the region within a radius of 25 km. Besides this, chronological study of the monuments have been made phase-wise along with inscriptions and mason marks." Some other authors have also written books on archaeological studies of Agra and Fatehpur Sikri. [8] Dr Sharma has also made archaeological studies on other monuments like the Ibadat-Khanah which Akbar used for religious discussions, the Agni-Kunda of the so-called Jodha Bai's Palace, Hiran-Minar etc, with new interpretations.

Dr Sharma believes that, to hide original Hindu symbols and Hindu and Jain idols of the fort and palaces of Fatehpur Sikri, Akbar had dumped them in the place which is now known as the Birchhabili Tila. Many idols had been hidden inside the walls of the fort and Dr Sharma and his men recovered many such idols. According to Dr Sharma, some of these idols were of second century AD, or of the times of Kushan King Kanishka, while some of them are of the Gupta period of fourth or fifth century AD. But all the idols are found to be headless. According to the speculation of Dr Sharma, Muslim invaders used hammer or some other heavy and

blunt tool to break the heads of the idols. From a nearby mound, Dr Sharma and his team could discover some ceramic articles and according to Dr Sharma, those specimens were of 1200 BC.

All these discoveries undoubtedly prove that, even 1000 years before the times of Akbar, Sikri was a flourishing and thriving city, which is contrary to the opinion of the secular historians, who try to convince that Sikri was a small village up to the times of Akbar. Most importantly, Dr Sharma and his team have unearthed a stone edict written in Sanskrit. From the said epigraph it has been known that in older days, the place was called Saikarikya. Dr Sharma and other scholars are convinced that the present name Sikri is nothing but a corrupt of Sanskrit Saikarikya.

Dr Sharma and his team have also discovered rubbles of broken Hindu temples and Jain Maths at the said Birchhabili Tila. These discoveries undoubtedly prove the existence of Hindu temples and Jain Maths (monasteries) in Sikri which the Muslim invader Akbar had demolished. Most importantly, the discovery has served a death blow to secular theory that says that the present city of Fatehpur Sikri has been authored by Akbar and before his times Sikri was an unknown village surrounded by forest.

However, the ASI team has not yet done an intensive investigation inside the fort-palace complex of Fatehpur Sikri and, experts believe that such an excavation of the complex would lead to more startling discoveries sufficiently adequate to disprove the myth of Akbar's authorship of the city. On the contrary, such an effort would firmly establish the Hindu authorship of the fort and palaces of Fatehpur Sikri. We may hope that in near

future, archaeological investigations would be carried out in other monuments of Delhi and Agra, like the Qutb Minar, the Red Fort, the Agra Fort, the Taj Mahal and thus many unknown information would come to light, which would help reveal the true history of the Muslim period of India.

It is well known that the rising sun makes the good people happy, while it makes the nocturnal animals, as well as dishonest people like thieves and dacoits, scary. So, the archaeological discovery at Fatehpur Sikri is good news for patriotic and nationalist historians, while it is extremely bad news for the so called pseudo secular, Marxist and Nehruvian historians. Hence, it is not difficult to comprehend that the above mentioned discoveries at Fatehpur Sikri have produced a panic in the camp of the above mentioned dishonest historians.

In India, there is a Parliamentary Committee to direct the activities of the ASI, and at that time, when Dr Sharma and his team were working at the Birchhabili Tila in Fatehpur Sikri, Eduardo Faleiro, a leader of the National Congress Party, was the in-charge of that Committee. It should be mentioned here that the said [Congress Party is the chief patron of the so called pseudo-secular and Marxist historians' lobby](#). Moreover, Eduardo Feleiro was a Christian and hence a Hindu basher.

So, for obvious reasons, the news of archaeological discoveries at Fatehpur Sikri enraged Mr Feleiro and immediately he convened an emergency meeting of the said Parliamentary Committee on July 6, 2000, to assess the situation. In that meeting, Mr. Feleiro and other pseudo-secular members severely deplored the activities of ASI at Fatehpur Sikri. He declared the effort of ASI

motivated and ill-intentioned. He also alleged that, in the name of scientific excavation, ASI has taken up the job only to search for Hindu temples and Hindu idols. He severely attacked Dr Sharma and said that his prime objective was to generate communal hatred between the Hindus and the Muslims. He also said that a similar reckless effort of ASI in Ayodhya unleashed communal tension, which ultimately led to the demolition of the Babri Masjid in 1992.

It should be mentioned here that in 1528, Mir Baqi, one of Babar's generals, according to his master's instigation, partially pulled down the Ram Janmabhumi Temple at Ayodhya and converted it into a mosque, known as Babri Masjid. Mr Faleiro also blamed ASI for letting out the results of its investigations, in haste, to the media. So, from the above discussions, it becomes evident that Mr. Feleiro and his lot do not want the true history of India comes to light. [9]

The above allegations of Mr. Feleiro deserve critical attention. In so many words, he tried to say that, firstly, the ASI should not initiate any excavation if it is apprehended that such an excavation may lead to any discovery which is contrary to the ongoing politics of Muslim appeasement. Secondly, in case of such discovery, that should not be communicated to the press without consent from the Parliamentary Committee. Or in other words, the true history of India must be kept buried under the earth for all time to come. So, it becomes evident that unless a true nationalist government comes to power, the false history in conformity with the politics of Muslim appeasement would continue.

However, after the said emergency meeting, Mr. Feleiro and his lot succeeded to obtain a written statement from Mr. Komal Anad, the then director of ASI, obviously under intense political pressure, that says that, after studying the archaeological exhibits discovered at Fatehpur Sikri, the Archaeological Survey of India had come to the conclusion that Emperor Akbar had never demolished any Hindu temple at that place. But the said exhibits conclusively prove that, there was a big Jain temple and a monastery at Sikri which were demolished by the Muslims. Question naturally arises – Who had demolished those buildings? If it was not Akbar, then who was the culprit? The reader should notice that, Babar might also be the possible culprit. It is quite likely that after the victory in the Battle of Khanua, Babar demolished those structures to please Allah. So, a detail and careful scientific experiment can only reveal the truth.

To conclude, it should be said that, so long as the present politics of Muslim appeasement persists, the political leaders would never allow the ASI to undertake archaeological excavation at a site, if they apprehend that such an excavation might lead to discoveries contrary to the false history fabricated by the so called secular historians under strict political guidance. **The people of India would be able to know the true history of their country only when a strong nationalist political force succeeds to put an end of the present ongoing politics of Muslim appeasement.**

References:

[1] R. C, Majumdar, *'The History and Cultures of the Indian People'*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 Vols), VII, 763.

[2] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *The History of India -As Told by Its Own Historians* (in 8 volumes), Low Price Publication, Delhi (1996) IV, 40.

[3] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, IV, 62.

[4] R. C, Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 760.

[5] R. C, Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 770.

[6] R. C, Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 768.

[7] Sikri's New Past, S Kalidas, *India Today* (Weekly), Feb 28, 2000

[8] *Tajmahal Agra & Fatehpur Sikri*, by Subhadra Sen Gupta; *Agra & Fatehpur Sikri* by Amrita Kumar; *Excavations At Fatehpur Sikri* by R C Gaur, published by : Aryan Books International

[9] *Bartaman* (A Bengali Daily) July 8, 2000, edition

Part 6A

The Distorted History of Taj Mahal:

There is no doubt that Taj Mahal in Agra is one of the most beautiful architectural marvels in the entire world and hence it is called one of the great wonders of the world. But who is the author of this excellent exhibit of architecture? Opinions in this regard are highly contentious. The general notion is that, it is the creation of Mughal Emperor Shah Jahan. In previous articles, we have seen how the authorship of excellent pieces of architecture in Delhi, Agra and Fatehpur Sikri are being falsely attributed to the foreign Muslim invaders, who occupied and ruled India for nearly eight centuries. So, the question naturally arises: Is the claim of Shah Jahan's authorship of Taj Mahal true? Or is the said view merely a part of the process of distortion of Indian history, to appease the Muslims? In this article, we shall try to find a plausible reply to these questions.

In this regard, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* states, "*Taj Mahal is a mausoleum complex in Agra, in western Uttar Pradesh state, in northern India, on the southern bank of the*

Yamuna (Jumna) River. ...the Taj Mahal is distinguished as the finest example of Mughal architecture, a blend of Indian, Persian, and Islamic styles. One of the most beautiful structural compositions in the world, the Taj Mahal was designated a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1983. It was built by the Mughal emperor Shah Jahan (reigned 1628–58) to immortalize his wife Mumtaz Mahal (“Chosen One of the Palace”). The name Taj Mahal is a derivation of her name. She died in childbirth in 1631, after having been the emperor’s inseparable companion since their marriage in 1612. The plans for the complex have been attributed to various architects of the period, though the chief architect was probably Ustad Ahmad Lahawri, an Indian of Persian descent.”^[1]

The Wikipedia Encyclopedia maintains a similar view and says, *“The Taj Mahal is a mausoleum located in Agra, India, built by Mughal Emperor Shah Jahan in memory of his favorite wife, Mumtaz Mahal. The Taj Mahal (also “the Taj”) is considered the finest example of Mughal architecture, a style that combines elements from Persian, Indian, and Islamic architectural styles. In 1983, the Taj Mahal became a UNESCO World Heritage Site and was cited as “the jewel of Muslim art in India and one of the universally admired masterpieces of the world’s heritage.”^[2]*

In this context, we should mention what the India’s historians have to say in this matter. Historian R C Majumdar, in this regard, writes, *“The Taj Mahal, a splendid mausoleum built by Shah Jahan, at a cost of fifty lacs of rupees, over the grave of his beloved wife, Mumtaz Mahal, is rightly regarded as one of the wonders of the world for its beauty and magnificence.”^[3]* Another historian S K Saraswati writes, *“But all the above architectural creations of Shah Jahan are thrown into shade by that superb conception of the mausoleum that the emperor raised up at Agra to enshrine the mortal remains of his beloved consort, Arjumand Banu*

Begam, better known as Mumtaz Mahal. The Taj Mahal, as it is called after the title of the empress, stands on an elevated ground on a bend of the river Jamuna so that it has a fine view from whatever angle it is seen."^[4]

As a result of this worldwide propaganda, Shahjahan's authorship of Taj Mahal, mixed with story of romantic love between Shah Jahan and his wife, has become so pervasive that it has become a universal symbol of love between a husband and his wife. Even a common man, at first instance, refuses to admit any other version, even if it is more convincing and rational. **Even the Nobel Laureate Poet Rabindranath Tagore, being swayed by the above story, described the Taj Mahal, in one of his poems, as a drop of tears of the grief-stricken Emperor Shahjahan.**

The True History of Taj Mahal:

But according to Stephen Knapp, a well known researcher on Taj Mahal, it was not built by Shah Jahan and he writes, "*There is ample evidence that the Taj Mahal was never built by Shah Jahan. Some say the Taj Mahal predates Shah Jahan by several centuries and was originally built as a Hindu or Vedic temple/ palace complex and Shah Jahan merely acquired it (by brute force) from its previous owner, the Hindu King Jai Singh.*"^[5] Not only Stephen Knapp but many other researchers like Yogesh Saxena, V S Godbole and Prushottam Nagesh Oak (or P N Oak) hold a similar view and P N Oak is the most prominent and pioneer among scholars who worked to discover the real author of Taj Mahal.

It is well known that Emperor Akbar got *Akbarnama*, a history of his reign, written by his court-chronicler Abul Fazl and in a similar manner, Shahjahan had the history of his reign titled *Badshahnama* written by his court-

chronicler Abdul Hamid Lahori. The original *Badshahnama* was written in Persian using Arabic alphabets and in 1963 P N Oak made a startling discovery that the pages 402 and 403 of the edition of *Badshahnama*, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal (see the fascimile of the page 402 and 403 of the edition in Figure-1), contain the true history of the building now known as Taj Mahal. An English translation of the contents from line 21 of page 402 to line 41 on page 403 of *Badshahnama* is given below.

Meanwhile, we should notice another important point. It is well known that the two British historians, H M Elliot and J Dowson, have done the great job of writing history of India, under Muslim rule, starting from the attack on Sindh by Mohammed bin Kasim in the 8th century to the fall of Marathas in the 19th century, a period covering nearly 1200 years. It has been written, based on chronicles of the court chroniclers of the Muslim rulers only. The work of Elliot and Dowson was published in 8 volumes during 1867 to 1877 and the Volume 7 of their work deals with the reigns of Shahjahan and Aurangzeb. But it is really astonishing that there is not even a mentioning of Taj Mahal in the said work.

Many Muslim chroniclers have described the times of Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb, e.g.

- (1) *Badshahnama* by Abdul Hamid Lahori,
- (2) *Wakiyat Jahangiri* by Emperor Jahangir,
- (3) *Shahjahan-nama* by Enayet Khan,
- (4) *Tarikh-i- Mufajjali* by Mufajjal Khan,
- (5) *Mirat-i-Alam* by Bakhtyar Khan,
- (6) *Alamgirnama* by Muhammad Qazim and

(7) *Mustakhab-ul-Lubab* by Kafi Khan.

But in none of above works, there is even mentioning of Taj Mahal, except *Badshahnama* by Lahori and that too as a palace of Jai Singh

While commenting on this point, Dr Yogesh Saxena writes, “*The authors should have said, ‘Though we have presented history of Shahjahan based on his official chronicle Badshahnama, we did not find any reference to Taj Mahal in it’. They did no such thing. And Historians have kept even this information from us for the last 130 years.*”^[6] It was Professor P N Oak, who, for the first time, made the startling discovery that there is mentioning of the building now called Taj Mahal, but as a palace of the Hindu king Jai Singh, in *Badshahnama*.

There is another important point to note. There is a rumour that Shah Jahan engaged 20,000 labourers who toiled for 20 (or 22) years to complete the construction of Taj Mahal. This rumour was originated by the French traveler Jean Baptiste Tavernier. It is really unthinkable that Shah Jahan completed such a gigantic job, spending so much money, employing so many people throughout so many years, but it escaped the attention of his sycophant chroniclers, and they did not even say a single word about the said job in their works. So, the logical conclusion is that the said gigantic construction never took place during the reign of Shah Jahan, and *Badshahnama* confirms this fact.

The original *Badshahnama* was written in Persian using Arabic alphabets and the pages 402 and 403 of the edition published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal contain the true history of the building now known as Taj Mahal. Professor Oak got the two pages translated into English by a scholar of Persian language and the

said translation of the contents from line 21 of page 402 to line 41 on page 403 of Vol-I of Badshahnama is given below.

*“Friday, 15th Jamadiulawal, the sacred dead body of the traveller to the kingdom of holiness Hazrat Mumtazul Zamani, who was temporarily buried, was brought, accompanied by Prince Mohammad Shah, Suja bahadur, Wazir Khan and Satiunnesa Khanam, who knew the temperament of the deceased intimately and was well-versed in view of that Queen of the Queens used to hold, was brought to the capital Akbarabad (Agra) and an order was issued that very day coins be distributed among the beggars and fakirs. The site covered with a majestic garden, to the south of the great city (of Agra) and amidst which **the building known as the palace of Raja Man Singh, at present owned by Raja Jai Singh, grandson of Man Singh, was selected for the burial of the Queen, whose abode is in heaven. Although Raja Jai Singh valued it greatly as his ancestral heritage and property, yet he agreed to part with it gratis for Emperor Shahjahan, still out of sheer scrupulousness and religious sanctity, he (Jai Singh) was granted Sharifabad in exchange of that grand palace (Ali Manzil). After the arrival of the deadbody in that great city (of Agra), next year that illustrious body of the Queen was laid to rest and the officials of the capital, according to royal order, hid the body of that pious lady from the eyes of the world and the palace so majestic (imarat-e-alishan) and capped with a dome (wa gumbaje) was turned into a sky-high lofty mausoleum”.**[7]*

Many historians try to convince that Shah Jahan purchased a piece of land from Raja Jai Singh and erected Taj Mahal on that land. But the lines 29 and 30 on page 403 of Vol-I of Badshahnama reads, “Pesh az ein Manzil-e-Rajah Mansingh bud wadari waqt ba Rajah Jaisingh (29) Nabirae taalluq dasht barae madfan e an bahisht

muwattan bar guzeedand .. (30)." According to experts, the correct translation of the phrase "*Manzil-e-Rajah Mansingh bud wadari waqt ba Rajah Jaisingh*" is "*...the building known as the palace of Raja Man Singh, at present owned by Raja Jai asingh*". So, it is evident that it cannot be a transaction of land but of a magnificent palace. In line 37, further clarification has been made and said that it was a transaction of an *imarat-e-alishan* (i.e. a gigantic building) and not of land

In 1964, when Prof P N Oak started to disclose his doubts about Shah Jahan's authorship of Taj Mahal and presented the document in *Badshahnama* as the proof, many of his opponents said that his translation of *Badshahnama* was not correct. One of his bitter critiques was a Kashmiri Pandit. He was also a scholar of Persian language. To narrate the incident Dr Yogesh Saxena writes, "One of his opponents was a Kashmiri Pandit. Eventually they went to Government of India Archives. At the suggestion of the Librarian there, the Pandit started to read *Badshahnama*; soon he came to Volume I, page 403. One line read: *va pesh azin manzil-e-Raja Mansingh bood, vadari vakt ba Raja Jaisingh*. He confessed that Shah Jahan took over Raja Mansingh's palace for burial of Mumtaz. We owe so much to this honest opponent of Mr Oak. He gave word by word translation of pages 402 and 403 to Mr Oak, who promptly published it in his book '*Taj Mahal is a Hindu Palace*' (1968). However, Mr Oak never stated that the translation was his. It was done for him by a Persian expert."^[6]

The name of the Queen, in whose memory the Taj Mahal is being said to have been erected, was **Arjumand Banu**. She was married to Shahjahan in 1612 A.D. and

within 18 years of her married life she gave birth to 14 children and in fact she died in 1630 (or in 1631) while she was delivering her 14th child. According to *Badshahnama*, she was buried temporarily at Burhanpur and in the same year her body was brought from Burhanpur to Agra and the next year her body was permanently buried at the majestic palace of Raja Man Singh. From the *Badshahnama* it becomes evident that the edifice, now known as Taj Mahal, was not authored by Emperor Shahjahan.

Who was The Author of Building called Taj Mahal?

So, according to the narrations of *Badshahnama* and from other evidences, it becomes clear that the edifice, now known as Taj Mahal, was not authored by Emperor Shah Jahan. The question, therefore, naturally arises: Who built that magnificent building?

A locality, nearly 4 km away from Taj Mahal, is called Bateswar and in 1900 A.D. General Alexander Cunningham, the then Director of the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), conducted an excavation at Bateswar and discovered an edict, now known as the *Munj Bateswar Edict* and kept at the Lucknow Museum. The epigraph contains 34 verses written in Sanskrit, out of which 25th, 26th and 34th verses are important in the present context. The original Sankrit text and English translation of the above verses are given below -

Prasādo vaiṣṇavastena nirnimitotavahan hari /

Murdhn āspriśati yo nityaṃ padamasaiva madhyamam // (25)

“He built a marble temple which is the abode of Lord Vishnu and the King bows down to touch His feet” (25).

Akāryacca sphatikāvadātamasāvidam mandiraminidumauleḥ /

Na jātuyasminnibsnsadevah kailāsvasayacakara cetaḥ // (26)

“The King has built another marble temple which has been dedicated to the Lord Who has the moon as His ornament on His forehead and Who, getting such a beautiful abode, has forgotten to return to Kailash ” (26).

Pakṣa tryakṣamukhāditya saṁkhye vikramavatsare /

Aśvina śukla pañcmyām bāsare vāsave śitu // (34)

“Today, the 5th day of the bright half in the month of Ashwin, the Sunday, in the year 1212 of the Vikram Samvat, the edict is being laid” (34)

Mr. D.J. Kale, a well known archaeologist, has mentioned the said Munj Bateswar Edict in his celebrated work ‘Epigraphica India’. On page 124 of the said work, Mr. Kale writes, “The said Munj Bateswar Edict was laid by King Paramardidev of the Chandratreya dynasty on Sukla Panchami in the month of Ashwin, in the year 1212 Vikram Samvat (or A.D. 1156) ... King Paramardidev built two magnificent temples with white marble, one for Lords Vishnu and the other for Lord Shiva and they were desecrated later on by the Muslim invaders. Perhaps a farsighted man took the edict to a safer place at Bateswar and buried it beneath the ground”.[8] Perhaps, after the said desecration, the temples were no longer used as religious places and due to this reason Abdul Hamid Lahori mentioned them as palaces, not as temples. According to the renowned historian Mr. R.C. Majumdar, the other name of the Chandratreya or Chandel King Paramardidev was Paramal and their kingdom was known as Bundelkhand aka Jejakabhukti[9]

Today, there are two marble palaces in Agra, one is the Mausoleum of Idmat-ud-Daula, the father of Noorjahan and the other is *Taj Mahal*, and it is evident

from the Munj Bateswar edict that once upon a time, one of them was the temple of Lord Vishnu and the other was a temple of Lord Shiva. Experts believe that it is the temple of Lord Vishnu that has been made the mausoleum of Idmat-ud-Daula, and the temple of Lord Shiva has been converted into the mausoleum of the queen Arjumand Banu. There are so many evidences that support of this conclusion and we shall try to discuss them in future installments of this article.

References:

[1] <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/581007/Taj-Mahal>

[2] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taj_Mahal)

[3] R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, '*An Advanced History of India*', MacMillan & Co (1980), 586

[4] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, 793

[5] Stephen Knapp, *Taj Mahal: Was it a Vedic Temple? The Photographic Evidence*

(www.stephen-knapp.com/was_the_taj_mahal_a_vedic_temple.htm)

[6] Yogesh Saxena, *Taj Mahal - It is time to tell the truth,*

(<http://agrasen.blogspot.com/2009/04/hidden-facts-in-indian-history.html>)

[7] P N Oak, *Tajmahal - The True Story*, Published by A Ghosh, p 9-12.

[8] D J Kale, *Epigraphica India*, published by S D Kale & M D Kale, I, 270-274.

[9] R C Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Vol-5, p-122

Part 6B

When construction of Taj Mahal was completed:

In the previous article, it has been mentioned that the name of the Queen, in whose memory the Taj Mahal is being said to have been erected, was Arjumand Banu.

She was married to Shahjahan in 1612 and died at Burhanpur in 1631 (or 1630) A.D. and within 18 years of her married life she gave birth to 14 children. In fact, she died while she was delivering her 14th child. According to Badshahnama, she was buried temporarily at Burhanpur and in the same year her body was brought from Burhanpur to Agra. So it was not possible for Shah Jahan to begin the so-called construction of the Taj Mahal before 1631. According to the French traveler Jean Baptiste Tavernier, the said construction continued for 22 years and hence the construction had been presumably completed not before 1653 AD.

Regarding this account of Tavernier, Dr V S Godbole says, "These figures come from a book 'Travels in India' by J B Tavernier, a French jewel merchant. He was a great adventurer who made six voyages to India in the days of Shivaji (1638 to 1668). Tavernier says," I witnessed the commencement and completion of this monument (Taj Mahal) on which 20,000 men worked incessantly for 22 years."^[1]

Dr Godbole also says, "In 1889 Dr Ball translated the original French book (Travels in India by J B Tavernier) into English, corrected some mistakes in earlier translation and provided extensive footnotes. He also studied Tavernier's movements thoroughly and provided details of his six voyages. From this it is clear that Tavernier came to Agra only twice - in the winter of 1640-41 and in 1665."^[1] So, it was not possible for Tavernier to see either the beginning, or the finishing of the construction of Taj Mahal. It therefore appears that his claim of seeing the beginning and end of the construction of Taj Mahal is baseless and untrue.

History tells us that, in 1658, Aurangzeb had imprisoned his father Shahjahan in the Fort of Agra and occupied the throne. So, when Tavernier visited Agra for the second time, Aurangzeb was the emperor. While commenting on this aspect, Dr Godbole says, "No historian claims that Aurangzeb completed Taj Mahal. So, Tavernier could not have seen the completion of Taj Mahal either." [1] This also makes one doubtful about other narrations of Tavernier that says that, Shahjahan engaged 20,000 workers who laboured for 22 years to erect the edifice which is now known as Taj Mahal.

On the other hand, it is clear from the accounts of Badshahnama that in the same year (most probably within 6 months) Arjumand Banu had died, her body was exhumed from her temporary burial at Burhanpur and brought to Agra, and in the next year her body was permanently laid to rest in Agra. As it was not possible to erect a new building within such a short period of time and hence there is no doubt that an existing building was used as her permanent burial. In this regard, Badshahnama says that a marvellous building (imar-at-e-alishan), with splendid dome (wa gumbaje) known as the palace of Raja Man Singh, at present owned by Raja Jai asingh, grandson of Man Singh, was selected for the burial of the Queen. Badshahnama also says that Shah Jahan gave Raja Jai Singh a place called Sharifabad in exchange of that grand palace (Ali Manzil). It is to be noted here that Badshahnama did not furnish any detail of the place Sharifabad, not also the location of the place. So, many believe that, Shah Jahan occupied the palace by brute force and to save his face his sychophant cronicler Abdul Hamid Lahori, later on, fabricated the story exchange of land in the mythical place Sharifabad.

It should also be noted here that, according to Islam, looting kafir properties is a pious duty for every Muslim. During the life time of Prophet Muhammad, Allah, through his divine message in Koran, directed the Muslims to kill the adult male kafirs, loot their wealth and riches, occupy their properties, take their women and children as captives, rape their women, keep them as sex-slaves or sale them in the slave market and so on. Muhammad, in his life time, used to receive one fourth of the loot as hoily Khum. So long Akbar was alive, the people of Allah could not perform their pious duty of occupying the palace as Mansingh was an ally of Akbar. But after his death and the death of Mansingh, there remained no hindrance for Shah Jahan to usurp the building by force and convert it into a mausoleum for his wife.

It should also be mentioned here that, an author called Khan Bahaddur Syed Muhammad Latif, in his book Agra Historical and Descriptive had mentioned that the palace, now called Taj Mahal, was the property of Mansingh and after his death his grandson Jaisingh became the owner of the palace. So, Dr Godbole writes, "In 1896 Khan Bahaddur Syed Muhammad Latif wrote a book entitled Agra Historical and Descriptive. He refers to Badshahnama many times but does not quote specific page numbers. On page 105 he says, "The site selected for the mausoleum was originally a palace of Raja Mansingh but it was now the property of his grandson Raja Jaisingh." Many authors have referred to Latif in their bibliography but have not cared to see what he has said. This truth was also hidden away from us by our Historians." [1]

Aurangzeb's Letter refutes Shah Jahan's Authorship of Taj:

There is another strong evidence to show that the building, now known as Taj Mahal, was not built by Shah Jahan. "In 1652, Aurangzeb wrote a letter complaining of the extensive repairs that are in need of being done on Taj Mahal. He says that several rooms on the second storey, the secret rooms and tops of the seven storey ceiling have all absorbed water through seepage and are so old that they were all leaking, and the dome had developed a crack on the northern side. However, in the letter herein Aurangzeb ordered immediate repairs at his expense while recommending to the emperor that more elaborate repairs such as the roof be opened up and redone with mortar, bricks and stone." [2] The facsimile of the letter is shown above.

The reader should notice that, according to general rumour, Arjumand Banu died in 1631 and Shah Jahan initiated the construction of Taj Mahal in the same year, and it took 22 years to complete the construction. It implies that Shah Jahan finished the construction of Taj Mahal in 1653. So, when Aurangzeb wrote the above letter, Taj Mahal should have been a newly constructed building. But according to the description of Aurangzeb, Taj Mahal was a very old building that deserved a massive repair work. So, Aurangzeb's letter is more than sufficient to conclude that the claim of Shah Jahan's authorship of the building, now known as Taj Mahal, is a fraud.

According to Stephen Knapp, Aurangzeb wrote the said letter in 1632 and if that is true, it appears that Aurangzeb wrote that letter when the construction of Taj Mahal had just begun. Stephen Knapp, in this regard,

writes, "It also covers such things as the descriptions found in the old Agra court papers on the Taj; descriptions and measurements of the building in the old records; Aurangzeb's letter of the much needed repairs even in 1632 which is unlikely for a new building;" [3]

However, to give the existing palace an Islamic face, Shah Jahan had to undertake some modification of the existing palace, such as replacing Hindu symbols and decorating it with Koranic inscriptions. Nearly a year was, perhaps, spent to finish these jobs at the cost of Rs 40 lakh. And hence the Badshahnama says, "... the foundation was laid and geometricians with far sight and architects of talent incurred an expenditure of Rs 40 lakhs on this building." [4] It is also evident from Badshahnama that, it was decided before bringing the body of Arjumand Banu to Agra, that her body would be permanently laid to rest at the palace of Jai Singh. So the Badshahnama says, "The site covered with a majestic garden, to the south of the great city (of Agra) and amidst which the building known as the palace of Raja Man Singh, at present owned by Raja Jai asingh, grandson of Man Singh, was selected for the burial of the Queen, whose abode is in heaven." [4]

The above view has been endorsed by Stephen Knapp and he writes, "... records that reveal Shah Jahan acquired marble but was it enough for really building the Taj or merely for inlay work and decorative coverings; the observations of European travelers at the time; the actual age of the Taj; how the architecture is definitely of Indian Hindu orientation and could very well have been designed as a Shiva temple; the issue of the arch and the

dome; how the invader Timurlung (1398) took back thousands of prisoner.” [3]

But if we accept the other view, as presented by the Munj Bateswar Edict that, the building now called Taj Mahal, was built, as a temple of Lord Shiva, by the Bundel King Paramardi Dev, nearly 500 years before the times of Shah Jahan, Aurangzeb’s description of Taj Mahal becomes plausible and acceptable.

The cost of construction of Taj Mahal:

There is another important point to notice in this regard. According to Badshahnama, Shah Jahan spent Rs 40 lakh (or Rs 4 million) to build the Taj Mahal. But the so-called pseudo-secular historians of India could detect that, even in those days a sum of Rs 4 million was not enough to erect an edifice like Taj Mahal. So, they began to inflate the figure according to their sweet will. The estimates by different authors are given in the following table.

TABLE - I

| | Spending in rupees | Source |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 40,00,000 | A H Lahori [4] |
| 2 | 50,00,000 | R C Majumdar [5] |
| 3 | 50,00,000 | A C Roy [6] |
| 4 | 1,50,00,000 | Muhammad Din [7] |
| 5 | 1,84,65,000 | Guide to Taj [8] |
| 6 | 4,18,48,000 | Kanwar Lal [9] |
| 7 | 9,17,00,000 | Keene [10] |
| 8 | 3,00,00,000 | J B Tavernier [11] |

The wild variations of the figures suggest that they have not been collected from an authentic source. Simple

common sense tells that, had Shah Jahan built the edifice by spending money from the royal treasury, it would have been possible for the authors to collect the actual figures from records. But, since such records are not there, they have put a figure according to their sweet will and conjecture. One observes from the above table that the figure supplied by Keene is the highest and it is nearly 23 times of the figure given by Abdul Hamid Lahori. Out of the figure 4,18,48,000 given in the Guide to Taj, it is said that Rs 86,09,000 was spent from the royal treasury, while the rest was donated by the Nawabs. But there is no mentioning of the source, where from the data have been collected. It is needless to say that the said anomaly of figures points to the same conclusion that the building, now known as Taj Mahal, was not built by Shah Jahan.

Time taken for construction of Taj Mahal:

One observes a similar anomaly regarding the time taken to build the edifice called Taj Mahal. A detail is given in Table - II below.

TABLE - II

| | Year of initiation | Year of completion | Time Spent (Years) | Source |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 1632 | -1654 | 22 | Encly Britt [12] |
| 2 | 1632 | -1650 | 18 | Muhammad Din [7] |
| 3 | 1631 | -1648 | 17 | R C Arora [13] |
| 4 | 1641 | - 1663 | 22 | J B Tavernier [14] |
| 5 | 1630 | -1648 | 18 | Col. Gazetteer [15] |

It has been mentioned earlier that Arjumand Banu, the wife Shah Jahan, died in 1631. It was not possible for Shah Jahan to begin the construction of a mausoleum before the death of his wife and hence it is plausible to

assume that Shah Jahan began the construction of Taj Mahal in 1631 or 1632 AD. Historian A. C. Roy, to avoid the dispute regarding the year of beginning and the year of completion, simply says that it took 18 years for Shah Jahan to complete the construction. [6] Most importantly, the renowned historian R C Majumdar has kept silence in this matter. It is not difficult to understand that the absence of a reliable source is the cause of his silence.

According to the account of Tavernier, Shah Jahan had begun the construction 10 years after the death of Arjumand Banu and hence one should conclude that the construction was completed during the reign of Aurangzeb, who ascended the throne in 1658. But no historical record says that Aurangzeb had completed the construction of Taj Mahal. Most importantly, all these accounts seem to be meaningless, in view of the letter of Aurangzeb in 1652, suggesting an urgent repair of the building called Taj Mahal. So, from the above discussions, it becomes apparent that there is no authentic record to ascertain the year of beginning and the year of completion of the construction of Taj Mahal and hence the data furnished in the Table - II are baseless and untrue. It points to the same conclusion that Shah Jahan was not the author of Taj Mahal and we have seen, in the previous article that, the building, now known as Taj Mahal, was built by the Bundel King Paramardi Dev, as a temple of Lord Shiva, nearly 500 years before the times of Shah Jahan.

Who prepared the plan of Taj Mahal?

The similar is the case with the question, "Who was the designer of the building now known as Taj Mahal?" In this regard the historians of India say that Shah Jahan floated a global tender and the respondents were asked

to submit designs and wooden models along with the tender. Innumerable plans with models had been received by the authorities and at last a council of the renowned architects selected Muhammad Isa as the chief architect and his model. It should be pointed here that these historians simply copied the version of Encyclopaedia Britannica which reads, *“The plan was prepared by a council of architects from India, Persia, Central Asia and beyond and the credit for the final plan was given to Ustad Isa of either Persian or Turkish origin.”* [16]

All these extremely ridiculous narrations make one amazed – how far the baseless wild conjectures can go. While reading all these cock and bull stories, we should take care that in those days horse driven cart on land and boats plying on oars on water were the speediest modes of transport. For common people, bullock cart was the only mode of transport capable of moving 40 miles a day (Tavernier). An example would make the point clear. In 1756, nearly 100 years after the times of Shah Jahan, Siraj ud Daula, the nawab of Bengal, invaded Calcutta and occupied the city by defeating troops of the East India Company.

At that time general Clive was in Madras. It took more than a month for General Drake to convey this message to Clive in Madras and it took another month to bring forces from Madras to Calcutta and recover the lost city. So, any sane man would refuse to believe that in those days Shah Jahan floated a global tender, asked for designs and wooden models, many respondents submitted their designs and models and out of these specimens Shah Jahan picked up the model submitted by Muhammad Isa and the entire job was done within less than a year. [Perhaps, even a donkey would refuse to](#)

believe in all such nonsensical narrations of the secular and Marxist historians of India.

References:

- [1] Dr V S Godbole, '*Taj Mahal - It is time to tell the truth*'
(<http://agrasen.blogspot.com/2009/04/hidden-facts-in-indian-history.html>)
- [2] Aseemaa, June 2009, p-42
- [3] Stephen Knapp, *Taj Mahal: Was it a Vedic Temple? The Photographic Evidence* (www.stephenknapp.com/was_the_taj_mahal_a_vedic_temple.htm)
- [4] Mullah Abdul Hamid Lahori, *Badshahnama*, Asiatic Soc. Bengal, I, 403.
- [5] R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychaudhury and K. Datta, '*An Advanced History of India*', MacMillan & Co (1980), 586
- [6] A C Roy, *Bharater Itihas* (in Bengali), I, 186.
- [7] Muhammad Din, *Illustrated Weekly*, Dec 30, 1951.
- [8] *A Guide to Taj at Agra*, Victoria Press, 14.
- [9] Kanwar Lal, '*The Taj*', R K Publishing House, Delhi, 10.
- [10] Keene's *Handbook for Visitors to Agra & its Neighbourhood*, E A Duncan (Editor), 154
- [11] A C Roy, *ibid*, I, 107.
- [12] *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1964), XXI, 758.
- [13] R C Arora, '*The City of Taj*', Hibernian Press, Calcutta.
- [14] Jean Baptiste Tavernier, *Travels in India*, (Tr. V Ball), (1889) MacMillan & Co, London.
- [15] *Columbia Lippincot Gazetteer*, II, 19.
- [16] *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1964), XXI, 759

Part 6C

It has been mentioned in the previous article that, according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Shah Jahan floated a global tender and the respondents were asked to submit designs and wooden models along with the

tender. Innumerable plans with models had been received by the authorities and at last, according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "The plan was prepared by a council of architects from India, Persia, and Central Asia and beyond and the credit for the final plan was given to Ustad Isa of either Persian or Turkish origin." [1] Some historians believe that the name of the chief architect was Makamal Khan. And some others believe that his name was Abdul Karim. [2]

It is really amusing to note that, according to some Western historians, the chief architect was from Venice, Italy and his name was Jarenimo Verona [2]. But, most surprisingly, a French traveller called Thevenot, in 1650, said that the Taj Mahal was an excellent example of India's finest architectural and artistic skill. [2] From the above discussions, it is not difficult to understand that there is no authentic source that contains the name of the chief architect and the names provided above are outcomes of wild conjectures. But the Munj Bateswar edict clearly states that the building, now called Taj Mahal, was built by the Chandel King Paramardi Dev nearly 500 years before the times of Shah Jahan and hence its architect must have been none other than an Indian or a Hindu architect.

Mr D J Kale, in his Epigraphica India, has given a genealogy of the Chandratreya or Chandel Kings, that shows that King Paramardi Dev ascended the throne in 1165 (or 1167 AD).[3] According to R C Majumdar, the Chandel Raj Paramardi Dev ruled from 1163 to 1203 AD. [4] It has also been mentioned earlier that, the Munj Bateswar Edict was laid in 1212 Vikram Samvat or 1156 AD. Or in other words, it was laid nearly 475 years

before the death of Arjumand Banu, the wife of Shah Jahan.

The so-called secular and Marxist historians of India, according to their policy of Muslim appeasement and to glorify the foreign Muslim invaders, are used to project Shah Jahan as a luxurious and foppish man having refined taste and say that due to this reason Shah Jahan used marble to build palaces and monuments. So, the historian S K Saraswati writes, "Imbued with the prevailing ideas and his (Shah Jahan's) love for pomp and luxury and display of splendour, Shah Jahan chose marble as the chief medium for all his architectural undertakings." [5] There is no doubt that Mr Saraswati points to Taj Mahal of Agra and the marble palace, called Dewan-i-Khas, inside the Red Fort in Delhi. But the Munj Bateswar Edict has disproved the claim of Shah Jahan's authorship of Taj Mahal. It has also been pointed out earlier that [Shah Jahan's authorship of the Red Fort in Delhi is a fraud](#). But these spineless slave historians are harping on the same string and say that Shah Jahan built Taj Mahal in Agra and the Red Fort in Delhi.

It has been mentioned in the previous article that, according to the Munj Bateswar Edict, the Chandel King Paramardi Dev built two marble temples, one for Lord Vishnu and the other of Lord Shiva, in Agra and the Muslim invaders Shah Jahan converted the temple of Vishnu to the mausoleum of Idmat-ud-daula and the temple of Shiva to the mausoleum of his wife Arjumand Banu. And there are so many evidences to show that the building, called Taj Mahal today, was, firstly a Hindu temple and more pointedly, a temple of Lord Shiva.

A few evidences that Taj Mahal was a Hindu Temple

[Figure 1, Red lotus at apex of the entrance]

As shown in Figure-1, there is a red lotus at the apex of the main entrance of the so called Taj Mahal. There is no doubt that, Hindus use lotus for worshipping their deities and the lotus is a Hindu symbol.

[Figure 2: The figure of the OM design, in Devnagrii, within the carved marble flower, is definitely a Hindu design]

The Figure-2 shows the design of OM in Devnagri, carved out of stone in the wall of Taj Mahal. It is well known that OM and Swastika are considered holiest symbols by the Hindus. It should also be mentioned here that, had the building, now called Taj Mahal, been built by the Muslim ruler Shah Jahan, he would certainly not have tolerated Hindu symbols like OM and lotus in stone carvings of Taj.

Here is an example of the conch shell design incorporated into the three top central petals in the flowers.

In a detail on the gate, we can see two elephant's trunks, one on either side of the design, which would indicate Lord Ganesh.

[Figure 3: Here is an example of the conch shell design incorporated into the three top central petals in the flowers]

The Figure-3 shows conch-shells, as petals of flowers, carved out in the stone wall of Taj Mahal. It is exclusively a Hindu religious practice to blow conch-shells during worshipping of gods and goddesses. Hence conch-shell is a Hindu symbol which Muslims abhor. So, the existence of these conch-shells on the stone wall of Taj

Mahal is a strong evidence the once upon a time the building, now called Taj Mahal, was a Hindu temple.

[Figure 4: In a detail on the gate, we can see two elephant's trunks, one on either side of the design, which would indicate Lord Ganesh]

In Figure 4, the reader should notice that the Idol of Lord Ganesh has been carved out of leaves and flowers. One should also notice two elephant trunks on both sides of the idol of Lord Ganesh. This provides strong evidence that the building, now called Taj Mahal, was originally a Hindu temple.

[Figure 5. Picture of the South Gate of typical Vedic style]

The Figure-5 shows the top of the South Gate of Taj Mahal. One should notice inverted water-pots, which is a Hindu system of decoration. The number pots must always be in odd numbers and there are 11 in the picture. One should also notice the design of cobras in pairs, just below the gallery. It should be mentioned here that copying Allah's creation, either in painting or in sculpture, is a terrible sin in Islam. So, there is no doubt that, had the Muslims been the designer and builder of the building, now called Taj Mahal, they would not have incorporated such designs declared sinful in Islam. One should also notice that the Koranic inscriptions were a graffiti added by Shah Jahan in order give the entire edifice an Islamic face.

[Figure 6: Naqqar Khana alias Music House in the Taj Mahal]

The Figure-6 shows the Naqqar Khana or Naubat Khana, alias a Music House, in the Taj Complex, which is a contradiction. A mausoleum is generally a place of

silence and hence the existence of this Music House is a strong evidence that the building, now called Taj Mahal, was originally not a mausoleum. On the contrary, it provides a strong evidence in favour of the claim that originally it was a Hindu temple complex, as a Music House is an integral part of many temple complexes of the Hindus. In a Hindu temple complex, the Naobat Khana or the Music House is used for playing Shehnai and other musical instruments at dawn and at sunset.

[Figure 7: Typical Vedic style corridors]

[Figure 8: Vedic design on ceiling of a locked room]

[Figure 9: Note the veranda is typical Rajput architecture]

The Figure-7 shows a corridor, built according to typical Vedic or Hindu design. The Vedic or Hindu design is reflected in the design of the ceiling of a room, shown in Figure-8. Hindu, particularly Rajput design, is also prominent in the design of the veranda shown in Figure-9.

Tavernier mentioned in his Travel in India that a big shopping market had sprung up surrounding the Taj complex. Such markets usually grow up around a Hindu temple complex, but not in a Muslim mausoleum. Even today, one finds such market complexes around the temples at Benares, Puri, Hardwar, Madurai, Kalighat in Kolkata, and so on. It is also evidence that proves that the Taj Mahal of today was originally a temple complex of the Hindus.

In this article, we have provided a few evidence to show that the building now known as Taj Mahal, was originally a Hindu temple complex and in the next

instalment, we shall try prove that the said temple complex was dedicated to Lord Shiva.

References:

- [1] Encyclopaedia Britannica, (1964), XXI, 759.
- [2] A C Roy, Bharater Itihas (in Bengali), I, 186.
- [3] D J Kale, Epigraphica India, published by S D Kale & M D Kale, I, 140-141.
- [4] R.C. Majumdar (General Editor), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 volumes), Mumbai (1996) V, 122
- [5] R.C. Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996) VII, 781

Part 6D

In the previous article, a few evidences were presented that support the claim that the building, now known as Taj Mahal, was originally a Hindu temple. We should now proceed to establish that it was temple of Lord Shiva.

A few evidences that Taj Mahal was a Temple of Lord Shiva

The metallic pinnacle on the top of the central dome of the Taj Mahal is a trident or a three-pronged spear, which is the weapon as well as the emblem of Lord Shiva. This is a unique feature for every Shiva temple, big or small, in India. A close up of the dome, with the trident pinnacle, is shown in the figure-1. One should also notice that the upper part of the dome, on which the pinnacle rests, is an inverted lotus and furthermore the design of the dome resembles a peepul leaf. These two aspects undoubtedly show that the building, now called Taj Mahal, was designed by the Hindus.

A closer view of the pinnacle, as shown below, reveals that the trident is a specially designed and ornamental one, incorporating some other Hindu symbols. According to experts, the lower portion of the trident has been made like a crescent, which is the ornament of Lord Shiva. A group of historians try to convince that the presence of the crescent establishes the Muslim authorship of the Taj Mahal. But the other name of Lord Shiva is Chandramaulishwar or the deity who uses the crescent as an ornament attached to his clotted hair. This crescent provides the two side prongs of the trident.

It is most important to study and analyze the middle prong of the trident. Its main body resembles a water pot (kalash) with mango leaves (amra pallav) which Hindus use during worshipping a deity and a coconut on the top of the pot. It is undoubtedly a part of Hindu ritual and whenever Hindus worship a deity, they place a decorated water pot on the top of which place mango leaves and a coconut, as shown in the pinnacle. It is important to notice that the word Allah is inscribed in Arabic alphabet on the water pot. Perhaps, Shah Jahan wanted to remove the pinnacle as it contains Hindu symbols. But it was found that the pinnacle could not be replaced without causing damage to the dome. So he had to abandon his plan to replace the pinnacle and remain satisfied by inscribing the word Allah on it.

Figure 3 shows the full scale replica of the pinnacle inlaid on the red stone courtyard of Taj Mahal. Most astonishingly, if any one makes a Google (Image) search for the "pinnacle of Shiva temple", he will find this inlaid figure of the pinnacle in Taj Mahal. This is very significant and it shows that the Google operators are convinced that Taj Mahal was really a temple of Lord

Shiva. This figure shows three more water pots (kalash) below the crescent.

The flower called datura-stramonium in English is known as dhotra or dhutra in India. This flower is a must for worshipping Lord Shiva and the figure-4 shows a full grown Dhotra plant bearing dhotra flowers, in the marble work of the Taj Mahal. In the previous article, we have seen how the dhotra leaves were carved out of marble in the design of OM. One finds dhutra flowers in marble carving in several places of the Taj Mahal. This special attention to dhutra leaves and dhutra flowers in marble carving provides strong evidence in favour of the claim that the building called Taj Mahal today, was originally a temple of Lord Shiva.

The Munj Bateswar Edict tells us that the temple of Shiva was extremely beautiful; it was so beautiful that Lord Shiva had forgotten to return to His original abode Kailash after obtaining the temple as His dwelling place. There is no doubt that the beauty of Taj Mahal is the only match for the beauty described in the Munj Bateswar Edict.

Taj Mahal is a two-storey mausoleum – fake cenotaph on the marble plinth (or the upper floor) of Taj, while real burial and cenotaph on the lower floor beneath the marble plinth. There is no other Muslim mausoleum like this in India. But there two-storey Shiva temple, with one emblem of Shiva (Shiva Linga) on the upper floor and another Shiva emblem on the lower floor such as in Ujjain and elsewhere. This is another evidence that today's Taj Mahal was originally a Shiva temple, turned into a mausoleum by Shah Jahan.

In a Muslim mausoleum, no body circumambulates the cenotaph but there is such a provision in Taj Mahal.

But it is the Hindu practice to circumambulate their deity in a temple. So, it is very likely that the devotees of Lord Shiva used to circumambulate the Shiva emblem (or Shiva Linga) in the Taj Mahal, when it was a Shiva temple and the provision for circumambulation in Taj Mahal is an evidence in this regard.

Any visitor, after entering the Taj Mahal, observes that there is long chain hanging from the ceiling of the main dome. The staff of the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) has attached an electric lamp with the chain. The existence of this chain is quite unfit for a mausoleum and it is impossible to explain it considering Taj Mahal as burial. But it very simple to explain it if one accepts that the Taj Mahal was originally a Shiva temple. It is a Hindu ritual to hang a water-pot (kalash), with a minute hole, over emblem of Shiva so that drops of water can trickle down on the emblem. So, it is very likely that when the Taj Mahal was a Shiva temple, a water pot was attached to the chain and drops water used to fall on the emblem of Lord Shiva.

The acoustic design of Taj is such that if any one makes a sound inside it, the sound reverberates for a long time. The visitors make various kinds of sound to feel that reverberation. But if one shouts "Hara Hara Bom Bom", the reverberation becomes most magnificent and persists for several seconds. This proves that the original acoustic design was particularly made for the said slogan "Hara Hara Bom Bom", a war cry in the name of Lord Shiva. Scholars believe that English "Hurray" is a corrupt of "Hara Hara".

It is a Hindu practice to call the Shiva emblems of different temples by different names. For example, the Shiva emblem of the temple of Somnath is called the

Yotirlinga. Professor P N Oak was convinced that the Shiva emblem of the Taj Mahal was called Tejolinga, and hence the shrine was called Tejo Mahalaya. And the present name Taj Mahal is simply a corrupt of Tejo Mahalya. And the name of the queen Arjumand Banu was changed to Mamataj Mahal, only to establish parity between the name of the queen and the name of the building. The fact is ridiculous in the sense that, if a building is erected to commemorate a person, the name of the monument follows the name of the monument. But in the case of Taj Mahal, the name of the person has been altered to fit the name of the monument.

Many may argue that the other name of Queen Arjumand Banu was Mamataz-ul-Jamani and that was the reason for naming her mausoleum Taj Mahal. It is nice, but in that case, the name of her mausoleum should have been Mamataz Mahal. So, question naturally arises: Why 'Mama' of 'Mamataz' had been deleted? And why is it not Taz Mahal but Taj Mahal? There is only one reply to these questions - the word Taj Mahal had been coined from Tejo Mahalaya, not from Mamataz-ul-Jamani. Professor Oak also believed that another name of the Shiva emblem of Taj Mahal was Agreswar Mahadev, or the Lord of the city of Agra.

There are so many other buildings in the Taj Complex, which is quite unlikely for a mausoleum. On the contrary, it can be compared with large temple complexes like those in Puri, Madurai, Tirupati, and so on. In fact, when Taj was a temple of Lord Shiva, the other buildings were used for several other purposes. Some buildings as rest house for the pilgrims, some as servant quarters, and some as guest houses, some as stables and cow-sheds, some as office of the

administrative officers and so on. Apart from all these buildings, there are many other underground rooms. There are 22 underground rooms on the rear side of the Taj Mahal, facing the River Jamuna. Even a preliminary investigation leads one to discover another storey below the lower storey, where lie the actual burials of Shah Jahan and his queen Arjumand Banu and their real cenotaphs. This storey contains so many other rooms and a long corridor links the 22 rooms facing the River Jamuna. Many of these rooms and apartments are now sealed by raising brick walls. Many believe that other vital evidences are hidden in these sealed apartments.

From 1959 to 1962, the renowned archaeologist Dr S R Rao was the Superintendent of the Agra Division of the Archaeological Survey of India and during his tenure, a crack was detected in the wall of an underground apartment. While inspecting the crack, the ASI staff discovered many Hindu symbols and Hindu idols dumped inside the room. The matter was readily hushed up and, at the instigation of the then Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru the room was sealed by raising brick wall.

Some of the rooms were sealed by Shah Jahan himself to conceal the Hindu history of Taj Mahal Many believe that in these sealed rooms many valuable evidence such as Sanskrit inscriptions, Hindu idols, the desecrated Shiva Linga, Hindu scriptures and temple equipments are concealed. Beside these rooms sealed by Shah Jahan, there are many such rooms sealed by the Government of India just to keep the Hindu identity of Taj Mahal secret, according to its pokicy of Muslim appeasement.

Before the advent of the Muslim invaders, when today's Taj Mahal was a Shiva temple, there was an

extremely valuable railing made of gold decorated with costly gems and jewels, surrounding the emblem of Lord Shiva. Later on, Shah Jahan misappropriated it and replaced the same with a marble railing, which one observes today. Historian R C Majumdar, regarding this older and valuable railing, says, "The marble railing around the cenotaphs is said to be a later replacement, the original having been one gold set with jewels." [2] [rcm bvb vii 795]

According to R C Majumdar, the designer of the garden inside the Taj Complex was a Hindu and his name was Ranmal [3]. [rcm bvb vii 797] The question naturally arises – While the entire Taj Complex is said to have been designed by Ustad Isa, or Abdul Karim, why a Hindu Ranmal was entrusted to design the garden? This is also an outcome of wild conjecture, and that too for want of authentic records. In this context, it should be mentioned that in the said garden there are some plants, like Dutra Stramonium, Harshringar and Marmelos fruit (figures 9, 10 and 11), which are very dear to Lord Shiva. It is another evidence to prove that the building, now known as Taj Mahal, was originally a Shiva temple.

In 1973, Mr Marvin Mills, a Professor in the Department of Archaeology at the Pratt School in New York, USA, took a sample of wood from a worn out door of one of the 22 rooms shown in Figure 5. He then handed over the sample to Dr Ivans Williams, the director of Radio Carbon Laboratory of the Brooklyn College, to conduct a Carbon-14 test for determining the antiquity of the sample. The result of the test showed that the said piece of wood was of from 1320 to 1398 AD. Or in other words, that sample of wood was older by nearly 300 years than the times of Shah Jahan. This

provides a scientific evidence that Taj Mahal was not authored by Shah Jahan.

References:

[1] Most of the information of this article has been collected from '*Taj Mahal: The True Story*' by Prof P N Oak, Published by A Ghosh,

[2] R. C. Majumdar (General Editor), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (in 12 volumes), Mumbai (1996) VII, 795. .

[3] R.C. Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan (1996), VII, 797

Part 6E

[Editors Note: *The following article is sourced to present the topic for further investigation. The editors do not necessarily endorse nor reject the findings and the conclusions presented herewith. Due to the technical nature of the subject, it is upto the unbiased professional historians and archaeologists to take up this subject for further research and development, and present their findings preferably at a professional conference.]*

It has been mentioned earlier that the so-called pseudo-secular and Marxist historians of India are projecting the Taj Mahal as a pure example of Islamic architecture and in support of their claim, they highlight four features, e.g (1) the dome, (2) the octagonal base, (3) the angular arch and (4) the four minarets at the four corners of the plinth of the edifice now known as Taj Mahal. They claim that these four features of Taj Mahal are absolutely Islamic. We should recall that Mollah Abdul Hamid Lahori has mentioned in his *Badshahnama* that the original Rajput palace of Jai Singh, which was later on converted into a mausoleum by Shahjahan, had a spectacular dome at the top of the building (imarat-e-alishan wa gumbaje). Regarding this aspect, P N Oak writes, "The presumption that the dome is a Moslem

invention is baseless. To call the dome a Moslem creation amounts to linking it somehow with Prophet Mohammed's birth. What possible connection could there be between the dome as an architectural design and the origin of Islam." [1] It should be mentioned here that the great English architect E B Havell was convinced that the dome is a Hindu constructional form [2].

Regarding the octagonal structure, it should be said that it is a pure Hindu style of architecture and eight sides represent eight Hindu directions such as Purva (East), Pashchim (West), Uttar (North), Dakshin (South) Ishan (Northeast), Agni (Southeast), Vayu (Northwest), Nairit (Southwest). In fact, Hindu scriptures mention ten directions - the eight directions as given above and the other two are Urdhvah (Zenith) and Adhah (Nadir). According to the historian Arthur Upham Pope, the pointed and trefoil arches, the transverse vault, the octagonal form of building, the dome etc. were originated in India (see below).

It is needless to say that [the said pseudo-secular and Marxist historians of India derive inspiration from book 'Monuments of Muslim India' by John Marshall](#), where the author, regarding the Qutb Minar in Delhi, wrote, "The whole conception of the minar and almost every detail of its construction and ornamentations is essentially Islamic. Towers of this kind were unknown to the Indians, but to the Muhammadans they had long been familiar, whether as mazinias attached to mosques or as free standing towers like those at Ghazni." [3] As a matter of fact, the said comment of John Marshall is now being profusely used by the so-called secular historians of India to attribute the authorship of the Qutb Minar to Qutb-ud-din. But the reader should recall that in my

earlier articles I have shown that **the minar, now known as Qutb Minar, was built by the renowned astronomer Varaha Mihira several centuries before the coming of the Muslim invaders in India, and hence it is excellent piece of pure Hindu architecture.**

In this context, it would be relevant to mention the opinion of another historian, A K Saraswati, who wrote, "Arthur Upham Pope has ably demonstrated how Indian (or Hindu) ideas in art and architecture migrated to Western Asia and reached concrete forms under the technical ingenuity of the Persian builders. Indeed, many of the fundamental forms of Persian architecture, such as the pointed and trefoil arches, the transverse vault, the octagonal form of building, the dome etc. were originated in India ... It is through such cultural contacts that art in the West acquired substance and individuality which the establishment of Islam could hardly change or alter." [4] So, it becomes evident from the above comment of Arthur Upham Pope that the form and style of architecture, which are now being projected as Islamic or Saracen, are basically Indian or Hindu architecture.

Most of the historians believe that building minarets, including four minarets of Taj Mahal, is an Islamic architecture. But it has been mentioned above that the minarets like Qutb Minar in Delhi and a similar minaret at Ghazni were built by Varaha Mihir several centuries before the arrival of the Muslim invaders. Varaha Mihir built the former with red sandstone with the help of the Rajput artisans while for the latter he used bricks and mortar for want of Rajput builders.[5] Hence they are pure exhibits of Hindu architecture. Regarding the four towers at the four corners of the Taj Mahal, P N Oak writes, "Blind adherents of the Indo-Saracenic theory of

architecture, seem to be unaware, that towers starting at the ground or plinth level like chimneys of brick-kilns, are speciality of the indigenous ancient Hindu architecture. Saracenic minarets begin from the shoulders of the buildings as they do in mosques. And usually such minarets are not hollow from within and have no stairs." [6] So, the people who are exposing these minarets as Indo-Saracen architecture, should, now on, delete the word Saracen.

In this context, it should be mentioned here that, Giles Tillotson, in his book "Taj Mahal" writes, "The technical know-how to create a building with the structural form of the Taj simply did not exist in pre-Mughal India." [7] There is no doubt that Mr Tillotson, through this comment, has exposed his colossal ignorance about India and her civilization. It is really amazing that such a half-educated man has attempted to write a book on Taj Mahal and it is more astonishing that a renowned publishing house like "Penguin Books" has come forward to publish this rubbish. Mr Tillotson should know that from very ancient times the architectural engineering, called "Vastu Shastra" in Sanskrit, was a branch of learning and was taught in ancient Indian universities. Mr Tillotson should remember that, when the engineers of India were making planned cities at Mahenjodaro, Harappa, Lothal, and in many other places, his ancestors were roaming naked in the forests and eating raw flesh. He should also know that India is the country that has civilized the entire world. Many Western scholars have highlighted this aspect in their writings. I quote below a few of them for his convenience.

Will Durant, the prolific American writer, historian, and philosopher, in his "The Story of Civilization" wrote, "India was the mother of our race and Sanskrit the mother of Europe's languages. She was the mother of our philosophy, mother through the Arabs, of much of our mathematics, mother through Buddha, of the ideals embodied in Christianity, mother through village communities of self-government and democracy. Mother India is in many ways the mother of us all." To comment on India's contribution to the world, Albert Einstein said, "We owe a lot to the Indians, who taught us how to count, without which no worthwhile scientific discovery could have been made." While praising Indian civilization, George Bernard Shaw once said, "The Indian way of life provides the vision of the natural, real way of life. We veil ourselves with unnatural masks. On the face of India are the tender expressions which carry the mark of the Creator's hand."

J. Robert Oppenheimer, the father of nuclear bomb, exclaimed a verse out of Hindu scripture Bhagavad Gita after the first nuclear explosion. He also said, "*Access to the Vedas is the greatest privilege this century may claim over all previous centuries.*" There is no doubt that most of the Hindu temples in India are marvels of architecture and were built before the Muslim period. It is needless to say that the temples at Khajuraho are splendid exhibits of architectural engineering. According to the *Wikipedia Free Encyclopedia*, all these temples were built over a span of 200 years, from 950 to 1150, i.e. well before the arrival of the Muslim invaders. Above all, according to the comment of Arthur Upham Pope, as quoted above, Indian (or Hindu) ideas in art and architecture migrated to Western Asia, now being designated as Islamic. So, it would have been better for Mr Tillotson to write a book

on Taj Mahal, after studying the subject a bit more and acquiring proper understanding of Indian or Hindu civilization.

Many believe that the British scholars were aware of the real or Hindu origin of the edifice called Taj Mahal, but they continued to uphold the mythical notion of Shah Jahan's authorship due to political reasons. But at present, that myth is on the verge of collapse. Discoveries of real history of Taj Mahal in the pages of *Badshahnama* by P N Oak, Aurangzeb's letter to Shah Jahan regarding the urgent repair of the building, carbon dating of a piece of wood by the American architect Marvin Mills, etc. have served a death blow to the myth of Shah Jahan's authorship of Taj Mahal. So the British conspirators, who are still active, have engaged Mr Tillotson to thrust a final effort to save that collapsing myth and as a result the half educated Tillotson, perhaps in exchange of a good fortune, undertook to write a book to counter the above mentioned discoveries with foolish, immature and ridiculous arguments. But, there is no doubt that, despite all such efforts of despicable people, truth will come to surface and the story of Shah Jahan's authorship of Taj Mahal would be thrown into garbage in near future. It has been mentioned earlier that the *Google* operators are already convinced that, once upon a time, today's Taj Mahal was a Hindu temple dedicated to Lord Shiva.

It should be mentioned here that according to a similar conspiracy, the British conspirators have started to glorify M K Gandhi afresh when his image is dwindling in his own country and the people have started to understand the true face of Gandhi. Gandhi was the most trusted and most loyal stooge of the British Empire. And hence he is a symbol of slavery. Gandhi

used to maintain the view that India would be benefited by its British connection and it would be a calamity to break the connection between the British people and the people of India. And there is no doubt that *due to this unwavering loyalty to the British Crown, he was chosen by the British to bring him back to India from South Africa to lead the freedom movement, or to sabotage the real freedom movement.*

It was not difficult for the British to understand that his harmless nonviolent *Satyagraha* would pose no threat to the British Empire as he used to say, "*A Satyagrahi should expect to get killed by an aggressor and not to kill him*". British in India, at that time, were terribly afraid of violent freedom struggle launched by the patriots of Bengal, Maharashtra and Punjab, which compelled the British to shift capital from Calcutta to a safer place New Delhi. But Gandhi, through his speeches and writings, could have managed to expose that he was against any sort of violence in Indian freedom movement.

At that historic hour, people of this country saw Sri Gopal Krishna Gokhale to sail to London and visit South Africa on his return journey. He landed at Cape Town on October 22, 1912, and pressed Gandhi to return to India. While in London, Gokhale pleaded to the Prime Minister Mr. Gladstone to repeal the so called Black Act of South Africa, an unjust tax of £3 per Indian, for which Gandhi was then fighting. Mr. Gladstone agreed just to glorify Gandhi. After reaching South Africa, Gokhale, whom Gandhi revered as his political guru, communicated this piece of news to Gandhi and said that he (Gandhi) would have to return to India within a year (according to the plan of his British master).

So, it is needless to say that, so long as the people of India continue to follow Gandhi, mentally they would remain slaves to the Western powers and fail to stand on their own foot. And that is the reason they have started to glorify Gandhi and revive his legacy of cowardice in the name of nonviolence. It is also as clear as day light that the conspiracy of the British power has led to partitioning of India and creation of the Islamic state of Pakistan. It is also the conspiracy of the British to propagate the myth of the death of Subhas Chandra Bose in a plane crash and it is this British conspiracy that has prevented his entry into independent India, so that the country could be run by their lackeys.

It is also important to mention that the so-called secular historians of India, patronized by these lackeys of the West, are distorting Indian history as they like. They are writing that all the most beautiful exhibits of architecture, including the Taj Mahal, have been authored by the Muslim invaders. We have seen earlier that, according to inscriptions of the Munj Bateswar Edict, the building, now called Taj Mahal, was built by the King Paramardidev of Bundelkhand in 1156 AD, or nearly 5 centuries before the times of Shah Jahan. Several other evidences support this fact. Vincent Smith writes that Babur, the first Mughal emperor and grandfather of Akbar, died in 1530, in a garden palace in Agra [8]. What that garden palace could be other than the palace complex now called Taj Mahal? "The same palace is described by Babur himself in his Memoirs as the one adorned with a peristyle of pillars and having a dome in the center", writes P N Oak [9]. So it appears that the building, now called Taj Mahal, was there a century before the death of Shah Jahan's wife Arjumand Banu.

However, in this article we would like to discuss another approach by which some scholars have succeeded to prove the Hindu origin of the building now called Taj Mahal. If someone constructs a building today, he would use either of the two systems of measurement of length such as the British system with units like foot, inch, yard etc. or the Metric system with units like meter, centimeter etc. When any of the two systems is used, it is most likely that the dimensions of the plinth and that of other important parts of the building would be integral multiples of the basic units. So, by measuring the dimensions of a building, it is possible to determine the units of length that have been used to construct the building.

Dr R. Balasubramaniam, a Professor in the Department of Materials and Metallurgical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, India, has done commendable research in this direction and in his article "New insights on the modular planning of the Taj Mahal", he writes, "Dimensional analysis has revealed that the modular planning of the Taj Mahal Complex was executed using the traditional measurement units mentioned in the Arthasastra, and, in particular, the vitasti measuring 12 angulams of 1.763 cm. (see Table - I) The riverfront terrace and garden sections of the complex were planned using square grids of 90 vitasti to the side, while the forecourt and caravanserai section using square grids of 60 vitasti to the side. The logical numbers that result for the dimensions have been analyzed to show the ease of division of these numbers into symmetric elements to understand quadratic division of space of the garden area and the triadic division of space of the mausoleum, including decimal divisions. A novel approach to understand the metrology of historical

architectural structures of the Indian subcontinent is revealed.” [10]

Table-I

| | Unit | Numbers of Angulam | Measure in cm |
|----|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
| 1 | Angulam | 1 | 1.763 |
| 2 | Vitasti | 12 | 21.256 |
| 3 | Pada | 14 | 24.682 |
| 4 | Aratni | 24 | 42.312 |
| 5 | P - Hasta | 24 | 42.312 |
| 6 | C - Hasta | 28 | 49.364 |
| 7 | F - Hasta | 54 | 95.202 |
| 8 | Kishku | 42 | 74.046 |
| 9 | Kamsa | 32 | 56.416 |
| 10 | Danda | 96 | 169.248 |
| 11 | Dhanus | 108 | 190.404 |

Dr Balasubramaniam also writes, “The Taj Mahal complex is one of the most visited and well-known archaeological structures of India. This is also one of the wonders of the modern world¹. The overall plan of the Taj Mahal complex reveals that it was planned based on ordering of grids, with the main architectural features of the complex placed on bilateral mirror symmetry along the north-south axis.” We shall discuss this aspect in the next installment.

References:

[1] P N Oak, *Tajmahal: The True Story*, Published by A Ghosh (1969), p - 170

[2] E B Havell, *Indian Architecture*, Ch - XI, as mentioned by P N Oak, *ibid*, p - 170

[3] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VI, 669

[4] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VI, 661.

[5] Acharya Vapu Vankar, *Itihas Darpan*, New Delhi, II, 57.

[6] P N Oak, *ibid*, p - 172.

[7] Giles Tillotson, *Taj Mahal*, Penguin Books (2008), p - 113.

[8] V. A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press, p-9

[9] P N Oak, *ibid*, p - 181.

[10] (http://www.iitk.ac.in/dord/research_news/42.pdf)

Part 7A

The True Face of Shah Jahan:

Shah Jahan was born on Jan. 5, 1592 at Lahore (now in Pakistan) and died on Jan. 22, 1666 at Agra. He was the fifth Mughal ruler after Babur, Humayun, Akbar, and Jahangir and ruled the Mughal empire from 1628 to 1658. His mother was a Rathore Rajput Princess, known as Princess Jagat Gosain who was Jahangir's second wife. Shah Jahan's original name was Khurram (Persian for 'joyful'), given by his grandfather Akbar. He distinguished himself as a military commander while leading his father's armies in numerous campaigns like Mewar, the Deccan, Kangra etc. He was responsible for most of the territorial gains during his father's reign. After Jahangir's death, he garnered enough support to proclaim himself the emperor. He was no different from other Muslim rulers and like his ancestors Babur, Humayun and Akbar, he was a brute killer, a religious fanatic and a formidable lecher.

But the myth of his authorship of the Taj Mahal, falsely depicted as a monument of love, provided the so-called pseudo secular and Marxist historians of India a

great opportunity to project this basically barbaric king as an extremely soft hearted man. These dirty historians are also fabricating mythical, Romeo-Juliet type, love stories between him and his wife Arjumand Banu, later on re-named Mumtaz. These despicable historians also propagate lies and say that his reign was a *golden period* of Indian history and marked the zenith of Mughal court splendour. They also project him as a great builder and say that his great architectural undertakings, including a fortress-palace, now called the Red Fort, built when he transferred the capital from Agra to Delhi. They also say that his most famous creation is the Taj Mahal. **These spineless creatures called secular historians do not hesitate to paint an orthodox religious bigot as a tolerant ruler** and say that, though a more orthodox Sunni Muslim than his father, he was less orthodox than his son and successor, Aurangzeb, and he was relatively tolerant of his Hindu subjects. [1]

But though small in number, there are honest historians too, who do not hesitate to uncover the true face of Shah Jahan. In this regard, the Keene's Handbook says, "*Shah Jahan surpassed all the Mughal emperors in autocratic pride and was the first of them to safeguard the throne by murdering all possible rivals... According to Sir Thomas Roe, who knew Shahjahan personally, his nature was unbending and mingled with extreme pride and contempt of all.*" It also says, "*Shahjahan in open rebellion (against his own father Emperor Jahangir) seized Fatehpur Sikri and sacked the city Agra, where, according to Della Valle, a noble Italian then on a visit to India, his army committed fearful barbarities. The citizens were compelled under torture to give up their hoarded treasures, and many ladies of quality were outraged and mutilated.*"^[2] Here one should read rape in stead of outrage and chopping of breasts in stead of mutilation.

It was a regular practice for Shah Jahan to invite the scholars of other religions in the name of peaceful religious discussions and after a namesake dialog, issue an order to convert them to Islam. Those who complied with the order were saved and the rest were butchered with various types of barbaric cruelties. Most were trampled under the foot of an elephant.^[3] To narrate the cruelty of Shah Jahan, the Keene's Handbook says that, before ascending the throne, Shah Jahan blinded his principal rival, his own brother Khusru. After ascending the throne, he thought it not safe enough to keep blinded Khusru alive and hence he stabbed him to death. He blinded another rival Shahryar and many believe that he also killed his two cousins to make his throne safe.^[4] Due to boundless lechery, hypocrisy, indocility and wicked and evil attitude, father Jahangir used to call him a *Shaitan* (wretch). In his autobiography *Jahangirnama*, he wrote, "*I directed that henceforward he should be called 'wretch' and whenever the word 'wretch' occurs in the Ikbalnama, it is he who is intended.*"^[5] Like his ancestors and other Muslim rulers, Shah Jahan was also a terrible iconoclast and destroyed thousands of Hindu temples. To narrate this aspect of Shah Jahan, Abdul Hamid in *Badsahnama* writes, "*It had been brought to the notice of His Majesty that during the reign of his father many idol temples had been begun, but remained unfinished at Benares, the great stronghold of infidelity. The infidels were now desirous of completing them. His Majesty, the defender of the faith (of Islam) gave order that at Benares, and throughout all his dominion in every place, all temples that had been begun should be cast down. It was now reported from the province of Allahabad that seventy six temples had been destroyed in the district of Benares.*"^[6] Historian Kanwar Lal writes, "*Shahjahan was professedly a strict Sunni (Muslim) and*

probably at the instigation of Mumtaj Mahal, he had renewed the destruction of Hindu temples.”^[7] But the so-called secular and Marxist historians are projecting this demon as a great builder and write, “Though not gifted with the same originality and nobility of imagination as that of his grandfather (i.e. Akbar), Shah Jahan was also a great builder. His projects were many and compare favourably with those of Akbar in vastness and extensiveness. In Agra and Lahore forts he planned to replace the sandstone buildings of previous period by palaces and pavilions in marble, and this he carried out in a very large measure involving the construction of many new edifices. Not only that, he projected a new capital city in Delhi, that of Shahjahanabad where he built a fortress citadel of unusual dimensions and erected within it splendid palaces, office buildings and other structures.”^[8]

The reader should notice that in the above paragraph, the author is telling about the famous Red Fort in Delhi with its internal buildings like Dewan-i-Khas, Dewan-i-Am etc. and thus ascribing its authorship to Shah Jahan. To this end, he further writes, *“In 1638, Shah Jahan began in Delhi the construction of a new capital, that of Shahjahanabad, to contain within its perimeter a sumptuous palace-fortress for the accommodation of the imperial household and the court. The palace-fortress, the Red Fort as it is known because of the red sandstone fabric of its rampart walls, has been designed on an unprecedented scale with all the amenities of the busy and luxurious life of an imperial house and court provided for within its walls in a regular and systematic order”*.^[9] One also observes a tablet (Figure 1) that has been raised inside of the Red Fort in Delhi by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) that proclaims Shah Jahan’s authorship of the fort.

[Figure 2: This tablet raised inside of the Red Fort in Delhi by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) that

proclaims that Shah Jahan (who ruled from 1628 to 1658 A.D.) built this fort from 1639 to 1648 A.D]

Shah Jahan did not build the Red Fort:

But we have seen earlier (in Part 1 of this series of articles) that the fortress called Red Ford (or Lal Qila) in Delhi was there several centuries before the times of Shah Jahan. In that article we have provided many evidences to disprove the claim of Shah Jahan's authorship of the Red Fort. Figure 2 shows the photograph of the painting of Shah Jahan's time preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. It depicts Shah Jahan receiving the Persian Ambassador inside the fort in 1628, the very year of his accession. It obviously implies that the fort, now called the Red Fort, existed long before Shah Jahan. This single documentary evidence is more than enough to disprove the claim of Shah Jahan's authorship of the fort.

Figure 3 shows the Royal Emblem at the entrance of the Khas Mahal, alias the King's own royal apartment in the Red Fort in Delhi. This was the Royal Emblem of its real builder King Anangoal. It consists of a pair of swords laid hilt to hilt curving upwards, the sacred Hindu pot (kalash) above the hilts, a lotus bud and a pair of scales of justice balanced over it. Dotted around are representations of the sun from whom Indian ruling dynasties descent. At the sword points are two small conches considered sacred in Hindu tradition. Bigger conches may be seen at the left and right corners at the base. This royal Hindu insignia of the Hindu king who built Delhi's Red Fort, is still there in the Khas Mahal pavilion. But even this visual symbol has been blatantly misinterpreted. The two swords laid hilt to hilt, curving upward are being inadvertently styled by ignorant

guides, archaeologists and historians as an Islamic crescent. The sacred Hindu kalash (water pot) on the hilts is never noticed. The lotus bud on the kalash represents royal wealth. The pair of scales is symbolic of impartial justice. The figure 5 shows the perforated marble screen inside the Khas Mahal (i.e. the King's own chamber) in Delhi's Red Fort, is a Hindu specialty. Such perforated screens, called 'jalees' are mentioned even in Ramayanic descriptions of palaces. Therefore some buildings claimed to be mosques in Ahmedabad, Fatehpur Sikri and elsewhere, which boast of such exquisite jalees (lattices) were Hindu edifices converted to mosques by the Muslim invaders. Most importantly, the Hindu royal emblem mounted on the upper part of the jalee, disproves the claim that Shah Jahan built the fort.

The figure 6 shows the grand entrance to the Khas Mahal, while the figure 7 shows an enlarged view of the same gate, where one observes the resplendent Hindu midday sun (from whom Hindu rulers claim their descent) in the arch above flanked by sacred OM. This proves the hollowness of the claim of Shah Jahan's authorship of the Red Fort. The figure 8 shows two life size elephants flanking the Delhi Gate of the Red Fort. It should be mentioned here that it is a sin for the Muslims to imitate Allah's creation through painting, or by sculpture, or by any other means. This implies that, had Shah Jahan been the builder of the Red Fort, he would have never allowed to install the said life size elephants mentioned above. On the contrary, decorating homes, forts, palaces and temples with elephants is a pure Hindu tradition. To the Hindus, an elephant symbolizes might, power, glory and wealth. So, these life size elephants, flanking the Delhi Gate of the Red Fort, are an

unmistakable sign of the fort's Hindu origin. There is no doubt that, this is one of the conclusive proofs that the Red Fort was commissioned by Raja Anangoal (1060 AD), and not by the Mughal emperor Shah Jahan (1639-48), as is erroneously believed. The fort therefore predates Shah Jahan by 600 years. Many believe that, there were two similar big life-size stone elephants decorating the Naqqar Khana (Music House) gate and they were destroyed by the Muslim invaders. The chopped up pieces may still be found stored in the Khas Mahal basement.

The figure 9 shows the decorated door knob of the Khas Mahal gate and figure 10 shows the close up view of the same. It shows that an elephant holds the metal ring with its trunk and a mahut (rider) is sitting on the elephant. It has been mentioned earlier that, imitating Allah's creation is a sin for the Muslims and hence it implies that the author of the Red Fort was not a Muslim. This provides another evidence for its Hindu origin. In fact, Muslims are the destroyers of statues not creators.

The figure 11 shows the entrance of the Moti Masjid inside the Red Fort. The archaeological tablet, raised outside, claims that the mosque was built by Aurangzeb, son and successor of Shah Jahan. But many believe that the claim is baseless due to the following reasons. Firstly, the entrance is of a temple design. Secondly, the arch between the domes there are stone carvings of banana bunches, which is used by the Hindus while worshipping their deities. Thirdly, the naming buildings after gems (Moti means pearl) is purely a Hindu custom. Fourthly, the truncated Hindu perambulatory passage may still be seen to exist on the building's left flank. All these evidence suggest that, originally it was a Hindu

temple and, later on, converted into a mosque by the Muslim invaders.

References:

[1] B. P. Saksena, *History of Shahjahan of Dihli* (rev. ed. 1958, repr. 1962); M. Lal, *Shahjahan* (1986).

[2] Keene's Handbook for visitors to Agra and its neighbourhood, E A Duncan (Editor), *Thacker's Handbook of Hindustan*, p-25.

[3] *Trans. Arch. Soc. Agra.* (1978), Jan-June, viii-ix

[4] Keene's Handbook for visitors to Agra and its neighbourhood, *ibid*, p-38.

[5] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, '*The History of India as told by its own historians*' (in 8 Volumes), Low Price Publications, New Delhi (1996) VI, 281

[6] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, VII, 36.

[7] Kanwar Lal, '*The Taj*', R K Publishing House, Delhi, p-26

[8] R.C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, 783

[9] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan*, *ibid*, VII, 787.

Part 7B

The Lechery of Shah Jahan

Though the pseudo-secular and Marxist historians of India are trying to portray Shah Jahan a noble and kind hearted Indian king, one should always remember that he was a foreigner, a devout Sunni Muslim born out of Turkish and Mongol blood. For him, India or Hindustan was not his motherland but a country to loot and to wage jihad against its Hindu infidels. His primary intention was to earn the title of *Ghazi* by killing the Hindus, to glorify and establish the supremacy of his faith [Islam] by pulling down Hindu temples, to turn entire country into a *Dar-ul-Islam* and to swell his harem by inducting

Hindu women by force. It should also be mentioned here that the faith called Islam is a product of pastoral Arabia and hence pastoral barbarity, brutality, cruelty and lechery is the part and parcel of every Muslim, and Shah Jahan was not above this trend.

It has been mentioned in the previous article (Part 7A) how Shah Jahan blinded and, later on, stabbed his own brother Khusru, his most prominent political rival, to death. How he brutally killed his other political rivals. It has also been mentioned, how he used to kill the scholars of the other faiths, with utmost cruelty and barbarity. What kind of barbarity he displayed on the innocent Hindu citizens of Agra, when he sacked the city during his father's life time. It has also been mentioned how he desecrated and vandalized Hindu temples. The most horrendous example in this regard is his desecration of the temple of Lord Shiva at Agra and converting it into a mausoleum, now called Taj Mahal.

It has been said earlier that the so called secular historians are busy painting Shah Jahan as a liberal and generous king free of religious discrimination and fanaticism. But in reality, he was as fanatic in religious matters as the other Muslim rulers of India. A few incidents may be presented here to expose his religious frenzy. In 1632, when he was returning from a military campaign in Kashmir, it was brought to his knowledge that many Muslim women in Rajouri, Bhimbar region and some other places of Gujarat, were marrying Hindu boys, and subsequently they were converted to Hinduism. The emperor immediately sent his men to bring those couples to the capital and issued an order that, they could retain their wives only on their embracing Islam. Most of the Hindu boys declined and

they were executed. As many as 4,500 women were recovered and reconverted to Islam.^{1]}

Another incident, narrated by the historian R C Majumdar, says, *“In 1635, it was reported to the emperor that a Muslim girl, Zinab, had been converted (to Hinduism), given the new name Ganga and was taken as a wife by Dalpat, a Hindu boy of Sirhind. The woman, along with her children – one son and six daughters – was taken away and the man (Dalpat) was executed and Zinab and her children were converted to Islam again.”*^[1]

According to Vincent Smith, Akbar had 5000 women in his harem. It should be mentioned here that these harems of the Muslim rulers were nothing but chattels and after the death of the ruler, his son used to gain control of it. So, after the death of Akbar, his harem went to his son Jahangir, who enhanced it to a harem of 6000 by inducting 1000 new members. When Shah Jahan became the emperor, after the death of Jahangir, the ownership of that 6000 strong harem went obviously to him.^[2] Who were the inmates of those cursed harems? In this context, it should be recalled that the standard Islamic practice, after the victory in a war, were (1) to slaughter all male prisoners of war, (2) to sell the elderly women and children as slaves, (3) to rape the younger women and keep them as sex-slaves and (4) to acquire and loot the properties of the defeated enemy. So, it is needless to say that almost all the unfortunate women of the harems of the Muslim rulers and harems of nobles of their courts were Hindu women, taken captives (*mal-e-ganimat*) after a war. Beside that, these rulers were constantly in hunt for good-looking Hindu girls and the Sufi fakirs were their secret emissaries and informers in this affair. In this manner, new young members were

inducted and old ones were driven out and the harems were thus refreshed. The court flatterers of those rulers as well as the wicked historians of today, to hide the said inhuman barbarity of the Muslim rulers, say that these rulers used to allot separate rooms for these unfortunate women. But neither in Delhi nor in Agra one could find a building having 5000 separate rooms which Akbar could have used to provide his 5000 concubines. On the contrary, Itmad-ud-daula, the father of Meher-un-nissa, (later on renamed as Nurjahan, a wife of Jahangir who married her after assassinating her husband Sher Afghan, the jagirdar of Barddhaman), has given some description regarding the wretched life of the inmates of the harems. According to him, if a woman gave birth to female child, she was saved as the child could be put to use in future. But if the child happened to be a male one, he was either blinded or put to the sword immediately after birth, so that after gaining age, he might not claim the throne.^[3]

To narrate the social condition of India during the Muslim rule, historian P N Chopra writes, "*Polygamy was the privilege of the rich Muhammadans, most of whom kept 3 to 4 wives at a time... A man (i.e. a Muslim) might marry any number of wives by mutah, but only four by nikah.*"^[4]

In this context, it should be mentioned here that two types of marriage are in vogue in Muslim society: (1) nikah and (2) mutah. In the Muslim society, marriage is simply a social contract and if the husband pronounces 'talaq' thrice, the contract gets dissolved. Regarding *nikah*, the contract is permanent till the husband pronounces *talaq*. But in the case of *mutah*, the contract itself is temporary and terminates after a stipulated time. A muta may last for merely from 10 minutes to 99 years.^[5]

Whether it is a *nikah* or a *mutah*, the husband has to pay dowry (*mehr*) to his wife and when the contract paper is prepared, the *mehr*, in terms of cash, is entered into it and it is a legal binding for the husband to pay that cash to his wife, if he pronounces *talaq* to that wife. But, instead of entering into the controversy of *nikah* or *mutah*, it is better to designate the thousands of women of the Mughal harem as simply 'concubines'.

However, Shah Jahan had several wives, out of *nikah*, other than Arjumand Banu. One finds the burials of two such wives, namely Satiunnesa Khanam and Sarhandi Begum, within the same *Taj Mahal* complex as is declared as the tomb of Arjumand Banu. Apart from that, one is astonished to find another burial within the same Taj complex and that of a personal maid servant of Arjumond Banu. The question naturally arises: What inspired Shah Jahan to raise the status of a maid servant to the height of her mistress Arjumand Banu, whom he loved madly and in whose honour he raised a monument like Taj Mahal? All these facts lead one to conclude that Shah Jahan had no special relation with Arjumand Banu and she was like his other women and the stories of profound love between him and Arjumand Banu, which are now propagated, were fabricated later on.

Niccolao Manucci, a Venetian traveler, visited India during the reign of Shah Jahan and regarding Shah Jahan, he in his memoirs '*Storia do Mogor*', wrote, "Numerous scandals connected with the private life of Shah Jahan depict him as a man of despicable character, whose only concern in life was how to indulge in bestial sensuality and monstrous lewdness."^[6] Manucci also wrote, "It would seem as if the only thing Shah Jahan cared for was the search for women to serve his pleasure."^[6] He also mentioned that

Shah Jahan had illicit relations with the wives of his court ministers Jafar Khan and Khalilullah Khan.^[6]

Another European traveler Francois Bernier, in his *'Travels in the Mughal Empire'*, wrote, *"The frequent fancy (mina) bazar in the palace, where hundreds of abducted Hindu women were bought and sold and presented with Emperor, the maintenance of a large number of dancing girls (prostitutes) by the state, the presence of hundreds of (castrated) male servants (khojas) in the harem were the objects for the satisfaction of Shah Jahan's lust."*^[6]. Sebastian Manrique, another traveler from Europe, in his *'Travels of Sebastian Manrique'*, wrote that Shah Jahan had illicit relation with the wife of his brother in law Shayesta Khan. He also mentioned that whenever the wife of Jafar Khan was on her trip to the palace, the onlookers used shout, "Shah Jahan's breakfast is going to the palace". In a similar manner, whenever the wife of Khalilullah Khan was seen to move towards the palace, the onlookers used to shout, "Shah Jahan's lunch is going"^[7].

It is well known that Shah Jahan used to have regular sex with his eldest daughter Jahan Ara. To defend himself, Shah Jahan used to say that, it was the privilege of a planter to taste the fruit of the tree he had planted. [7] While commenting on this matter, Francois Bernier wrote, "Begum Sahiba, the elder daughter of Shah Jahan, was very handsome and of lively parts, and passionately beloved by her father. Remour has it that his attachment reached a point which it is difficult to believe, the justification of which rests on the decision of Mullahs or the doctors of Islamic law. According to them, it would have been unique to deny the king the privilege of gathering fruits from the tree he had himself planted." [7] According to Peter Mundy, another European

traveler, Shah Jahan had illicit sexual relation with his younger daughter Chamni Brgum.[7]

From the above mentioned facts it becomes difficult to believe that a passionate love could have developed between Arjumand Banu and the monstrously lecherous Shah Jahan, who used to cohabit with so many married wives, 6000 concubines in his harem, wives of several nobles of his court and above all, who used to have sex with his own daughters. When commenting on this aspect, P N Oak, in his *'Tajmahal: The True Story'* writes, "Stories of Shahjahan's exclusive infatuation for Mumtaz's are concoctions. They have no basis in history nor has any book ever written on their fancied love affairs. Those stories have been invented as an afterthought to make Shahjahan's authorship of the Taj look plausible." [8]

But the propaganda of passionate love between Shah Jahan and his wife Arjumand Banu is so prevailing that even the Nobel Laureate Poet Rabindranath Tagore, in one of his poems, described Taj Mahal as a drop of tears for his beloved and departed wife Arjumand Banu. There is also no doubt that, had Rabindranath been aware of the real character of Shah Jahan, he would never have written that poem. Was Shah Jahan a soft-hearted man?

It has been pointed out earlier that the myth of Shah Jahan's creation of Taj Mahal has provided the wicked historians of India with a golden opportunity to portray Shah Jahan a very kind and soft hearted man, and, in fact, they are profusely utilizing that scope. So, it is necessary to delve into this aspect of Shah Jahan a bit. It has also been mentioned that there are so many incoherent descriptions regarding the duration of construction and number of labours employed for the

construction of the building now called Taj Mahal. According to Jean Baptiste Tavernier, the French traveller, 20,000 workers laboured for 17 years to complete the construction of Taj Mahal and he in his Travels in India writes, "The labour was all forced and very little payment made in cash to the 20,000 workmen, who were said to have employed for 17 years." [9] The Keene's Handbook, in this regard, says, "The labour was forced and little was paid to the workmen in cash, while their allowances of cash was curtailed by the rapacious officials. So great was their distress and so frightful the mortality among them that they must have cursed the memory of Mumtaz and cried out in despair: Have mercy, God, in our distress, So we die too, with the Princess." [10]

Beside that, there are stories like chopping the hands of the workmen so that they might not be able to build another Taj Mahal. Even if these stories are partially true, one is led to conclude that Shah Jahan was nothing but a fearful and brute monster. In this context, the question naturally arises - What construction activities Tavernier had observed? We have seen earlier that the building, now called Taj Mahal, was built by the King Paramardidev of of Bundelkhand, nearly 600 years before the times of Shah Jahan. So, it was not possible for Tavernier to see its construction. It, therefore, leads one to conclude that Tavernier must have seen the minor work undertaken by Shah Jahan to turn the building into a mausoleum and give it an Islamic face. One should also notice that the number of labours, Shah Jahan employed for that minor work, was much less than 20000. However, even this small number of workers was ill treated mercilessly exploited by Shah Jahan.

References:

- [1] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, 312
- [2] V A Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 359.
- [3] P N Oak, *Tajmahal: The True Story*, Published by A Ghosh, p-207
- [4] R. C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, VII, 700.
- [5] www.faithfreedom.org/content/iranian-documentary-mutah-and-prostitution (Iranian documentary on mutah).
- [6] Kanwar Lal, 'The Taj', R K Publishing House, Delhi, p-26
- [7] Kanwar Lal, *ibid*, p-27
- [8] www.faithfreedom.org/content/true-story-taj-mahal (The True Story of Tajmahal)
- [9] As quoted in 'Guide to Taj at Agra, Victoria Press, p-14.
- [10] Keene's 'Handbook for visitors to Agra and its neighbourhood', E.A. Duncan (Editor), Thacker's Handbook of Hindustan, p-154

Part 7C

Was Shah Jahan's reign a "Golden Period" of Indian History?

Shah Jahan, the fifth Mughal Emperor, ruled the Mughal Empire for 30 years (from 1628 until 1658). It has been mentioned earlier that the pseudo-secular and Marxist historians of India are busy projecting his reign as a *golden period of Indian history*, which is big lie. They are saying it not on the basis of the prosperity, wellbeing and livelihood of the *hoi polloi* but to glorify Shah Jahan, like every other Muslim ruler as the standing policy of the politics of Muslim appeasement now going on in India. Furthermore, it is not difficult to understand that one has to import ten lies for establishing one lie. These

despicable creatures called secular historians have fabricated many myths regarding Shah Jahan, like his authorship of Taj Mahal at Agra, Red Fort and Peacock-throne in Delhi, etc. and it is needless to say that they have propagated this myth to make the other myths credible.

But in reality, his reign was far from a golden era and even worse than his ancestors. It is not difficult to conceive that the colossal spending for extremely luxurious and sumptuous living of these rulers and their nobles were provided by the common people, particularly the peasants, through their toil and hard labour. In fact, the money for their luxury used to come from the loot of the riches and treasure of the solvent Hindus and from the loot of agricultural produce of the farmers. So, common sense tells that, more violent was the loot to replenish the huge spending from the exchequer by a more luxurious king. In this context, it should be mentioned that Shah Jahan's luxury was phenomenal and this leads one to conclude that the common people were worst sufferers during his reign.

As a matter of fact, common people, particularly for the Hindus, the entire period of Muslim rule that lasted for nearly for 700 years, was a period of poverty, indignity and peril. They were used to be looted by two means -firstly, by Zizya and other heavy taxes and secondly, by the extortion of the local lords. Above all, there was the fear of extermination at any moment. How perilous was the general condition of the Hindus under the Muslim rulers may be gauged through a dialogue between Sultan Alauddin Khilji and a qazi narrated below. .

One day a Qazi called Mughisuddin visited the court of Sultan Alauddin Khilji and his court chronicler Ziauddin Barni, to describe the incident in his *Tarikh-i-Firozshahi*, writes, "The Sultan asked the qazi, 'How are Hindus designated in the (Islamic) law, as payers of tribute (Kharaj-gauzar) or giver of tribute (Kharaj-dih)?' The qazi replied, 'They are called payers of tribute and when the revenue officer demands silver from them, they should, without question and with all humility and respect, tender gold. If the officer throws dirt into their mouths, they must without reluctance open their mouths wide to receive it. By doing so, they show their respect for the officer. The due subordination of the Zimmi (tribute payer) is exhibited in this humble payment and by this throwing of dirt in their mouths. The glorification of Islam is a duty. ... Allah holds them in contempt, for He says, 'Keep them in subjection'. To keep the Hindus in abasement is especially a religious duty because they are the most inveterate enemies of the Prophet and because the Prophet has commanded us to slay them, plunder them and make them captive, saying, 'Convert them to Islam or kill them, enslave them and spoil their wealth and property. No doctor but the great doctor (Hanifa), to whose school we belong, has asserted to the imposition of the *jezya* (poll tax) on Hindus. Doctors of other schools allow no other alternative but 'death or Islam'." [1]

While commenting on the wretched condition of the Hindus during the Muslim rule, Swami Vivekananda once observed, "When the Muslims first came to India, there were, according to their historical records, sixty crores (600 million) of Hindus in India. This calculation suffers rather from underestimation than exaggeration; for lots of people perished solely through the persecution of the Muslims. Therefore it is obvious that the number of the Hindus was even more than sixty crores. But today the same Hindus have dwindled into twenty crores (200 million)." [2]

While commenting on this matter, historian Ashirvadilal Srivastav writes, "*The masses and inferior artisans were, on the other hand, poor, but they did not starve except in times of drought and scarcity.*" [3] In the above quotation, one should read famine instead of drought and scarcity. In fact, the entire Muslim period of Indian history is blackened by regular occurrence of famines when millions of poor peasants, mostly Hindus, were starved to death and the rulers used to do nothing for preventing it or to save the victims with relief. In many occasions, a famine lasted for several years. It should be pointed out here that starvation and death of the Hindus was, in fact, a good news for these rulers because extermination of the Hindus, either by a natural calamity, or by a famine, or by the tongue of the sword, or by any other means was beneficial for Islam.

In this context, another incident may be cited, narrated by the historian R C Majumdar. It is well known that Man Singh was an ally of the Mughal emperor Akbar and hence his Rajput army used to fight with the Mughal army against the Hindu Kings. The incident happened in 1576, in the battle field of Haldighat and, "*Badauni (a Mughal General) who could not distinguish the friendly from the enemy Rajputs shot arrows indiscriminately for, as Asaf Khan (another Mughal General) remarked – on whichever side they may be killed, it will be a gain of Islam.*" [4] The reader should recall that the US Army Major Malik Nedal Hasan, driven by the same Islamic psyche, gunned down 12 and wounded 30 of his fellow comrades at Fort Hood on Nov 5, this year. According the media report, he cried Allahu-Akbar during the shooting spree. [5] There is nothing surprising in it because this is the true Islamic mentality while dealing with non-Muslim infidels.

However, famines were of frequent occurrence throughout the entire Mughal period. There were 5 famines in between 1573 and 1595, and that of 1595 continued for 3 consecutive years. As many as 13 famines occurred in between 1614 and 1660 and one should note that most of these famines occurred during the tenure of Shah Jahan, who ruled from 1628 to 1658 AD. [3] The famine that took place in 1630-31, that is, in the very year Arjumand Banu died, was most gruesome and horrible. It was spread over the entire Deccan and Gujarat. While commenting over this severe famine, Molla Abdul Hamid Lahori, in his *Badshahnama*, writes "*The inhabitants of these two counties (i.e. Deccan and Gujarat) were reduced to direst extremity. Life was offered for a loaf, but none would buy; rank was to be sold for a cake, but none cared for it. ... For a long time dog's flesh was sold for goat's flesh and the pounded bones of the dead were mixed with flour and sold. ... Destitution at length reached such a pitch that men began to devour each other and the flesh of a son was preferred to his love.*" [6]

So it is not difficult to understand, what kind of golden era was the reign of Shah Jahan. While commenting on it, historian Ashirvadilal Shrivastav writes, "*In spite of recurring famines, the Mughal Government did not take adequate steps to provide relief.*" [3] The so-called pseudo-secular and Marxist historians try to project that "devastation of warfare and failure of annual rains" were the causes of famines. The reader should give a deep thought over the comment and try to find the true connection between devastation of war and famine. A war or military confrontation takes place between two armies and the military personnel fall victim of a 'devastation of warfare' and not the peasantry. So, how it comes that such military warfare

produced famines! Hence we have to delve into the matter a bit.

During the Muslim period, military confrontations used to take place between the Hindu and Muslim forces. Whenever the Muslims could win a victory, they used to massacre not only prisoners of war but also the innocent Hindus, including the peasantry, according to the kafir-killing instructions laid down by Allah. So, after such warfare and the massacre of the peasants that followed, there remained none to till the land and raise the crop. Vast stretches of land remained uncultivated and famine followed. A few examples are presented below to help the reader understand the horridness of these incidents.

In 1194 AD, Mohammad Ghori launched a military campaign against Raja Jaichand of Benaras. On their way to Benaras, they occupied the fortress at Kill and to describe the incident, Hassan Nizami in his *Taj-ul-masir* writes, *“By the edge of the sword they (more than 50,000 Hindus) were despatched to the fire of Hell. Three bastions were raised, as high as heaven, with their (slain) heads and their carcasses became the food of the beasts of prey. They destroyed nearly one thousand temples and raised mosques on their foundations”*. [7]

In 1196 AD., Kutubuddin Aibak invaded the fort at Gwalior. To describe the incident, Minhaz-us-Siraj in his *Tabakat-I-Nasiri* writes, *“In compliance with the divine (i.e. Koranic) injunction of holy war (jihad), they drew out their blood-thirsty swords before the enemies of religion (i.e. Hindus)”*. [8] To describe the same incident, Hassan Nizami in his *Taj-ul-masir* writes, *“The army of Islam was completely victorious and one lacks Hindus were swiftly despatched to the hell of fire. ... He (Kutubuddin) destroyed*

the pillars and foundations of idol temples and built their stead mosques, colleges and precepts of Islam". [9]

In 1197, Kutubuddin invaded the fort at Naharwala in Gujrat. On the way a battle was fought with the king Karan Singh. Describing the incident, Minhaj-us-Siraj in his *Tabakat-I-Nasiri* writes, "*Nearly fifty thousand infidels (Hindus) were dispatched to the hell by the sword and from the heaps of the slain, hills and the plain became one level*". [10] Regarding the capture of the Kalinjar Fort by Kutubuddin in 1202, Minhaz writes, "*... fifty thousand men came under the collar of slavery and the plain became as black as pitch with the blood of Hindus*". [11]

In 1360 AD., Firoz Shah Tughlaq invaded Orissa and desecrated the temple of Lord Jagannath and threw the idol in the Bay of Bengal. On his return journey, when he was passing through Jajnagar (the then capital of Orissa), it was brought to his knowledge that nearly 120,000 Hindus had taken shelter at an offshore island. Firoz Shah then went to that island with his men and butchered those 120,000 Hindus on a single day.

Ulugh Khan (later on Sultan Ghiasuddin Balban), when he was serving sultan Nassiruddin (brother of Sultana Rizia) as a commander, went to the Gahrwal and promised his men that he would reward them with one rupee for bringing the head of a slain Hindu and two rupees for bringing a Hindu alive. Like hungry dogs his army set out for the hunt of kafir Hindus. The massacre went on for three long weeks and several hundreds of thousands of Hindus were slain. Ulugh Khan then raised three high-rise bastions with the heads of the slain Hindus.

It has been mentioned earlier that, when Maharana Sangram Singh was defeated in the battle of

Khanau, Babar ordered general massacre, and his chief commander Mohammadi and other commanders massacred 100000 Rajput prisoners of war and another 1,00,000 civilian Hindus. It has also been mentioned how Akbar massacred Hindu warriors and peasants after capturing the Chitor Fort. As a matter of fact, such killings of Hindus went on unabated during the entire period of Muslim rule that lasted for about 700 years. Perhaps the reader has come to comprehend why famines followed military devastations or warfare.

When the Muslim invaders came to India, our Hindu rulers took into account their military might alone. To fight this new enemy they followed the same strategy their ancestors used to follow—the eternal rules and traditions handed down to them from the days of Mahabharata, and they failed to discover the element of jihad, the kafir killing motives of these barbaric new invaders. Being guided by their age old civilized tradition that the prisoners of war were to be set free and not to be harmed, Hindu kings after winning a victory over the Muslim army, used to set the soldiers free. But on the contrary, victorious Muslim rulers, being guided by their kafir killing doctrine of jihad, used to massacre the entire regiment of Hindu prisoners of war as well as the innocent civilians.

While commenting on the general condition of the common Hindus under the Muslim rule, historian R C Majumdar writes, *“So far as the Hindus were concerned, there was no improvement either in their material and moral conditions or in their relations with Muslims.”* [12] So, it becomes evident that, what kind of distorted history is being taught in the educational institutions of today's India. While commenting on this pre-planned and

politically motivated distortion of Indian history, historian R C Majumdar writes, *"It is very sad that the spirit of perverting history to suit political views is no longer confined to the politicians, but has definitely spread even among the professional historians. ... A history written under the auspices of the Indian National Congress sought to repudiate the charge that the Muslim rulers broke Hindu temples, and they were the most tolerant in matters of religion."* [13]

To explain how this trend had originated and gained momentum, he writes, *"But the climax was reached by politician-cum historian Lala Lajpat Rai, when he asserted that the Hindus and Muslims have coalesced into an Indian people very much in the same way as Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Danes and Normans formed the English people of today. His further assertion that, 'The Muslim rule in India was not a foreign rule' has become the off-repeated slogan of a certain political party."* [13] It is really strange that some Hindu leaders of today are uttering the same words, what Lajpat Rai said nearly a century ago. There is no doubt that only the people, who are ignorant of Islam, can say like this.

It is well known that Aurangzeb was the most violent temple breaker among all the Muslim rulers of Delhi. But the so-called secular historians say that the temple breaking enterprise of Aurangzeb is a disputed matter. While commenting over this, historian R C Majumdar writes, *"If temple breaking policy of Aurangzeb is a disputed point, is there a single fact in the whole recorded history of mankind which may be taken as undisputed?"* [13]

References:

[1] H.M. Elliot & J. Dowson, *'History of India As Told by It's Own Historians'*, Low Price Publication, Delhi (in 8 Vols), III, 184

[2] *Rules and Regulations of the Ramakrishna Math*, (1897-98), Plan of work for India, Item-1

[3] R.C. Majumdar (Gen Ed), *History & Culture of the Indian People* (in 12 Volumes), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, 735

[4] R.C. Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, 132.

[5] <http://abcnews.go.com/WN/fort-hood-shooting-army-doctor-leaves-12-dead/story?id=9007938>

[6] H. M. Elliot & J. Dowson, *ibid*, VII, 24.

[7] H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 224.

[8] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 227.

[9] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 215.

[10] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 230.

[11] H.M. Elliot and J. Dowson, *ibid*, II, 231.

[12] R.C. Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, xi

[13] R.C. Majumdar, *ibid*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai (1996), VII, xii-xiii